





Jussi Hanska

.....

"And the Rich  
Man also died;  
and He was  
buried in Hell"

– The Social Ethos in Mendicant Sermons

Kansikuva: Konrad Holtzner, Sermones de tempore. Bav. burghes. 180, f. 107r. © Bibliotheca  
Apostolica Vaticana

© Jussi Hanska

ISSN 1238-3503

ISBN 951-710-076-0

Hakapaino Oy

Helsinki 1997

## ■ Acknowledgements

Every single dissertation is in the end a product of a long process in the course of which many people and institutions have made crucial contributions. The present book is no exception of the rule, on the contrary, I feel that it reflects a high degree of team work. Now at the end of my labour, it is a pleasant duty to thank all the people and institutions involved in making it.

I would like to thank my former Professor Olli Vehviläinen as well as my present (Professor Marjatta Hietala for believing in the project and giving me a pleasant surroundings to work. I also thank all my colleagues at the Tampere University History Department to whom I own many long formal and informal discussions over my work.

At different stages of the process many people have been reading and commenting on my manuscript. They deserve due recognition for the trouble and pain they have gone through: Professor David d'Avray, Professor Veikko Litzen, Professor Bernard Rosenthal, Doctor David Flood OFM., Docent Christian Krötzl, Docent Pauli Annala, Doctor Päivi Mehtonen, Lic.Phil. Antti Ruotsala, Lic.phil. Virpi Mäkinen, M.A. Maiju Lehmijoki and M.A. Tapio Salminen. All of them have given me valuable advise, some taken some stubbornly refused.

Due to the nature of sources used in this study I have had to travel extensively to European manuscript libraries. The staffs in most of them has been overwhelmingly helpful and sympathetic. Here it is not possible to name each and every institution, however there are some which I want to mention particularly: Dottore Massimo Ceresa from Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana who has been a pleasure to work with as well as a close personal friend. The Reposektionen of Uppsala Universistets Bibliotek is without any doubt the fastest and most efficient I have ever come across. It is indeed a pleasure to thank them.

Over the years, while pursuing my post-graduate studies I have received generous support from various institutions and foundations to whom I would like to express my gratitude. These are: The Finnish Academy, H. Weijolan

---

rahasto, Oskar Öflunds stiftelse, Niilo Helanderin säätiö and Eemil Aaltosen säätiö.

I would also like to thank Tampereen kaupungin tiederahasto for a grant for publishing my dissertation and The Finnish Historical Society for accepting it in their series *Biblioteca Historica*. I wish to thank Rauno Énden from his unbelievable flexibility under the extraordinary circumstances when preparing this book for publication. I am also grateful for M.A. Robert MacGilleon for correcting my English and our enjoyable discussions over the book. Docent Teivas Oksala has been kind enough to read the manuscript and check out the Latin quotations; *gratias tibi ago!*

Lastly I would like to thank my wife Terhi and my family. Many is a page in this book written on a time borrowed from them.

Tampere, October 1997

Jussi Hanska

# ■ Contents

## Acknowledgements

## Contents

Note on translations, transcriptions and names	9
1. In Search of a Mendicant Social Ethos	11
1.1. The Purpose of the Study	11
1.2. Socioeconomic Conditions in the Thirteenth Century	17
1.3. Sources and Method of Study	20
1.4. Poverty, Sermons and the Study of History	25
2. Dives and Lazarus	28
2.1. The Exegetical Tradition of the Lazarus Parable	28
2.2. The Lazarus Parable in Model Sermons	32
2.2.1. The General Outline and the Message of the Sermons	32
2.2.2. "There was a Certain Rich Man"	39
2.2.3. "And there was a Certain Beggar"	58
3. Who were the Rich and the Poor of the Lazarus Sermons?	64
3.1. The Noble and the Powerful	66
3.1.1. Plunderers and Pillagers	66
3.1.2. Distorted Justice	73
3.1.3. Pride and Vanity	77
3.2. Prelates	82
3.2.1. Clerical Avarice	82
3.2.2. Clerical Vainglory	85
3.3. Do Merchants have a Hope of Salvation?	88
3.4. The Poor as Good Christians	92
3.4.1. The Poor and the Sick	92
3.4.2. The Workers	95
4. Et videtur quod non – Objections to Hypothesis	104
4.1. The Dead Weight of Tradition	104
4.2. Turning the Tables – the Virtuous Rich and the Sinful Poor	106
4.3. Pauperes cum Lazaro or Pauperes cum Petro?	114
4.4. The Humble Franciscans and the Aristocratic Dominicans	117

4.5. The Conflict between Reality and Mendicant Writings	119
5. Et videtur quod sic	122
5.1. The Real Role of the Tradition in Sermons	122
5.2. Possibility vs. Probability	124
5.3. Virtuous and even more Virtuous Poverty	133
5.4. The Homogeneity of the Mendicant Orders	138
6. Focus on the Other World	142
6.1. Conservative Radicals	142
6.2. Reward	151
6.3. Revenge	156
7. Respondeo quod sic – Conclusions	168
Abbreviations	175
Bibliography	176
Appendix	182
Name index	195



## Note on translations, transcriptions, and names.

This book includes numerous passages cited from the manuscripts and early printed editions. Due to the difficulty for a reader to check personally all these sources, I have placed all citations in the original language in footnotes and translations in the main text. In the case of the preacher's handbook *Fasciculus morum*, I have used the translation by Siegfried Wenzel, which is included in his edition. In all other cases the translations are my own.

The transcriptions of the texts given in the footnotes follow the scribe's spelling save in the few cases where it is not possible to know how the original scribe would have spelled a word he has given in abbreviated form. A good example of such cases are the abbreviated quotations from the Bible, which are often given in manuscripts in the following form: *Ps. "Argentum igne exa. p. t. p. septuplum"*. Such passages are here enlarged: *Ps. [11:7]: "Argentum igne examinatum probatum terrae purgatum septuplum."*

In the case of the footnotes, manuscripts are always quoted with their full name, number and the folio numbers in question. In the case of the early printed editions, however, the year of printing is always given in the footnote.

The names of the medieval writers appear in the form used in the language they themselves spoke, thus not Humbertus de Romanis, but Humbert de Romans. Only in the case where the language and nationality of a person are unknown or uncertain is the Latin form of the name used. A good example is Nicolaus de Aquaevilla, who could have been either English or French.

Having said this I would like to borrow the immortal words of Simon Franklin and Jonathan Shepard: "*In controlled tests, the inconsistent transliteration of foreign names and terms might emerge as one of the main causes of high blood-pressure in the academic community. Transliteration is like gambling: however subtle the system, the odds will always defeat one in the end.*"<sup>1</sup> Bearing in mind this and the fact that my study is not a philological one, I would ask the reader to be patient with the almost inescapable errors in transcriptions and translations.

---

1 J. Franklin and J. Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus 750-1200* (London & New York 1986), p. x.



# ■ 1. In Search of a Mendicant Social Ethos

## 1.1. The Purpose of the Study

One of the great social and moral dilemmas of the thirteenth century was the relation between the different strata of society. The élite were extremely rich even according to modern standards, while the poor often found themselves below the level of subsistence. The lords and prelates used almost unlimited power within their jurisdiction while the rights of the lower orders were often either nonexistent or not respected.

Mendicant preachers as well as other men of the Church had to take some stand with the problems and social controversies of the time. This study seeks answers to three important questions. First: Was there a common mendicant social ethos, that is, a common mendicant response to the tension between the poor and the rich and between the humble and the powerful? Before this book I wrote my Licentiate thesis on the *Seven Capital Sins in the Late 13th and Early 14th Century Preaching Materials*.<sup>1</sup> One of the most stimulating findings of that study was the abundance of sources where the poor people and the humble workers were presented in a saintly light.

The other side of the coin, even more frequently encountered in these sources, was the sinfulness of the rich and the powerful. The Mendicants<sup>2</sup> seemed always to take the side of the ordinary man against the rich and powerful oppressor. Considering this, we can reformulate the question: *Is it the case that mendicants considered the rich and the powerful to be sinners, if not predestined to damnation, and further, were the poor, the sick and those who work considered to be good Christians and likely to be saved?*

This mendicant custom of taking the side of the poor in confrontations in thirteenth-century society has been proposed by other historians too. L.T. Smith wrote about the Franciscan Nicole Bozon: "[...] *his sympathies are manifestly on the side of the poor as against their oppression and robbery by rich masters and lords.*"<sup>3</sup> Edward Tracy Brett brings out the Dominican side of the matter, writing about Humbert de Romans: "*Finally, like most thirteenth-century friars, he displays great compassion for the poor and the oppressed, while seizing*

---

1 Jussi Vainionpää, *Seitsemän kuolemansyntiä 1200- ja 1300-lukujen saarnamateriaaleissa*. Yleisen historian lisensiaatintutkielma (unprinted, Tampere 1994).

2 I use the word mendicants in this study to mean exclusively Dominicans and Franciscans, since the impact of other mendicant orders on preaching materials was far less important.

3 L.T. Smith, English Popular Preaching in the Fourteenth-Century. *The English Historical Review* vol. VII (1892), p. 24.

every opportunity to chastise their wealthy and powerful oppressors.”<sup>4</sup>

Similarly G.R. Owst in his classic book characterised friars as champions of the poor, who attacked the tyranny and oppression of the lords, the weaknesses of the knights, the ravages of retainers, the cunning and extortion of merchants, the corruption of the law, in short every conceivable form of injustice in the land.<sup>5</sup> In fact the whole book can be read as a collection of stories that confirm this characterisation. The same applies to its sequel, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*.<sup>6</sup>

L.T. Smith and E.T. Brett made observation of one friar only and Owst came to his conclusions, not on the basis of systematic analysis but of a wide reading of sermon manuscripts (this is not to argue that his conclusions are not reliable). Furthermore, Smith and Owst analysed only English material, or material preserved in English libraries which in some cases might well have been originally written on the Continent. Owst's observations concern mostly the fourteenth and fifteenth century, although he occasionally uses preachers who certainly wrote in the thirteenth century.<sup>7</sup> Brett's study is of a French friar, only one man, although an influential one. As a synthesis of these studies one can say that although the mendicant tendency to take the side of the poor and the oppressed has been perceived by historians for some time, a systematic study on the subject is lacking. There is still room for a study that concentrates on the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and analyses systematically mendicant sermons not only (or even mostly) English but also from the Continent. The present book aims to narrow the gap.

Before we go any further, we must define what is meant with the concept *poor* in this study, since the everyday meaning of the word differs from its thirteenth century connotations. Two important divisions need to be taken into account. The first is that there were poor in the strict sense of the word and poor in the wider meaning. The poor in the strict sense of the word were those who lived in destitution and could not support themselves. The definition of such poverty is of course relative and varies in different times and places.<sup>8</sup>

In the broader sense of the word poor was seen as an opposite to the words *potens, miles, or diues*. The expression *pauperes Christi*, the poor of Christ, embraced all those who were suffering for one reason or another. Amongst their ranks were the poor, the sick, prisoners, the old, the weak, those who

---

4 E.T. Brett, *Humbert of Romans. His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society*. Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Studies and Texts 67 (Toronto 1984), p. 161.

5 G.R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England. An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period c. 1350-1450* (Cambridge 1926), p. 80.

6 G.R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters & of the English People* (Cambridge 1933).

7 Owst did not enjoy the benefits of Schneyer's *Repertorium* and thus he was at the mercy of the attributions made in manuscripts themselves, which are often lacking and occasionally misleading. A quick look into the index of Owst's book reveals that several preachers did come from the Continent and some of his sources were written in the thirteenth century or both (Nicolaus de Aquaevilla, Berthold von Regensburg, Étienne de Bourbon, and Nicolas de Gorran to name but few).

8 M. Mollat, *La notion de la pauvreté au Moyen Age*. In M. Mollat, *Études sur l'économie et la société de l'Occident médiéval XIIe-XVe s.* (London 1977), p. XIV,7.

were mentally ill, those who were oppressed, slaves, those who were not nobles and so on. The concept poor in its wider sense could include all those who were not rich or noble (although even poor knights are mentioned every now and then in the sources). It is also important to note that the poor were often associated with farmers and workers who worked day after day never having any security of tomorrow's sustenance. Thus being engaged in manual work meant that one was counted to be poor in the widest sense of the word.<sup>9</sup>

According to Alexander Murray the poor in the widest sense of the word included the poorer peasantry in the country and small shopkeepers, artisans and wage-earners in towns. Thus some people who would according to modern practice definitely be counted as middle class were seen to belong to the poor. At the lower fringe of these classes and below them were the poor in the narrow sense of the word. They were those people whose only source of sustenance was lawbreaking or charity.<sup>10</sup>

The poor were divided not only according the actual extent of their poverty but also on the basis of its motivation. They were divided into (using Gerhoh von Regensburg's expression) *pauperes cum Petro* and *pauperes cum Lazaro*, that is, the voluntarily poor and the poor due to necessity, or as Mollat writes, *les pauvres proprement dits*.<sup>11</sup> This division is important with respect to the first key question in this study. One of the most important themes in twelfth- and thirteenth-century history was the apostolic life movement and the strong emphasis it placed on the voluntary poverty. According to general opinion, abandoning one's temporal property and *nudus nudum Christum sequere* (naked follow the naked Christ) was the surest way to salvation and sanctity.

An interesting problem is how much the sanctity of voluntary poverty was transmitted to actual and less voluntary poverty? It is certainly true that the voluntarily poor, that is, the religious, were considered to be good Christians who live a saintly life. More arguable, however, is the question in to what extent, if at all, the glory of voluntary poverty was reflected onto *les pauvres proprement dits*? Mollat answers this question by pointing out that during the later Middle Ages the word poor became synonymous with words like lazy, vagabond and criminal. One of the themes of this research is to see whether Mollat's results are equally valid for Lazarus sermons.<sup>12</sup>

For the sake of clarity I have sought to specify whether it is a question of the poor in the strict or wider sense of the word, or whether it is a question of the voluntarily poor or *les pauvres proprement dits*. Only in such cases where it is obvious from the context or a matter of indifference which poor are referred

9 M. Mollat, *La notion de la pauvreté au Moyen Age*, pp. XIV, 5-6; M. Mollat, *Les pauvres et la société médiévale*. In M. Mollat, *Études sur l'économie et la société de l'Occident médiéval XIIe-XVe s.* (London 1977), p. XV, 75; B. Geremek, *Geschichte der Armut. Elend und Barmherzigkeit in Europa* (München und Zürich 1988), pp. 31 and 41.

10 A. Murray, *Religion among the Poor in Thirteenth-Century France: The Testimony of Humbert de Romans*. *Traditio* XXX (1974), p. 295.

11 B. Geremek, *Geschichte der Armut*, p. 35; M. Mollat, *Les pauvres et la société médiévale*, p. 72.

12 M. Mollat, *Les pauvres et la société médiévale*, p. 77.

to, I have used the word without further explanations.

The second key question arises from the first. If the answer to the first is accepted, we must ask: *Why did the mendicant social ethos turn out to be what it was?* What were the ideas or concrete socio-economic reasons behind it. In the preliminary stage of the inquiry three hypothetical explanations may be sketched. The first is that friars simply reacted to the current situation in society. The poor and the lower strata were maltreated or neglected in such a manner that it demanded the attention of the friars, or at least this is how they perceived the situation. This explanation would mean that they more or less spontaneously reacted to current social problems.

The second explanation is a variant of the first. It can be called a teleological explanation. The friars were aiming at some concrete result, merely improving the conditions of the poor, the sick and other outcasts of society by raising the level of the social conscience of the better-off. To achieve these results they chose their publicly stated opinions and ways of communicating them accordingly. This explanation suggests that the friars knowingly assumed a certain policy instead of reacting spontaneously to the current situation.

The third explanation differs from the others in one aspect. In it the chosen attitude is not that of the friars, but it is built into the Christian religion. This can be called the biblical explanation. Advocacy of the poor and oppressed against the rich and the powerful was and is buried deep inside the Christian religion and it can be detected throughout the *Bible*. Thus in reality the friars were not free to decide how they would react to the problem of the poor and poverty, their reactions were predetermined by the Bible and other Christian authorities (i.e. the Fathers).

It is quite obvious from these preliminary soundings that all of these considerations were involved the development of mendicant social thinking. What needs to be done is to find out exactly to what extent these two causes – the actual social situation and biblical influence – can be used to explain the actual effect, i.e. mendicant social thinking. There are some difficulties in doing so. If we start from the actual social situation as a cause underlying the mendicant social ethos (be it through spontaneous action or carefully planned policy), we must analyse different sources in their socio-economic context. When, where and under what kind of circumstances were they written? These are crucial questions, since the socio-economic situation varied greatly in different times and places. Circumstances in late thirteenth-century Florence were certainly different from, say, those of early fourteenth-century Sweden.

If we try to connect the sermons to the specific circumstances under which they were written we run into some serious problems. In most cases we cannot accurately date or localise individual model sermon collections. Even their writers often remain somewhat shadowy figures. In worst cases we only know the name and nationality of the writer. Even if we do know where and when some collection was published, we still cannot be sure whether it was also written then. The following examples will make it easier to emphasise the difficulties in localising and dating individual sermons within the collections.

Writers of model sermon collections could put their collections together in several ways. They could borrow sermons from other collections or unpublished sermons from their fellow brothers. These they could include as such or remodel the better to suit their purposes. If they used their own sermons, they could either write completely new ones or they could use sermons they had preached earlier to real audiences. This latter method was used at least by Servasanto da Faenza (as suggested by Father Bataillon) and Berthold von Regensburg, who tells us so explicitly in his prologue to *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Any one of these methods or any combination of them could have been used to create a new model sermon collection.<sup>13</sup>

Here several problems emerge. If someone wrote a model sermon collection in Florence, it does not necessarily mean that sermons included in it reflect the situation in Florence. He could have borrowed from someone who wrote in England or he could have used a sermon that he himself had preached in England twenty years previously! Here it is important to remember that friars were often on the move (suffice it to mention Bonaventure's or fra Salimbene's well-documented lives). Even if we could assume that the errors arising from the mobility of men and sermon material could be eliminated by checking the style of individual sermons against the style of the proposed writer or with internal evidence that would allow us to localise and date a sermon, we would still have to remember the function of the model sermon collections.

They were officially published collections that were meant to be used by other preachers, preferably in as large a geographical area as possible and hopefully for years after publication. Individual sermons preached live could, and probably every now and then did, refer directly to problems and abuses at a certain place and time. Model sermons, however, had to operate on a more general level to gain popularity. They were supposed to include material that was continuously interesting and always fashionable regardless of specific socio-economic circumstances; the problems and themes presented in these sermons were of a such nature that they could reasonably be assumed to remain valid in every corner of Christendom. It is thus not relevant to connect the sources of this study to their original surroundings. It is more to the point to see them through the general outline of late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century social and economic history. Despite regional differences there were general problems which prevailed everywhere and these were the questions handled in model sermon collections.

The problem in explaining the social view of the mendicant brothers by biblical tradition is that any attitude towards any subject at all taken up in

---

13 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars. Sermons diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford 1988, first published 1985), pp. 96-104; L.-J. Bataillon, *Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons*. In *La prédication au XIIIe siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993), p. 21. Berthold von Regensburg's prologue is edited in A.E. Schönbach, *Studien zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Predigt. Die Überlieferung der Werke Bertholds von Regensburg II* (Wien 1906), p. 3. "Istos sermones ea necessitate coactus sum notare (cum tamen invitissime hoc fecerim), quod cum predicarem eos in populo, quidam simplices clerici et religiosi, non intelligentes, in quibus verbis et sententiis veritas penderet, voluerunt notare sibi illa, que poterant capere, et sic multa falsa notaverunt."

mendicant sources would certainly be confirmed with biblical authorities. As it is known even today, anything at all can be proposed and argued by using the *Bible* or selected parts of it as an argument. Therefore the problem is: whether the *Bible* was the origin of the ideas presented or whether the ideas were merely argued and confirmed by using alleged biblical authority.

The third main question is of the nature of a by-product in this study. David d'Avray has proposed the idea of "the mental calendar of mendicant preaching". He points out that certain themes and topics were discussed by preachers on particular Sundays or feasts. Lenten sermons were mostly concerned with the penance and sermons for the second Sunday after Epiphany were often about marriage.<sup>14</sup> The main corpus of sources in this present study comprises the sermons of the first Sunday after Trinity Sunday. These will be analysed systematically and thus it is the third key objective of this study to establish what topics were discussed in these sermons.

