

THE IMAGE OF THE IDEAL HUSBAND IN THIRTEENTH CENTURY FRANCE*

by
Nicole BERIOU and David L. D'AVRAY

Wedding and marriage imagery is common in the Bible, from the prophetic and sapiential books to the book of Revelation : hence its importance in medieval clerical literature. As a theme for meditation it seems to have appealed to the imagination of twelfth century monks, and especially of Cistercians, fascinated as they were by the *Canticle of Canticles*¹. In the thirteenth century the symbolic richness of the theme ensured that it would play a part in the effort of preachers to diffuse Christian ideas and images more widely, which marked a new stage in the Christianisation of Europe.

Thus for instance in the collection of alphabetical *Distinctiones*² of Maurice de Provins and Nicolas de Biard we find substantial developments under the heading of *Nuptie* (see Appendix, texts 1 and 2). Nicolas de Biard constructs his *distinctio* coherently around the three kinds of possible partners : the World, the Devil, and God. Maurice, for its part, veers between *nuptie* as a metaphor, and the institution of marriage and weddings in the literal sense. All the same the two writers agree in their overall interpretation. Neglecting the symbolism of the union between Christ and the Church, they

* The authors would like to acknowledge a pervasive obligation to Louis-Jacques Bataillon.

1. See J. LECLERCQ, *Le mariage vu par les moines au XII^e siècle*, Paris, 1983, especially ch. 7 ; and ID., *Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France*, Oxford, 1979.

2. *Distinctiones* were one of the most important genres of tools for preachers. See especially R.H. and M.A. ROUSE, "Biblical Distinctions in the Thirteenth Century", in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, 49^e année, t. 41, 1974 (1975), p. 27-37 ; L.-J. BATAILLON, "Les instruments de travail des prédicateurs au XIII^e siècle", in G. HASENOHR et J. LONGERE (ed.), *Culture et travail intellectuel dans l'Occident médiéval*, Paris, 1981, p. 197-209 ; ID., "Intermédiaires entre les traités de morale pratique et les sermons : les *Distinctiones* bibliques alphabétiques", in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales*, Actes du Colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve (1981), Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982 (Université Catholique de Louvain, Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales, 2^e série : Textes, Études, Congrès, vol. 5), p. 213-226.

both offer scriptural materials which would enable preachers to deal with the personal union of the soul and God³.

In preaching on John 2, 1 : *Nuptie facte sunt*, this theme of the marriage of Christ and the soul is indeed very frequent. It gave preachers an opportunity to sketch the soul as ideal wife. One describes her as just and discreet in herself, merciful and of good cheer with the household and friends of her husband, and faithful to him in all things⁴. She is pure, loving, faithful, attentive, and firm when tried, says another⁵. And the bishop of Paris, Guillaume d'Auvergne († 1249), tells us that she does not deceive her husband, that she brings up her children well, looks after the patrimony, and does not abandon her husband under the pretext that he is poor or sick⁶.

3. Here it is worth noting the variety of interpretations in commentaries on the Bible. In an interpretation by Augustine of the marriage feast of Cana the Hypostatic Union is mentioned : *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, Tract. VIII, 4 (ed. R. WILLEMS, CCSL, 36, Turnhout, 1954, p. 83-84 ; there is a brief echo in the *Glossa Ordinaria*, ed. Venise, 1588, t. V, fol. 192^{ra}). In the gloss on *Hosea* 2, 19 (*ibid.*, t. IV, fol. 333^r) the emphasis is on the union between Christ and the Church, contrasted with the unfaithful synagogue ; cf. also for example Bernard, Sermon 67 on the Canticle of Canticles, (in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. LECLERCQ, C.H. TALBOT and H. M. ROCHAIS, t. II, Rome, 1958, p. 195-196). Hugh of St. Cher, in his interpretation of the marriage feast of Cana (*moraliter*) distinguishes the marriage between God and human nature, between Christ and the Church, between God and the soul, and between Christ and *vir religiosus* (Venise, 1703, edition of his commentary, vol. VI, fol. 290^r-290^v). One finds the first two elements of this distinction in the *Distinctiones* of Nicolas de Biard, under the rubric *Sponsauit nos Christus* (Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 16487, fol. 250^{ra}).

4. Anonymous sermon on the text *Nuptie facte sunt*, ms Paris, Bibl. nat., lat. 14956, fol. 158^r, lat. 13581, fol. 9^r, and Paris, Sainte-Geneviève, 2788, fol. 25^r : *Notandum quod in premissa auctoritate notantur tria que sunt cuilibet necessaria ad hoc ut placeat uiro suo, sic et tu si uis placere Christo : primo ut sit iusta et discreta per discretionem (refrenationem in lat. 13581) illicitorum et punitionem (preuaricationem in lat. 13581) uitiorum (...) ecce primum quoad se ; secundum ut sit misericors et leta quo ad familiam et amicos sponsi (...) ; tertium ut sit fidelis in omnibus quo ad sponsum (...).*

5. *Quinque igitur puellae necessarie sponse sunt mundicia mentis et cordis (...), dilectio et amor uiri super omnes alios (...), fidelitas ut numquam admittat adulterium (...), cura et sollicitudo familie sponsi (...), constans perseuerancia ut nulla aduersitate deserat Christum uirum suum* (anonymous, Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15959, fol. 258^{rb} ; cf. J.-B. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium der Lateinischen sermone des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150-1350*, Münster, 1969-1979, t. V, p. 237, n° 226 : now cit. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium*).

6. *Item matrimonium liber est noster in quo possumus et debemus legere qualiter erga Dominum nos habere debemus. Sicut enim mulier a nullo alio concipere debet nisi a uiro, aliter si ab adultero concipiat digna est lapidatione ut erat in ueteri lege, ita christiana non debet concipere nisi a Deo quam desponsauit in baptismo. Similiter et liberos, id est bonas cogitationes, debet nutrire et educare et huiusmodi (...); item mulier debet fideliter custodire et sollicite ea que uir eius affert in domo et acquirit (...); item seruire legem matrimonii ut ipsum sanum, infirmum et pauperem et huiusmodi seruet et custodiat* (Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15959, fol. 248^{ra} ; cf. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium*, t. V, p. 236, n° 216).

These passages do not, however, attract the historians' attention so strongly as does a passage in which Robert de Sorbon sets out the qualities of the ideal husband. This passage is more interesting not because the emphasis is on the male partner in the image, but for other reasons which we will try to elucidate. Since they make little sense without a close knowledge of Robert's extended analogy, it is worth translating the passage in full (for a transcription see Appendix, text 3).

1(a). Therefore in the marriage of the faithful soul to Christ we should consider those six things which we said above, namely : what the marriage is, who the bridegroom is, and who the bride, what the impediments to the marriage are, etc. Firstly, what the marriage is, who the bridegroom is, and who the bride is ? The marriage < or wedding > is the spiritual one of every faithful soul to the son of God, Jesus-Christ. The bridegroom is Christ, the bride, the holy and faithful soul. And it should be known that a woman who wants to get married will normally look for six or seven things in that husband which a faithful soul ought to look for in Christ.

(b). Firstly, that the husband be good to look at. Friend, if you want to marry your soul, it must marry God or the devil. But is not Jesus-Christ good to look at ? Yes, for the holy soul says in the Cantic of Canticles (5, 10) : "*My beloved, that is, 'mos maritz' [my husband], is white and red, that is, 'trop be coloratz' [high-complexioned], chosen from thousands.* Then (Cant. 1, 15) : "*Behold, thou art beautiful, my beloved.* Psalm (44, 3, Vulgate numbering) : "*Beautiful in form [fol. 148^{ra}] above the sons of men.* Peter (I Peter 1, 12) : "*He whom angels long to behold.* Bernard : "*Inestimable grace, O soul, that you should be found worthy to be the bride of him whom the angels long to behold.* Whence has it come to you that your husband should be one at whose beauty the sun and the moon marvel ?" — But many marry their soul to the devil, whose foulness all the masters in the world could not describe. Therefore however beautiful the soul may be beforehand, after it has taken the devil as a husband it is most foul. Lamentations (4, 8) : "*She is blackened with coals.*

2. But it is not enough for a woman that he be good to look at, because if he is feeble he would be called 'so es us bons malvatz' [a real wimp]. Therefore the second thing she looks for is that he be strong (*fortis*) 'e poichans' [and powerful]. But that is what the son of God is like, Ps. (23, 8) : "*The Lord is brave and powerful.* The Apostle says (Hebrews 1, 3) : "*Carrying all things by the word of his might.* But the devil is so weak that one weak and poor woman puts him to flight, by her prayer, that is, and strikes him down. Therefore Augustine says : "*Prayer is a scourge to demons, a succour to the one who prays, a sacrifice to God.*" And so the demon <said> : "*Bartholomew, servant of God, your prayers are consuming me with fire.*" Yet there are many who put on a big show of bravery, and carry a lance and sword, etc., whom he drags 'a melhiers' [by the thousand] to hell. Yet one little woman puts him to flight. Gregory <the Great says> : "*It is a weak enemy who cannot conquer anyone who does not want to be conquered.*" A fly or a flea afflicts a man whether he likes it or not, but the devil cannot do so unless the man is willing. The devil is therefore weaker than a flea. But it would be a shameful thing for a man if one flea were to drag him by a cord to the gallows. More shameful, therefore,

when the devil drags man to the gallows of hell. He is weak, therefore, and so he makes his bride, the soul, weak, so that she cannot keep herself upright. Lamentations (1, 8) : *Jerusalem sinned a sin, and therefore she was made to totter*. It is no wonder, because her feet have gone rotten, that is to say, her feelings and thoughts (*affectiones*). But when the soul is married to God, she is so strong that the whole world could not conquer her, as is clear from the instance of blessed Agnes. But the soul who is married to the devil is 'paurucha' [jumpy], like a hare which is under a tree and which flees when it hears the sound of branches and of the leaves of the tree. Therefore the sound of a leaf floating through the air (*uolantis*) will terrify them, that is, words of derision.

3. It is not, however, enough that he should be good to look at and strong, because we see many such men, and yet men with these good qualities seldom get themselves married (?- *non multum boni coniugant se*). Thirdly, therefore, she looks for someone who is rich. The Son of God fits this description. (Psalm 11, 3) : *Glory and riches in his house*. The same authority (Psalm 23, 1) says : *The Lord's is the land* etc. Isaiah (64, 4) and St. Paul (I Cor. 2, 9) : *The eye has not seen, nor has the ear heard ... what God has prepared for those who love him*. But the devil is so poor that he does not have 'lo valen d'una mealha' [the value of a halfpenny]. If you marry your soul to him, he will lead her to his land, that is, to hell, where there is such dearth that a drop of water cannot be had for the whole world. Therefore the rich feaster asked for a drop of water for more than a thousand years, not in a goblet but on the finger of a leper, that is, of Lazarus, not yet did he have it, nor might he have it, not for a thousand worlds. In his land there is no grain and no wine, and therefore he robs the soul he has married of what she has, and she is poor, however rich she was before. Lamentations (1, 10) : *They sent the hand of the enemy to everything of hers that was desirable*.

4. Fourthly, the three things listed above are not enough unless he is noble, that is, 'd'aut parage' [of a noble line]. Christ fits this description : on his mother's side, from a race of many kings — Matthew : 14 generations. On his father's side he is so 'gentils' [noble] that it is beyond telling. Isaiah (53, 8) : *His birth is beyond our knowing*. Apoc. (19, 16) : *King of kings*. Proverbs (31, 23) : *Her husband is noble at the gates*. Psalm (82, 19) : *Thou alone art the most high in all the land*. But the devil [fol. 148^{rb}] is of such low condition 'so es us forbanitz' [that he is an outlaw].