Finally, before embarking upon the actual study, I may give a brief account of its contents. This is somewhat unconventional, but so is indeed the plan of this book - it is partially based on the model of the medieval *quaestio*. The first chapter is a short description of socio-economic situation in Europe in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century (1.2). Furthermore it includes a description of the sources and methods used in this book as well as some of the earlier studies that have been influential in its making (chapters 1.3 and 1.4).

The second main chapter describes what the Lazarus sermons were like, what theological and exegetical tradition they were based on (2.1), how they were organised, and what their central message was (2.2.1). This chapter also deals with certain *topoi* and similarities encountered in several sermons regardless of the religious order of the writer or the dating of the sermon (2.2.2 and 2.2.3).

The third chapter analyses other sources in order to complete the picture drawn from the Lazarus sermons. The material presented in it is, to use jargon familiar from the natural sciences, a control group to which the actual sample, i.e. the Lazarus sermons, is compared. It clarifies who were the sinful rich (3.1-3.3) and the virtuous poor (3.4) in real life, and just why they were considered to be sinners or model Christians.

The above-mentioned *quaestio* starts in the fifth chapter. It could be formulated as follows: *Quaeritur utrum pauperes meliores christiani quam divites sint et facilius salventur quam illi?* The fourth chapter presents several counterarguments for the general hypothesis of this study, while the fifth and sixth seek to answer these and present plausible counterarguments. The inevitable *respondeo* phase follows in the seventh and last chapter of the book.

---

14 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 249-251; D.L. d'Avray, *Method in the Study of Medieval Sermons*. In *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons. Essays on Marriage, Death, History and Sanctity* by Nicole Bériou and David L. d'Avray. Biblioteca di Medioevo Latino 11 (Spoleto 1994), p. 4.



## 1.2. Socioeconomic Conditions in the Thirteenth Century<sup>15</sup>

*De durost ultima ferro.  
protinus inrupit uenae peioris in aeuum  
omne nefas: fugere pudor uerumque fidesque;  
in quorum subiere locum fraudesque dolique  
insidiaeque et uis et amor sceleratus habendi.  
(P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon I,127-131)*

This is how the Roman poet Ovid described the coming of his own age, the iron age. The golden age, even though it never existed outside people's imagination, had to be invented to serve as a contrast to the violence and abuses of the real world. The Christian version of *aetas aurea* was of course the garden of Eden before the fall of man. Since then men have been living in the iron age brought on by sin. The presence of sin had metamorphosed the perfect world created by God to a state of corruption.

In Paradise all (i.e. both) people enjoyed equal and everlasting prosperity and good health. They had enough to eat and they had no unfulfilled needs. In the world corrupted by sin everything has changed. Some still have everything they can imagine, while others die of hunger, cold and disease. Poverty had become, and during the thirteenth century it continued in ever increasing measure to be, a social problem.

The thirteenth century was seen as a golden age ("*heureux temps de Monseigneur Saint Louis*") by historians of the last generation. Modern research has largely changed that view.<sup>16</sup> In fact it was a time of violence and social injustice, not particularly so when compared to preceding or immediately following centuries, but nevertheless it was very much alienated from the Christian idea of an *aetas aurea* or perfect society.

The thirteenth century has been seen as a part of a phenomenon known as the commercial revolution. Monetary economy was revived, trade flourished, and towns multiplied in number as well as in population. It is important to remember, however, that despite these changes Europe remained an essentially agrarian society.<sup>17</sup> A huge majority of its population gained their daily living from agriculture. Thus it was the fortunes of agriculture that dictated the general well-being of the population. A good harvest meant relative well-being whereas a bad one or even worse, crop failure, meant hunger and death.

It is true that the first half or first three quarters of the century were a time of relative prosperity, and in some areas like northern Italy the prosperity continued well beyond that time. Until the middle of the thirteenth century new land was amply available for cultivation and the general economic situation remained

15 What follows is a short sketch of the economic history of the thirteenth century. It is based on textbooks rather than specific studies. The idea is to present the common landscape in which the preachers wrote without going into regional details.

16 M. Bourin-Derruau, *Temps d'équilibres, temps de ruptures XIIIe siècle*. Nouvelle histoire de la France Médiévale 4 (Paris 1990), p. 7.

17 There are exceptions such as Northern Italy, where the size of urban population was much larger than in other parts of Europe.

satisfying. Carlo Cipolla writes: "The combination of favourable circumstances made possible a general economic expansion from which everybody in Europe appears to have benefited, though in different degrees."<sup>18</sup>

The problems of the late thirteenth century were mostly agricultural. The trade and wealth of the cities continued to grow after the stagnation of the countryside had set in. The demographic pressure steadily increased all through the century and eventually things came to the point where lands with diminishing marginal returns were being cultivated. Down to the latter half of the century new land was claimed for cultivation through internal colonisation as well as external expansion. Forests were cleared, large areas of Spain were repossessed from Muslims by reconquest, and German movement eastward had considerably enlarged western Christendom. All these sources of land were running out. In some areas the extensive deforestation began to be counterproductive due the erosion and decline of fertility, and everywhere the amounts of forest to be cleared simply diminished and became unimportant.

All this amounted to an increasing hunger for land. There was a tendency on the part of landlords to commute labour services into money rents and to lease their demesnes to those better off peasants who could afford to rent them. It has been demonstrated that the size of the farms diminished and their number increased towards the end of the century. The number of smallholders, and those who did not have any land at all grew and it led to the increasing impoverishment of agrarian Europe. Some of the landless managed to find sustenance by working for others, others were forced into mendicancy. Some historians prefer to call this the birth of the rural proletariat. The effects of this situation were not confined to the countryside, for the increase in population and relative decrease in agricultural production meant rises in the prices of most agricultural commodities. As at the same time wages came down, the relative rises were even more dramatic and they were equally painfully felt by the poorer people in towns.<sup>19</sup>

How great a social problem was poverty? Even in the times of relative prosperity in the first half of the century, there were winners and losers, and those who were caught on the wrong side of that line were numerous. The situation grew much worse in the latter half of the century. It is difficult to obtain trustworthy quantitative evidence, but nevertheless some historians have made calculations for those areas where enough sources have survived to make it possible. Others have taken the chance to present some tentative hypothesis on a more general level. As might be expected, the numbers of the poor varied

---

18 C. Cipolla, *Before the Industrial Revolution. European Society and Economy, 1000-1700*. (London 1980), pp. 204-207.

19 See for instance: G. Duby, *L'économie rurale et la vie des campagnes dans l'Occident médiéval II* (Paris 1977), pp. 121-132; C. Cipolla, *Before the Industrial Revolution*, pp. 204-207 and 214; R. Cameron, *A Concise Economic History of the World. From Paleolithic Times to the Present* (New York - Oxford 1989), pp. 74-75; R. Fossier, *Histoire sociale de l'Occident médiéval* (Paris 1979), pp. 243, 304 and 315; W. Rösener, *Peasants in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1992), pp. 33-34; J.Z. Titow, *English Rural Society 1200-1350*. Historical Problems: Studies and Documents 4 (London 1969), pp. 65-73.

in different places and times. However, it is useful to present some figures as general guidelines.

According to Robert Fossier in thirteenth-century Picardy, 12% of the population were downright poor and beggars; 33% had so small fields that it was difficult to get by and one bad year would have ruined them completely; 36% had a decent amount of land, but is doubtful whether they could afford any draught whatsoever; 16% were relatively well off and only 3% can be calculated to belong to the peasant élite.<sup>20</sup> It has been estimated that in the latter half of the thirteenth century in England, one half of the peasant population had holdings insufficient to maintain their families even at the bare minimum of subsistence. Estimations of the number of those who held ten acres or less, an amount certainly below subsistence level, have varied between 40 and 50% of the peasant population.<sup>21</sup> Figures for the southern parts of Holland in 1289 were almost equal to percentages presented by Fossier.<sup>22</sup>

Michel Mollat has estimated the situation on the European level. According to his calculations the number of those who were unable to sustain themselves was rarely below 20% and often more than 50% of the population. These figures describe the situation starting from the beginning of the fourteenth century, which was economically less favourable than the thirteenth century (due to demographic pressure, plague, ravages of the war between France and England, and worsening climate); however, even allowing for some little modification, the number of the poor in the strict sense of the word remains high.<sup>23</sup> One must remember, on the other hand, that there were major differences in the number of smallholders and cottagers between different geographical areas of Europe. Furthermore there were differences in availability of additional sources of income to complement the scant output from agriculture. Nevertheless, in most areas the extent of social differentiation within the peasantry increased during the High Middle Ages.<sup>24</sup>

If we turn to the cities of the time we find there too that poverty was an important issue, if not as severe as it was in the countryside. Poverty in towns was generated by under-payment, which made it difficult for urban workers to support their families, especially if there were numerous children.<sup>25</sup> In addition to under-paid workers there was always a certain number of beggars and temporarily unemployed persons.

Putting all these figures together we must arrive at the conclusion that the proportion of poor people who were either unable to sustain themselves and

---

20 R. Fossier, *La terre et les hommes en Picardie jusqu'à la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Paris - Louvain 1968), p. 647.

21 M.M. Postan, *Medieval Agrarian Society in its Prime: England*. In *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*. Vol. I. *The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages*. Edited by M.M. Postan (Cambridge 1971), p. 622.

22 C. Lis & H. Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe* (New Jersey 1979), p. 15.

23 M. Mollat, *Les pauvres et la société médiévale*, p. XV, 81; C. Cipolla, *Before the Industrial Revolution*, pp. 214-216; E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Histoire du climat depuis l'an mil* (Paris 1967), pp. 14-15.

24 W. Rösener, *Peasants in the Middle Ages*, pp. 203-205.

25 C. Lis & H. Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe*, pp. 16-17.

their families or just barely managed to do so was between one third and half of the total population. Thus the problem of the poor and the poverty was indeed a substantial one and certainly visible in thirteenth-century society. The number of the poor was simply too great to be overlooked.

Furthermore the contrast between the very rich and the very poor had become more glaring, more keenly felt and more heavily charged with consequences. There had been social unrest, riots, and even civil wars in towns, and pressure in the countryside was also growing. Even though there were no revolts comparable to *Jacquerie* or other major rebellions of the fourteenth century, there certainly was a growing feeling of dissatisfaction which was manifested in a more peaceful manner. A good example of latter is England, where both royal and manorial records are exceptionally abundant. There is a huge number of cases where peasants tried to pursue their rights against their lords through courts.<sup>26</sup>

While a large part of population suffered from serious impoverishment, others were becoming ever richer. Most landlords (noblemen, monasteries, prelates and richer peasants) profited from the rises in rents and prices of agricultural commodities, although one has to keep in mind that many landlords were still increasingly in debt due to living beyond their means. Merchants were also on the winning side of the line. Despite the stagnation in the countryside, trade was producing good profits, as were money-lending activities. These people were the rich and the powerful, that is, the potential sinners.

### 1.3. Sources and Method of Study

The main sources of this study are sermons on Jesus' parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-31).<sup>27</sup> This gospel pericope was chosen because the themes of preaching picked from it (as indeed the whole gospel itself) held great attraction for anyone concerned to present his social views and opinions on such problems as wealth, power, poverty and the tension between the poor and the rich. Most common themes taken from this gospel were: *Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur in purpura et bysso* and *Fili recordare, quia recepisti bona in vita tua*. Occasionally also themes such as *Mortuus est dives et sepultus est in inferno* and *Pater Abraham miserere mei* were used. It is the *a priori* idea based on a selective reading of Lazarus sermons that in commenting on this passage from Saint Luke's Gospel, preachers often managed to crystallise the social views they had. It is hard to imagine a more suitable situation to express one's negative opinions about wealth and the rich than preaching on the theme *Mortuus est dives et sepultus est in inferno*. Not only was this parable of Jesus inviting, it also was extensively used in this context, as G.R. Owst already noted "He [i.e. medieval preacher] was not slow to grasp the significance of

---

26 M. Mollat & P. Wolff, *The Popular Revolts of the Late Middle Ages* (London 1973), pp. 35-53 and 87-88.

27 From here on I shall for the sake of brevity call it the Lazarus parable.

*the parable of Dives and Lazarus, with its terrible account of the rich man's end.*"<sup>28</sup>

The Lazarus parable was read according to Dominican liturgy on the first Sunday after the Holy Trinity (T. 41 in Schneyer's *Repertorium*). In the Franciscan liturgy it was read on the Thursday of the second Lenten week (T. 20/5 in *Schneyer's Repertorium*).<sup>29</sup> This seems to imply that Franciscan preachers did not use the Lazarus parable in their sermon collections save for *quadragesimales* collections, which were more popular in the later middle ages than in the thirteenth century. In practice, however, Franciscan writers occasionally used other calendars and produced collections which either served needs of the area where they were preaching or were arranged according to the model of Paris, which was identical to that of the Dominicans. Some, like Berthold von Regensburg, did not put any liturgical titles to their sermons. In the oldest and most reliable manuscripts of his Sunday sermons, individual sermons are numbered instead of being placed in any liturgical system. Thus they were easy for potential preachers to use no matter what liturgical system they adopted.<sup>30</sup>

Some prominent Franciscan preachers such as Pierre de Saint-Benoît wrote their model sermon collections according to their own order's custom and thus failed to include the Lazarus parable. They used instead Lk. 6:36-42, which was the gospel for the first Sunday after Whitsunday. This is one reason why the number of Dominican sermons used as sources in this study exceeds that of Franciscan sermons. Another reason is that the Dominicans simply seem to have been either more active in writing model sermon collections or more lucky and skilful in promoting their works.

Model sermons have been chosen as the sources of this study because, due to the very essence of preaching, they were tuned to the level of their users (i.e. less educated preachers) and eventually to their ultimate audiences (i.e. ordinary people). Preachers were not supposed to say anything original and they could not propound ideas which would have seemed alien to their audience, at least not if they wanted to be successful preachers.<sup>31</sup> Therefore one can expect to find in model sermons opinions that were popular or at least were not too controversial in their own age. Model sermons were in a sense "the voice of a common mendicant". If one wishes to study the common mentality and ethos of the thirteenth century mendicants, model sermons are the source to be studied, not the writings of Bonaventure or Aquinas.

Another reason for studying model sermons in this context is that they did not merely reflect the common mentality but also participated in creating it. David d'Avray has called them the drip-drop method of incalculating beliefs. The same or similar ideas were repeated time and time again until they would

---

28 G.R. Owst, *Literature and the Pulpit in Medieval England*, p. 297.

29 See M. O' Carrol, *The Lectionary for the Proper of the Year in the Dominican and Franciscan Rites of the Thirteenth-Century*. *AFP* XLIX (1979).

30 G. Jacob, *Die lateinischen Reden des seligen Berthold von Regensburg* (Regensburg 1880), pp. 14-15.

31 D.L. d'Avray, *Method in the Study of Medieval Sermons*, p. 4.

eventually metamorphose into general opinions and beliefs. The same model collections were read and used all over Europe and over an extended period of time. Furthermore, model sermons were transmitted to huge audiences by those preachers who used them. d'Avray points out that the oral stage of the process of communication must have massively multiplied the impact of the ideas.<sup>32</sup> Thus the study of model sermons not only allows us to know what was the mendicant social ethos, at the same time it also reveals a great deal about the common social ethos of the thirteenth century.

Since it is quite impossible to go through all the sermons on Luke 16:19-31, I have decided to concentrate on so-to-speak best-sellers. This follows from the *a priori* assumption that those writers whose collections were most popular, also better reflected the opinions of the rank and file friars in the field, and are thus most representative sources for the study of common mendicant social ethos. Only those sermons that have survived in twenty or more manuscripts, and whose writer is known (i.e. anthologies have been omitted) have been accepted into the corpus of sermons to be analysed systematically. The counting of the manuscripts is done on the basis of Schneyer's *Repertorium*.<sup>33</sup>

Despite the obvious shortcomings of the *Repertorium* and the fact that Dominican sermon manuscripts are better covered in Father Kaeppli's *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, I have felt it wiser to use only Schneyer. The main reason for this is that since there is nothing like Kaeppli's books on the Franciscan sermon manuscripts, using it would make the selection of sources even more Dominican biased. At least the faults and shortcomings of Schneyer's *Repertorium* are equal for both orders.

There are some risks in deciding on the popularity of an individual work merely by counting manuscripts. David d'Avray has presented four additional means of evaluating the importance of certain sermons or sermon collections. The first is to check whether they were diffused by the *pecia* system, which is a certain sign of demand. This is certainly useful for the present material. The second method is to establish their geographical distribution by studying paleographically and codicologically the manuscripts that carry them. In our case this, alas, is not possible due to the huge number of manuscripts to be studied. The third possibility is to ascertain the success of *incunabula* editions. This is relevant mostly in finding out how successful certain collections were in the fifteenth century and does not much help with the current problem. The final method, taking into account the liturgical weighting of feasts, unfortunately suits the *de sanctis* sermons only.<sup>34</sup> The conclusion is that lacking better methods

---

32 D.L. d'Avray, *Method in the Study of Medieval Sermons*, pp. 9-10. One has to take into account the fact that the sermons preached to the population with the help of model sermons were not necessarily exact copies of their models. Thus the impact of model sermons on the final message delivered to audiences differed in different preachers. However, it is likely that the general tone of the message remained very much the same.

33 J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters. Für die Zeit von 1150-1350* (Münster 1969-1990).

34 D.L. d'Avray, *Method in the Study of Medieval Sermons*, pp. 11-17.

to evaluate the success and importance of different model sermon collections one has to use the simple manuscript count despite its obvious shortcomings.

Counting from *Repertorium* produces a corpus of 35 sermons from 18 different preachers.<sup>35</sup> The popularity of individual collections and sermons varies from barely 20 manuscripts to more than three hundred. These sermons are divided between the two orders in such a manner that 13 of the preachers and 28 of the sermons were of Dominican origin, five preachers and seven sermons of Franciscan origin. If one were to look into the popularity of these collections, the Dominican bias would be even more obvious, since the real best-sellers were nearly all written by the Dominicans.

The earliest of these sermons was written either by the Dominican Pierre de Reims sometime before his death in 1247 or his confrere Hugues de Saint-Cher (we do not know exactly which since the dating of the sermons is problematic). The latest of them was written by the Franciscan François de Meyronnes in the early fourteenth century. Most of them, however, were written in the latter part of the thirteenth century. Geographically these writers are from different parts of Europe: Berthold von Regensburg from Germany, Peregrinus de Oppeln from Poland, Guibert de Tournai from France, Jacopo da Varazze from Italy. Yet one must keep in mind the importance of Paris as a centre whence the mendicant sermon collections were diffused all over Christendom; many of them were circulated through the *pecia* system.

The sources will be cited according to one manuscript or one early edition. Only in cases of obviously corrupt or destroyed passages are other manuscripts explicitly cited in the footnotes. In spite of this, all the sermons have been read from at least two manuscripts. The idea was not to check the text on a word to word basis, but to be sure that the general ideas presented in one manuscript are to be found in other too; to put it briefly, the object was to avoid using interpolations or wrongly attributed sermons. All the manuscripts used in this study are to be found in the bibliography at the end of this book.

The selection of the manuscripts was based mostly on a random selection of conveniently available manuscripts and early editions. From a point of reliability this is of course a risk, but considering the huge number of surviving manuscripts and their distribution throughout Europe and even other continents, I considered it impossible to check out all the manuscripts to pick the best copies to be used. For practical reasons, the manuscripts used are mostly from the great manuscript libraries of Europe.

Other sermons on that particular pericope are used when they are readily available (modern editions, or manuscripts conveniently available). They are, however, used only sporadically and not analysed systematically nor checked against other manuscripts. Thus the selected corpus of sermons forms the basis of argumentation in this study.

Firstly, the structure of these sermons will be analysed. By structure I do not mean the general schemes presented in *artes praedicandi* books, but more

---

35 For more specific information on these sermons and their writers, see Appendix.

specifically what kinds of divisions and subdivisions were used in Lazarus sermons. Were there any common methods in compiling these sermons, i.e. something like divisions which would appear in several preachers' sermons? The importance of the structure lies in the fact that in the case of medieval sermons, the structure cannot be separated from the actual message of the sermon. The mode of dividing the sermon immediately gives the reader some basic understanding of the essential message of the preacher.

The text of the sermons is then analysed to find common topics handled by many preachers, literary commonplaces and also personal details. All this of course is done keeping in mind the three key questions mentioned earlier. In short this method could be called horizontal comparison. The large number of preachers and sermons from a relatively short time period are compared to find their common ways of thinking.

The results of the analysis of Lazarus sermons are compared to certain other mendicant, mainly *ad status* material from the thirteenth century. The comparison is made because in many cases Lazarus sermons refer to certain social standings and to the social realities only in obscure or very general terms. It is therefore useful to compare the picture drawn from the Lazarus sermons to that of *ad status* materials. The importance of *ad status* material, as proposed by numerous previous historians, lies in the fact that it presents thirteenth-century society in a nutshell. Each *ad status* sermon addresses directly a certain faction of the population and handles themes concerning the realities of their life. If the picture formed on the basis of the Lazarus sermons appears to be similar to that emerging from *ad status* sources, one has every reason to believe that it is indeed reliable and reflects actual mendicant opinion.

The most important "comparative" sources used in this study are the often analysed *ad status* sermon collections; Guibert de Tournai's *Sermones ad status* and model sermons in Humbert de Romans' *De eruditione praedicatorum* as well as two less frequently used but at least equally important books: John of Wales' *Communiloquium*, and Johannes von Freiburg's *Confessionale*.<sup>36</sup>

Perhaps with the exception of Jenny Swanson's excellent book on John of Wales<sup>37</sup>, these two works have received amazingly little attention at the same time when historians have been ever more intensively concerned with the above mentioned *ad status* sermon collections. Yet, these give an equally good picture of thirteenth-century society, and they were very influential books judging from the number of the surviving manuscripts, which is indeed vast.

---

36 These three works and the *ad status* sermons of Guibert de Tournai and Humbert de Romans have been analysed systematically, other numerous comparative texts have been used in a more sporadic manner.

37 J. Swanson, *John of Wales. A Study of the Works and Ideas of a Thirteenth-Century Friar* (Cambridge 1989).



#### 1.4. Poverty, Sermons and the Study of History

Both poverty and sermons have long constituted the subject matter of historical research. Despite this the sermons have only rarely been used as sources for the study of socio-economic relations in the Middle Ages. Both Bronislaw Geremek and Michel Mollat have written excellent books on the subject of poverty. Mollat has also worked on the subject in numerous articles, some of which have been republished.<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless neither Geremek nor Mollat have made extensive use of commentaries on the Lazarus parable in either existing form (i.e. sermons and Bible commentaries). It seems that medieval poverty has been considered to be too large a subject to be studied from the unprinted sources.

Robert Fossier notes the new emphasis on the problem of poor relief in the thirteenth century. He states that until that time, the poor were at the mercy of those generous persons who decided to silence the voice of their conscience by giving alms to the poor. Only after the middle of the century, was attention increasingly paid to the problems of poverty. This was done in a paternalistic way. These new social ideas were born among the clergy, especially in university circles, and transmitted to the ordinary people by preachers, in most cases mendicants.<sup>39</sup> Unluckily Fossier does not use any concrete mendicant sermons to confirm his ideas.

The Dutch historians Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly have suggested an approach to the history of medieval poverty and poor relief similar to that of Robert Fossier. Sadly (from the point of view of medieval studies that is) their book is not solely concentrated on the Middle Ages but comes down to the latter half of the nineteenth century. Therefore the space left for medieval poverty is limited indeed, although the account is very competent in many respects.<sup>40</sup>

Apart from the above, some interesting anthologies of medieval poverty have been published.<sup>41</sup> In fact, the only study that acknowledges the importance of the Lazarus parable is included in one of them. F. Graus writes that glorification of poverty dominates in Christian literature. As an example of this he states that the Lazarus parable enjoyed great popularity and was often cited in works of preachers and moralists. Graus sums up these writings pointing that from the theologian's point of view poverty was more safe than being rich. If a rich man wanted to obtain salvation, he was obliged to give huge amounts of alms, for "it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for

---

38 B. Geremek, *Geschichte der Armut. Elend und Barmherzigkeit in Europa* (München und Zürich 1988); M. Mollat, *Etudes sur l'économie et la société de l'Occident médiéval XIII-Xe s.* (London 1977).

39 R. Fossier, *Histoire sociale de l'Occident Médiéval*, pp. 264 and 338-339.

40 C. Lis & H. Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-industrial Europe* (New Jersey 1979).

41 *Etudes sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*. Recueil édité sous la direction de Michel Mollat, 2 vols. (Paris 1974); *La concezione della povertà nel Medioevo*. Antologia di scritti a cura di Ovidio Capitani (Bologna 1983, first published 1974).

a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”<sup>42</sup> Graus’ conclusions are based mainly on the patristic material and he comes to them on the basis of an impression drawn from the sources, not on the basis of systematic and documented analysis. Nevertheless, his findings fit nicely to the hypothesis of this study.

Poverty has been intensively studied in connection with the mendicant orders, especially the Franciscans. Most studies, however, have concentrated mainly on the internal problems of Franciscans (spirituals versus conventionals) or relations between mendicants and the Holy See vis à vis the problem of voluntary poverty.<sup>43</sup> The attitudes of the mendicants towards actual, involuntary poverty have been touched only rarely and sporadically.

There is then a group of studies that have concentrated either wholly or for a substantial part on the problems relevant to this study. Most important here are the books of Murray<sup>44</sup>, Lesnick<sup>45</sup>, and Little<sup>46</sup>. Suffice it here to mention why these studies constituted such an important impulse for this book, since they will all be analysed and commented extensively later on. Alexander Murray’s book is important because he argues on the contrary to my basic hypothesis, the powerful, that is, the noblemen, were in fact considered to be better than average Christians. They were noble from the religious point of view too.

Lesnick’s book is important because it is as far as I know the only existing study which seeks to analyse the social realities and their impact on mendicant preaching and vice versa. Sadly it is rather limited in the geographical sense, since it only handles the situation in Florence. One of the most important arguments presented in Lesnick’s book from the stand point of this study is the sharp distinction he draws between the socio-economic situation of the Dominican and Franciscan clientele. The presence of such difference would mean that there simply could not have been any common mendicant social ethos.

The most important thesis in Little’s book is that mendicant preaching, or for that matter the mendicant orders as such, were an answer to the spiritual needs of the rising urban classes. He also underlines the fact that paradoxically it was the mendicant doctors who legitimised commerce and money-lending as acceptable and honourable professions. This point makes it difficult to see the mendicant orders as having been generally anti-rich and anti-powerful. If

---

42 F. Graus, *Poveri della città e poveri delle campagne*. In *La concezione della povertà nel Medioevo*, pp. 74-75.

43 For a short summary of the problems associated with poverty in the Franciscan order see G. Leff, *The Bible and Rights in the Franciscan Dispute over Poverty*. In *The Bible in Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*. Edited by Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Oxford 1985), pp.225-228; see also H. Feld, *Franziskus von Assisi und seine Bewegung* (Darmstadt 1994), pp. 192-193.

44 A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1991, first published 1978).

45 D.R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence. The Social World of Franciscan and Dominican Spirituality* (Athens, Georgia 1989).

46 L.K. Little, *Religious Poverty and Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (New York 1983, first published 1978).

so, why should have they sought means of legitimising those professions which were most profitable for the persons who practised them?

Another major stimulus to this work has been the ever growing amount of work done in the field of medieval preaching.<sup>47</sup> Here I only mention the numerous books and articles of David d'Avray and Father Louis-Jacques Bataillon.<sup>48</sup> Especially d'Avray's idea of a mental calendar of the preacher has a central place in the structure and basic ideas of this study, i.e. limiting the study to sermons of a certain Sunday. Nicole Bériou comes close to the subject of this book in her study on the lepers and how they were presented in medieval *ad status* sermons. Lazarus was considered to be a leper during the Middle Ages and consequently he became the patron of leper hospitals.<sup>49</sup>

Bériou concludes that the general attitude towards the lepers was positive. Their disease was seen as a sign through which God invites men to do penance. Leprosy was also considered to be a penance in itself. It was known to some preachers as present purgatory or salutary discipline. Unluckily Bériou discusses only briefly the connection or relation between the lepers and other poor (in the wider sense of the word) and thus she does not make any comparisons to other poor nor does she present any general conclusions as to the spiritual values of earthly tribulations. Nonetheless Bériou's work is a valuable contribution to the history of actual poverty and the poor.

---

47 See T.N. Hall, *A Basic Bibliography of Medieval Sermon Studies*. In MSS 36 (1995), pp. 26-42.

48 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars. Sermons diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford 1988, first published 1985); D.L. d'Avray, *Death and the Prince. Memorial Preaching before 1350* (Oxford 1994). It would not be sensible to give all the bibliographical information on articles here, however, as most of them have been republished in the following books; *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons. Essays on Marriage, Death, History and Sanctity* by Nicole Bériou and David L. d'Avray (Spoleto 1994); L.-J. Bataillon, *La prédication au XIIIe siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993).

49 N. Bériou, *Les lépreux sous le regard des prédicateurs d'après les collections de sermons ad status du XIIIe siècle*. In N. Bériou et F.-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus. Les lépreux entre conversion et exclusion aux XIIème et XIIIème siècles* (Spoleto 1991).

## ■ 2. Dives and Lazarus

### 2.1 The Exegetical Tradition of the Lazarus Parable

Mendicant preachers did not build their sermons on nothing. The Lazarus parable had already been analysed and interpreted in commentaries and homilies starting from late Antiquity. Some of the *topoi* used by thirteenth-century preachers were directly taken from the early Fathers. The earliest tradition seems to have been to interpret allegorically the rich man and his brothers to mean Jews and heretics (especially Jews) who were not willing to convert to Christianity. This particular interpretation is first met in Ambrose's *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* and it was later circulated in works of Augustine of Hippo, Gregory the Great and The Venerable Bede.<sup>1</sup>

In the thirteenth century the allegorical or spiritual interpretation was put aside and the emphasis was put on the literal interpretation.<sup>2</sup> This is not to say that this interpretation was any novelty in the case of Lk. 16. Already Augustine had presented it in a nut shell: "The bosom of Abraham, that is, the resting place of the blessed poor, who shall inherit the kingdom of heaven, is where they are received after this life. Sepulchre of hell, or multitude of punishment, is the place that devours the proud and the unmerciful after this life."<sup>3</sup> The Venerable Bede borrowed this from Augustine almost verbatim.<sup>4</sup> Among the most influential moral expositions of the Dives and Lazarus parable were the three sermons of Petrus Chrysologus on *De Lazaro et divite*. They were frequently cited in thirteenth-century Lazarus sermons (under the name Petrus Ravennatensis).<sup>5</sup> Petrus' sermons were extremely hostile towards the rich man and riches in general.

The tradition starting from the above cited passage of Augustine held out little hope for the rich. The sepulchre of hell awaited them no matter what the

---

1 Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam*. In Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis opera, Pars IV. Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam, fragmenta in Esaiam. CCSL 14 (Turnhout 1957), pp. 302-305; Augustine of Hippo, *Questionum evangeliorum liber secundus: Quaestiones in Evangelium secundum Lucam*, q. 38. PL. 35, c. 1350; Gregory the Great, *Homiliarum in evangelia liber II*, Homil. 40. PL 76, c. 1302; Beda Venerabilis, *In Lucae evangelium expositio*, Liber V. PL. 92, c. 536-538.

2 B. Smalley, *The Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1983, third revised edition), pp. 281 ff.

3 Augustine of Hippo, *Quaestiones in Evangelium secundum Lucam*, q. 38, c. 1350. "Sinus Abrahae, requies beatorum pauperum, quorum est regnum caelorum, in quo post hanc vitam recipiuntur. Sepultura inferni, poenarum profunditas, quae superbos et immisericordes post hanc vitam vorat."

4 Beda Venerabilis, *In Lucae evangelium expositio*, Liber V, c. 535.

5 *Sancti Petri Chrysologi Collectio sermonum*. Pars II. Cura et studio Alexandri Olivar. CCSL XXIV A (Turnhout 1981).

situation was. Later writers who wrote before the thirteenth century reflect this situation. A good example is Bruno Astensis, abbot of Monte Cassino. He writes in his *Commentarius in Lucam*: "There was a rich man etc. These words are very necessary to the rich and the poor, since for the rich they give fear and for the poor consolation. Let the rich hear about their punishment, let the poor hear about their joy." Later on he continues: "Thus, riches lead to misery and poverty to a saintly life. For the poor heaven, and for the rich hell is open."<sup>6</sup> As we shall see, this attitude was later frequently repeated in Lazarus sermons.

There are certain common features in the rich man and Lazarus exegetics before the friars. One of these is the assumption that the sin of the rich man was in the first place pride. Almost all sources use terms such as *dives superbus*. Another commonly mentioned reason for the harsh judgement of the rich man was his lack of mercy.

What was not so common nor so open to generalisation was the general attitude of the Fathers towards temporal wealth. When one looks into the exegetics of the Lazarus parable, one finds absolutely negative views on the rich and riches. Being wealthy seems to have been more or less equated with being a sinner. However, this view changes somewhat if we look into other exegetical materials produced by the Fathers. Beryl Smalley has argued that the Fathers adopted the opinion that poverty itself was no virtue, and that riches were spiritually dangerous only for those who did not know how to use their wealth rightly.<sup>7</sup>

The automatic connection between wealth and sin was also called in question by twelfth- and thirteenth-century scholastic theology. This process is excellently described by Jacques Le Goff in his article on sinful professions. His arguments hold good not only for the sinful professions, but also for other sinful circumstances, such as being rich. No longer was richness held to be sinful as such; attention was directed to the reasons for sinfulness. When someone, no matter how rich he was, managed to avoid these dangers, he was completely acceptable to the Church. Richness was not sinful *ex natura*, but *ex causa*.<sup>8</sup>

Hugues de Saint-Cher (or the team of Saint Jacques Dominicans working under his supervision) wrote a highly influential commentary on Luke around the year 1235.<sup>9</sup> Hugues' commentary rehabilitated wealth as such in several places. A good example is the beginning of the Lazarus parable: "There was a rich man. The word rich has two meanings, having riches and loving them.

---

6 Bruno Astensis, *Commentarius in Lucam*, P. II, c. 16, PL. 165, col. 422 and 424. "Homo quidam erat dives etc. Haec verba et divitibus et pauperibus valde necessaria sunt, quia et illis dant timorem, et istis consolationem. Audiunt hic divites poenas suas, audiunt et pauperes gaudia sua." and "Divitiae igitur ad miseriam, paupertas ad beatitudinem perducit. Pauperibus caelum, divitibus infernum aperitur."

7 B. Smalley, *The Gospels in the Schools, c. 1100-c. 1280* (London 1985), p. 42.

8 J. Le Goff, *Métiers licites et métiers illicites*. In J. Le Goff, *Pour un autre Moyen Age* (Paris 1977), pp. 97-98.

9 R.E. Lerner, *Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology in the Revelation Commentaries of 'Hugh of St. Cher'*. In *The Bible in Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*. Edited by Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Oxford 1985), p. 171. On the influence of Hugues' Postils see B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, p. 273.

*God does not reproach the rich in the first sense of the word. Job 36. a: 'God doth not cast away the mighty, whereas he himself is also mighty.' Genesis 13. a: And Abraham was very rich', not for the sake of himself but for sake of the poor [...] God reproaches the rich in the second sense and expels them from his kingdom."*<sup>10</sup>

Hugues' interpretation of Jesus' words in Lk. 6:24 continues the same revisionist approach (revisionist in comparison to Petrus Chrysologus and those other Fathers who took the negative view on wealth) to the rich: "'Woe unto you that are rich etc.' That is, to you who love temporal or earthly riches, or own them unjustly, or seek them unjustly."<sup>11</sup> With these few words of explanation Hugues gives a new significance to the words of the Gospel and offers the possibility of salvation for the rich. There are abundant other similar examples of Hugues' exegesis.

Hugues' Postils were not only highly successful as standard Bible commentaries, but were also extensively used as preaching aids. Several of the commonplaces featuring in Lazarus sermons are to be found in Hugues' commentary on the Lazarus parable. Since the preachers were not always keen to mark their sources we cannot know whether some idea was taken directly from the works of, say, Gregory the Great, or through Hugues' Postill. Nevertheless the volume of similarities between Hugues' Postill on Luke 16 and the Lazarus sermons by the friars makes it reasonably plausible that Hugues was often the preacher's source. However, research on relations between preaching and Bible commentaries is sadly lacking.<sup>12</sup> Another thirteenth-century Dominican, Constantino da Orvieto, wrote his commentary on Luke borrowing heavily from Hugues. It was not nearly as successful as Hugues', but it contains some interesting remarks on poverty.<sup>13</sup>

Moving to the Franciscans, Bonaventure's *Commentarius in evangelium Lucae* is fairly permissive in the question of riches. In every case he manages to find explanation that leaves the door of salvation open to the rich. He comments on Lk. 16:13 as follows: "*And thus he puts: 'You can not serve both, God and mammon'. It is said 'serve mammon' in whose affection riches dominate the owner in such a manner that he can be called avaricious, which then is idolatry. Since, as it is said in the Letter to Ephesians, fifth chapter: 'Avarice is servitude to idols.' Glossa: 'It does not say own riches, but serve*

10 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*. In Vgonis de Sancto Charo s. Romanae Ecclesiae cardinalis Opera Omnia. Tomus VI. In Evangelia secundum Matthaeum, Marcum, Lucam, Johannem (Köln 1621), f. 230v. "'Erat diues'. Dupliciter dicitur dives habere vel amare divitias. Primo modo non reprobatur Deus divites Job. 36. a. 'Deus potentes non abiciit cum et ipse sit potens'. Genes. 13. a. 'Erat Abraham dives valde', non sibi sed pauperibus [...]. Secundo modo reprobatur Deus divites et abicit a regno suo."

11 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*, p. 166v. "'Ve vobis divitibus etc' qui amatis divitias temporales sive terrenas, vel inique habetis, vel habere cupitis."

12 See L.-J. Bataillon, *De la lectio à la praedictio: Commentaires bibliques et sermons aux XIIIe siècle*. In L.-J. Bataillon, *La prédication au XIIIe siècle en France et Italie. On Hugues de Saint-Cher*, see especially pp. V,568-569, V,572. Bataillon notes the tendency of Guillaume Peyraut to borrow extensively from Hugues' Postils in his sermons.

13 C. Cenci, *Il commento al Vangelo di S. Luca di Fr. Constantino da Orvieto, O.P. Fonte di S. Bernardino da Siena. AFH 74*, pp. 103-145.

them.”<sup>14</sup> Bonaventure’s attitude to the rich and wealth are consistent throughout the commentary. For instance in the case of Lk. 18:25, his interpretation is, that when Jesus says that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God, He does not actually mean a rich, but an avaricious person. He rounds off his argument by referring to patriarchs of the *Old Testament* as examples of the virtuous rich.<sup>15</sup> We have already noted that Hugues de Saint-Cher used the example of Abraham to legitimise being rich. Referring to Abraham and other *Old Testament* patriarchs as examples of the virtuous rich to say that it is possible to be both rich and a good Christian became a standard *topos*, not only in academical exegesis, but equally in Lazarus sermons.

Not surprisingly Thomas Aquinas follows the same lines as Bonaventure and Hugues de Saint-Cher. He states explicitly in his *Catena aurea super Lucae Evangelium* that being rich was not the cause of the rich man being buried in hell in this parable: “*He was not tortured because he was rich, but because he was not merciful [...].*” Thomas writes that poverty does not necessarily mean saintliness nor riches sinfulness. His view is even more clearly presented when commenting on Lk. 18:23-24. “*And Jesus, seeing him become sorrowful, said: How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! He did not say, that it is impossible for them to enter, only that it is difficult: They can reach things above with their riches, but difficult it is.*”<sup>16</sup> Aquinas puts the emphasis on the possibility of salvation for the rich, not on the difficulty of it, although the latter is mentioned. The *Catena aurea* was used as a source by later preachers. As to the Lazarus sermons, we have documented evidence from Jacopo da Varazze only, but without doubt further analysis of parallels between sermons and the *Catena aurea* would bring out more cases.<sup>17</sup>

This more tolerant attitude towards wealth and the rich is also reflected in Nicolaus de Lyra’s Bible commentary from the late thirteenth century. Commenting on Matthew 19:16-26, Nicolaus writes: “*Next it states (i.e. the Gospel) how riches make it difficult to obtain perfection, saying: ‘Amen I say to you that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven.’ He does not say it is impossible, but difficult.*” Nicolaus goes on to say that from this we can deduce that the word *rich* in this particular context does not mean just any rich man, but rather one who trusts in his riches, and thus neglects God. He

14 Bonaventure OFM, *Commentarius in evangelium Lucae*. C. 16. In S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia. Tomus VII (Quaracchi 1895), p. 411. “Et ideo infert: ‘Non potestis Deo servire et mammonae.’ Dicitur autem servire mammonae in cuius affectu divitiae dominantur, ita ut possit dici avarus, quia tunc est servus idolorum. Nam, sicut dicitur ad Ephesios quinto, ‘Avaritia est idolorum servitus’. Unde Glossa: ‘Non ait: habere divitias, sed servire.’”