5. Fifthly, she looks for someone who is generous. Christ is such a man. James (1, 5) : *He gives copiously to all*. Matthew (John 16, 24 ; cf Matth. 7, 7 ; Mark 11, 24) : *Ask and you shall receive*. He gave everything. Psalm (8, 8) : *You have thrown everything down* (*Omnia subiecisti*). And finally, he gave himself on the cross. Therefore his hands have holes in them, as is said of the generous man. But the devil is a thief, who steals everything he can. - But a woman will say : "I don't want my husband to be too generous, sir, because he may give away everything and we may become poor". But see that Christ can give away everything and cannot be poor. The proof : If someone could make something from nothing, he could not be poor, even though he were to give away everything. That is how Christ is, he who made everything from nothing.

6. Sixthly, a woman looks for someone who is not a bad man, that is, 'felos' [evil-tempered], who might beat his wife. But he <Christ> is a peacemaker (*pacificus*). *Learn from me because I am gentle* (Matthew 11, 29). St Paul (Titus 3, 4) : *The kindness ... was revealed* (*aparuit benignitas*). But the

devil on the other hand is cruel, and will not have mercy. Gregory : "It is a bad thing to serve an odious man who is not placated by any obedience".

7. Seventhly, she looks for someone who is wise, because, if he were stupid, all would be lost. Christ is such a one, because *all the treasures of wisdom are in him* (Col. 2, 3). But the devil is so stupid that he does harm (*dampnum facit*) to himself by making men sin. His wife, that is the soul of the sinner, does the same, when she has given a bad example to others : even though she is in hell, still her punishment increases all the time as other people sin in the world because of her bad example. Therefore Augustine says that the punishment of Arius is not yet settled.

8. Eighthly, the young lady will say : "Sir, even though he may have all these things, perhaps he will die tomorrow, and I will lose everything". Therefore, eighthly, she would if it were possible look for a husband who would live forever. The description fits Christ. *Christ rising from the dead does not die* (Romans 6, 9). The devil has this alone among all the things we have said : that he will never die. But this makes it worse. When a woman has a bad husband she greatly longs for his death, and it would please her greatly if he were to die rather than live. So too would the soul married to the devil want this same thing, but (Apocalypse 9, 6) : *They will desire death and it will flee from them*.

This, or something very much like it, is what a Paris congregation heard on 16 January 1261. It is a part of a sermon on the text *Nuptie facte sunt* (John 2, 1), for the second Sunday after Epiphany⁷. The sermon is initially divided into seven parts⁸, in the first of which different senses of marriage are alluded to⁹, but on that Sunday the main theme was to be the marriage of the soul with Christ or the devil. One of the main vehicles used here to expound this topic is a list of the canonical impediments to marriage, the rules of Canon Law being transformed by analogy into discussion

7. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium*, t. V, p. 225, n° 14. On this genre of sermons see D. D'AVRAY, "The Gospel of the Marriage Feast of Cana and Marriage Preaching in France", in *The Bible in the Medieval World*. Essays in memory of B. Smalley, ed. by K. WALSH and D. WOOD, Oxford, 1985 (Studies in Church History, Subsidia 4), p. 207-224.

8. *Vbi septem possumus respicere : primo que nuptie, quis sponsus, que sponsa ; secundo que impediunt nuptias istas ; tertio quando fuerunt facte, quia tertia die, unde immediate ante hoc euangelium dicitur tertia die ; quarto ubi, quia in Cana Galilee ; quinto quod Deus mutauit ibi aquam in uinum ; sexto quod ibi erat Maria, mater Iesu, sed Iesus et eius discipuli fuerunt uocati* (Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15971, fol. 147^{vb}). The execution of this plan is continued in the *collatio* which follows (fol. 148^{vb}, l. 9 - fol. 149^{va}), in which the second part is continued at length and a brief third section added. Then we find the words *De aliis nichil dixit, sed dic forte sic* (fol. 149^{va}), after which Peter seems to have added three more brief parts himself (*ibid.*).

9. *De primo sciendum quod est matrimonium carnale ... Secundo est matrimonium spirituale multis modis. Primum est Christi ad humanam naturam ... Secundum est Christi ad ecclesiam ... Tertium est cuiuslibet prelati ad ecclesiam suam ... Quartum est anime fidelis ad Christum ... Quintum est cuiusque anime peccatricis cum dyabolo ...* (ms cit., fol. 147^{vb}).

of obstacles to union with Christ. The other main vehicle is the passage on the ideal husband, our principal concern here.

The preacher was Robert de Sorbon, whose memory has been perpetuated as the founder of the Sorbonne and by the stories about him in Joinville's *Vie de saint Louis*¹⁰. His words on that day were written up from notes in the rather difficult hand of Pierre de Limoges, who made a series of "*reportationes*" of sermons preached in the year 1260-1261¹¹. Robert has left a body of pastoral and spiritual writings which can only be described as engaging : one has the sense of an unusually attractive intellectual personality. There is something of this quality in the passage we have translated, but that alone does not account for the sense that it has something to tell historians if they will ask the right questions.

The most obvious question to which it might seem to give an answer is : what were the qualities of an ideal husband according to the value system of the thirteenth century ? The objection that the passage represents only one man's view is not necessarily valid, even apart from the fact that echoes of the passage can be picked up from other manuscripts of thirteenth century Paris sermons. There is something to be said for Mark Pattison's view that preachers cannot stray too far from the assumptions of their listeners¹², and

10. See P. GLORIEUX, *Aux origines de la Sorbonne. I : Robert de Sorbon, l'homme, le collège, les documents*, Paris, 1966 ; N. BÉRIOU, "Robert de Sorbon", in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, t. 13, Paris, 1988, col. 816-824 ; also JOINVILLE, *Histoire de saint Louis*, ed. (in modernised French) by M. NATALIS DE WAILLY, Paris, 1865, p. 14-16.

11. The date has been calculated by P. GLORIEUX, *op. cit.*, p. 48. On Pierre de Limoges, see B. HAUREAU, in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. 26, 1873, p. 460-466 ; P. GLORIEUX, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1933, t. I, p. 365-366 ; N. BÉRIOU, "Pierre de Limoges et la fin des temps", in *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Age - Temps Modernes*, t. 98-1, 1986, p. 65-107, especially p. 68, note 12 (bibliography). On the technique of '*reportatio*', B. SMALLEY, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed., Notre-Dame, Indiana, 1978, p. 200-208 ; J. HAMESSE, "'Reportatio' et transmission de textes", in M. ASZTALOS, ed., *The Editing of Theological and Philosophical Texts from the Middle Ages*, Stockholm, 1986 (*Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis*, *Studia latina Stockholmiensia*, 30), p. 11-34 ; "Acts of the Symposium of Florence *Del Pulpito alla Navata*, 1986, in memory of Z. Zafarana", in *Medioevo e Rinascimento*, t. 3, 1989. For other examples of *reportationes* in a manuscript belonging to Pierre de Limoges, see N. BÉRIOU, "La prédication au béguinage de Paris pendant l'année liturgique 1272-1273", in *Recherches Augustiniennes*, t. 13, 1978, p. 105-229, especially p. 111-116 ; ID., *La prédication de Ranulphe de la Houblonnière. Sermons aux clercs et aux simples gens à Paris au XIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1987, vol. I, p. 59 sq.

12. "The preachers of any period ... are as necessarily bound to the preconceived notions, as to the language, of those whom they have to exhort. The pulpit does not mould the forms into which religious thought in any age runs, it simply accommodates itself to those that exist. For this very reason, because they must follow and cannot lead, sermons are the surest index of the prevailing religious feeling of their age",

one would expect a competent preacher to argue from analogies to which his public would give a ready assent.

It is true that we do not know for certain what the audience was on this occasion, and that an audience of academics cannot be ruled out¹³. Even if that were so, however, one might argue that the sermon would tell us what an intelligent observer believed to be the qualities sought for in a husband : he should be good looking, strong, wealthy, noble, generous, kind, and wise.

The ideas and the imagery are echoed in a striking manner by a sermon of Adam le Picard, or "de la Vacherie" (see Appendix, text 4)¹⁴. This sermon, also for the second Sunday after Epiphany, the Sunday when the Gospel of the marriage feast of Cana was read, was delivered before the University on the 19th of January, 1282. Robert's sermon was apparently his model. Adam's list of the qualities of a husband is substantially the same, except that he

M. PATTISON, "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750", in *Essays and Reviews* (no editor), London, 1860, p. 276.

13. In the absence of a specific rubric it is best to be wary of categorical assertion about the audience of a given sermon. The fact that the sermon is continued by a *collatio* (given in the evening of the same day) might in itself suggest a formal university context : cf. D. D'AVRAY, « 'Collectiones fratrum' and 'collationes fratrum' », in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, t. 70, 1977, p. 152-156, at p. 155. On the other hand official university sermons would be preached in Latin, whereas Pierre de Limoges inserts French words and sentences in the Latin text of his 'reportatio'. Furthermore, the rubrics of some sermons in this series specify that they were given in Latin, which may indicate that the other sermons (including the one under discussion) were delivered in the vernacular. A further complication is that the fragments of vernacular are in Pierre's own Limousin dialect, which was quite different from the French of Robert de Sorbon. Perhaps the most probable provisional hypothesis is that Robert preached the sermon in the vernacular, either to a university audience on an unofficial occasion, or to an audience including laypeople.

14. The sermon is contained in two manuscripts, Paris, Bibl. nat., lat. 14947 (fol. 209^{rb}-210^{rb}) and 15005 (fol. 112^{va}-113^{rb}), which are both witnesses to sermons preached before the University of Paris in 1282-1283 ; they include the only four sermons by this Adam 'Picardus' which are known. This master was mistakenly identified as a Dominican by U. Chevalier (*Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age. Bio-bibliographie*, t. I, Paris, 1905, col. 39) and by J.-B. Schneyer (*Repertorium*, I, p. 48). P. Glorieux (*Répertoire des maîtres en théologie à Paris au XIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1933, I, n° 195) suggests he is the same as Adam de Gulyn, who is twice cited in H. DENIFLE and A. CHATELAIN, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, I, Paris, 1889, p. 595 and 597, under the year 1282. Adam de Gulyn, however, is a Scot, the archdeacon of Lothian rather than of Laon (*Laudonensis*) : see on this point G.W.S. BARROW, "A Scottish master at Paris : Master Adam de Gulyne", in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, t. 17, 1950, p. 126-127. There is no reason to identify him with our master Adam, who must have belonged to the Picard nation of the university, and who may have come from Vacquerie-le-Boucq (Pas-de-Calais, arr. Arras, cant. Auxi-le-Château), the earliest mention of which dates from the end of the eleventh century (comte Auguste MENCHE DE LOISNE, *Dictionnaire topographique du département du Pas-de-Calais*, Paris, 1907, p. 376).

has nothing to say about liberality and immortality. It is evident that he is trying to compress the material with which Robert's sermon had provided him into a smaller compass (a single sermon instead of a sermon and a collation). Unlike Robert, Adam seems not to have striven for the light touch. One misses the remarks that Robert had put into the mouth of the imaginary girl : "I don't want my husband to be *too* generous, sir..." ; "Sir, even though he may have all these things, perhaps he will die tomorrow, and I will lose everything". Lacking Robert's flair for the memorable phrase, Adam works his way through the points, indicating the coincidence of interest with moral duty, and reiterating like a leitmotiv the phrase *debemus nubere*. Though it suffers from comparison with Robert's version, Adam's is effective enough in itself.

In the lower margin of one of the copies of Adam's sermon (Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 14947, fol. 209^r), an anonymous reader of the manuscript has added, in his turn, another (closely related) variation on the theme of *Christus sponsus*, following the verses of Hebrews ch. 1 (see Appendix, text 5). Thus Christ is a fluent speaker and good advocate, very rich, very wise, very beautiful, very powerful, very noble, and eternal. It is only theoretically possible, and very unlikely, that this version is independent of the line of descent from Robert. It is even conceivable that Robert himself was responsible for this re-working of the idea. Interestingly enough, almost the same commentary as in the marginal addition to lat. 14947 turns up in one of the manuscripts which Robert of Sorbon left to his college in 1274 in a sermon of "Guillaume" de Mailly on the text *Nuptie facte sunt* (see Appendix, text 6), so presumably Robert knew this version even if it was not his own work¹⁵.