15 Bonaventure OFM, *Commentarius in evangelium Lucae*. C. 18.

16 Thomas Aquinas OP, *Catena aurea super Lucae evangelium*, Lucas XVI. “Non autem quia dives fuerat, torquebatur, sed quia misertus non fuit [...].”; “Non autem quia sancta paupertas aut divitiae criminosa; sed ut luxuria infamat divitias, ita paupertatem commendat sanctitas.” and Lucas XVIII. “Videns autem Iesum illum tristem factum, dixit: ‘Quam difficile qui pecunias habent in regnum Dei intrabunt.’ Non dicit, impossibile est eos intrare, sed difficile: possunt enim per divitias adipisci suprema, sed difficile est.”

17 L-J. Bataillon, *Jacopo da Varazze e Tommaso d’Aquino*. In L-J. Bataillon, *La prédication au XIIIe siècle*, p. XVIII,23.

even refers to a modern explanation, that the eye of the needle in Jesus' speech refers to a certain gate of Jerusalem, not to an ordinary needle, although he adds that this is not likely, since such a name for a gate is not mentioned in the Scripture.<sup>18</sup>

All these commentaries on the Lazarus parable seem to confirm the opinion of Lester K. Little, that it was the mendicant doctors who made it morally acceptable, or at least legal (from the point of view of the Church) to earn money and become rich.<sup>19</sup> However, bearing in mind the above view of Beryl Smalley, one has to conclude that there seem to have been no generally accepted, absolute views on poverty or wealth. Some writers took a more tolerant attitude towards wealth, others condemned it harshly. Thus the exegetical tradition left the scene open for the friar preachers to build up their own opinions, and be able to confirm them with patristic authorities, no matter which view they chose to take.

Reverting to Lester Little's theory, there seem to be two major problems. The first is that his book concentrates on mercantile money-making and the rich in the cities. He has very little to say concerning the traditional rich and the powerful in the countryside, noblemen, prelates and so on. Another major problem is, that he almost exclusively concentrates on *avant-garde* theologians such as Aquinas and Bonaventure. Presuming that he is right in his claim that mendicant doctors rehabilitated being rich and those professions that were likely to lead to richness, we still have to ask whether these opinions were also accepted in the field where the day-to-day pastoral work was carried on. Little does not take into the account the resistance to change amongst the rank and file preachers and confessors. Rome was not built in a day – not even in the Middle Ages.

## 2.2 The Lazarus Parable in Model Sermons

### 2.2.1 The General Outline and the Message of the Sermons

Basically these sermons all belong to the genre of the "scholastic" or – as it was called at that time – *sermo moderna*.<sup>20</sup> Naturally there are personal differences between the approaches of different preachers. Some are more "scholastic", others like Antonio Azaro Parmense come very close to traditional homily style. In fact due to their homily style Antonio's sermons are often

---

18 Nicolaus de Lyra OFM, *Postilla super totam Bibliam* (Venice 1488), Matthew 19. "Consequenter ostendit quomodo divitie faciunt difficultatem in attingendo perfectionem dicens: 'Amen dico vobis quia dives difficile intrabit in regnum celorum.' Non dixit impossibile, sed difficile."

19 L.K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, passim.

20 The word *scholastic* has been widely used to describe thirteenth-century sermons. However, this can be somewhat misleading as David d'Avray has pointed out. Therefore I use it in quotation marks; D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 163-180. On the structure of "scholastic" sermons see Th.M. Charland, *Artes praedicandi. Contribution à l'histoire de la rhétorique au Moyen Âge* (Paris and Ottawa 1936).



called postills in manuscripts.<sup>21</sup> The sermons used in this study seem to prove right David d'Avray's preliminary sounding that scholastic *quaestiones* were abnormal in thirteenth century preaching.<sup>22</sup> The only sermons in our sample that have *quaestiones* or anything resembling them were those of Antonio Azaro Parmense and Giovanni da San Gemignano (the latter uses them extensively). Antonio wrote in the late thirteenth and Giovanni in the early fourteenth century and thus stylistically neither of them really belonged to the thirteenth century. They were writers of the transitional period and their sermons reflect more the conventions of the fourteenth century. Instead of questions, model sermons are filled with endless other "scholastic" features such as defining, dividing and raising contradictions.

The length of these sermons is also very variable. Some of them (namely those of Hugues de Saint-Cher and Nicolas de Gorran) would make less than one modern printed page if transcribed, while others would run into half a dozen or even more. Hugo de Prato Florido even informs his readers in his prologue not to be scared because of the length of his sermons. He advises them to pick up only that portion of the sermon which is suitable for their own purposes.<sup>23</sup> This was the common custom with model sermons. They were not meant to be read aloud, but rather to help preachers in making their own sermons. However, I know of no other texts which present this fact as clearly as Hugo's prologue does.

Belonging to the genre of *sermo moderna*, all these sermons have one thing in common. They have a theme taken from the Bible and they use it to divide the sermon into primary divisions (*divisio*). The number of these divisions and whether or not they were subdivided (*subdivisio*) varies from one writer to other. Interestingly, certain common basic ideas were used in making the primary division in the majority of these sermons. Most of these preachers seem to have set out from the notion of the sinfulness of the rich and powerful. This basic attitude is often reflected in the structure of the Lazarus sermons. In most cases the division of the sermon is built around a comparison between the circumstances of the rich man and Lazarus in this world and in the kingdom to come.

The moment of death seems to be the line of demarcation between the divisions of the sermons. Preachers compare the situation between and after the death of the two men. The exceptions to this rule are those writers who wrote several sermons for this Sunday (or for the fifth day of the second Lenten week) and who were thus able to divide this general scheme between different sermons instead of within one sermon. A good example is Jacopo da Varazze. His third sermon on the first Sunday is on the theme *Mortuus est dives* etc. It

---

21 G. Meersseman, *Le opere di fra Antonio Azaro Parmense O.P. nella Biblioteca Nazionale di Monaco Baviera*. *AFP* X (1940), p. 21.

22 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 169-170.

23 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Prologus (Nürnberg 1483), f. a4r. "Nullus ergo propter prolixitatem sermones dictos abhorreat vel devitet, quia si ipse multum habet predicare inde accipiet unum membrum uel duo uel solius litere expositionem enarret, prout melius iudicauerit dignum fieri."

does not handle the circumstances of the rich man and Lazarus while alive because they were already dealt within two preceding sermons.<sup>24</sup>

This is likewise the case with sermons by Konrad Holtznicker. He wrote three sermons for this Sunday. The first is on the theme *Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur in purpura et bysso*. It deals with the sins the rich men often make themselves guilty of. The division of the sermon is built around three sins: superfluous clothing, gluttony and lack of compassion towards the poor.<sup>25</sup> The second is on the *Mortuus est dives et sepultus est in inferno* and it is all about the punishments of the rich man after his death.<sup>26</sup> Konrad's third sermon does not suit to this scheme at all. It is on the *Mitte Lazarum ut intinguat extremum digiti sui in aqua ut refrigeret linguam meam*. This sermon describes four ways by which a tongue can burn.<sup>27</sup>

If, however, we move back to the more common case, that is, to those preachers who chose to make their division inside one sermon instead of writing several, we find that there seem to have been two popular ways of making a division according to the scheme of comparison between the present world and the future. The first was to build the division around the triplicate status of the human being, that is in life, in death and after death. This scheme is to be found in Guillaume Peyraut's and later in Jacopo da Varazze's sermons.<sup>28</sup>

If we take a closer look into these sermons we find that greater emphasis is placed on the first main division, that is, on the activities of the two men while still amongst the living. These were naturally most important for the assumed ultimate audiences of the sermons. What the audiences needed to know was how to behave in a such manner that they would be transported to the bosom of Abraham like Lazarus rather than buried in hell with the rich man. The actual description of the destinies of these two men in death and after death was important only from the point of view of encouraging positive action, and scaring those who might not otherwise understand what was best for themselves.

The second way was simply to compare the situation and activities of the rich man and Lazarus in this life and in eternity. This mode of division is presented by an anonymous Italian Dominican in a sermon on the theme *Recordare fili quia recepisti bona in vita tua*. He announces the theme and

---

24 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermones I-III (Venice 1497).

25 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, pp. 116-118. This manuscript has page numbers instead of customary foliation system.

26 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. BAV. Burghes. 180, ff. 107r-v.

27 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo tertius. BAV. Burghes. 180, ff. 107v-108r. "Considerandum ergo quod inuenimus linguam inflammatam quadrupliciter, uidelicet per maliciam, per gratiam, per iehennam, per iram."

28 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex euangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis, sermo primus (Tübingen 1499), nv. "Describit Dominus duas personas, unum diuitem et alterum pauperem, et primo ostenditur eorum uita, secundo finis uitae ibi 'factum est ut moreretur etc.', tercio status eorum post mortem."; Jacopo da Varazze, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 74r. "Secundum Augustinum status hominis tripliciter consideratur, scilicet in uita, in morte et post mortem. Quantum igitur ad istum triplicem statum describitur hic diues et pauper."

continues "Four things are noted in these words. First the prosperity in the present life of the bad [...], second the short adversity of the just in this world, third the eternal happiness of the just [...], and fourth the eternal calamity of the impious."<sup>29</sup>

This can be compared to a live sermon preached in Paris by Bonaventure. "Secondly, four things are considered in these words. Firstly on the part of this rich man and others like him, their temporal prosperity: 'Son, remember etc.'. Secondly of Lazarus and other good poor men their brief adversity: 'and likewise Lazarus evil things'. Thirdly of Lazarus and those similar to him their happy joyfulness: 'now he is comforted'. Fourthly of the rich man and other evil men their eternal calamity: 'thou art tormented'."<sup>30</sup>

Guibert de Tournai follows the same method of division. He states the theme and gives four things that are noted in it: 1. The temporary prosperity of the bad in this world, 2. their eternal calamity, 3. the brief adversity of the good in this world, and 4. their happiness in the future.<sup>31</sup> Some fifty years later Peregrinus de Oppeln and Giovanni da S. Gemignano used exactly the same division.<sup>32</sup> Perhaps in its most sophisticated form this basic division is to be found in a sermon of François de Mayronnes, which falls into two "considerations": "The first consideration is to see how the rich man and Lazarus lived differently, earning different rewards [...]. The second consideration is to see how they were different in death, for as they were different in this life gaining merit,

29 Anonymus Italian OP, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post pentecosten. In *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Opera Omnia*. Tomus XV (Parma 1864), p. 163. "Quattuor notantur in verbis istis. Primo reprobatorum in praesenti prosperitas [...], secundo iustorum brevis in hoc mundo adversitas, tertio aeterna justorum felicitas [...], quarto impiorum perpetua calamitas." About the attribution of this collection see L.-J. Bataillon, *Les sermons attribués à saint Thomas: Questions d'authenticité*. In L.-J. Bataillon, *La prédication au XIIIe siècle en France et Italie*, pp. XV, 326-331.

30 Bonaventure OFM, *Dominica II post pentecosten*. In *Saint Bonaventure, Sermons de diversis*. Nouvelle édition critique par Jacques Guy Bougerol. Volume I (Paris 1993), p. 373. "Secundum hoc quattuor tanguntur in istis verbis: primo, a parte huius mali divitis aliorumque similium, temporalis prosperitas, cum dicit: 'Fili recordare' etc.; secundo, a parte Lazari et aliorum bonorum pauperum brevis adversitas: 'et Lazarus similiter mala'; tertio, a parte Lazari sui que similium felix iucunditas: 'nunc vero consolatus'; quarto, a parte divitis et aliorum malorum aeterna calamitas: 'tu vero cruciaris'." This sermon was probably preached in 1272. See P. Glorieux, *L'enseignement au Moyen Age. Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, au XIIIe siècle. Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, année 43 (1968), p. 152. Interesting thing about this sermon is that Bonaventure says much more about the general nature of the rich and the poor than in his officially published Bible commentary on the same text. Unlike other sermons referred so far in this chapter, this was not a model sermon intended for a publication, but normal university sermon preached in front of a live audience. Perhaps he felt more free to use harsher rhetoric in such a situation than in his officially published and circulated writings.

31 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 413, f. 248r. "Quattuor ergo notatur in uerbis propositis. Primum est malorum temporalia prosperitas. Secundum est aeterna calamitas. Tercium ex parte bonorum brevis aduersitas. Quartum futura felicitas."

32 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. dominica I post pentecosten. BL. Add. 18340, f. 47r. "In predictis ergo uerbis quattuor nobis intimantur. Primum malorum in hoc mundo consolatio ibi 'recepisti bona'. Secundo ipsorum in futuro cruciatio ibi 'tu uero cruciaris'. Tercio iustorum in hac uita afflictio ibi 'et Lazarus similiter mala'. Quarto eorum consolatio in futuro ibi 'nunc consolatur'."; Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 24998, f. 129r-131v.

similarly they were different in death receiving their rewards.”<sup>33</sup> Both of these primary considerations were subdivided into six “conclusions”.

Among the chosen corpus of Lazarus sermons there are of course some that do not fit these general models. For example, the sermons of Nicolas de Gorran are very short and have only simple divisions. The first of them deals only with the rewards of Lazarus and punishment of the rich man, whereas the second is dedicated to describing reasons for them.<sup>34</sup> Berthold von Regensburg built his division around different kinds of rich men and different kinds of poor men. Both categories included those who are damned, those who are saved, and those who not only are saved but will also reap great glory in heaven.<sup>35</sup>

Giovanni da San Gemignano uses his Lazarus sermon to rebuke three errors general among the people: “The first error is committed by those who believe that as man prospers in this life, similarly he will prosper in the other [...]. The second error is committed by those who say all pains are inflicted unto people because of some guilt. [...]. The third error is committed by those who say that God does not take care of the people.”<sup>36</sup> The primary division of the sermon is threefold, and it is built around these three errors.

No matter how the division is made, all these sermons have one thing in common. They all handle problems such as poverty, riches, the poor, the rich, sin and virtue. That is exactly what makes these sermons extremely interesting. They take the Lazarus parable out of the gospel and expand it to cover all similar people, good and bad. Instead of speaking of the rich man in the Gospel, they often use the plural form and address their words to all rich men. Such is also the case with the poor. The writers of model sermons saw Lazarus as an archetype of the virtuous poor man.

One can argue that it goes without saying that the function of the sermon is not to interpret a passage of the Bible without putting it into a larger and contemporary context. All the sermons were and still are supposed to have contemporary relevance. However, I feel it necessary to underline that most mendicant preachers handled the Lazarus parable as a valid statement of social realities and their eventual outcome, not just as a story of two individuals and their destinies.

Even those few who took the position that it was a question of a true story instead of an *argumentum* invented by Jesus, were keen to underline the fact

---

33 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), ff. 116v-117v. “Prima consideratio est uidere qualiter fuerunt differentes in uita diues et pauper, diuersa premia merendo [...]. Secunda consideratio est uidere quomodo sunt differentes in morte, quia sicut differentes fuerunt in uita merendo, sic in morte premium recipiendo.”

34 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BL. Royal coll. 9.B.IV, f. 18r-18v.

35 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42r-43r.

36 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 57r-v. “Primus eorum qui dixerunt quod sicut homo prosperatur in mundo isto, sic prosperatur in alio. [...] Secundus est error eorum qui dixerunt quod omnis pena infliguntur homini propter aliquam culpam. [...] Tertius est error illorum qui dixerunt Deum de humanis prouidentiam non habere.”

that it works equally well as an *exemplum*. Guillaume Peyraut wrote: "From the fact that the name of Lazarus is mentioned we see that it is a question of history; nevertheless, it was also a parable [...]."<sup>37</sup> Allegorical stories like the rich man and Lazarus parable were easily adapted to the current social situation.<sup>38</sup>

The abuse of riches was a contemporary and relevant problem and Jesus' parable was interpreted as a description of the current situation. The striking feature in many sermons is that they lack a sense of history. The preachers were not able to see differences between the Jerusalem in Jesus' time and their own personal surroundings. A good example of this non-historical approach is the sermon of Peregrinus de Oppeln. He clearly sees the rich man of the parable as a contemporary nobleman. The dogs in the rich man's house that licked Lazarus' wounds were self-evidently hunting dogs. What else could they have been in the nobleman's household?<sup>39</sup>

This same lack of historical thinking becomes evident if we examine contemporary illuminated Bible manuscripts. None of the persons depicted uses eastern style of clothing, nor do they wear clothes of the proper century. All are depicted wearing contemporary clothes as well as using contemporary equipment and working methods. Nevertheless, one must ask whether it really was a question of not understanding differences in time and place, or whether the preachers intentionally modernised the story the better to convince their audiences, and evoke certain images in their minds. The above-cited example of the rich man's dogs was a very useful stunt to connect him and contemporary noblemen in the minds of the audiences.

There is further evidence of the preachers' method of knowingly updating the material they used. One of the most popular *exemplum* stories of the thirteenth century was the history of the young man condemned to death who bites his father's nose off thinking that the father is to blame for his fate since he had neglected to educate his son.<sup>40</sup> Originally this story comes from the pseudo-Boethian book *De disciplina clericorum*. In the original version the young man is son of a rich Roman, and he is taken to be crucified.<sup>41</sup> In the thirteenth-century versions all traces of his historical background have vanished and he is going to be hanged instead of crucified.<sup>42</sup> One writer even states that

---

37 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. nr. "Ex hoc quod nomen Lazari exprimitur uidetur esse rei geste narratio, nihilominus tamen parabola fuit [...]."

38 B. Geremek, *Geschichte der Armut*, pp. 24-25.

39 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 47r. "Quarto consistit in mundanis uanitatibus ibi sed 'et canes ueniebant et lingebant.' Habebat enim canes ad uenandum iocunditatem [...]."

40 On the popularity of this exemplum, see F.C. Tubach, *Index exemplorum. A Handbook of Religious Tales*, FF Communications no. 204 (Helsinki 1981), no. 3488.

41 Pseudo-Boethius, *De disciplina clericorum*, PL 64, col. 1267.

42 L. Hervieux, *Les fabulistes latins. T. 4. Eudes de Cheriton et ses dérives* (Paris 1896), p. 19; Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad coniugatas, sermo tercius. BN lat. 15943, f. 145v; Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones decalogo preceptorum*. Sermo quinto super quartum preceptum. BAV. Vat. lat. 4368, ff. 128v-129r; Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP, *Expositio decalogi* (*Sermones* 29). BAV. Ottob. lat. 1610, ff. 18r-v.

he was taken to the gallows by the king's bailiff.<sup>43</sup> It seems plausible that Peregrinus de Oppeln's interpretation of the rich man's dogs was an intentional modernisation similar to the thirteenth-century version of pseudo-Boethius' story.

This pre-eminence of contemporary concern was expressed in several sermons. An unknown preacher embarks on his Lazarus sermon right after the theme with these words: "*This gospel is read for two reasons, firstly for the confutation of the evil rich. Secondly for the consolation of the good poor. In this rich man, all evil rich men are confuted, when they hear that he was placed in danger of being buried to hell by the Lord.*"<sup>44</sup> For the mendicant preachers the rich man was not merely a rich man, he represented in reality all sinful richmen. Similarly Lazarus stood for all the righteous and patient poor.

Antonio Azaro Parmense wrote: "*The Lord proposed this story for two reasons. Firstly for the consolation of the just poor and secondly for the confusion of the evil rich.*"<sup>45</sup> According to Antonio, the message of the Gospel was not only directed to those who were listening to Jesus, but to all the righteous poor and the evil rich. This was the view taken by Nicolas de Gorran as well: "*Here we are proposed two things, first the reward of the poor man so that we might expect it [...]. Secondly the damnation of the rich man to make us fear it.*"<sup>46</sup> Konrad Holtzner says nothing of the positive example of Lazarus, but states that the vices of the rich man are the very same that can be criticised in the rich of his time too.<sup>47</sup>

Guillaume Peyraut ends his own Lazarus sermon with the following words. They are well worth quoting *in extenso* since they include the essential message of these sermons and make a clear statement with the regard to their envisaged audiences: "*And note that this exemplum is a mirror for both the rich and the poor. If you are rich and use your riches to obtain glory and lascivious living and if you are avaricious towards the poor, you are a stingy man and will receive the same end as did this rich man. The same road leads to the same destiny. But if you have mercy on the poor according to your means, you will have the solace of Abraham, who was hospitable, and thus found peace.*

43 A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, dominicain du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 1877), no. 43.

44 Anonymous (similar to MS. Leipzig 747), *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 15831, f. 55v. "Duobus de causis legitur euangelium istud, primo propter malorum diuitum confutationem. Secundo propter bonorum pauperum consolationem. In diuite isto omnes mali diuites confutantur audientes enim eum in tantum a Domino periculum ut inferno sepelitur."

45 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. CLM 2774, f. 147v. "Hoc exemplum Dominus proposuit duplici de causa. Primo ad consolationem bonorum pauperum. Secundo ad confusionem malorum diuitum."

46 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. UUB. C 18, 40r. "Secundum hoc proponuntur nobis hic duo, primo premiatio pauperis ut ipsum appetamus. [...], secundo dampnatio diuitis ut eam caueamus."

47 Konrad Holtzner OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, p. 116. "Certe diues iste triplici macula hic reprehenditur de quibus etiam moderni diuites reprehendi possunt, uidelicet de uanitate in uestiando, de gulositate in edendo, de impietate in non miserendo."

Gregory in a homily: "The words of the Holy Scripture are intended to instruct us to fulfil the commandment of piety; we find Lazarus every day if we only search for him, even if we do not search every day, we will learn to know him. Look how painfully the poor offer themselves to us. They who will be our intercessors ask from us, surely it is us who should do the begging, and yet we are asked. Take a look and see if we should say no to what is asked of us, for they are in reality our masters who ask."

Gregory: "When one sees the reprehensible poor man, one should advise him, not despise. If one sees one without anything reprehensible, one should greatly venerate him like an intercessor, and yet we meet so many whose merits we do not know. Therefore they are all to be venerated, and you must humble yourself in front of everyone for you do not know who among them might be the Christ." And when you offer to one who is lying on the ground you give to Him who sits in heaven.

If you are a poor man, then pay attention to the end of the poor man in the parable, and you will be comforted in your poverty knowing that the patience of the poor will not be wasted in the end.<sup>48</sup> Peyraut used the word mirror ("speculum"), which often appeared in names of moral theological treatises; he thus implies that the Lazarus parable is essentially a guideline to living for the rich and the poor given by Jesus himself, an ultimate *exemplum*, one might say. This passage from Peyraut's sermon is typical in two ways. Firstly it strongly insists on generalising the message of the parable to cover all the rich and all the poor. Secondly it relies heavily on the authority of Gregory the Great. Gregory is without doubt the most frequently cited authority in these sermons.

### 2.2.2 "There was a Certain Rich Man"

So far we have dealt with the structure and general message of the Lazarus sermons. In order to establish more specifically what they were like, we may next move into the actual texts of the sermons. I decided to take as a starting-point Nicolaus de Aquaevilla's sermon in the *Dominica prima post festum*

---

48 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n4r. "Item notandum quod hoc exemplum est speculum et diuitum et pauperum. Si diues es et diuiciis ad gloriam et delicias uteris et pauperibus auarus et parcus existis, finem ad quem deuenit diues iste consequeris. Eadem uia ad eundem finem ducit. Si uero iuxta facultatem tuam pauperibus misericors fueris, solacium habebis quia Abraam qui hospitalis fuit erat in requie. Gregorius in omelia: 'Uerba lectionis sacre debent nos instruere ad implenda mandata pietatis, quottidie Lazarum si nos querimus inuenimus, quottidie etsi non Lazarum querimus cernimus. Ecce importune pauperes se offerunt rogant nos qui tunc pro nobis intercessores ueniant, certe nos omnino rogare debuimus et tamen rogamur. Uidete si negare debemus quod petimur quando patroni sunt qui petunt.' Item Gregorius: 'Dum pauper reprehensibilis cernitur moneri debet et despici non debet. Si uero reprehensionis nihil habet, uenerari summopere sicut intercessor debet, sed ecce multos cernimus quis cuius sit meriti nescimus. Omnes ergo uenerandi sunt tantoque necesse est ut omnibus te humiliare debeas quanto quis sit Christus ignoras.' Idem quando iacenti in terra porrigitis sedenti in celo datis. Si pauper es attende finem pauperis ut in paupertate tua solacium habeas sciens quod patientia pauperum non peribit in fine." Citations of Gregory are from his Lazarus homily (no. 40).

*trinitatis* on the theme *Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur etc.*<sup>49</sup> This will be compared to other Lazarus sermons (and occasionally to other pastoral material as well) in order to find general commonplaces in these sermons. Beside the common *topoi*, novel and original approaches are also pointed out.

Nicolaus opens his sermon with what we may call *the nameless rich man topos*. He notes that the name of the rich man is not mentioned, since it was unknown to God. God did not want to recognise the rich man because of the sin of pride. Lazarus, on the other hand, is mentioned by his Christian name, since God willingly knows the humble and the poor.<sup>50</sup> There is nothing original or especially thirteenth-century in this. It was an age-old *topos* first included in Gregory the Great's homily no. 40 and repeated by different writers ever after.<sup>51</sup>

Then Nicolaus moves to the division of his sermon. The principal division is twofold, the reasons for the punishment of the rich man, and the reasons for the reward of Lazarus. The first primary division is subdivided into five parts, that is five sins of the rich man. These were according to Nicolaus: 1. being rich, and furthermore using his riches badly, 2. using superfluous clothing, 3. gluttony, 4. having no mercy on Lazarus, and 5. sins of the tongue. When putting things together at the end of these subdivisions, Nicolaus lists them again. This time the first sin is said to be merely using his riches badly, not just being rich. One is tempted to think that when writing the sermon Nicolaus let himself loose and identified without hesitation richness and sinfulness, but in the end decided to present his message in a less controversial manner.<sup>52</sup>

49 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 82r-84v. Nicolaus' sermon is fairly long, it includes many of the general *topoi*, and furthermore, it is more explicit than many other sermons. Therefore it helps to interpret several things that are presented in less direct way in some other sermons.

50 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 82r.

51 Gregory the Great, *Homiliarum in Evangelia*, L. II, h. 40, PL 76, col. 1305. Of the later writers see for instance Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*, f. 230v; Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Sermones de evangelis dominicalibus*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Roma Angelica 715, f. 71r; Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. nv; Luca da Bitonto OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BN. Nouv.acq.lat. 410, f. 194v; Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis, sermo secundus (Venice 1497), f. 75r; Nicolas de Byard OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. CLM 16028, f. 124v.

52 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 82r-84r. "Primum fuit quod ipse peccavit in hoc quod dives erat et cum dives esset diuiciis suis malo utebatur. [...] Secundum in quo peccavit fuit quia uestimentis nimis induebatur preciosis. [...] Tertio peccavit in peccato gulae. [...] Quarto peccavit quia Lazaro non compaciabatur. [...] Quinto peccavit quia in mensa sua inter conuiuia inutilia uerba loquebatur."; and f. 84r. "Propter ista quinque quia diuiciis suis male utebatur et quia uestimentis nimis pretiosis induebatur et quia cotidie splendide epulabatur et quia Lazaro non compatiabatur et quia in mensa sua inutilia loquebatur, sepultus est in inferno [...]."



The sermon proper starts by dividing riches to three categories.<sup>53</sup> The first category covers the riches of fortune, or temporal riches (the other two categories, riches of virtue and riches of eternal glory, being not material, but heavenly riches, do not concern us here). Nicolaus states that riches of fortune are dangerous for three reasons: they give no peace to their possessor, they often drag people into sin, and in many cases they prevent their victim from entering paradise. Nicolaus uses extremely interesting biblical citations to confirm his first point that riches do not give any peace to their possessor.

He points out two cases of controversies between either the Old Testament patriarchs themselves or their servants. As pointed out earlier, several other writers used these patriarchs (Abraham, Lot, Jacob, and Esau) to legitimise being rich, not to condemn it as Nicolaus does. Nicolaus may have taken this idea from Maurice de Provins' *Distinctiones*, for it is the only other source I know that uses patriarchs as an argument against being rich.<sup>54</sup> In discussing the riches which prevent their owners from entering the paradise, Nicolaus refers to Lk. 18:23-24. But in contrast to the earlier cited commentaries of Aquinas and Nicolaus de Lyra, the emphasis is here on the difficulty of salvation for the rich, not on the possibility of it. Nicolaus de Aquaevilla uses the phrase "in many cases" (*multotiens*) to express the high probability of negative consequences of being rich.<sup>55</sup>

Nicolaus' three categories of riches can be found in numerous other sources as well. The Franciscan Maurice de Provins and the Dominican Nicolas de Gorran use them in their *Distinctiones* collections. According to them there are temporal, spiritual and heavenly riches. Temporal riches are described to be sinful and dangerous whereas the two other categories are to be sought by every Christian.<sup>56</sup> Dividing riches into bad (i.e. temporal) and good ones (i.e.

53 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 82r-v. "Unde sciendum est in primis quod tria sunt genera diuiciarum, quia quedam sunt que appellantur diuicie fortune ut sunt diuicie rerum temporalium [...]. Item alie sunt diuicie que dicitur uirtutum et glorie [...]. Item sunt alie diuicie que dicuntur diuicie etemis glorie."

54 Maurice de Provins OFM, *Distinctiones*. BAV. Vat.lat. 980, f. 70v.

55 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 82v. "De diuitiis fortune que sunt multum periculose diues fuit iste de quo dicitur hic Homo quidam erat diues. Uere iste diuicie sunt multum periculose et hoc propter tria. Primum quia non sinunt hominem illas habentem quiescere nec dormire unde Eccl. 5. Saturitas diuitis non sinit eum dormire. Similiter ipse non sinunt eum cum proximis pasificum esse. Unde Gen. 33 dicit quod Jacob et Esau non poterant simil habitare quia diuites erant ualde et Gen. 13 dicit quod rixa erat inter pastores Abrahamis et inter pastores Loth quia diuites erant ualde. Secundum est quia hominem ad peccatum pertrahunt sepe unde Eccl. 11. Si diues fueris, non eris immunis a delicto. Tertium est quia multotiens impediunt hominem ad paradysum uenire unde Lucas 18 dicit quod contristatus est iuuenis quia diues erat ualde quando Dominus dixit ei: 'Uade et uende omnia que habes et da pauperibus.' Uidens Ihesus illum tristem dixit: 'Quam difficile est qui pecuniam habet intrare in regnum celorum!'"

56 Maurice de Provins OFM, *Distinctiones*. Diuicie. BL. Royal coll. 9.E.III, f. 76v. "Tria sunt genera diuitiarum temporales, spirituales et celestes."; Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Distinctiones*. Diuicie. BL Royal 9.B.IV, f. 130v. "Diuitiarum tria sunt genera quedam temporales, quedam spirituales et alie celestes."

spiritual) was a method also used by Guibert de Tournai in his model sermon to the upper bourgeoisie.<sup>57</sup>

The negative attitude to temporal wealth is likewise reflected in other Lazarus sermons and in other pastoral material. The Franciscan preacher Luca da Bitonto gives four examples of potential sins attendant upon the possession of money. Then he rounds his sermon off with several biblical passages that condemn wealth.<sup>58</sup> Potential dangers connected to temporal wealth are also noted in Antonio Azaro Parmense's sermons.<sup>59</sup>

Nicolas de Gorran implies to his readers that the reason for the damnation of the rich man was his wealth. He quotes Luke 6:24: "But woe to you that are rich! for you have received your consolation."<sup>60</sup> Berthold von Regensburg uses the same passage of scripture in a similar context: "Blessed are the poor: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. This is not said of the rich but rather: "But woe to you that are rich! For you have received your consolation, that is in temporal riches."<sup>61</sup> An anonymous Franciscan university preacher makes his opinion of riches quite clear: "The means of reaching God is poverty, which is proved by its opposite: the means of going to hell are excessive riches, as Luke says: 'The rich man also died; and he was buried in hell.' Beware! There is nothing between the rich man and hell."<sup>62</sup>

The most comprehensive treatments of the dangers of wealth were, however, the *distinctiones* collections.<sup>63</sup> The oldest of the best-seller *distinctiones*

---

57 D.L. d'Avray, *Sermons to the Upper Bourgeoisie by a Thirteenth-Century Franciscan*. In *The Church in Town and Countryside*. Studies in Church History, 16. Edited by D. Baker (Oxford 1979), p. 195.

58 Luca da Bitonto OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Paris B.N. Nouv.acq. 410, f. 194r-197r. There is some doubt as to the authorship of this sermon. Schneyer suggests that it may be Gerard de Mailly's; Schneyer, *Repertorium IV*, 59 (no. 128). Nevertheless it is not included in the catalogue of Gerard's sermons printed in L.-J. Bataillon & N. Beriou, "G. De Mailly" de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs. *AFP LXI* (1991).

59 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. In die cinerum. UUB. C 347, f. 17v. "Nullo modo ponatis fiduciam in rebus terrenis cito perituris quia quis confidit in eis cum eis deficiet [...]. Primo quia inutile et uanum. Talis enim thesaurus aliquando per se corrumpitur, aliquando a furibus diripitur, etsi quod mundum sit cito in morte dimittitur unde Johannes ii: 'Nolite diligere mundum quia mundus transit.' Secundo quia anime et corpori ualde periculosum, corpori quia sepe contingit quod possessor talis thesauri propter ipsum perimitur [...]. Anime quia talis thesaurus in corde homini non solum amorem Dei minuit immo sepe ex toto tollitur et sic homo coram Deo nullius ualoris existit."

60 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BL. Royal coll. 9.B.IV, f. 18r-v. "Secundo status fortune cum suppositione culpe ibi diues. Luc. vi: 'Ue uobis diuites qui habetis hic consolationem.'"

61 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 3215, f. 42v. "'Beati enim pauperes quia ipsorum est regnum celorum', hoc de diuitibus non dicitur, sed potius dicitur eis: 'Ue uobis diuites qui habetis hic', scilicet in temporalibus, 'consolationem.'"

62 Sermo cuiusdam fratris minoris in festo beatae Agnetis 21.1. 1231. In M.M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-1231. Contribution à l'histoire de la prédication médiévale*. Études de philosophie médiévale XV (Paris 1931), p. 385. "Medium autem eundi ad Deum est paupertas quod probatur per locum ab oppositis: Sic medium per quod itur in infernum sunt nimiae diuitiae. Unde Lucas: 'Mortuus est dives et sepultus est in inferno.' Ecce nihil est medium inter diuitem et infernum."

63 On the thirteenth century mendicant distinctiones collections, their dating, and popularity see L.-J. Bataillon, *Intermédiaires entre les traités de morale pratique et les sermons: les distinctiones bibliques alphabétiques*. In L.-J. Bataillon, *La prédication au XIIIe siècle en France et Italie* (Aldeshot 1993), pp. VI, 213-226.

collections, that of Maurice de Provins, divides riches into the same three categories (temporal, spiritual and heavenly) as Nicolaus de Aquaevilla. Then he goes on to judge temporal riches as utterly dangerous and harmful.<sup>64</sup> The extremely influential *Summa de abstinentia* by Nicolas de Byard tells us that: "Riches are dangerous to obtain for many reasons. They drag you to sins and pollute those who touch them, for they are hardly possible to obtain without danger, theft, lies and fraud." Nicolas de Byard also marches forward all the standard phrases of scripture that have something negative to say on wealth. He seems to be one of those mendicants who, as Lester K. Little puts it, had a deep-seated hatred of money.<sup>65</sup>

Nicolas de Gorran's *distinctio* on *diuicie* is very similar to Nicolas de Byard's. According to Gorran temporal riches are vile, dangerous to those who obtain them and harmful to possess, and cause great anxiety to those who love them. All the standard biblical quotations against the rich and riches are cited here as well (Ps. 61:11, Prov. 28:20, Ecclesiastes 5:9, Ecclesiastes 5:12, Ecclesiastes 6:1-2, Ecclesiasticus 11:10, Lk. 14:16-24, Lk. 16:19-31, James 5:1).<sup>66</sup>

Having stated three reasons why temporal wealth is dangerous for its owners, Nicolaus de Aquaevilla goes on to mention three ways in which men usually sin in riches. These are: 1. loving them too much, 2. obtaining them by evil means, and 3. using them badly. There are almost no end of intertextual references to this triad. Pierre de Reims writes that men sin in riches in three ways: gaining them greedily, keeping them badly and using them badly.<sup>67</sup> Franciscan Maurice de Provins used Pierre's triad with slightly different wording in his *Distinctiones*, as did Berthold von Regensburg and Hugo de Prato Florido.<sup>68</sup> Jacopo da Varazze says that the rich man in this parable sinned in three things concerning riches: 1. keeping them avariciously, 2. spending them vainly, and 3. loving them too much.<sup>69</sup>

Several writers prefer to give four modes of sinning associated with riches instead of three. Nicolas de Byard writes that men commonly sin with riches

64 Maurice de Province OFM, *Distinctiones*. Diuicie. BL. Royal 9.E.III, f. 76v.

65 Nicolas de Byard, *Summa de abstinentia*. De diuitiis. UUB. C 230, f. 21v-23r. "Sunt ergo diuicie periculose acquirendo propter multa, quia ad peccata trahunt et inquinant tangentes, uix enim sine periculo furti, uel mendacii uel doli acquiruntur."; Cf. L.K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, p. 164.

66 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Distinctiones*. Diuicie. BL Royal 9.B.IV, f. 130v.

67 Pierre de Reims OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 369, f. 15r. "In tribus enim peccatur in diuitiis. Primo in mala acquisitione [...]. Secundo peccatur in mala detentione [...]. Tercio peccatur in malo usu."

68 Maurice de Provins OFM, *Distinctiones*. Diuicie. BL. Royal Coll. 9.E.III, f. 76v. "[...] sciendum quod sunt diuicie que male acquiruntur. [...] Idem sunt que male detentur [...] Tercie sunt que male dispensantur."; Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticani de dominicis*, dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42v. Illorum diuitum qui dampnantur primi sunt qui diuitias habent male acquisitas. [...] Similiter diuites mali sunt qui male expendunt. [...] Tercii diuites mali sunt qui male suas reseruant [...]."; Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. cc6r. "Dampnatur autem diues tripliciter uel quia male acquisiuit, uel quia male retinuit, uel quia male expendit."

69 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime, sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22r. "Non autem reprehenditur ex eo quod diues erat, sed quia circa diuitias tripliciter peccabat. Primo eas auare retinendo [...]. Secundo eas uane expendebat [...]. Tertio ipsas diuitias nimis amando, [...]."

in four ways. Three of them are identical with those of Nicolaus de Aquaevilla's.<sup>70</sup> Gerard de Mailly's sermon presents four reasons why the rich man was buried in hell: he was greedy for gain, pompous and free in spending, lascivious in living, and miserly and cruel in keeping his fortune.<sup>71</sup> Peregrinus de Oppeln gives four ways of sinning with riches: desiring them badly, acquiring them badly, spending them badly, and finally, donating them to the Church unjustly.<sup>72</sup>

Giovanni da San Gemignano was not satisfied with three or four ways; he stated that men tend to sin in riches in no less than five ways: acquiring them badly, keeping them avariciously, thinking too much of themselves because of riches, loving them too much, and using them vainly.<sup>73</sup> Here we have again the triad of Nicolaus de Aquaevilla and some personal additions. Giovanni's speciality lies in his reference to the change of personality through riches. He observes that the rich, and especially those who have gained their wealth recently, tend to be contemptuous, proud, to brag about their riches, and to be ambitious and unjust.<sup>74</sup>

Judging from these and numerous other similar cases, the various sins associated with money were a widely used *topos* that remained pretty much the same with different writers. Some individual sins or names by which they were called might change, but the general idea remained the same – riches presented considerable dangers for those who obtained, owned or spent them. Whether any of these writers copied from each other or from some common source remains an open question. However, there seems to have been no general consensus on the matter, since none of the lists is identical *verbatim*. Three, four or five sins concerning wealth were certainly a common *topos*, but it was not a codified one like the 'three goods of marriage', *fides-proles-sacramentum*.<sup>75</sup>

70 Nicolas de Byard, *Summa de abstinentia*. De divitiis. UUB. C 230, f. 21v-22r. "Solent homines peccare in diuitiis quattuor modis. Primo male acquirendo ut uillicus iniquitatis qui defraudauit dominum suum Luc. xvi. Secundo in malo usu ut diues ille qui induebatur in purpura et bisso Luc. xvi. Tertio in mala detentione Luc. xii. Quarto in nimia delectatione Luc. xviii."