We find yet another version of the idea in Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 16482¹⁶, on fol. 101^{vb}-102^{rb} (see Appendix, text 7). It is closely related to and quite probably descended from the text of Robert, which was our starting point. The last few lines of it, however, are an application of the schema to the chapter 1 of the letter to the Hebrews, as in the two abbreviated versions of the idea which we have just considered¹⁷. It seems clear that all these texts are closely

15. Paris Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15959, fol. 264^{vb} ; cf. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium*, t. II, p. 484, n° 17. On the author, who must now be called Gérard de Mailly, see L.-J. BATAILLON and N. BÉRIOU, « 'G. de Mailly', de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs », in *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* (forthcoming).

16. In this manuscript belonging to Pierre de Limoges, many extracts of Paris sermons, which were preached in or about 1272-1273, are classified under rubrics in an alphabetical order (cf. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium*, IV, p. 694-700), to form a tool for preachers. For a description of this manuscript, see N. BÉRIOU, *La prédication de Ranulphe de la Houblonnière*, op. cit., vol. I, p. 166-167.

17. Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 14947, fol. 209^r, lower margin, and 15959, fol. 264^{vb}.

related with one another. Their precise relationship is not especially important for our present purpose, the salient point being that the passage of Robert with which we started is not isolated, but belongs to a group, which probably depends on it.

A special problem is posed by a Middle English text called *The Wooing of our Lord*¹⁸. The list of qualities is almost the same as Robert's¹⁹, but seems to be earlier. Robert is not likely to have used a work in Middle English, so the most probable hypothesis is that of a common source. It may be confidently hoped that this will come to light sooner or later (and indeed that some reader of this article may be able to identify it) though the discovery should not substantially affect our conclusion.

Parts at least of the general pattern, however, exist in versions whose relationship to Robert, though real, were more remote. In the *Distinctiones* of Nicolas de Biard²⁰, under the rubric *Sponsi Christi amissio lugenda est*, five qualities are attributed to Christ, husband of the soul: he is *dives*, *pulcher*, *sapiens*, *benignus uxori*, and *nobilis*²¹. Moreover the Franciscan John of Wales²², in his postill on St. John's Gospel, lists the qualities of the *sponsus* as *genus*, *virtus*, *sapientia* and *pulchritudo* — and the qualities of a *sponsa* as *genus*, *pulchritudo*, *diuitie et mores*²³, when developing a remark about God's goodness in deigning to be the *sponsus* of the Church or the holy soul. Moreover John names a source, Papias. The latter's *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum*, composed towards the middle of the eleventh century, does indeed contain this

18. Our attention was drawn to this by Mrs Marie Denley, who therefore deserves the whole credit for discovering what we regard as an important connection. The text has been re-edited recently by N.F. BLAKE, *Middle English Religious Prose*, London, 1972. We have used (for convenience) the translation facing the edition in R. MORRIS, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises*, London, 1868 (Early English Text Society old series, 34), p. 268-287 (especially p. 268-274).

19. In the introductory list (see R. MORRIS, p. 268-269) it might appear that "virtue, politeness and faultless manners" are a separate item, but these qualities seem to be grouped under the category of birth and nurture in the detailed execution of the scheme (p. 272-273) and in the summing up of it (p. 274-275). However, the last item on the list in 'The Wooing', natural kinship or affinity, is not the same as Robert's eight quality (see below p. 120).

20. On Nicolas see for example R.H. and M.A. ROUSE, "Biblical Distinctions" and L.-J. BATAILLON, "Les instruments de travail", *op. cit.* note 2; and D. D'AVRAY, *The Preaching of the Friars: sermons diffused from Paris before 1300*, Oxford, 1985, s.v. in index.

21. Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 16487, fol. 250^{va}.

22. For a general study see J. SWANSON, *John of Wales: A Study of the Works and Ideas of a Thirteenth Century Friar*, Cambridge, 1989.

23. Cf. *Bonaventurae Opera omnia*, ed. A. C. PELTIER, t. XI, Paris, 1867, p. 306. On the authorship of the book, see BALDUINUS AB AMSTERDAM, "The Commentary on St. John's Gospel, edited in 1589 under the name of St. Bonaventure, an authentic work of John of Wales, O.Min. († ca. 1300)", in *Collectanea Franciscana*, t. 40, 1970, p. 71-96.

double enumeration of qualities, under the word *uxores*, with special emphasis on *sapientia* for the man and *mores* for the woman²⁴. It is evident that the list of qualities was a topos. Nor does the topos begin with Papias. We find it in the *Vita sanctae Rictrudis* of Hucbald of St. Amand, who died in 930²⁵, and further back still in St. Isidore's Etymologies, where they are illustrated by an analysis of Dido's feelings of admiration for Aeneas²⁶.

Of the texts which we have examined so far, Robert's and *The Wooing of our Lord* are the only ones to list eight qualities. Although their lists coincide including (though not in the same order), beauty, wealth, liberality, wisdom, strength and bravery, nobility, and gentleness, as qualities of the ideal husband, *The Wooing* ends with natural kinship or affinity, whereas Robert gives immortality as the eighth quality. In doing so Robert may have been trying to convey an extra level of meaning, for eight is the symbolic number which usually indicates the resurrection of Christ, his triumph over death²⁷.

In its broad lines, however, Robert's image of the ideal husband was evidently not an uncommon one. Yet the parallels or anticipations reopen the question of whether the image can be taken as a reflection of lay attitudes. It might be argued that Robert was merely giving expression to an idea familiar only within the confines of religious clerical culture. The question can be decided by looking outside those limits.

Even though one could not base any firm conclusions about lay attitudes on Robert's remarks alone, the foundation for inference is

24. Papias, Milan edn., 1476 (Paris, Bibl. nat., Rés. X 152), unfoliated. On the author and the sources of his work see V. DE ANGELIS, *Papiae Elementarium littera A*, 3 vol., Milan, 1977.

25. *Sed ea conveniunt in utrisque quae spectari solent in eligendo marito vel uxore. In viro enim virtus, genus, pulchritudo, et sapientia, quae ex his ad amoris affectum potior est, inerat. In uxore autem pulchritudo, genus, diuitiae et mores, qui magis quam caetera quaerendi sunt, habebantur* (P.L., 132, col. 834). On Hucbald see H. PLATELLE, "Le thème de la conversion à travers les œuvres hagiographiques d'Hucbald de Saint-Amand", in *Revue du Nord*, t. 68 (69 printed on cover), n° 269, 1986, p. 511-529. We found the references thanks to J. LECLERCQ, "Pastorale matrimoniale e amore coniugale", in *Anthropotes. Rivista di Studi sulla Persona e la Famiglia* t. I, 1987, p. 107-117, at p. 116.

26. *Isidori... Etymologiarum libri XX*, ed. W.M. LINDSAY, Oxford, 1911, vol. I (IX.7.27-29). Other evidences of the success of this topos could be found in sermons on the theme: *Non est talis mulier super terram* (Judith 11, 19) applied to blessed women, for example St. Agnes (Guibert de Tournai: cf. SCHNEYER, *Repertorium*, t. II, p. 290, n° 101); or St. Catherine (anonymous sermon in ms Assisi, Bibl. comunale, 474, fol. 121^v). Robert de Sorbon uses it in his sermons on marriage, v.g. in the sermon *Honorabile coniugium: Parentes possunt dare aliquando pulcrum, nobilem et diuitem filiis suis, sed bonam potest dare solus Deus* (Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15959, fol. 263^{va}; SCHNEYER, *Repertorium*, t. V, p. 230, n° 69).

27. See H. DE LUBAC, *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Écriture*, Paris, 1959-1964, t. II, 2^e partie, p. 22-23.

secured by the corroborative evidence of a quite different set of sources, the secular romances of Chrétien de Troyes. Though Chrétien wrote in the second half of the twelfth century, it is not unlikely that many people read or heard his stories in the thirteenth²⁸.

Even a cursory search shows that the qualities Robert picks out were also emphasized in this influential fantasy world, and attributed to knights who were regarded as interesting by noble ladies. The manner in which the key words of approbation are worked into the story is important for an appreciation of their connotations and emotional colouring.

In the following passage from *Cligès* a young woman cannot sleep for thinking about the man for whom she has conceived a passion :

« And when she has refreshed herself somewhat with thinking to her heart's content, she stretches and tosses about again, and ridicules all the thoughts she has had. Then she takes another course, and says : "Silly one, what matters it to me if this youth is of good birth and wise and courteous and valorous ? All this is simply to his honour and credit. And as for his beauty, what care I ? Let his beauty be gone with him! But if so, it will be against my will, for it is not my wish to deprive him of anything. Deprive ? No, indeed ! That I surely will not do. If he had the wisdom of Solomon, and if Nature had bestowed on him all the beauty she can place in human form, and if God had put in my power to undo it all, yet would I not injure him ; but I would gladly, if I could, make him still more wise and fair"²⁹ ».

The words which Comfort has translated as "of good birth and wise and courteous and valorous" are 'deboneire', 'larges', 'cortois', and 'proz' (l. 890-891). 'Deboneire' might be better translated as "kind" or "gentle"³⁰. If so it corresponds to *benignus et mittis* in Adam Picard's list of qualities, and to Robert of Sorbon's remark that : *Sexto respicit mulier quod non sit malus, id est 'felos'*. 'Larges' would seem to mean generous or liberal rather than wise, and corresponds to the fifth attribute listed by Robert, *largus*. Wisdom, Robert's sixth attribute, is brought in near the foot of this passage of Chrétien : "S'il avoit le san Salemon" (l. 898) ; "Plus sage et plus bel le feroie" (l. 906). 'Cortois' and 'proz' do indeed seem to mean something like "courteous and valorous". 'Proz' is probably not far from Robert's *fortis* 'e poichans', which

28. It would seem that the question of the public of vernacular romances has not yet received a clear answer. Cf. J.-Ch. PAYEN and F. DIEKSTRA, *Le roman*, Turnhout, 1975 (Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental, 12), p. 26-29.

29. CHRETIEN DE TROYES, *Arthurian Romances*, transl. W.W. COMFORT, London, 1914 (1975 print), p. 102-103 ; cf. *Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes, II : Cligès*, ed. A. MICHA, Paris, 1957, p. 27-28, l. 883-906.

30. In interpreting Chrétien's words we have been guided by W. FOERSTER, *Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes' sämtlichen Werken*, Abdruck der 2. veränderten Auflage von Hermann Breuer, Halle, 1964.

are the second attribute on his list. The word here used by Chrétien for beauty, the first attribute on Robert's list, is 'biauté' (l. 893, 894, 901), with 'bel' (l. 906) as the adjective³¹.

The lady married the knight, and their son was Cligès, after whom the poem is named. As a youth of about fifteen he is sent to Germany with a picked company of knights by his uncle (who is now emperor at Constantinople). Cligès becomes an object of great interest to the German emperor's lovely daughter, though she does not know who he is and is in any case supposed to marry the uncle rather than the nephew. Apparently Cligès has everything : wisdom ('san'), beauty ('biauté'), generosity ('largesce'), and strength ('force') (l. 2747) : all qualities on our original lists. The pair exchange significant glances³². Though she knows nothing of him, she does know that if she were to marry anyone for the sake of their beauty, she would not look any further³³. Soon, however, she has the opportunity to see him fighting, and he sets out to show her that he is bold and very skilled³⁴. He is so successful (fulfilling Robert's second condition), that everyone starts talking about him and the news of his high birth (Robert's fourth condition) reaches the girl, Fenyece. She is happy to know that love has not made sport of her (has not made her fall for someone of lower rank ?), for she has given her heart to the man who is 'le plus bel', 'le plus cortois', 'le plus preu' who could be found anywhere³⁵.

The family of the girl who married Chrétien's Érec was in reduced circumstances, and she was delighted to marry the son of an ordinary king. After he had declared his intentions in her presence to her father, and they had been betrothed, "The maiden sat quiet ; but she was very happy and glad ... because he was valiant ('preuz') and courteous ('cortois') : and she knew that he would some day be king, and she should receive honour and be crowned a rich queen³⁶".