71 Gerard de Mailly OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 351, f. 85r-v. "[...] primo enim fuit cupidus iste diues in acquirendo. [...] Secundo fuit pomposus et excedens in expendendo. [...] Tertio fuit deliciosus in uiuendo. [...] Quarto fuit auarus et crudelis in retinendo."

72 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 47v. "[...] sed diuitias quas homo male desiderat, male acquirit, male expendit, male hereditat." I have here assumed that the word *heredito* is here used in the meaning to donate (to the church); A. Blaise, *Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (Turnhout 1975), p. 436. In that case it is reasonable to assume that what Peregrinus had in mind was donating to the church from unjustly gained riches.

73 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Sermo in feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, ff.57v-58r. "Contingit tamen habere diuitias quinque modis peccare circa eas. Primo in acquirendo in quantum per modos illicitos acquiruntur. [...] Secundo peccatur circa diuitias in retinendo scilicet cum quis auaro et ardenti animo eas retinet. [...] Tertio peccatur circa diuitias extimando in quantum propter diuitias extimat de se illud quod non est. [...] Quarto peccant circa diuitias in diligendo. [...] Quinto peccatur circa diuitias in expendendo in quantum male expenduntur scilicet pro mundo, non pro Deo."

74 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Sermo in feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 58r. "[...] Philosophus in secundo Rethorice ponit quod diuites, et precipue qui de nouo ditati sunt, sunt contumeliosi, et elati, et delicati, iactatiui, ambitiosi et iniusti."

75 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, p. 249.

What is especially interesting in Nicolaus de Aquaevilla's sermon is that he gives real life examples of each these three sins attendant upon wealth: "Firstly loving riches too much and receiving them avariciously. In this those avaricious laymen and clerics sin who possess so much wealth that it rots in their coffers; and, when they see the poor dying of hunger, are unwilling to disburse anything to them from their riches. Likewise, they have so many suits hanging in their wardrobes that often they are devoured by the moths, and yet they do not want to give a single piece of clothing to Christ's poor when they see them freezing to death in winter."<sup>76</sup> This passage speaks of considerably rich laymen and priests. The question of the laymen remains open, but the members of the clergy meant must be the prelates, since ordinary parish priests hardly met the description of wealth given here.

The second sin associated with riches is connected to the social standings more explicitly: "Secondly obtaining them badly like those robber bailiffs and knights, and those usurers and covetous unfaithful merchants who want to become rich by evil and faithless commercial transactions and by bad acquisitions. All these make with their own hands the rope with which they will be hanged in hell [...]."<sup>77</sup> Here we have bailiffs, knights and merchants named as potential sinners.

Peregrinus de Oppeln sacrifices a great deal of space in his sermon to a description of the different methods of acquiring money sinfully. He names five or seven ways of doing so: stealing, robbing, committing usury, cheating in business transactions, making false oaths, measuring and weighing dishonestly, accusing others, and exploitation.<sup>78</sup> What is even more interesting is that he also points out several people who are likely to commit these sins. Merchants are naturally mentioned in connection with cheating in business transactions. The other social group mentioned are the knights. They were accused of exacting money unjustly from the poor. Peregrinus writes that God has given his poor to the rich and the powerful of this world to be taken care of. He has also instructed them through John the Baptist to do violence to no man and be happy with their wages (Lk. 3:14). Yet they spend their days in inventing new methods to exact more money. The obligatory comparison to the wolf and the sheep is presented to round off the exposition.<sup>79</sup>

76 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 82v. "Primo illas nimis amando et auare recipiendo. In hoc peccant isti auari laici et clerici qui habent tot diuicias quod putrescunt in archis suis et cum uident pauperes Christi morientes fame nichil uolunt de diuiciis suis eis erogare. Similiter habent tot paria uestimentorum pendendum in particis suis quod sepe a tineis comeduntur et tamen nolunt unum uestimentum uetus dare pauperibus Christi cum uident illos mori frigore in hieme." The reference to the poor dying in the cold was a common *topos*. See for instance C. Cenci, *Il commento al Vangelo di S. Luca di Fr. Constantino da Orvieto*, p. 135.

77 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 82v-83r. "Secundo malo acquirendo ut isti raptores bedelli et milites et isti usurarii et cupidi infideles mercatores qui uolunt diuites fieri per malas et infideles negociationes et per malas adquisiciones. Omnes isti faciunt propriis manibus laqueos quibus suspendentur in inferno [...]."

78 The number of these ways of sinning differs from one manuscript to another. There are also differences between the two different redactions of this sermon; see Appendix.

79 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BL. Add. 18340, f. 47v-48r.

Nicolaus de Aquaevilla's and Peregrinus de Opelein's comments on the wrongdoing of the knights and the bailiffs in this context are interesting in that the view taken by Gregory the Great – and often repeated by later preachers – was that the rich man was not punished for robbing others, but because he did not give of his own.<sup>80</sup> Instead of repeating this opinion of Gregory they chose to rebuke the current custom of oppressing the poor. This solution was devised on purpose, since both writers cite other passages of Gregory's homily in their sermons. They were certainly aware of Gregory's interpretation but chose not to follow it.

### *Superfluous Clothing*

The next subdivision in Nicolaus de Aquaevilla's sermon is the superfluous clothing of the rich man. He gives the three ways of sinning in clothes as follows: "And note that men and women sin three ways in adornment of clothes, in price, in softness, and in superfluity."<sup>81</sup> A particularly interesting point in this part of the sermon is that Nicolaus mentions women, having said nothing at all of them before.

Sinning in clothes was a theme handled in many Lazarus sermons. Konrad Holtzner dedicated one of his to the evil use of riches. He describes five ways of sinning in clothes. These were sumptuousness, superfluity, carnality, curiosity (that is, fine adornment, different colours and so on), and shamefulness. The latter refers to using clothes unsuitable to one's social standing or sex. Konrad refers his readers to Deuteronomy 22:5 "The woman shall not be clothed with man's apparel: neither shall a man use woman's apparel."<sup>82</sup>

If we take a closer look at these ways of sinning with clothes we perceive that Konrad Holtzner covers all the points presented by Nicolaus (his carnality being the same thing as Nicolaus' softness) and adds two more. Nicolaus relies on the authority of Gregory the Great when he condemns too expensive clothing. Gregory reasoned that if expensive clothing were not sinful, Jesus would not have underlined the fact that the rich man used purple and fine linen. Konrad Holtzner cites the same passage of Gregory in the same context. Nicolaus does not, however, limit himself to repeating authorities. He adds that it is surely unworthy to dress a rotten cadaver with expensive clothing when many poor men could be maintained with the same money. He also asserts citing again Gregory, that expensive clothes are used only for the sake of vain glory, since no man uses them when he is all alone. He adds that obtaining such clothes is hardly possible without sinning. This latter comment strengthens the

---

80 Gregory the Great, *Homily 40*, col. 1304. "Hic autem dives iste non abstulisse aliena reprehenditur, sed propria non dedisse. Nec dicitur quia vi quempiam oppressit, sed quia in acceptis rebus se extulit."

81 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 83r. "Et sciendum est quod tribus modis peccant homines et mulieres in ornatu uestimentorum, in pretiositate, mollicie et superfluitate."

82 Konrad Holtzner OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, p. 117.

conclusion that Nicolaus thought that being rich almost automatically means being sinful.<sup>83</sup>

Nicolaus de Aquaevilla and Konrad Holtzner were not the only writers to present lists of sins associated with clothes.<sup>84</sup> The actual names and number of the sins vary from writer to writer, but the message remains the same. It is sinful to have too expensive clothes, too many of them, to wear clothes unsuitable for one's social position, and lastly to use clothes out of pride. Despite the differences, the texts bear such a large number of similarities in message and style that it is obvious that there was a common *topos* of sins in clothing originating from the Lazarus homily of Gregory the Great. The text of Gregory was complemented by additions from preachers themselves, and these additions were subsequently circulated alongside original quotations from Gregory.

The idea of spending on clothing money that should be used to maintain the poor is met in several Lazarus sermons. Hugo de Prato Florido and François de Mayronnes imply that purple clothes are coloured by the blood of those poor who could have been sustained with the money that was spent on them.<sup>85</sup> This idea is already noted in the Dominican Constantino da Orvieto's commentary on Luke. He writes that some people have such precious clothing that many poor could live on its value, and while the expensive clothes hang in closets the poor die naked in the frost.<sup>86</sup>

Clearly this motive was a literary *topos* copied freely by different authors. Nevertheless, it can also be seen as a sign of the social ethos of the mendicants.

---

83 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 83r. "Dicit beatus Gregorius: 'Si cultus pretiosorum uestimentorum non esset peccatum, sermo Domini non tam euigilanter exprimeret [quod] diues induebatur purpura et bysso ut apud inferos torqueretur. Certe indignum est quod putridum cadaueris pretiosa ueste ornaretur unde possent multi pauperes sustentari.'"; Konrad Holtzner OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, page 117. "Et nota quod quinque modis diuites in uestibus excedunt, uidelicet sumptuositate unde hic dicitur quod induebatur purpura et bysso. Gregorius: 'Si cultus pretiosorum uestium culpa non esset sermo Dei tam euigilanter non exprimeret quod diues qui torquetur apud inferos purpura indutus fuisset.'" Citations of Gregory the Great are from the homily no. 40.

84 See for instance Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. cc6r. "Sunt autem quatuor que aggrauant et inducunt peccatum in luxu uestium. Primum est sumptuositas quando tantum datur pro uno uestimento de cuius superfluitate possent multi pauperes uiuere. Secundum est multiplicitas ut quando partice pendunt onerate uestibus et pauperes nudi frigore moriuntur. Hiero.: 'Aliena rapere conuincitur qui ultra necessitatem sibi retinere comprabatur.' Tertium est indecentia que respicit ordinem et statum persone, non enim decet clericum habitu militari uestiri nec rusticum ueste regali. Quartum est ostensio que respicit uanitatem et laudem unde non est gloriandum de uestibus cum potius sint uituperium."; François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117r. "Reprehenditur etiam luxus in uestitu propter sui pretiositatem que respicit pretium, propter multitudinem que respicit numerum, propter curiositatem que respicit studium, propter indecentiam que respicit persone statum, propter fallaciam que respicit aliene uisum, propter ostentationem que respicit ornatum uanum unde Gregorius: 'Nemo putet in luxu uestium deesse peccatum [...].'"

85 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. cc6r. "Purpura autem sanguine tingitur. Purpura ergo uestiuntur, qui uestimenta sua multiplicat de sanguine maxime crucifixi ut clerici uel de sanguine pauperum ut usurarij et predones et raptores."; François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117r. "Purpura tingitur de sanguine et quia ea de quibus uiuere debent pauperes in usus suos conuertunt."

86 C. Cenci, *Il commento al Vangelo di S. Luca di Fr. Constantino da Orvieto*, p. 135.

They felt it important to emphasise the social wrongdoing of the rich man. His clothing was not only vanity. Equally important, if not more so, is that it was a crime against those who were not so well off. It was money that should have been used to feed and clothe the poor.

Then Nicolaus moves on to the softness of the clothes. He says that John the Baptist used to wear clothes made of camel's hair and cites the *Glossa ordinaria*, which says that God's servants are not supposed to have clothes for pleasure, but for the covering of nudity. He also cites Gregory the Great, who wrote that if such clothes were not sinful the Lord would not have praised so much the clothing of John the Baptist.<sup>87</sup> Konrad Holtzner repeats in his sermon the same biblical passages and same citations of the *Glossa* and Gregory almost *verbatim*. The only significant difference is that Konrad presents the citation from Gregory under the subdivision on the curiosity of clothing.<sup>88</sup>

Nicolaus de Aquaevilla and Konrad Holtzner were not the only writers to make extensive use of Gregory the Great's quotations against superfluous clothing. These passages were already cited in Hugues de Saint-Cher's *Postilla* and later on by numerous preachers and writers of the Lazarus sermons.<sup>89</sup> It would be a tempting option to assume that their popularity was due to the popularity of Hugues' postills, since many of the common *topoi* found in the Lazarus sermons were indeed to be found there too. However, one has to be careful in making such connections, since none of the writers refers to Hugues. They always refer to Gregory the Great in such a manner as if they had consulted his homily directly, which of course does not prove that they so did. Even if the preachers had cited Gregory through Hugues, they would quite likely still mention only Gregory's name.

The final subdivision of sartorial sin is superfluity. Nicolaus de Aquaevilla reprehends hypocrite prelates who drag their clothes through the dirt in order to look more saintly.<sup>90</sup> This seems to confirm the idea of Bronislaw Geremek that the aura, or as he puts it, the nimbus of saintliness associated with the voluntary poor was to a certain extent also transmitted to "*les pauvres*

87 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 83r. "[...] et super illud Matth. 3: 'Iohannes habebat uestimenta de pilis camelorum', et dicit Glossa: 'Seruus Dei non debet habere uestimenta ad delectationem sed tamen ad tagendum nuditatem', et beatus Gregorius: 'Nemo estimet in fluxu ac studio pretiosarum uestium deesse culpam, quia si hoc culpa non esset, nullo modo Dominus Iohannem de uestimenti sui asperitate laudasset.'"

88 Konrad Holtzner OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, p. 117. "[...] contra quod Mt. 3. 'Iohannes habebat uestimentum de pilis camelorum.' Glosa: 'Seruus Dei non debet habere uestimentum ad decorem uel ad delectionem sed ad tegendum nuditatem.'"

89 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*, f. 230v. Other preachers who quoted Gregory were Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. CLM. 2774, f. 145v; François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117r.

90 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 83v. "[...] ut isti prelati papelardi qui contrahunt uestes suas per lutum ut uideantur boni et sancti." The word *papelardi* is replaced by the word *ypocriti* in BL Harley 1660, f. 110r.



*proprement dits*" due to the similar appearance, clothing and activities.<sup>91</sup> Why should Nicolaus' hypocrite prelates have done what they did, if actual poverty was not considered to be virtuous?

Then Nicolaus de Aquaevilla moves on to reprehend noble women who drag long trains behind them, thus exposing expensive clothes to the dirt, not caring about the nudity of Christ manifested in the poor.<sup>92</sup> The only other writer in our sermon corpus who mentions women in this context is Hugues de Saint-Cher.<sup>93</sup> Others either thought that vanity in clothes was not particularly a feminine sin, or they thought that the connection with women was so obvious that it went without saying. After the noble women Nicolaus de Aquaevilla reprehends those who have several sets of clothing and yet prefer them to be eaten by the moths than to give them to the poor. The message is confirmed with several biblical citations, the last being Lk. 3:11. "*He that hath two coats, that is as the Glossa interlinearis says, more than he needs, let him give to him that hath none.*"<sup>94</sup> Konrad Holtnicker cites the same passage from Luke's Gospel but does not put the finger on any particular group of people. He lets his readers draw their own conclusions.<sup>95</sup>

Similar passages on sinfulness in clothing are to be found in other writers. Guillaume Peyraut's sermon includes almost *verbatim* the arguments presented by Nicolaus de Aquaevilla and Konrad Holtnicker.<sup>96</sup> Jacopo da Varazze compares sin to a wound, and clothes to bandages used to cover it. He asserts that it is equally stupid to take pride in one's clothing as it would be for a wounded man to take pride in his bandages. Then he launches into a similitude on the subject: "*Man is like an apple where there are three parts, that is, outer peel, the substance in the middle, and interior core. The outer peel signifies the exterior clothing of man. Just as the peel of the apple is white and red, similarly people take pleasure and show off in different colours of clothes. The substance of the apple signifies the body itself. The interior core signifies the soul and thus it is customarily said that the core is the soul of the apple. Stupid is the man who would give away the whole apple and keep to himself only the*

---

91 B. Geremek, *Geschichte der Armut*, p. 50.

92 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 83v. "Item in longitudine peccant sepe iste domine que longas caudas suas trahunt post se pretiosis uestibus terram induentes et de nuditate Christi in pauperibus suis non curantes [...]."

93 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Sermones de evangelis dominicalibus*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Roma Angelica 715, f. 71v. "Nota quod ex pretiosis uestibus et superfluis homines et maxime mulieres multa mala proueniunt."

94 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 83v. "Preterea quia consilium evangelii Christi non adimplerunt de quo dicitur Luc. 3. 'Qui habet duas tunicas, id est superfluas dicit Glossa interlinearis, det unam non habenti.'"

95 Konrad Holtnicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, p. 117.

96 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), ff. n2r-v. Peyraut counts as many as seven different ways of sinning in clothes (sumptuositas, multitudo, curiositas, indecentia, ostentatio, presumptio ex vanitate, and anticipatio).

peel. Such men are the vainglorious who give their body and soul to the Devil and keep to themselves only the vain glory of clothes.”<sup>97</sup>

### Gluttony

The third subdivision of Nicolaus de Aquaevilla deals with the sin of gluttony in the rich man. He writes that two things are to be noted in the passage “*fared sumptuously everyday*”. These are the continuous nature of sinning (“*everyday*”) and superfluity in eating and drinking (“*sumptuously*”). Nicolaus informs his readers that men tend to sin in gluttony in five ways: asking food too soon, demanding it in too fine a form, eating too much, too ardently, and preparing their food too elegantly. These five species of gluttony are taken from Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job*. Then Nicolaus recommends readers to seek further information from another of his sermons, *Ductus est Ihesus in deserto a spiritum etc.* (Dominica prima in quadragesimae).<sup>98</sup>

Konrad Holtznicker’s view of gluttony is quite similar to that of Nicolaus’. The only personal addition is his moderate opinion on the better diet of the rich. He states that it is legal for the rich occasionally to refresh themselves better if they have a good reason such as hard work or physical weakness. However, it is not acceptable to be replete and stuffed all the time.<sup>99</sup> Guillaume Peyraut is equally moderate. He accepts banquets as long as the poor are not left without and the display of the food and drink is not immoderate. When writing about immoderate banquets, Guillaume does not concentrate on the measure and quality only, he also condemns the excessive appearance of the food and golden, silver or otherwise ostentatious dishes.<sup>100</sup>

97 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 74v. “Homo quidem est tanquam pomum in quo sunt tria, scilicet cortex exterior, substantia media et granum interius. Per corticem exteriorem intelligitur habitus exterior. Sicut enim cortex pomi est alba et rubea, sic homo in diuersis coloribus uestium delectatur et gloriatur. Per substantiam pomi intelligitur anima. Unde et uulgariter ipsum granum anima pomi uocatur. Stultus autem esset ille qui totum pomum alteri daret, et sibi solam corticem retineret. Tales sunt uanagloriosi qui dant Diabolo corpus et animam et sibi tamen retinent uestimentorum uanam gloriam.”

98 Nicolaus de Aquaeuille OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 83v. “Tercio peccauit in peccato gule quod notantur cum dicit ‘epulabatur cottidie splendide’. In hoc quod dicit cottidie notatur assiduitas. In hoc quod dicitur splendide notatur superfluitas. In iste duobus peccauit iste diues. Sciendum quod in peccato gule peccat homo quinque modis qui notatur in iste uersu: ‘Pre prope, laute, nimis, ardentem, studiose.’ De istis quinque modis quare in illo sermone *Ductus est Ihesus in deserto a Spiritu* etc. (the sermon in question is Dominica I quadragesimae in ff. 40v-44r. of the manuscript).”; Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job* (PL. 76), col. 621.

99 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, pp. 117-118. “[...] possent diuites propter laborem uel propter debilitatem uel propter aliam honestam causam quandoque melius refici, sed ve ei qui semper uult esse saturatus et plenus sicut iste de quo dicitur hic epulabatur cotidie splendide.

100 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex euangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n2v. “Notandum quod in conuiuio est aliquando splendor commendabilis, aliquando reprehensibilis. Commendabilem facit hilaritas caritatis uel pietatis. [...] Splendor reprehensibilis est immoderate delectabilitatis, ut cum queritur ibi delectabilitas non solum secundum gustum sed etiam secundum uisum, ut in colore uini Prouer. xxiii: ‘Ne intuearis uinum quando flauescit in uitro.’ Attenditur etiam splendor iste non solum quantum ad ferculam sed etiam quantum ad uasa aurea uel argentea uel superflua luminaria.”

Aldobrandino da Toscanella condemns the gluttony of the rich man. According to him gluttony is detestable because men sin with food and drinks in three ways. They eat too often, different foods at the same time, and too much. Aldobrandino's reasons why these things are harmful are quite pragmatic. Eating too often is an obstacle to gaining knowledge and virtues. One cannot study while eating. Eating several dishes at the same time is bad for the digestion, and eating too much makes one's stomach grow.<sup>101</sup> Aldobrandino's laments seem to be an abbreviated version of Gregory the Great's list, but his arguments are certainly different; one could say more practical.

Jacopo da Varazze interprets from the passage "*feasted sumptuously everyday*" that the rich man held fine and luxurious banquets every day. He condemns these practises since "*He that loveth wine and fat things shall not be rich*" (Prov. 21:17), because continuous feasting leads to intemperance in drinking (Prov. 23:20), and because luxurious banquets lead to lechery. The latter reasoning is taken from Gregory the Great.<sup>102</sup> It was one of the common *topoi* of pastoral literature to connect gluttony and lechery.<sup>103</sup> In our corpus of sources this connection is explicitly made by Hugues de Saint-Cher and Hugo de Prato Florido.<sup>104</sup> As a matter of fact reading works belonging to the *summa de vitiis* genre one almost gets the impression that gluttony in itself is not a very grave sin, but it is taken as such since it leads to other, more dangerous sins – above all to lechery.

#### *Lack of Compassion*

Nicolaus de Aquaevilla's fourth subdivision comprises the rich man's lack of compassion for Lazarus. Nicolaus cites the relevant passage from the parable and moves to the most cited biblical authority underlining the importance of compassion to the poor James 2:13 "*For he shall have judgement without mercy, that hath shown no mercy.*" He also notes with a rather cynical tone that the rich man certainly was not like Job, who had never withheld from the poor

101 Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus BAV. Ottob. lat. 557, f. 125v-126r.

102 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime, sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22r. "Tertio fuit in delitiis quia 'epulabatur quotidie splendide', faciebat enim conuiuia lauta, unde dicitur 'epulabatur', nam epule ab opulentia sunt dicte, et talia ducunt hominem ad inopiam, Prouer. xxi: 'Qui diligit epulas in egestate erit.' Conuiuia continua, unde dicitur 'quotidie' et talia ducunt ad intemperantiam, Prou. xxiii 'Noli esse in conuiuuiis potatorum et cetera'. Conuiuia delicata unde dicitur 'splendide', et talia ducunt ad luxuriam, Gregorius: 'Pena semper epulas comitatur uoluptas.'"

103 See for instance Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis*. T.II.p.1. De multiplici malo quotidie corpori et animae ex vitio gulae proveniente; Servasanto da Faenza OFM, *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis*, Dist. 7. De gula et eius remediis. Firenze Biblioteca Nazionale Conv. soppr. E. VI. 1046, f. 65v; John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, 1.8.7. BAV. Vat. lat. 1018, f. 59v. "Uentrem distentum cibo sequitur uoluptas genitalium ut ait Ieronimus epistola xxxvii."

104 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Sermones de evangelis dominicalibus*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Roma Angelica 715, f. 71v. "Nota quod uitium gule multa mala sequitur. Luxuriam gignit [...]."; Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. cc6r-v. "Tertio fuit gulosus et luxuriosus quia epulabatur quotidie splendide. Ubi nota quod uenter et genitalia sunt aduicina et unus seruit alteri."

their desire nor eaten his morsel alone. Nor was he father to the poor (Job 31:16-17 and 29:16).<sup>105</sup>

The lack of compassion in the rich man was already a general *topos* in patristic sources. Its importance remained in mendicant sermons and it was in fact one of the most common themes in Lazarus sermons. Gregory the Great had already pointed out that the rich man was not reproached because he had stolen from others, but because he did not give of his own.<sup>106</sup> This argument of Gregory's was often either cited directly or its central idea was borrowed.<sup>107</sup>

Gerard de Mailly's whole sermon is more or less built around this theme. It begins by stating that since the rich man ate everything in the morning and reserved nothing for the evening meal (i.e. did not give anything to the poor Lazarus), he deserved to hear the words of Abraham: "Son, remember that thou didst receive good things in thy lifetime."<sup>108</sup>

Gerard's sermon has two subdivisions which describe the misery of the rich man and explain why God did not have mercy on him. The latter of them gives four reasons: he had already received mercy in this life, being rich, he did not show any mercy to Lazarus, the time of mercy had already passed, and finally he asked mercy in an unsuitable way. The important point here is the second reason, namely the lack of mercy towards Lazarus. It is argued in a vernacular proverb (the knife must be similar to the sheath in order to fit), and the ever familiar quotation from the Bible (James 2:13): "For he shall have judgement without mercy, that hath shown no mercy."<sup>109</sup> In addition to Nicolaus de Aquaevilla and Gerard de Mailly, this particular passage from James' epistle is mentioned by several other writers, who equally condemn the cruelty of the rich man.<sup>110</sup>

---

105 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 83v.

106 Gregory the Great, *Homily 40*, col. 1304. "Hic autem dives iste non abstulisse aliena reprehenditur, sed propria non dedisse."

107 Guillaume Peyraut quotes Gregory verbatim in *Sermones dominicales ex evangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n2r. Peregrinus de Oppeln does not cite Gregory, but the idea is clearly taken from him; Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 48r. "Diues iste reprehenditur non tamen de diuiciis male acquisitis sed quia sua pauperibus non tribuit. Non enim legitur aliena rapuisse sed propria non dedisse."

108 Gerard de Mailly OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 351, f. 85r. The comparison to morning (this world) and evening meal (eternity) prepare the reader to the following sunday's sermon on the theme *Homo quidam fecit cenam magnam*, which expands this comparison further and is in a certain sense continuation of the Gerard's Lazarus sermon.

109 Gerard de Mailly OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 351, f. 85r-86v. "In quibus uerbis duo possumus considerare, primo eius miseriam, misericordiam implorantis. Secundo Dei iustitiam misericordiam denegantis. [...] Sequitur secundum scilicet Dei iustitia misericordiam ei denegantis. Iustissime enim fuit sibi misericordia denegata propter quatuor rationes. Primo quia bona receperat. [...] Secundo quia misericordiam non fecerat et sic dicitur uulgariter [...], talis est uagina talem cultellum requirit. Iudicium enim sine misericordia fiet illi qui non fecit misericordiam Iac. ii. [...] Tertio quia tempus misericordie transierat. [...] Quarto quia petebat misericordiam modo indebito."

110 To mention but a few; Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v. "Misericordiam postulat qui sine misericordia fuerat, quasi nesciens illud Jacobi ii. Iudicium sine misericordia fiet ei qui non fecit misericordiam."; Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "[...], nam non petebat

The importance of condemning cruelty and negligence towards the poor is clearly reflected in the amount of time and space preachers devote to the subject. Konrad Holtznicker gives it a central place in his first Lazarus sermon. The sermon is built around three sins committed by the rich man. The last of these was unmercifulness towards Lazarus.<sup>111</sup>

The rich man's sin was even more dangerous since he actually committed two sins at the same time. Not only he did not give to Lazarus, but he also lacked the right state of mind for Christian charity. According to canon law it was taken for granted that every man's obligation was to give to the poor who were in serious need. This as such was not a particularly virtuous act, it was merely fulfilling one's obligations as a Christian. Almsgiving only became virtuous when it was done with the right intention. According to Augustine there were two kinds of almsgiving, that of the heart and that of money.<sup>112</sup> The latter was not virtuous without the former, for "God loves a cheerful giver" and only a cheerful giver. Giving as such was not meritorious.

The idea that it is obligatory to give to the poor when they are in need likewise is reflected in the Lazarus sermons. One of the most common *topoi* in discussing the lack of compassion in the rich man was to emphasise that he had no excuse for his actions. Here the preacher would name several possible legitimate reasons for not giving to the poor, and then rule them all out in this particular case. Guillaume Peyraut writes: "And there was a certain beggar. This passage shows the impiety of the rich man and handles seven things that aggravate his sin. The first one is that there was one beggar. Had there been more, he could have said who can give to so many; this is noted in word certain.

The second is that he was a beggar, which allows us to understand the scale of his poverty (in this passage Peyraut makes it clear that Lazarus would have been entitled to help from the rich man, due to his extreme poverty). The third is that he was laid at his gate, so that the rich man could not say 'I did not see him. He was in the corner and I could not see him'. Gregory in Homily: 'Perhaps the rich man could have some excuse had the poor and sore-ridden Lazarus not been laid at his gate, and had he been further away and his poverty difficult to reach with eyes.'

The fourth is that he was full of sores. If the poor man's poverty did not move him, his serious sickness should have, for he did not cry out to the rich man with his mouth only, but with his whole body. Petrus Ravennensis: 'One voice did not mean a thing to the rich man's hardened ears.' Therefore God opened the poor man's whole body with wounds in order to open the rich man's heart.

---

balsamum neque situlam aque, nec manum plenam aqua, sed tamen minimum digitum in aqua intingi, et tamen non potuit obtinere, quia sicut dicitur Jac. ii. 'Iudicium sine misericordia fiet ei qui non fecit misericordiam.'"; Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 43r. "[...] tunc tanta Dei iustitia pleni erunt quod nulla compassione ad ipsos dampnatos flecti possent. 'Iudicium sine misericordia fiet ei qui non fecit misericordiam'"

111 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, p. 116.

112 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law: A Sketch of Canonical Theory and its Application in England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959), pp. 35-37 and 53.

*There were as many crying mouths as there were wounds. [...] The fifth is that the poor man would have been satisfied with lesser quality, he did not ask anything precious or delicate, which is evident from his desiring to be fed with crumbs. [...] The sixth is the impiety of the rich man's family, which is apparent in the words 'and no one gave to him.' [...] The seventh is that rich man's dogs had more mercy on the poor man than the rich man himself, of which it is written 'and the dogs came.'"*<sup>113</sup>

These excuses of the rich man are frequently presented in the Lazarus sermons, although their number occasionally varies a bit. Jacopo da Varazze mentions only six of them. They are similar to those of Peyraut, save that Jacopo does not mention the rich man's dogs.<sup>114</sup> Gerard de Mailly finds as many as nine reasons that made the behaviour of the rich man inexcusable.<sup>115</sup> Antonio Azaro Parmense is satisfied with only four excuses.<sup>116</sup> François de Mayronnes also presents four reasons, but they are slightly different from those

113 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n2v-n3r. "Erat quidam mendicus. Hic ostenditur impietas diuitis, et tanguntur septem que eius peccatum aggrauant. Primum est quod erat unus. Si enim plures fuissent posset dicere quis tot pauperibus sufficeret dare, hoc pertinet ad illud 'quidam'. Secundum est quod 'erat mendicus' in quo datur intelligi paupertatis magnitudo. Tercio quod 'iacebat ante ianuam eius', ut diues dicere non posset: 'non uidi, in angulo fuit, aspicerere non potui.' Grego. in omel.: 'Haberet aliquam excusationem forsitan diues si Lazarus pauper et ulcerosus ante eius ianuam non iacuisset, si remotus fuisset si eius inopia non fuisset oculis importuna. Quartum est quod 'erat ulceribus plenus'. Si non mouisset eum ad compassionem paupertas, poterat eum mouere magna infirmitas. Non enim solum ore clamabat ad diuitem sed enim toto corpore. Petrus Ravennensis: 'Auribus diuitis obturatis nihil esset uox unius clamantis.' Unde Dominus ad aperiendum cor eius totum corpus pauperis uulneribus aperuit ut quot essent uulnera tot essent ora clamantia. [...] Quintum est quod pauperi uilia suffecissent, non quesisset preciosa uel delicata quod notatur ibi 'cupiens saturari de micis etc'. [...] Sextum est impietas familie diuitis ad quod pertinet illud 'et nemo illi dabat.' [...] Septimus est quod canes diuitis mitiores fuerunt pauperi quam diues de quo ibi 'sed canes ueniebant.' Citation of Petrus Rauennatensis is from Petrus Chrysologus, *Sermo CXXI*, p. 730.

114 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus (Venice 1497), f. 75v. "Quartum peccatum istius diuitis fuit inmisericordia, quia mendici nullam misericordiam habere uoluit. [...] Non potuit autem aliquam excusationem habere uel quod essent multi quia tamen unus erat, uel quod sibi ipsi sufficiebat, quia erat mendicus, uel quod esset sibi ignotus, quia ante ianuam positus, uel quod laborare poterat, quia ulceribus plenus, uel quod nimis delicata petebat, quia micis erat contentus, uel quod familia sua sibi subueniebat, quia nemo illi dabat."

115 Gerard de Mailly OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 351, f. 86r. "Et nota nouem que reddunt habitudinem istum inexcusabilem ex toto, posset enim dicere quod nullus esset qui indigeret misericordiam contra quod dicitur 'erat', uel quod tot erant quod non sufficiebat ad misericordiam omnibus faciendam contra quod dicitur 'quidam' non multi, uel non petebat contra quod 'mendicus', uel non cognoscebam eum contra quod 'nomine Lazarus', uel non expectabat contra quod 'iacebat', uel longe nimis erat et non habebat per quam mittererem contra quod 'ad ianuam eius', uel trutannus erat et poterat laborare contra quod 'ulceribus plenus', uel non comedisset de cibariis meis contra quod 'cupiens saturari', uel nimis preciosa petebat contra quod de 'micis qui cadebant', scilicet de hiis de quibus nullus curabat."

116 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C. 268, f. 39v. "In uituperationem autem diuitis est eius crudelitas que ostenditur in multis. Primo quia Lazarus non querebat ferculum aut panem et diues libencius dabat canibus quam pauperibus. Secundo quia Lazarus iacebat ante ianuam, itaque diues intrans et exiens super eum poterat uidere et ideo [non] potuit dire: 'Non uidi.' Tercio quia Lazarus totus leprosus iste autem nunquam est motus ad compaciendum sibi. Quarto quia diues crudelior erat Lazaro quam canes sui qui lingebant ulcera eius sibi prestabant refrigerium unde Petrus Rauennatensis: 'Canes diuitis ulcera pauperis curant magisterio nature', diues uero pauperem negligit nature accusante." Citation is from Petrus Chrysologus, *Sermo CXXI*, p. 731.

of Antonio Azaro Parmense.<sup>117</sup> Hugo de Prato Florido gives no less than eight.<sup>118</sup> Again it would be tempting to argue that this *topos* originates from the postill of Hugues de Saint-Cher. Hugues gives only four things that render the sin of the rich man more grave (the place of Lazarus close to his door, Lazarus' sores, his hunger, and the fact that he only asked crumbs of bread).<sup>119</sup> Later writers repeated and expanded Hugues' words according to the same basic logic. Some even added new knowledge from other sources, for example Hugo de Prato Florido, who refers to Jewish sources and states that Lazarus was a beggar living in Jerusalem and quite well known to everyone in town.

The basic point of these excuses of the rich man and their refutation was to show that the beggar in the parable was indeed a legitimate beggar, and it was therefore the duty of the rich man to feed him. The duty of giving alms to beggars was limited to legitimate ones only. Those beggars who were able to work and yet decided not to do so were not to be fed. They were seen as harmful vagabonds and criminals. The very word *trutannus* used by Gerard de Mailly ("[...] uel *trutannus* erat et poterat laborare contra quod *ulceribus plenus* [...]") was a common expression that meant a false beggar.<sup>120</sup> It was extremely important to show that Lazarus belonged to the group of legitimate beggars, since the idea was not to encourage people to abandon their occupations and start to beg. Begging was to be presented as a legitimate way of making a living, but certainly not as a profession open to everyone.

### *Sins of the Tongue*

The fifth and last of Nicolaus de Aquavilla's divisions of the rich man's sins is the sin of the tongue. The sins of the tongue (*peccatum linguae*) were a sort of additional category of sins incorporated in the system of the seven capital

117 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117v. "Ostenditur igitur indigentia istius mendici ad pene diuitis augmentationem. Primo in eius egestate quia 'mendicus.' Secundo in eius debilitate quia 'iacebat ante ianuam', unde Crisostomus: 'iacebat ante ianuam' ut crudelitatem diuitis in suo corpore demonstraret.' Tertio in eius infirmitate quia 'ulceribus plenus'. Solent enim ulcera infirmorum uisa affectum pietatis prouocare a quibus qui auertit oculos pietatis se negat. Quarto in famis anxietate, quia 'cupierat saturari de micis', unde pauper si peteret diuitias, non esset exaudiendus."

118 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. c66v. "Quarto fuit crudelis et immisericors quod ostenditur in sancto Lazaro cui noluit misereri. Aggrauant autem eius crudelitatem octo prout hic patet. Primo paucitas pauperum cum dicitur erat 'quidam mendicus', non enim a multis molestabatur. Secundo mendicitas rerum quia 'mendicus'. Pauper aliquid habet sed mendicus nihil. Tercio noticia persone quia 'nomine Lazarus' qui ab omnibus cognoscebatur mendicus et morabatur in Hierusalem ut tradunt iudei. Quarto impotentia exercitiorum quia 'ulceribus plenus' et ideo non poterat aliquid facere. Quinto propinquitas locorum quia 'iacebat ad ianuam eius', quia erat ita prope et semper ipsum intrando et exeundo poterat uidere. Sexto uilitas ciborum quia 'cupiens saturari de micis que cadunt de mensa diuitis' non enim querebat delicata et magna sed micas cadentes. Septimo improuidencia famulorum, quia 'nemo illi dabat'. Non enim ordinauerat ut aliquis de famulis beneficeret pauperibus Eccl. x: 'Secundum iudicem populi sic et minister eius' et 'qualis rector est ciuitatis tales inhabitantes in ea'. octauo misericordia catulorum, quia 'canes ueniebant et lingebant uulnera eius'."

119 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*, f. 231r-v.

120 Michel Mollat, *Les pauvres au Moyen Age*, p. 164.

sins by Guillaume Peyraut. These sins were known and referred to by earlier writers, but Peyraut was the first to give them a position in the traditional classification of sins.<sup>121</sup>

Nicolaus writes that the rich man was in the habit of speaking vain and useless words during his banquets. This is implicit because of all the possible parts of his body, it was his tongue that suffered most from the flames in hell. This was a sign for Nicolaus, as well as for many other preachers, that he was punished because of *peccatum linguae*.<sup>122</sup> It was a common belief that the punishment was in some way connected to the sin committed.<sup>123</sup> This is explicitly notified in several Lazarus sermons. Jacopo da Varazze writes: "*The rich man committed several sins and therefore he was tormented in different ways, for it is said in the Book of Wisdom: 'One is punished by the very things by which he sins.'*"<sup>124</sup> Peregrinus de Oppeln is even more laconic. He simply states: "*Where the sin, there also the punishment.*"<sup>125</sup> Once again this idea is already to be found in Hugues de Saint-Cher's Postil. He writes that the rich man's tongue was tormented especially because of loquacity ("*pro loquacitate*").<sup>126</sup>

After presenting the case against the rich man Nicolaus de Aquaevilla moves on to discuss sins of the tongue and banquets on a general level: "*Many people sin in this by speaking vain and dishonest words in their banquets and meals. Surely speaking vainly is a serious sin, but it is the worse to speak useless and dishonest things and backbite others in one's banquets and meals, for the Apostle says in I Corinthians 15: 'Evil communications corrupt good manners.' And similarly Solomon says in Proverbs 23: 'Be not among winebibbers, that*

121 On the concept of *peccatum linguae* and its history see Carla Casagrande and Silvana Vecchio, *I peccati della lingua: Disciplina ed etica della parola nella cultura medievale* (Roma 1987).