It is the second, third and fourth qualities on Robert's list that get an explicit mention here. Two more, good looks and kindness, are

31. On beauty as a cause of love see R. SCHNELL, *Causa amoris : Liebeskonzeption und Liebesdarstellung in der mittelalterlichen Literatur*, Bern and München, 1985, Register B under "Schönheit als Liebesursache". We owe this reference (the source of others) to Julia Walworth.

32. "Par boene amor, non par losange, / Ses ialz li baille et prant les suens" (l. 2768-2769, edn. cit., p. 85).

33. "N'an set plus mes que bel le voit, / Et s'ele rien amer devoit / Por biauté qu'an home veïst, / N'est droiz qu'aillors son cuer meist" (l. 2773-2776, edn. cit., p. 85).

34. "Preuz et bien adroiz" (l. 2877, edn. cit., p. 88).

35. Edn. cit., p. 90, esp. l. 2941-2946.

36. Comfort's translation, p. 9 ; *Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes, I : Érec et Énide*, ed. M. ROQUES, Paris, 1952, p. 21-22, l. 684-690.

added in a later passage, in which (interestingly enough) they are attributed to both of the lovers :

"They would not have ceased to survey each other even for promise of a reward ! A perfect match they were in courtesy ('cortiesie'), beauty ('biauté'), and gentleness ('debonereté'). And they were so alike in quality, manner, and customs, that no one wishing to tell the truth could choose the better of them, nor the fairer ('le plus bel'), nor the more discreet ('le plus sage')³⁷".

In Yvain the lady has to convince her men that her proposed husband is suitable. She wisely refrains from telling them that he is the slayer of her first husband, and argues instead that : "Beside his illustrious lineage ('haut parage'), he is so brave ('de si grant vasselage'), courteous ('tant a cortiesie'), and wise ('et san') that no-one has cause to disparage him³⁸".

As evidence for attitudes to eligibility all these passages converge with Robert de Sorbon, but they also draw attention to a lacuna in Robert's list. A principal virtue of Chrétien's heroes is 'cortiesie', as one might expect : but there does not appear to be any real equivalent in Robert's list of virtues. Was this perhaps because Robert disapproved of "courtly love" ? The explanation seems implausible. After all, vernacular literature in northern France does not dissociate love from marriage — rather the contrary³⁹.

The significance of the silence on the subject of 'cortiesie' is hard to assess. It is possible that Robert simply happened not to think of including it, but on the other hand the omission might be explained by his intention in writing⁴⁰. The portrait he draws of the ideal husband is a means to the end of a better understanding of Christ and his relation to the human person. The notion of 'cortiesie' may have had the wrong connotations, for the courtly knight is in a certain sense subservient to his lady, and Robert may have felt that this would distort the analogy with the relation of Christ to the soul. The other preachers in his time seem to use the

37. Comfort's translation, p. 20 ; ed. M. ROQUES, edn. cit., p. 46, l. 1482-1491. Our attention was drawn to the passage by Sally BURCH [NORTH], *A Study of Some Aspects of Marriage as presented in selected octosyllabic French romances of the 12th and 13th centuries*, Unpublished London University Ph. D. Thesis, 1982, p. 279, an important and wide ranging study which deserves to be better known.

38. Comfort's translation, p. 207-208 ; cf. *Les Romans...*, IV : *Le Chevalier au Lion* (Yvain), ed. M. ROQUES, Paris, 1960, p. 65, l. 2125-2128. On Yvain's qualities, see also Z. P. ZADDY, "Yvain as the ideal Courtly Lover", in *Studies in Medieval French Language and Literature presented to Brian Woledge*, ed. Sally BURCH NORTH, Genève, 1987, p. 253-275.

39. See in particular Sally BURCH, *A Study of Some Aspects of Marriage*, op. cit. note 37 ; P.S. NOBLE, *Love and Marriage in Chrétien de Troyes*, Cardiff, 1982 ; G. DUBY, *Le chevalier, la femme et le prêtre*, Paris, 1981, p. 237-239 ; J. LECLERCQ, *Monks on Marriage*, transl. New York, 1982, p. 63-66 ; M. SCHUMACKER, *Die Auffassung der Ehe in den Dichtungen Wolframs von Eschenbach*, Heidelberg, 1967.

40. Cf. here Q. SKINNER, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas", in *History and Theory*, t. 8, 1969, p. 3-53, *passim*.

same cautious language. In many sermons Christ (or God) is called '*curialis*' (would the preacher have translated this as 'courtois' ?), but the image conveyed is not that of a courtly lover, but of a generous nobleman : for Christ forgives again and again, unsparing of his mercy to sinners⁴¹. This could be the implicit meaning of the fifth quality in Robert's list, *largus*, which is often synonymous with *curialis* in the XIIIth century sermons.

Robert's remarks, we must remember, are an episode in the history of an analogy as well as a source for the history of attitudes to marriage. They have a place in the history of medieval images of Christ. Robert's image is more than a skilful device by which a preacher known for his cheerful bonhomie introduces his real message. The length of this part of the sermon and the care with which it is constructed suggest that the image is nearer than that to the centre of his thought. He implicitly accepts that analogies can be drawn between human qualities and divine names, at a time when this possibility was being debated by Paris theologians⁴². Nevertheless the basic image itself is not, as we have seen, particularly daring or new. The historical interest of the passage in the history of likenesses of Christ consists rather in the way Robert builds up and shapes the image.

It may well be asked how one is to pick out one or another image, from a century prolific in similitudes, as significant in cultural history. The task is not unlike that which historians of philosophy undertake when there is no existing "canon" of major thinkers or ideas. As often as not historians take an existing canon for granted, but we are thinking of work in hitherto unexplored areas, such as Grabmann's on Aristotelian scholasticism after Aquinas. One object of the history of imagery, as of the history of philosophical ideas, is to recover "cultural values" from the past⁴³.

41. For example, in the sermons of Thomas d'Aquin : see J.-P. TORRELL, "La pratique pastorale d'un théologien du XIII^e siècle : Thomas d'Aquin prédicateur", in *Revue Thomiste*, t. 82, 1982, p. 213-245, esp. p. 241-242. It is worth knowing that for Robert de Sorbon the opposite term to *curialis* is *rusticus* ; thus in a sermon for Good Friday : *Si tu, amice, non recompensas Deo quod fecit tibi, rusticus es et incurialis* (Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15971, fol. 80^{rb}).

42. Thomas d'Aquin points out that the same word *sapientia*, when applied to God or to man, does not express a single notion : cf. *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 13, a. 5. Another divine name that gives rise to debate is *potens* (see the *quaestiones* listed by P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique*, t. II, Paris, 1935, p. 365, s.v. *Potentia divina*).

43. Cf. H.-I. MARROU, *De la connaissance historique*, Paris, 1955, p. 251 : "J'assignerai de la sorte à l'histoire, comme une de ses fonctions essentielles, cet enrichissement de mon univers intérieur par la reprise des valeurs culturelles récupérées dans le passé. Par le terme, vague à dessein, de 'valeur culturelle', on désignera, de la façon la plus générale possible, tout ce que nous pouvons connaître et comprendre de vrai, de beau, de réel dans le domaine de la vie humaine, des faits de civilisation les plus élémentaires (un *artefact* quelconque, instrument ou outil, une

In the case of the history of philosophy, however, the criteria other than personal preference for assessing "cultural value" are relatively easy to define. One is originality : a non-trivial idea is interesting if no earlier philosopher had formulated it. Another is the extent to which the internal rationality of the thought is made manifest by logical argument. The concept of rationality, it should be noted, enables the historian to recognize the cultural values of ideas based on assumptions with which he profoundly disagrees⁴⁴.

In the case of genres which appeal to the imagination, too, it is possible to set out criteria for cultural value which go beyond personal preference or the vividness of the impression which a text may happen to leave on a late twentieth-century reader. We would suggest that the following are appropriate for the kind of text with which we have been concerned, and define more precisely the qualities that make Robert's metaphor of the ideal husband historically notable.

1. The words would have produced effects on the mind which cannot be characterized as purely verbal and intellectual, in that they elicit visual and other sense images, and / or affective judgments of good and bad, which would channel the emotions of the listeners in the direction appropriate to the message. It must be remembered, of course, that the effect of a sermon (or other text) would depend not only on the words, but also on the memories and experiences which the preacher (or other writer) could assume in most of his listeners, but which we may have to reconstruct.

Robert has selected, as we have seen, qualities which were already associated with ideal knights in Chrétien de Troyes and no doubt in the phantasy worlds of many contemporaries of Robert. The more the modern reader has made the imaginative world of chivalry his own, the easier it will be to experience something of the feeling and reactions of Robert's listeners.

2. Normally the memories which a successful metaphor brings to the surface should not be predominantly memories of previous use of the metaphor. This does not mean that a familiar metaphor could not have produced fresh images. Marriage was, as we have seen, a traditional metaphor for the soul's relation to God, but experience, observation, and the phantasy world of chivalry would have ensured that the mental images called up by the metaphor would remain fresh and varied. Robert's humour and psychological realism also protect the metaphor from staleness ("I don't want my

œuvre d'art, un concept, un sentiment) jusqu'aux plus vastes synthèses, ces 'supersystèmes idéologiques' que nous ont présentés les grandes civilisations en voie de s'organiser autour d'un idéal collectif... ".

44. Cf. Bryan R. WILSON, ed., *Rationality*, Oxford, 1970.

husband to be too generous, sir, because he may give away everything and we may become poor..." : cf. Robert's text, § 5).

3. The vividness of the effect of the metaphor on the mind should be adjusted to the message's level of generality. In the case of metaphor the level of generality of the message is that on which the image and what it stands for meet. In this instance the chief image is the ideal husband, and it stands for the idea of Christ insofar as they share common features (at least Robert thinks so).

Robert's sermon is indeed discriminating in its appeal to the sense imagination, for the descriptions of the ideal husband are not on the whole designed to stimulate strong visual and other sense images. Too vivid a picture of an eligible young knight would have distracted the listeners from an essentially spiritual message. It would have been a misjudgment to have highlighted those parts of the picture where the structural analogy with Christ broke down. (It is true that he does use some visual language in the passage on the husband's good looks, but there may have been a compensating reason, on which more below, and in any case the biblical language used would have a distancing effect).

As we hinted above, sense images are not the only kind of psychological processes, other than verbal and intellectual thought, which a metaphor can stimulate. It may also harness strongly held habitual judgments, charged with emotion, of certain objects as good or bad. Robert knew that many women would have hoped to marry a husband who was good looking, endowed with knightly virtues, well provided with land, etc., and that many men would have aspired to be such a man. The attributes had evidently valuable functions in the real world of thirteenth century France, and characterized the heroes of the best imaginative literature. Even without visual or other sense imagery, an allusion to these qualities would have been likely to command a positive response, and it no doubt elicited affectively charged approval in many of Robert's listeners. These emotions could be "transferred" by the metaphor to Christ.

4. A successful metaphor can convey ideas which could not otherwise be easily grasped by the audience. This may be why Robert enlarges on the beauty of the bridegroom (§ 1b). Although this may have carried with it visual images of too literal a kind⁴⁵, a

45. In his *Summa* (unpublished), Roland de Crémone, the first dominican master at the University of Paris, noticed the *simplicitas ymaginativa rusticorum, qui putent quod Deus inquantum Deus sit quasi quidam pulcherrimus homo* : quoted by P.-M. GY, "Évangélisation et sacrements au Moyen Âge", in C. KANNENGISSER and Y. MARCHASSON, ed., *Humanisme et foi chrétienne. Mélanges Scientifiques du*

danger which the sacred aura of scriptural interpretation in any case helps to neutralise, the section does manage to give imaginative shape to the idea that God is beauty (as well as goodness), an idea hard to assimilate when stated baldly. In the first sentence Robert says that the soul "must marry God or the devil", which would have prepared the listeners to apply the subsequent remarks to Christ in his divine as well as in his human nature.

5. Another criterion is the metaphor's capacity to grow. Robert's metaphor is itself a development of the image of marriage in the Bible and subsequent Christian tradition, and it seems to have stimulated further development. We have seen that the schema of the husband's qualities is combined with an interpretation of the first letter to the Hebrews⁴⁶. Whether Robert or another made the connection, the result was a new idea.

6. Finally, the subordinate parts of a metaphor, the various images and emotions it would call up (in its age), should strengthen rather than weaken one another. The different parts of Robert's description of the ideal knight build up a cumulatively coherent model. Even the order in which the qualities are introduced helps hold them together in the mind: looks⁴⁷, prowess, wealth, nobility, generosity (within reason), kindness, wise judgment — they might be the stages of a lady's growing interest in a knight.

Robert's imitator Adam Picard is not quite so successful. In the section which begins: *Quinta conditio est quod sit benignus...* (Appendix, text 4, § 5), he begins with God's kindness, not only to the just but to the unjust, then moves on to the iniquity of the devil, who cannot be satisfied with any service. At this point the imagery seems to lose its connection with the preceding context. Adam introduces the topos of the six daughters of the devil, of whom the first, Rapine, is married to knights, the second, Usury, to burghers, and so on. This diminishes the coherence of the imagery evoked by the section in two ways. To begin with, the listener or reader is expecting an illustration of the devil's harshness and

Centenaire de l'Institut Catholique de Paris, Paris, 1976, p. 564-572 (here, p. 569, note 25).

46. See the discussion of passages in Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 14947, 15959 and 16482, above, p. 118, and Appendix, texts 5, 6 and 7.

47. It should be noted that external beautiful appearance, which corresponds with this first quality, seems to be more and more praised in Robert's times. A. Paravicini Bagliani, who has noticed this in various documents, is preparing a study on the subject, and he has kindly drawn our attention to pope Nicolas III's epitaph († 1280), for example: *Corporis egregio decus adjecere decori / Mira pudicitia, graviumque decentia morum. / Qualis eras intus, foris elucebat, eratque / Ipsa patens species probitatis imago labentis* (ed. G.B. LADNER, *Die Papstbildnisse des Altertums und des Mittelalters*, Roma, 1970, II, p. 216).

unkindness, whereas the point of the "six daughters" topos is that each of these vices is "married" to men in a particular way of life, except Lust, which is a danger to all kinds of men.

A more serious incoherence in Adam's imagery in this section is that it gets the sexes jumbled up. In the main metaphor the bride stands for the human soul, the bridegroom for Christ / God or for the devil. In "six daughters" topos, however, the human party is suddenly in the husband's role. Since the language is metaphorical this is not actually illogical, but it is certainly discordant.

Since we are concerned with attitudes in France, an evaluation of the schema's use in *The Wooing of our Lord* need not be attempted. Direct comparison would not in any case be easy, because its whole tone suggests a different sort of public. It is much more emotional and exclamatory than the texts of Robert and Adam: e.g., "heaven with the mirths and immeasurable blisses, all is thine, my sweet one, and all (this) thou wilt give me, if I love thee aright. I cannot give my love to any man for (the sake of) a sweeter possession. I will hold then to thee, my beloved, and love thee for thyself, and for thy love forsake all other things that might draw and turn my heart from thy love. Ah ! Jesus, sweet Jesus, grant that the love of thee be all my delight"⁴⁸. One is tempted to guess at an audience (reading rather than listening ?) of religious, perhaps women⁴⁹. If so, its success or failure would have to be judged in relation to its own objectives. In any case a published text in Middle English from the thirteenth century is in less danger of neglect than are the passages from Latin sermons.

Literary criticism rather than History ? The dichotomy makes sense only when there is an established and accessible canon of important works, colonised by specialists to whom historians leave the value judgments. We have argued that when there is no canon, but a mass of manuscripts, the cultural historian cannot evade the task of choosing. The six criteria just set out are designed to be a rough and ready check on subjectivity, since historians must somehow assess the relative significance of the images through which preachers influenced their public. We have tried to explain the effectiveness of this metaphor, and, *en passant*, to suggest what historians should look out for in the imagery of other sermons.

Though we do not regard imagery as interesting only as a mirror of social facts or attitudes, the concepts of eligibility which the texts here presented assume should have a place in any history of attitudes to marriage in this period. The evidence of Robert and of Chrétien converge (except for Robert's interesting omission of

48. R. MORRIS, *Old English Homilies*, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

49. This suggestion, like the original discovery of the parallels with Robert de Sorbon, comes from Mrs Marie Denley.

'cortiesie') : the ideal husband is *dives*, and probably his wealth is his land, like Erec's⁵⁰ ; he is handsome (*pulcher*, 'bel') and valiant (*fortis*, 'poichans', 'preuz', 'de ... grant vasselage') ; he is wise (*sapiens*, 'sage') and kind (*non ... malus, id est 'felos' qui percussiat uxorem suam...*, *pacificus*, 'deboneire') ; he is generous (*largus*, 'larges'), though not to the point of leaving the couple poor ; and he is noble (*generosus*, of 'haut parage' like Yvain). As idealized notions go it is functional and practical, a formula for success in thirteenth century French society. The values it embodies are those of the noble and knightly class, though they no doubt commanded assent beyond the confines of that class. Robert and Adam made them a vehicle for converting their hearers to God.

Nicole BÉRIOU
Université de Paris IV Sorbonne

David L. D'AVRAY
University College London

50. Robert probably has landed wealth in mind, though he is not specific when talking about Christ, for when he goes on to talk about the poverty of the devil he says that *in terra eius non est bladum nec uinum* (Appendix, text 3, § 3).

ILLUSTRATIVE TEXTS

Orthography

Our general rule in the illustrative texts (and the footnotes) has been to follow the orthography of the scribe, but in cases like *condicio* / *conditio*, *numquam* / *nunquam*, or *michi* / *mihi*, one cannot consistently do so since the letters are often 'swallowed up' in abbreviations. For *c* and *t* we follow the classical spelling, since thirteenth century practice is not consistent. Since there is not even a firm classical convention for *m* and *n*, we make our best guess at the scribe's intention. We have consistently written *michi* and *nichil*, since this appears to have been something like a thirteenth century norm.

Errors and variants

We have corrected the most obvious scribal errors silently ; nor have we made explicit mention of cases where the scribe corrected his own careless mistakes. When more than one manuscript is used, trivial variants are not noted in the apparatus.

In the case of text 4, however, where there seems to be a consistent stylistic pattern underlying Paris, Bibl. nat., lat. 15005's variants from lat. 14947, we have given a fuller apparatus, without however recording mere variations in word-order, or senseless mistakes.

List of illustrative texts

1. Maurice de Provins, *Distinctiones*, s.v. *Nuptie*
2. Nicolas de Biard, *Distinctiones*, s.v. *Nuptie*
3. Robert de Sorbon, *Sermo in dominica secunda post Epiphaniam* (extract)
4. Adam le Picard, *Sermo in dominica secunda post Epiphaniam* (extract)
5. Anonymous note on Adam Picard's sermon
6. Gérard de Mailly, *Sermon on John 2, 1* (extract)
7. Anonymous notes (c. 1272-1273)

APPENDIX 1

Maurice de Provins, *Distinctiones*, s.v. *Nuptie*

(Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 3270, fol. 231^{rb}-231^{vb} ; lat. 16484, fol. 222^{rb}-223^{ra})

Multiplices sunt nuptie. Culpe, in quibus Sampson, id est ratio, decipitur, Iud. XIII, ubi agitur de secreto Sampsonis qualiter Philisteis nuntiatur. Item affectio polluitur, Sap. XIII (24) : *Neque mundas nuptias iam custodiunt*. Item delectatio in dolore uertitur, I. Mach. X (= 9, 41) : *Nuptie uerse sunt in luctum*.

Item sunt nuptie coniugales in quibus debet esse fidelitas, Os. II (20) : *Sponsabo te mihi in fide* ; item bona societas, Ge. XXIX (22) : *Vocatis multis amicorum turbis ad conuiuium fecit nuptias* etc. ; item festiua sollempnitas, Io. II(1) : *Nuptie facte sunt in Chana Galilee*.

Item sunt nuptie gratie, Mr. II (19) : *Non possunt filii nuptiarum ieiunare quamdiu cum eis est sponsus*. Et nota quod qui hiis nuptiis uult interesse indiget triplici documento quorum primum est documentum penitentie, secundum caritatis, tertium humilitatis. Primum necessarium est penitentibus, secundum proficientibus, tertium perficientibus, que tria documenta ipse expressit in triplici genere nuptiarum.

Primum expressit in nuptiis : deficiente uino iussit impleri ydrias aqua. Aqua illa est penitentia que mundat et lauat ab omnibus inquinamentis peccatorum secundum quod dicitur Eze. XXXVI (25) : *Effundam super uos aquam mundam* etc. Vinum est consolatio, Ps. (103, 15) : *Vinum letificat cor hominis*. Documentum ergo Christi, ut in nuptiis gratie impleantur ydrie aqua, id est penitentia. Et nota que sunt quinque ydrie, quarum prima [fol. 231^{va}] est cor que implenda est aqua contritionis, compunctionis et doloris, secunda est os que implenda est pudore et confusione confessionis. Quatuor sunt ex parte corporis que implende sunt labore satisfactionis, quia pedes nuditate, uenter abstinencia et ciborum ariditate, corpus et latera duriori lecti et uestium asperitate, capud sursum uigilia et clamore in oratione. Vel ut quatuor ydrie, quibus impletis iuxta documentum Saluatoris aqua penitentie, certum est quod ipse Ihesus mutabit in uinum, id est penitentiam in solacium et tristitiam in gaudium iuxta illud Io. XVI (20) : *Tristitia uestra uertetur in gaudium*.

Secundum documentum est caritatis quod significatur Mt. XXII (12-13), ubi *non habens uestem nuptialem* dampnabiliter a sollempnitate nuptiarum excluditur. Vestis nuptialis est caritas quam qui non habet excluditur a nuptiis gratie. Et nota quod in illa exclusionem triplex pena exprimitur. Prima est agnitio culpe, secunda consciencie confusio, tertia inflictio dampnationis eterne. Prima notatur ibi : *Amice, quomodo huc intrasti*, ubi arguit eum de triplici culpa, de ingratitude, de presumptione, de caritatis amissione. De ingratitude arguit cum dicit : *Amice*, quia de beneficiis acceptis debuit esse amicus Dei ; de presumptione cum dicit : *Quomodo huc intrasti*, quia presumpsit indignus ad tantas nuptias intrare ; de caritatis amissione cum dicit : *Non habens uestem nuptialem*. Secunda pena est confusio consciencie que exprimitur cum dicitur : *At ille obmutuit*, non audens loqui propter confusionem secundum quod dicitur I Reg. II (9) : *Impii in tenebris conticescent*. Tercia pena est inflictio dampnationis eterne que exprimitur cum dicitur : *Tunc dixit rex ministris*, ubi

tria notantur : impossibilitas ad bonum que designatur per manuum, id est operationum, et pedum, id est uoluntatum ligationem. Item exclusio a regno, que notatur ibi : *Mittite eum in tenebras exteriores* ; tercium afflictio in inferno que notatur ibi cum dicitur : *Ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium*.

Tertium documentum est humilitatis, Mt. XIII (= Lc 14, 8-10) : *Cum inuitatus fueris ad nuptias recumbe in nouissimo loco* in quo notantur tres humilitatis gradus : imus est [fol. 231^{vb}] humiliari in conuersatione, inferior in sui cognitione, nouissimus est in affectione. Primus est in abiciendo seipsum, secundus in iudicando se abiectum, tercius est ut abiciatur desiderium. De hiis tribus Ps. (130, 1) : *Domine non est exaltatum cor meum* in affectione *neque elati sunt oculi mei* in cognitione *neque ambulaui in magnis* in conuersatione. Que autem utilitas sequitur ex hoc documento, subditur postea : *Vt hic qui te inuitauit dicat tibi* etc. in quo triplex utilitas exprimitur. Prima est amicitia quoad Deum que notatur cum dicitur : *Amice* ; secunda est exaltatio quoad seipsum cum dicitur : *Ascende superius* ; tertia est honor et gloria quoad alios que exprimitur cum dicitur : *Tunc erit tibi gloria coram discumbentibus*.

Item sunt nuptie glorie, Mt. XXV (10) : *Que parate erant intrauerunt cum eo ad nuptias*. Circa quod nota duo : preparationem ad nuptias, Apoc. XIX (7) : *Vxor agni preparauit se* ut ueniret ad nuptias. Item nuptiarum sollempnizacio, Mt. XXII (1) : *Simile est regnum celorum homini regi* etc ; et nota quod in preparatione notantur et debent esse uirginitas, prudentia intentionis, puritas, claritas conuersationis, sollicitudo dominice expectationis que notantur Mt. XXV (1-4) ubi dicitur quod V uirgines, in signum istorum V, presumpserunt oleum in uasis suis et sic expectauerunt sponsum ut intrarent cum eo ad nuptias. Virginitas notatur in hoc quod dicitur : *Virgines*, prudentia in hoc quod dicitur : *Prudentes*, puritas in oleo, claritas conuersationis in uasis siue lampadibus, quantum notatur in hoc quod expectauerunt sponsum.

Secundum est sollempnizacio circa quam notatur gaudium et exultatio in coniunctione anime cum Deo, Apoc. XIX (7) : *Gaudeamus et exulemus* in Domino *quoniam uenerunt nuptie agni* ; item beatitudo de cenatione cum agno, Apoc. XIX (9) : *Beati qui uocati sunt ad cenam nuptiarum agni*.

APPENDIX 2

Nicolas de Biard, *Distinctiones*, s.v. *Nuptie*

(Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 16487, fol. 171^{vb}-173^{ra} ; lat. 16489, fol. 176^{rb}-177^{vb})

Nuptie tres sunt. Mundi, Gen. XXIX (22) : *Laban uocatis multis amicorum turbis ad conuiuium fecit nuptias et uespere Lyam introduxit*, ad quas non est ueniendum propter cibi insipitudinem et amaritudinem. Filii Israel in Egypto pepones et allia comedebant (cf. Num. 11, 5), qui in seruitio Dei positi, manna habente in se, omne delectamentum pasti sunt, Exo. XVI. Item propter ueniendi confusionem : turpe est enim uenire ad conuiuium non uocatus, Ysa. XXII (12) : *In die uocauit Dominus ad fletum et ad planctum et ad caluitium et ad cingulum sacci, et ecce gaudium et letitia occidere uitulos et iugulare arietes et comedere carnes et bibere uinum*. Item propter ianitoris incurialitatem : aufert

enim exeunti de nuptiis omnia que comedit, Ps. (48, 11) : *Relinquent alienis diuitias suas*. Item propter hospitis crudelitatem : statim repetit symbolum in exitu a conuiuio, [fol. 172^a] id est animam, Luc XII (20) : *Stulte hac nocte repentem animam tuam a te*.

Item sunt nuptie diaboli, II Mach. XIII (25) : *Nichanor rogauit Iudam ducere uxorem filiosque procreare et nuptias fecit, quiete egit communiterque uiuebant*. Ad istas non est ueniendum propter rationes dictas in c. (= *Conuiuium dyaboli, Distinctiones*, littera C, n° 61 ; Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 16487, fol. 53^{va}). In auctoritate predicta describitur dyabolus tripliciter. Primo, quantum ad naturalium dignitatem, ibi : *Nichanor*. Interpretatur statura lucida, et significat dyabolum qui pre ceteris angelis in lucidis naturalibus est creatus, unde dictus est Lucifer, sed quia de bonis acceptis contra Deum superbiuit, cecidit de celo. Sed multi hodie sunt similes illi, Iob XII (6) : *Audacter prouocant Deum cum ipse dederit omnia in manibus eorum*, sicut catus et canis manum sibi porrigentem panem aliquando mordent, et ideo merito destruentur. Rex enim sapiens castra subditorum sibi repugnantium subuertit et predia uastat, Ps. (20, 9) : *Inueniatur manus tua* etc. Secundo describitur quantum ad uirium debilitatem ibi : *Rogauit*, non coegit. Omnes demones non possent unum hominem compellere ad peccatum, sicut piscator non cogit piscem cadere in nassam, nec uenire ad hamum, nec anceps auem, sed alliciuntur aliquo delectabili, [fol. 172^b] Eccle. IX (12) : *Sicut pisces capiuntur hamo et aues laqueo, sic capiuntur homines in tempore malo*. Tertio describitur quantum ad operum iniquitatem que in tribus consistit. Agit enim quod peccato homo adhereat, quod notatur ibi : *Ducere uxorem*, id est cupiditati et luxurie que sunt eius filie firmiter adherere. Prou. XXX (15) : *Sanguissuge due sunt filie que semper dicunt : Affer, affer*. Non enim uult dyabolus quod homo accipiat luxuriam uel cupiditatem ad horam, sed quod habeat eam sponsam semper tenendo. Agit quod peccator alios suo exemplo corrumpat, quod notatur ibi : *Filiosque procreare*, id est proximos sibi similes facere in peccato. Sicut enim lepra alios inficit et tignia, sic peccatum, Gen. V (3) : *Adam, id est terrenus, filium genuit ad ymaginem et similitudinem suam*. Et dicit filios pluraliter. Plures enim sunt imitatores malorum quam bonorum, sicut lupa et canis plures habent catulos quam ouis agnos, Eccle. I (15) : *Stultorum infinitus est numerus*. Item agit quod homo peccatum non derelinquat, quod notatur ibi : *Nuptias fecit, quiete egit*, id est delicias suggerit ut alliciat, et afflictionibus non molestat ne affugiat, sicut lupo ouem parum stringit ne recalcitret, unde Sichem Dinam corruptam tristem blanditiis deliniuit, Gen. XXXIII (3).

[fol. 172^{va}] Item sunt nuptie Dei, Apoc. XIX : *Gaudeamus et exultemus et demus gloriam ei quia uenerunt nuptie agni*. Ad has ueniendum est propter rationes dictas in c. (= *Conuiuium Dei, Distinctiones*, littera C, n° 63 ; Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 16487, fol. 54^{rb}). Nota quod in nuptiis solent tria fieri que in nuptiis illis erunt : nouitas uestimentorum, sic Christus stola carnis immortalis induet animam. Iudic. XIII, Samson nouas uestes dedit iuuenibus qui ad nuptias uenerant, et ideo dicit : *Gaudeamus*. Item ciborum delicatarum copia. Sic Christus faciet. Luc XII (37) de sponso reuertente a nuptiis : *Amen, dico uobis quod precinget se et faciet illos discumbere et transiens ministrabit illis*, cibum scilicet in se habentem omnis saporis suauitatem, ideo dicit : *Exultemus*. Item sonitus organorum, et ita erit ibi cantus, scilicet angelorum et omnium sanctorum Deum collaudantium, Ps. (12, 6) : *Cantabo Domino qui bona tribuit mihi* etc. Ideo dicit : *Demus gloriam ei*, Deo scilicet, de bonis acceptis, sicut

hyrelli nobiles qui dant sibi uestes laudant et glorificant, Ps. (65, 1) : *Iubilate Deo omnis terra, psalmum dicite nomini eius, date gloriam laudi eius.*

Sed nota quod ab istis nuptiis repelluntur tria genera hominum. Nolentes penitere uel bona facere, Mt. XXII (8) de inuitatis ad nuptias, quorum alter iuit in uillam, alter in negociationem, dicitur [fol. 172^{vb}] : *Nuptie quidem parate sunt sed qui inuitati fuerant non erant digni.* Qui enim non uult symbolum soluere non sedet ad bonam mensam, Ps. (36, 3-4) : *Delectare in Domino et fac bonitatem et pascaris in diuitiis eius.* Si enim filius Dei ad has nupcias non uenit uel sedit donec symbolum persoluisset, multominus homo peccator, Luc XXII (29-30) : *Ego dispono uobis sicut disposuit mihi Pater meus regnum ut edatis et bibatis super mensam meam in regno meo.* Item tarde penitentes uel bene agentes, ut qui ad conuiuium uenire non uult quousque hostia sint clausa, Mt. XXV (10) : *Virgines que parate erant intrauerunt cum sponso ad nuptias et clausa est ianua,* aliis tarde uenientibus exclusis. Item penitentiam uel bona indebite facientes, id est in mortali peccato, Mt. XXII (12) : *Eiectus est de nuptiis non habens uestem nuptialem,* id est caritatem que dicitur uestis nuptialis, que coniunctionem sponsi et sponse facit, Io. III (16) : *Sic Deus dilexit mundum ut unigenitum suum daret.* Non enim recipitur ad nuptias sacco indutus, Apoc. XIX (7-8) : *Venerunt nuptie agni et uxor eius preparauit se et datum est illi ut cooperiat byssino splendenti et candido.* Vnde indutus sacco non intrabat aulam regis Assueri, Hester IIII (2).

Et nota quod in nuptiis [fol. 173^{ra}] Dei aqua conuertitur in uinum, id est tristitia in gaudium. Io. XVI (20) : *Tristitia uestra uertetur in gaudium.* Vnde, Io. II, in nuptiis Iohannis conuertit Christus aquam in uinum. In nuptiis diaboli conuertitur uinum in aquam, id est delectatio in penam, I Mach. IX (41) : *Conuerse sunt nuptie in luctum.* In nuptiis mundi simul bibitur aqua cum uino, quia similis est delectatio et pena, Ysa. 1 (22) : *Vinum tuum mixtum est aqua,* immo plus de pena quam de delectatione et ideo uinum mixtum est aqua et non econuerso, Prou. XIII (13) : *Risus dolori miscebitur.* Propter hoc dicitur Luc XIII (8-10) : *Cum inuitatus fueris ad nuptias, non discumbas in primo loco,* id est ne attendas principium nuptiarum istarum, *sed recumbe in nouissimo loco,* id est attende finem, quia si finem ipsarum attenderes, ad nuptias mundi uel diaboli non uenires, sed ad Dei nuptias hanelares.

APPENDIX 3 : THE IDEAL HUSBAND (1)

Robert de Sorbon, *Sermo in dominica secunda post Epiphaniam* (extract)
(Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15971, fol. 147^{vb}-148^{rb})
16 janvier 1261

1(a). In matrimonio quarto anime fidelis ad Christum consideranda sunt illa sex superius dicta, scilicet : que nuptie, quis sponsus, et que sponsa, que impedimenta nuptiarum istarum, etc. Primo, que nuptie, quis sponsus, que sponsa ? Nuptie sunt spirituales anime cuiuslibet fidelis ad filium Dei, Ihesum Christum. Sponsus est Christus, sponsa, sancta et fidelis anima. Et sciendum quod mulier que se uult maritare sex uel septem solet respicere in marito illo que anima fidelis debet in Christo respicere.

(b). Primo, quod sit pulcher maritus suus. Amice, uultis uos animam uestram maritare, oportet quod ducat Deum uel dyabolum. Sed numquid est pulcher Ihesus Christus? Ita, quia Cant. (5, 10) dicit anima sancta: *Dilectus meus*, id est 'mos maritz', *candidus et rubicundus*, id est 'trop be coloratz', *electus ex milibus*. Tunc (Cant. 1, 15): *Ecce, tu pulcher es, dilecte mi*. Psalm. (44,3): *Speciosus* (sponsus *ms*) *forma* [fol. 148^{ra}] *pre filiis hominum*. P<etrus> (I Pt. 1, 12): *In quem desiderant angeli prospicere*. Bernardus: "Inestimabilis gratia, o anima, ut eius sponsa merearis esse in quem desiderant angeli prospicere. Vnde tibi hoc ut tuus sponsus sit cuius pulcritudinem sol et luna mirantur?" — Sed multi maritant animam suam dyabolo, cuius turpitudinem non possent dicere omnes magistri de mundo. Vnde quantumcumque anima sit ante pulcra, ex quo duxit dyabolum in maritum turpissima est, T<ren> (4, 8): *Denigrata est super carbones*.

2. Sed non sufficit mulieri quod sit pulcher, quia si inhers diceretur 'so es (soes *ms*) us bons maluat'. Ideo respicit secundo quod sit fortis 'e poichans'. Talis autem est Dei filius, Ps. (23, 8): *Dominus fortis et potens*. Apostolus (Hb. 1, 3): *Portans omnia uerbo uirtutis sue*. Sed dyabolus est ita debilis quod una debilis et pauper mulier fugat eum, scilicet oratione sua, et percutit. Ideo Augustinus: "Oratio demonibus est flagellum, oranti subsidium, Deo sacrificium". Vnde demon: "Bartholomee, serue Dei, incendunt me orationes tue". Sed tamen multos qui faciunt se fortes, et portant lanceam et ense, etc., trahit 'a melhiers' in infernum, quem tamen una muliercula fugat. Gregorius: "Debilis est hostis qui non uincit nisi uolentem". Vna musca uel pulex affligit hominem uelut nolit, sed dyabolus non potest nisi uolentem, ergo dyabolus debiliior est pulice. Sed turpe esset alicui si pulex una traheret eum per cordam ad furcas. Turpius ergo quando dyabolus hominem trahit ad furcas inferni. Est ergo debilis, ideo sponsam suam, animam, facit debilem, ita quod non potest se sustinere. T<ren> (1, 8): *Peccatum peccauit Ierusalem propterea instabilis facta est*. Nec mirum quia habet pedes putridos, id est affectiones. Sed quando maritatur anima Deo, ita fortis est quod totus mundus non uinceret eam, ut patet de beata Agnete. Sed anima dyabolo desponsata est 'paurucha' (faurucha?), sicut lepus qui existens sub arbore fugit cum audit sonitum ramorum et foliorum arboris. Ideo terrebit eos sonitus folii uolantis, id est uerba derisionis.

3. Sed non sufficit quod sit pulcher et fortis quia multos tales uidemus, et tamen non multum boni coniugant se. Ideo, tertio, respicit quod sit diues. Huiusmodi est filius Dei <Ps. 111, 3>: *Gloria et diuitie in domo eius*. Idem <Ps. 23, 1>: *Domini est terra* etc. Ysaïas (64, 4) et Apostolus (I Cor. 2, 9): *Oculus non uidit nec auris*. Sed dyabolus est ita pauper quod non habet 'lo valen d'una mealha'. Si sibi maritas animam tuam, ducet eam in terram suam, id est in infernum ubi est tanta caristia quod non posset haberi gutta aque pro toto mundo. Vnde diues epulo plus quam mille annis petiit guttam aque, non in cifo sed cum digito leprosi, scilicet Lasari, nec adhuc habuit, nec haberet pro mille mundis. In terra eius non est bladum nec uinum, sed animam sibi desponsatam spoliatur, et pauper est quantumcumque diues ante. T<ren>(1, 10): *Miserunt manum hostis ad omnia desiderabilia eius*.

4. Quarto, non sufficiunt dicta tria nisi esset generosus, id est 'd'aut paratge'. Christus est huiusmodi: a parte matris, de genere regum multorum, Matth.: generationes 14. A parte patris est ita 'gentils' quod non potest dici. Ysaïas (53, 8): *Generationem eius quis enarrabit*. Apoc. (19, 16): *Rex regum*.

Prou. (31, 23) : *Nobilis in portis uir eius*. Ps. (82, 19) : *Tu solus altissimus in omni terra*. Sed dyabolus [fol. 148^{rb}] est ita uilis 'so es us forbanitz'.

5. Quinto, respicit quod sit largus. Talis est Christus, Iac. (1, 5) : *Dat omnibus afluenter*. Mt. (Io. 16, 24 ; cf. Mt. 7, 7 ; Mc. 11, 24) : *Petite et accipietis*. Ipse dat totum. Ps. (8, 8) : *Omnia subiecisti*. Et ultimo, dedit se ipsum in cruce. Vnde habet manus perforatas, ut dicitur de largo. Sed dyabolus est latro, qui totum quod potest furatur. — Sed dicet mulier : "Nolo quod sit nimis largus, domine, maritus meus, quod totum det et simus pauperes". Sed uide quod Christus totum potest dare et non potest esse pauper. Probatio : Si quis de nichilo posset facere aliquid, non posset esse pauper, licet totum dedisset. Huiusmodi est Christus, qui omnia fecit de nichilo.

6. Sexto, respicit mulier quod non sit malus, id est 'felos', qui percussiat uxorem suam. Sed iste pacificus. *Discite a me quia mitis sum* <Mt. 11, 29>. Apostolus (Tit. 3, 4) : *Aparuit benignitas*. Sed dyabolus e contrario crudelis est et non miserebitur. Gregorius : "Malum est seruire offenso qui nullo placatur obsequio".

7. Septimo respicit quod sit sapiens, quia, si stultus, totum esset perditum. Talis est Christus, quia <Col. 2, 3> *in ipso sunt omnes thesauri sapientie*. Sed dyabolus est ita stultus quod semper facit dampnum suum faciendo homines peccare. Similiter et eius sponsa, id est peccatoris anima, cum dedit aliis malum exemplum : licet sit in inferno, tamen semper crescit pena sua peccantibus aliis in seculo eius malo exemplo. Ideo dicit Augustinus quod pena Arrii nondum est determinata.

8. Octauo, dicet domicella : "Domine, licet habeat omnia ista, forte morietur cras, et perdidero totum". Ideo, octauo, respiceret si posset quod esset immortalis maritus suus. Huiusmodi est Christus. <Rm. 6, 9> *Christus resurgens ex mortuis iam non moritur*. Hoc solum inter omnia dicta habet dyabolus, quia numquam morietur. Sed hoc est peius. Mulier cum habet malum maritum multum desiderat mortem eius, et multum placeret ei si mor<ir>etur plus quam uiueret. Sic et anima sponsa dyaboli in inferno hoc idem uellet, sed : <Apoc. 9, 6> *Desiderabunt mortem et fugiet ab eis*.

APPENDIX 4 : THE IDEAL HUSBAND (2)

Adam Picardus, *Sermo in dominica secunda post Epiphaniam* (extract)
(Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 14947, fol. 209^{rb}-210^{rb} ; variants from lat. 15005,
fol. 112^{va}-113^{rb} in notes)
19 janvier 1282

Nuptie facte sunt in Chana Galylee etc. (Io. 2, 1). De nuptiis est hic notandum quod triplices sunt nuptie. Primo sunt nuptie carnales sicut fit uiri^a ad mulierem per matrimonium, et hoc contingit fieri legitime uel illegitime, scilicet per adulterium, et de hiis modo nichil^b plus dicitur. Alie sunt nuptie spirituales duplices, quia uel anima nubit Christo per meritum uel ipsa nubit^c dyabolo per peccatum. Et iste due nuptie^d fiunt per consensum. Modo de hiis est primo notandum quod sicut in matrimonio carnali sunt quedam conditiones in sponso et sponsa requisite et sunt etiam aliqua que possunt et debent^e

matrimonium impedire, ita contingit in hiis nuptiis spiritualibus. Est^f ista duo reperire et considerare^g.

Primo ergo^h sciendum est [fol. 209^{va}] quod in nuptiis carnalibus sex conditiones requiruntur in sponso et in spiritualibus similiter. Prima conditio condecens in sponso est speciositas. Cum enim speciosus est sponsus, tunc magis placet. Deus autem speciosissimus est. Vnde Ps. (44, 3) : *Speciosus forma pre filiis hominum*. Et in Canticis (1, 15) : *Dilectus meus candidus et rubicundus* etc. Et ideo animam sibi desponsatam summe decorat. Et ideo quelibet anima Christo debet desponsari per amorem et consensum. E contrario autem dyabolus est turpissimus, quia <Thren. 4, 8> *denigrata est super carbones facies eius*, ut de ipso diciturⁱ, et ideo animam sibi desponsatam deturpat et deformat uel denigratⁱ, unde in Trenis (1, 6) : *Egressus est a filia Syon omnis decor eius*. Ideo sibi non debemus nubere animas nostras, sed illi sponso specioso.

Secunda conditio requisita in sponso est potentia corporalis uel fortitudo. Nulla enim nuberet libenter uiro debili et^k impotenti. Certe Deus est summe potens, immo omnipotens. Vnde Ps. (23, 8) : *Dominus fortis et potens, dominus potens in prelio*. Dyabolus autem est debilis et impotens, cuius signum est quia^l paruo baculo uincitur, scilicet per orationem deuotam et huiusmodi bona. Vnde Augustinus : "Oratio demonibus est flagellum, oranti subsidium, angelis solacium", et ideo si istum turpem et^m malum uirum non uelimus habere, effugere et superare poterimus eum per orationem deuotam. Item Gregoriusⁿ : "Debilis est hostis qui non potest uincere nisi uolentem", et ideo animas nostras tali sponso non debemus nubere, sed Christo qui est tam potens, et bonum auxilium habebimus de ipso.

Tertia conditio^o sponso condecens et requisita est quod sit diues. Hec enim^p modo plus requiritur quam omnes precedentes conditiones^q. Deus autem summe diues est quia ipse^r habet omnem thesaurum et totam terram et omnia bona ab ipso procedunt, sicut dicit Iacobus apostolus^s. Vnde Ps. (23, 1) : *Domini est terra et plenitudo eius* etc. Vnde sponsa sibi debet dari anima cuiuslibet, quia eam summe dotat et diuitiis innumerabilibus adornat, scilicet uirtutibus, et eam diuitem facit in eternum. Item sponsam suam cum societate pulcherrima et amenissima ducit in pulcherrimo loco, scilicet in celo, ut ibi compleantur nuptie. Dyabolus autem pauperrimus est, quia exul de paradyso est^t, et ideo non habet ubi sponsam suam ducat, nisi in turpissimo, immundissimo et^u horridissimo loco, et cum turpissima societate, et eam uerberat sepe et male tractat, sicut fecit^v de illo diuite epulone, cuius lectus paratus fuit statim in inferno, quia animam suam per gulam et auaritiam dyabolo desponsauit, quia erat superbus et auarus et gulosus, et Lazaro micas de mensa cadentes negauit. Ipse autem^w postea petiit ab eo^x gutam aque in refrigerium lingue ardentis. Ecce quomodo dyabolus eum soluit de merito et desponsatione anime sue^y, sicut patet in ewangelio. Et dicit hic^z Gregorius : "Si ita fuit pugnitus qui sua non dedit, quomodo erit de illo qui aliena rapit". Ideo sibi non debemus nostras animas desponsare.

Quarta conditio est quod requiritur in sponso^{aa} quod ipse^{bb} sit de bona progenie. Ita est Deus, quia omnes bene agentes sunt de genere suo et filii eius. Vnde iustus quasi liber seruiat Deo, dyabolus autem e contrario est ignobilis, nec habet aliquem bonum in genere suo uel nobilem. Fuit enim exul et eiectus de paradyso, ideo sibi non debemus nubere animas nostras, sed Deo.

[fol. 209^{vb}] Quinta conditio est quod sit benignus et mittis. Deus autem summe est mitis et^{cc} benignus. Dat enim bona tam iniustis quam iustis temporalia saltem, et plura aliquando, et etiam spiritualia ut sanitatem et gaudium, ut patet de malis et usurariis, qui quasi nunquam sunt infirmi. Ex quo patet eius benignitas. Vnde in ewangelio <Mt. 11, 29> : *Discite a me quia mitis^{dd} sum et humilis corde*. Et propter hoc facere debemus ut sibi nubantur anime nostre, et non dyabolo. Ipse enim est summe iniquus^{ee}. Vnde Gregorius : "Valde durum est seruire tali domino qui nullo potest placari obsequio". Vnde notandum est quod secundum Bernardum dyabolus sex filias habet quas aliquibus nupsit. Prima est rapina quam nupsit militibus, secundo usura burgensibus, tertio dolus mercatoribus, quarto superbia clericis, quinto ypocrisis et inuidia nupta est claustralibus, luxuriam uero nulli nupsit : hec enim est pestilentia omnibus communis que intrat castra militum seu nobilium, subintrat muros^{ff} monachorum, penetrat cameras clericorum, senes infestat, iuuenes inquietat, ita ut non sit *qui se abscondat a calore eius* (Ps. 18, 7)^{gg}.

Sexta conditio requisita^{hh} est quod sit sapiens. Ita est Deus quia est fons totius sapientie et prudentie, unde Ps. (146, 5) : *Sapientieⁱⁱ eius non est numerus*. Dyabolus autem fatuissimus est. Plus enim diligit malum quam bonum, et obliuiscitur omnis boni. Ideo^{jj} non est sibi nubendum, sed illi qui omnia uidet et quem nichil latet. Sic ergo propter has sex conditiones animas nostras Deo nubere debemus.

a. de uiro.— b. non.— c. ipsa nubit *om.*— d. nuptie *om.*— e. et debent *om.*— f. est *om.* (*fortassis recte*).— g. et considerare *om.*— h. ergo *om.*— i. ut de ipso dicitur *om.*— j. et.— k. uel.— l. quod.— m. et *om.*— n. Augustinus alibi (*id. lat. 14947 ante corr.*).— o. in *add.*— p. uero conditio.— q. conditiones *om.*— r. ipse *om.*— s. sicut ... apostolus *om.*— t. est *om.*— u. immundissimo et *om.*— v. fuit.— w. ipse autem *om.*— x. ab eo / a quo.— y. de merito ... anime sue *om.*— z. et dicit hic / quod ibi dicit.— aa. est ... in sponso / in sponso requisita est.— bb. ipse *om.*— cc. mitis et *om.*— dd. mitis *om.*— ee. ipse ... iniquus / qui summe est iniquus.— ff. muros / choros.— gg. De hac dicit quedam glosa super Math. : Telum luxurie fugiat omnis homo, iuuenibus inheret, senibus adheret, ex uisu incipit, ex colloquio celebratur, ex tactu consummatur, ex cibo seuit, ex potu insanit et ex uoluptuosa cogitatione insurgit, pulcros habet, fedos possidet et nobiles non amittit et, quod maius est, sub specie religionis exercetur, ut adimpleatur secretius et difficilius percipiatur. De muliere etiam dicit Crisostomus super Mat. : Mulier est amicitia inimica, pena ineffugibilis, temptatio naturalis, calamitas ineuitabilis, necessarium malum, domesticum uicium, dyabolica suggestio, perditio communis *add.* ; lat. 14947 in *margin.* : de hiis plus in pos<tilla ?> rubea LVI.— hh. in sponso *add.*— ii. sapientie / et sapientie.— jj. ideo / et ideo.

APPENDIX 5

Anonymous note on Adam Picard's sermon
(Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 14947, fol. 209^v)

Nota VII conditiones in Christo que multum sunt honeste in sponso et tanguntur Heb. 1^o in principio. Primo quod sit facundus, 'bias parlios', ita

Christus per facundiam suam 'diraina nostre droit'. Ideo dicitur : *Multipharie multisque* (Hb. 1, 1), et adhuc est aduocatus noster, prima Io. II^o (cf. I I^o. 2, 1), Ysa. LXIII (1) : *Ego qui loquor iusticiam et propugnator ad saluandum*, id est 'je desraïne bien mon droit et me combat pour sauver les âmes'.

Secundo ditissimus, ideo dicitur ibi quem *constituit heredem uniuersorum* (Hb. 1, 2).

Tertio sapientissimus, ideo dicitur : *Per quem fecit et secula* (Hb. 1, 3). Prou. III^o : *Dominus sapientia fundauit terram* etc. (Prv. 3, 19).

Quarto pulcherrimus, ideo sequitur : *Qui cum sit splendor* (Hb. 1, 3), quia *speciosus forma pre filiis hominum* (Ps. 44, 3), *in quem desiderant angeli prospicere* (I Pt. 1, 12).

Quinto potentissimus, ideo dicitur : *Portans omnia uerbo* etc. (Hb. 1, 3).

Sexto nobilissimus, ideo sequitur : *Tanto excelsior angelis* (cf. Hb. 1, 4) factus ad quem enim angelorum dicit : *Tu es filius meus* (ibidem).

Septimo est durabilis et eternus, ideo dicitur : *Tu autem idem ipse es* etc. (Hb. 1, 12). Hic est *qui solus habet immortalitatem*, prima Thim. VI^o (13), ideo etc.

APPENDIX 6

Gérard de Mailly, Sermon on John 2, 1 : *Nuptie facte sunt* (extract)
(Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 15959, fol. 266^{ra-rb} ; lat. 16474, fol. 39^{rb}-39^{va})

Sunt autem VII conditiones in Christo que communiter in sponso solent requiri propter quas libenter debet anima cum ipso matrimonium spirituale contrahere que omnes tanguntur in principio epistole ad Hebreos.

Prima conditio est quod est eloquentissimus, gall<ice> 'biaus parliers'. Ipse enim per pulchram loquutionem suam rationabiliter allegauit querelam nostram in cruce, gall<ice> 'deraina', et adhuc in curia celesti allegat. *Aduocatum enim habemus apud patrem Ihesum Christum iustum*, prima Io. 2 (1), unde ipsemet dicit de se ipso, Ysa. LXIII (1) : *Ego qui loquor iustitiam et propugnator sum ad saluandum*, gall<ice> 'j'ai derainié bien ma droiture et si me combat bien por mon aman a saver'. Ista conditio tangitur cum dicitur (Hb. 1, 1) : *Multipharie multisque modis* etc., *nouissime loquutus est nobis in filio*.

Secundo est ditissimus, unde sequitur quod *constituit heredem uniuersorum* (Hb. 1, 5), ideo dicit anima sancta Sap. VIII (9) : *Proposui hanc*, id est sapientiam increatam Dei filium sponsum, *michi assumere qui communicabit michi de bonis suis*.

Tertio est sapientissimus unde sequitur : *Per quem fecit et secula* (Hb. 1, 2). Prov. III (19) : *Dominus sapientia fundauit terram, stabiliuit celos prudentia*.

Quarto est pulcherrimus unde sequitur : *Qui cum sit splendor glorie et figura substantie Dei* (Hb. 1, 3). Ipse enim est [fol. 266^{rb}] formosus in stola sua unde in Ps. LXIII (3) : *Speciosus forma pre filiis hominum, in quem desiderant angeli prospicere* (I Pt. 1, 12).

Quinto est fortissimus siue potentissimus, unde sequitur : *Portans omnia uerbo uirtutis sue* (Hb. 1, 3). Istam autem fortitudinem maxime declarat portando peccatores per expectationem. Facilius enim est portare totum mundum quam unum peccatum, unde Gregorius : "Deus qui omnipotenciam tuam parcendo" etc.

Sexto est nobilissimus unde sequitur : *Tanto excelsior angelis factus* (Hb. 1, 4), et sequitur : *Ad quem enim angelorum dixit : Filius meus es tu* (Hb. 1, 5).

Septimo est immortalis et eternus, unde sequitur : *Tu autem idem ipse es* etc. (Hb. 1, 12). Hic enim est *qui habet solus immortalitatem*, prima Thi. VI (16).

Propter igitur istas septem conditiones libenter debet anima contrahere matrimonium cum ipso. Sed aduertendum est quod iste sponsus quatuor conditiones requirit in sponsa, scilicet uirginitatis integritatem, amorem siue caritatem, obedientie humilitatem et ornatus spiritualis uarietatem (...).

APPENDIX 7

Anonymous notes (about 1272-1273)

(Paris, Bibl. nat., ms lat. 16482, fol. 101^{vb}-102^{rb})

Nuptie facte sunt. Sciendum quod ea que considerat mulier carnalis in sponso suo debet considerare anima fidelis que desponsatur uel Christo uel diabolo. Illa autem sunt VIII.

Primo considerat mulier si sponsus est pulcher. Sed Deus est ita pulcher ut dicatur in Ps. (44, 3) de eo : *Speciosus forma pre filiis hominum*, et in Cant. V (10) : *Dilectus meus candidus et rubicundus*. Bernardus : "Inestimabilis gratia ut eius mer<e>aris (meriaris *ms*) sponsa esse quem desiderant angeli prospicere". Diabolus uero turpis est, Tren. IIII (8) : *Denigrata est super carbones facies eius*.

Secundo considerat et uidet quod sit fortis et probus. Talis est Deus, Ps. (23, 8) : *Dominus fortis et potens in prelio*. Iob VII (= Iob 10, 7) : *Non est qui de manu sua possit eruere*. Et si fortitudo queritur, robustissimus est. Econtra diabolus est. Gregorius : "Debilis est homo qui non uin<cit> nisi u<olentem>".

Tertio considerat quod sit diues. Talis est Deus, Ps. (111, 3) : *Gloria et diuicie in domo eius*. Ysa. LXVII (= 64, 4) : *Oculus non uidit* etc., I Cor. VII (= 1 Cor. 2, 9), que preparauit diligentibus se. Vnde ducet sponsam suam in patriam, scilicet in gloriam eternam que est opulentissima. Econtra diabolus est multum pauper, spoliatus gratuitis et uulneratus in naturalibus et ducet sponsam suam in patriam [fol. 102^{ra}] pauperrimam, in qua nichil boni, unde diues guttam aque ibi habere non potuit. Luc 16, et sponsa sua depauperatur a diabolo etc.

Quarto considerat quod sit nobilis generis. Talis est Deus, Ysa. LIII (8) : *Generationem eius quis enarrabit ?* Econtra diabolus seruus est Dei sempiternus et inuitus, Iob XL (23) : *Accipies eum seruum sempiternum*.

Quinto considerat quod non sit avarus. Deus est multum largus qui *dat omnibus affluenter*, Iac. I (= Iac. 2, 5). Luc XI (*sic*) : *Petite et accipietis*. Ioh. XVI (24) : *Petite* etc. Econtra diabolus nichil dat in domo sua, scilicet in inferno, nisi tormenta, Mt. XIII (42) : *Ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium*.

Sexto considerat quod non sit superbus. Talis est Christus, Mt. XI (28) : *Discite a me quia mitis et humilis corde*. Econtra diabolus ualde est superbus, cuius superbia ascendit semper ut dicitur in Ps. Ysa. XIII (14) : *Ascendam* etc.

Septimo considerat ne nimis sit largus ne fiat pauper. Talis est Deus qui non potest pauper fieri, quia de nichilo potest facere omnia sicut fecit solo uerbo. Ps. (32, 9) : *Dixit et facta sunt*. Econtra diabolus est pauper et prodigus, Luc X, spoliatus gratuitis etc. Ita totum dedit quod sibi nichil retinuit.

Octauo considerat quod sit sapiens, non stultus. Talis est Deus cuius sapientie non est numerus, in Ps. Econtra diabolus stultus est <Prov.> XI (29) : *Stultus seruiet sapienti*, quod per stulticiam suam cecidit in inferno et illuc faciet cadere sponsas suas.

Nono requiritur quod sit optimus.

Christus est sponsus nobilissimus, alioquin contempneretur ; ditissimus, alioquin sponsam large non dotaret ; sapientissimus, quia si stultus totum dissiparet ; pulcherrimus, alioquin displiceret ; potentissimus, alioquin opprimeretur ; optimus, alioquin non diligeretur. De hiis omnibus Heb. I : *Locutus est nobis in filio*, ecce nobilitatis excellencia ; *quem constituit heredem uniuersorum*, ecce diuitiarum affluencia ; *per quem fecit et secula*, [fol. 102^{rb}] ecce sapientia ; *cum sit splendor glorie*, ecce forme elegantia ; *portansque omnia* etc., ecce potentia ; *purgationem faciens*, ecce bonitas immensa. Ve autem anime peccatoris que se iungit sponso diabolo in quo sunt contrarie dispositiones, ut habetur Gen. XVII : *Pater tuus Amorreus* etc. Ibi uide.