122 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84r. Other preachers who used this *topos* were Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. N3v. "Circa secundum notandum quod diues specialiter in lingua memoratur cruciari quia in lingua peccauerat."; Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Add. 18340, f. 47v. "Diues iste magis linguam quam alia membra conqueritur quia in epulis positus aliis detrahare non formidabat."; Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "Tertio peccaverat peccato gule, immo punitur a dustione lingue, non est autem dicendum quod diues iste habuit linguam corporalem, sed dicitur cruciari in lingua id est in anima que pro peccato lingue torquebatur."; Aldobrandino de Toscanella OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo tertius. BAV. Ottob.lat. 557, f. 127v. "Sed queritur de hoc quod dicit hic 'ut refrigeret linguam meam,' numquid anima habet linguam? Et dicendum quod in lingua affligebatur ibi pro peccato lingue."; François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 118r. "Ecce conueniens ordinatio pene ad culpam. Primo quia lingua peccauit, ibidem punitur iuxta sapientis: 'Per que peccauit etc.'"

123 A. Gurevich, *Medieval Popular Culture. Problems of belief and Perception* (Cambridge 1990), pp. 112-113.

124 Jacopo da Varazze, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "[...]diues uero fuit in tormentis diuersis, sicut fuerat in diuersis peccatis. Nam sicut dicitur Sap. xi: 'Per que peccat quis per hec torquetur.'"

125 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Add. 18340, f. 47v. "Ubi peccatum, ibi pena."

126 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*, f. 232v.



is where there is drinking beyond temperance; among riotous eaters of flesh, that is the flesh of one's neighbours which is eaten through backbiting."<sup>127</sup>

Konrad Holtznicker's third Lazarus sermon is most comprehensive in analysing the sins of the tongue. The theme of the sermon is *Mitte Lazarum ut intingat extremum digiti sui in aqua ut refrigeret linguam meam*. Konrad takes the idea of the tongue burning in flames and states that a tongue can burn in four ways: because of malice, grace, hell and wrath. The sermon has a quadruple main division built around these four modes of burning. The third part of the division is all about the sins of the tongue. He writes: "Of the third it is said: 'And cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.' Woe to the evil tongue that burns in perjuries, false testimonies, bad advices, lies, backbitings, quarrels, lecheries, gluttonies and other vices. Woe for it will burn in eternal fire with that rich man!"<sup>128</sup> Hugo de Prato Florido specifies that the rich man had committed the sins of speaking vanities, backbiting, and eating too much and therefore he was punished in his tongue.<sup>129</sup>

It is interesting that many preachers specify that the sin of language in this context is backbiting (*detractio*). Even when several sins of language are mentioned, backbiting is always included. Jacopo da Varazze for instance mentions three different sins of language committed by the rich man. These were mocking the poor, eating too voraciously, and backbiting in his banquets.<sup>130</sup> Also Peregrinus de Oppeln writes that the rich man suffered most in his tongue, because: "He was not afraid to backbite others while in banquets."<sup>131</sup> According to my knowledge no one has studied the hierarchy of the sins of language in practice, but my preliminary sounding is that backbiting was indeed considered to be the most dangerous or most common of them. At least it seems to appear in sources more frequently than other sins of the tongue.

A good instance of this attitude towards backbiting is the following *exemplum* from a late thirteenth-century Franciscan collection. It is also worth citing

- 
- 127 Nicolaus de Aquaeuille OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84r. "In hoc peccant multi loquendo iniutilia uerba in conuiuuiis et in mensa sua. Certe malum est, et pessimum est inter conuiuuias in mensa sua loqui inutilia uerba et inhonesta uel detractoria quia sicut dicit Apostolus Prima Cor. 15.: 'Corrumpunt bonos mores colloquia praua et uana.' Et immo dicit Salomon Prou. 23: 'Noli esse in conuiuuiis potatorum scilicet ubi est potus superfluitas, nec in commesationibus eorum qui carnes ad uescendum conferunt,' scilicet proximorum suorum per detractionem etc."
- 128 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo tertius. BAV. Burghes. 180, ff. 107v-108r. "De tertio dicitur hic: 'Ut refrigeret linguam meam, quia crucior in hac flamma.' Ve male lingua que in periuriis, in falsis testimoniis, in malis conciliis, in mendaciis, in detractionibus, in contentionibus, in luxuriis, in gulis et in aliis viciis ardet. Ve quia eternis ignibus cremabitur cum isto diuite!"
- 129 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd1v. "Et nota quod diues iste multum peccauerat in lingua et uaniloquio, et in detractioe et in epulatione et ideo torquebatur in lingua."
- 130 Jacopo da Varazze, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "Tripliciter enim peccauerat lingua. Primo pauperem irridendo. Secundo nimis uoluptuose edendo. Tertio inter conuiuuias ad detractioes ipsam laxando."
- 131 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Add. 18340, f. 47v. "Diues iste magis linguam quam alia membra conqueritur quia in epulis positus aliis detrahare non formidabat."

because it demonstrates nicely the above-mentioned tendency to think that the sin and its punishment were closely linked together: "Two brothers were travelling through the country and preaching the word of God. They spent the night with a certain holy man and woke before sunrise. They thought that it was dawn and set off on the road. They were walking through a certain field and saw there three men who looked as if they were dead. The brothers had seen them while they were still alive. They said to these men: 'Who are you who stand there, are you not the same men who died a while ago, and whom we used to know while still alive?' One of them replied: 'Yes we are.' And the brothers: 'How are things with you?' Two of them responded while the third one remained silent: 'We are damned forever.' When the brothers asked the reason for their judgement, the first one responded: 'While I lived I loved too much talkativeness, vain and idle words, and irrelevant, untrue and loose things. I did not do penance for these, and therefore I am forever damned.'

The second one said: 'While I was alive I loved to steal goods from others, not anything great, just small things, and did not confess these thefts, nor did I do penance, and for these I am damned.' The third one remained silent and did not say anything. The brothers wondered why he did not speak like his associates and asked them why. They responded: 'He was a backbiter while he lived, speaking loudly evil things against his neighbours, striking them with his tongue and he died impenitent. Therefore he is damned, and in addition to all the other punishments he suffers for his other sins, he has a special punishment; he has a big, miraculously burning, round stone in his mouth, which burns his tongue continuously, and the roof of his mouth so that he cannot open it to speak. This special punishment is reserved to those who are backbiters while they live, in addition to their other punishments.'"<sup>132</sup>

### 2.2.3. "And there was a Certain Beggar"

Having finished with his first primary division Nicolaus de Aquaevilla moves to the second. He notes three reasons why Lazarus was saved and carried by the angels to the bosom of Abraham.<sup>133</sup> If we look at the text from the quantitative point of view, we observe that this latter primary division (i.e. the one concerning reasons why Lazarus was saved), amounts to roughly 15% of the whole sermon. Clearly the emphasis was on the sinfulness of the rich, not on the goodness of the poor. This observation holds equally for the majority of the other Lazarus sermons, although there are exceptions. For instance Hugues de Saint-Cher's second sermon in the *Sermones de evangeliis dominicalibus*

132 *Speculum laicorum*, pp. 8-9.

133 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 84r. "Secundum est uidere propter quos rationes Lazarus cum moreretur ab angelis in sinu Abrahe fuit deportatus et hoc notatur cum dicit: 'Factum est autem cum moreretur mendicus ab angelis in sinu Abrahe', id est in requiem pacis, 'portaretur.' Sciendum est quod propter tres rationes deportatus fuit in sinu Abrahe ab angelis."

collection is mainly concerned with the positive consequences of death for Lazarus and the poor in general.<sup>134</sup>

The first reason why Lazarus was saved was that he was poor and a beggar. Nicolaus presents to his readers four reasons to love poverty: it makes one virtuous, it makes God one's servant, God calls the poor to be his co-judges in the Last Judgement, and finally: "Fourth is that in the end, it makes them possessors of the kingdom of heaven, as Mt. 5 says: 'Blessed are the poor in spirit'."<sup>135</sup>

This last reason is the most important. Nicolaus interprets that Jesus in this part of the sermon on the mount, is actually referring to the poor in the economic sense of the word, that is to *les pauvres proprement dits*. Nicolaus was not the only pastoral writer to give literal sense to these words of Christ. His view was shared by Luca da Bitonto, who writes that this world honours only the rich, but God honours the poor and he called them blessed.<sup>136</sup> Similarly Pierre de Reims describes the adversities and hardships of Lazarus and then adds consolingly that he was blessed, "because blessed are the poor for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."<sup>137</sup> An interesting point is that while Luca da Bitonto and Pierre de Reims refer to the Gospel of Luke which actually says only "blessed are the poor", Nicolaus de Aquaevilla quotes the Gospel of Saint Matthew which says "blessed are the spiritually poor". If we look into the above-mentioned exegetical sources (*Glossa ordinaria* and various Bible commentaries), we find that Saint Matthew's passage was often interpreted to mean voluntary poverty. Nicolaus, however, certainly interpreted it to mean the poor in the common sense of the word.

Here we are dealing with an interpretation which differs considerably from the obvious exegetical sources. One is tempted to think that Nicolaus understood the passage of Matthew differently on purpose, at least it is unthinkable that he did not know how it was generally interpreted. In fact, he even uses the *Glossa ordinaria* at other points in his sermon. Nicolaus was not the only friar who chose to interpret the "Blessed are the poor in spirit" passage to mean *les*

134 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Sermones de evangelii dominicalibus*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. Roma Angelica 715, f. 71v-72r.

135 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84r. "Prima est quia pauper et mendicus fuit unde dicitur hic: 'Erat quidam mendicus nomine Lazarus etc.' Certe multum diligenda est paupertas et hoc propter quatuor. Primum est quia facit hominem uirtutibus habundare unde 2a Cor. 8: 'Altissima paupertas habundauit in diuitiis simplicitatis eorum.' Secundum est quia Dominum ministrum suum meretur habere unde Psalmus: 'Ego autem mendicus sum et pauper, Dominus sollicitus est mei.' Tertium est quia faciet in iudicio *pauperes secum sedere ad malos iudicandum* unde Mt. 19: 'Dixit Christus Uos qui reliquistis omnia et secuti estis me, cum sederit Filius hominis in sede maiestatis sue sedebitis et uos super xii sedes iudicantes xii tribus israelis.' Et Iob: 'Pauperibus iudicium.' Quartum est quia faciet in fine regnum possidere celorum unde Mt. 5: 'Beati pauperes spiritu etc.'" The part written in italics is taken from the manuscript UUB. C 329, f. 325v. because the text given in Harley 102 seems to be corrupt.

136 Luca da Bitonto OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BN. Nouv.acq. 410, f. 194r.

137 Pierre de Reims OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 369, f. 15r. "[...] sed beatus quia 'beati pauperes quoniam ipsorum est regnum celorum.'"

*pauvres proprement dits*. Antonio Azaro Parmense did so later in his second Lazarus sermon.<sup>138</sup>

Even the interpreting Luke's words "blessed are the poor" to mean *les pauvres proprement dits* was a break from the exegetical tradition, since many earlier commentators had reasoned that Luke was reporting on the same speech of Jesus as Matthew, and if Matthew was referring to the voluntary poor, as is clearly said in the *Glossa ordinaria*, then that is also what Luke must have meant with his poor. This is the view taken by Aquinas in his *Catena aurea*.<sup>139</sup> Therefore, taking the position that when Jesus called the poor blessed, He was actually referring to the poor, not to the religious, was in any case a courageous if not a controversial thing to do. What the friars did was clearly a break from tradition, and an important and deliberate statement to support the spiritual status of the poor.

The second reason for Lazarus being transported to the bosom of Abraham was his contentment and happiness with his current position. Nicolaus writes: "The second reason is that he was happy with his poverty and accepted all hardships. We read that he never complained, and that is something that greatly pleases God, that is, joy in poverty, in tribulation, and in God's service."<sup>140</sup> There are two important things in this passage: joy in poverty and abstinence from complaints no matter how bad the situation was. These were the chief virtues of Lazarus in the eyes of many preachers, and these were the virtues they were recommending to the poor attending their sermons.

Pierre de Reims takes the view that abstaining from complaints was the reason why Lazarus was worthy to be carried by the angels to the bosom of Abraham.<sup>141</sup> Berthold von Regensburg writes that there are three kinds of poor. Those who are damned, those who are saved, and those who are not only saved, but who also receive great glory in heaven. The poor of the second group are saved because: "[...] they patiently sustain their poverty even though they would not mind being richer, they rather want to remain poor than be rich against God's will; against God's will meaning through theft, fraud or otherwise sinfully."<sup>142</sup>

Antonio Azaro Parmense also mentions these two virtues of Lazarus: "Secondly it describes the sick poor man who is praised for his patience, for he

---

138 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. CLM 2774, f. 147v. "Consolatur autem Dominus pauperes per tria. Primo per sacram scripturam Math: 'Beati pauperes spiritu' etc."

139 Thomas Aquinas OP, *Catena aurea super Lucae evangelium*, Lucas VI, p. 70.

140 Nicolaus de Aquaeuille OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84v. "Secunda ratio est quia letanter paupertatem suam et mala sua accepit unde legitur ipsum nunquam murmurasse et hoc est unum quod multum placet Deo, scilicet leticia in paupertate et in tribulatione et in servitio Dei."

141 Pierre de Reims OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BAV. Burghes. 343, f. 27r. "[...] neque enim eum legitur murmurasse unde etiam ab angelis in sinum Abrahae portari meruit."

142 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 43r. "[...] pacienter ferunt paupertatem suam et licet libenter essent ditiores, tamen potius uolunt pauperes esse cum uoluntate Dei quam diuites contra Dei uoluntatem, uidelicet furto uel fraude uel alio modo quod sit peccatum."

*never complained and supported everything patiently.*"<sup>143</sup> The role of patience is also emphasised by Aldobrandino da Toscanella. One of the main divisions of his sermon is the patience of the poor, and he writes that it is apparent in three things: Lazarus bore patiently his poverty, his sores, and the dogs who added their assaults to all other misery he had to bear.<sup>144</sup> Aldobrandino's interpretation of the dogs is interesting, since most other writers took the position that the dogs were trying to heal and comfort Lazarus instead of molesting him.

But let us return for a moment to the idea that Lazarus never complained. As seen above, Nicolaus de Aquaevilla states: "*We read that he never complained.*" Actually this not what we read in the Gospel. The words of the Gospel are: "*And there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, who lay at his gate, full of sores, desiring to be filled with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table. And no one did give him, moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom.*"

After this point the Gospel turns to treat the rich man, and Lazarus is only mentioned twice in passing. Nowhere does the Gospel say that he did not complain, although it does not say that he did either. Thus, what the preachers were using was a classical case of *argumentum ex silentio*. The Gospel does not say that he complained, ergo he did not. Had they so wanted the preachers could have said that he did complain because the Gospel does not say he did not. The key point here is that the patience of the poor, the single most important aspect of the preacher's message to the poor, is actually not to be found in the Gospel itself. It was something that suited the ideas of the preachers, and thus it was found in the Gospel by using the *argumentum ex silentio* stunt.

Nicolaus' second reason for Lazarus' salvation was his perseverance until the bitter end. This was apparent from the fact that he died a beggar.<sup>145</sup> Preachers thought that perseverance was an important virtue for the poor and the sick because poverty and sickness were seen as temptations or trials sent by God in order to test the chosen ones. Berthold von Regensburg writes: "*After reasonable tribulation, they will receive the reward that cannot be estimated or measured, for the short time in the service of the God, they will have the glory of eternal felicity.*"<sup>146</sup> François de Mayronnes emphasises the relative modesty of earthly

143 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 268, f. 39v. "Secundo describitur mendicus infirmus ex qua commendatur paciencia quia nunquam murmurauit sed pacienter portauit."

144 Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus BAV. Ottob. lat. 557, f. 125r. "In hoc euangelio tangitur auaritia diutum, patientia pauperis et iustitia iudicis. [...] Patientia pauperis introducitur contra insultum fortune, que destituunt quia 'mendicus' erat, et contra insultum nature quia 'ulceribus plenus' erat, et contra insultum creature qui molestabant quia 'et canes ueniunt etc.'"

145 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84v. "Tertia est quia perseueranter usque ad mortem paupertatem et mala multa sustinuit quia mendicus mortuus est unde dicitur hic: 'Factum est ut moreretur mendicus et portaretur ab angelis in sinu Abrahe.'"

146 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones dominicales*, dominica I post festum trinitatis. London BL. Harley 3215, f. 43r. "[...] pro modica tribulatione redditur eis merces sine estimacione et mensura et pro breui tempore seruitutis Dei rependitur eis gloria eterne felicitatis."

tribulations in almost the same words as Berthold: "Now he is comforted with eternal consolation for reasonable tribulation."<sup>147</sup>

Jacopo da Varazze says similar things in a truly eloquent manner: "Lazarus was God's gold, God's pearl, and God's star. This gold was placed in the furnace of poverty in order to be tried but it could not be broken. The pearl was put on the dunghill of sore-filled sickness but it did not catch infection. The star was put in the cloud of temptation but it was not shadowed. Therefore the gold was taken out of the furnace and laid in the heavenly treasury. The pearl was taken from the dunghill and used in regal adornment. The star was purged of clouds and shines to us as an example to follow."<sup>148</sup>

It was not a catastrophe to be poor or sick. On the contrary, it was a blessing as long as the person in question understood it to be so. Bearing diseases and poverty bravely and happily was considered to open the door to heaven and bring unimagined recompense. As Guillaume Peyraut put it: "God's legitimate sons are those who are in tribulation, whereas bastards are those who prosper."<sup>149</sup> Guibert de Tournai expresses the same thought in slightly different words: "Just as continuous good health and prosperity are the sign of Divine reprobation, similarly temptation and corporal sickness are the signs of love."<sup>150</sup> Such is the opinion of François de Mayronnes too: "For poverty itself is a sign of divine love."<sup>151</sup> These are good examples of the mendicant social ethos, which denied the older idea that poverty and sickness were results of sin.<sup>152</sup>

Nicolaus ends his sermon by saying that the bosom of Abraham, that is eternal rest, is meant not only for the poor, but also for those who work and do penance.<sup>153</sup> It was a common tendency to connect poverty and work. Peasants

147 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 118r. "Nunc uero hic consolatur"; eterna consolatio pro modica tribulatione."

148 Jacopo da Varazze, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "Erat quidem Lazarus aurum Dei, margarita Dei et stella Dei. Ut igitur probaretur positum est illud aurum in camino paupertatis et non potuit corrumpi, posita est ista margarita in sterquilinio ulcerose infirmitatis et non potuit infici, posita est ista stella in nebula tentationis et non potuit obscurari: sed modo extractum est aurum de camino et positum est in celesti thesauro, leuata est margarita de sterquilinio et posita in regali ornamento, purgata est stella ab omni nebula tentationum et refulget nobis per exemplum." The part written in italics was taken from Gregory the Great's homily, although Gregory's original text does not include the idea of poverty and sickness as a temptation; Gregory the Great, *Homily 40*. Pl. 76, col. 1312.

149 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex epistolis*. Dominica in sexagesima, sermo primus (Tübingen 1499), f. D2r. "Filii Dei legitimi sunt qui tribulantur, adulterini vero sunt qui prosperantur." The whole sermon is a discussion on the importance of tribulation and patience in this world. Guillaume makes a great effort to explain that those who do not suffer from tribulations are not in God's favour, on the contrary.

150 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad leprosos et abiectos sermo secundus. In N. Bériou et F.-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei Leprosus*, p. 139. "Sicut autem continuatio sanitatis et prosperitatis est signum diuine reprobacionis, ita temptatio et infirmitas corporalis signum est dilectionis."

151 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117v. "Nam ipsa paupertas est signum dilectionis diuine."

152 M. Mollat, *Les pauvres au Moyen age*, p. 158.

153 Nicolaus de Aquaeuille OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 102, f. 84v. "Glosa, Sinus Abrahe requies bonorum pauperum quorum est regnum celorum quo recipiuntur post hanc uitam.[...] Ad illam requiem eternam uocauit Dominus Ihesus Christus laborantes et oneratos onore penitentie."

and workers were considered to fall into the category of the poor in the broader meaning of the word. Not only were they considered to be poor, for as we have seen, a great part of them actually lived below the level of adequate subsistence. There was also a narrower, more restricted sense in which they were poor. These were the people who were entitled to beg and get poor relief.<sup>154</sup> It is important to remember that the virtuous poor in the Lazarus sermons could have been understood in the broader meaning of the word, and this seems to be what Nicolaus de Aquaevilla did by pointing out that also workers and penitents will be carried to the bosom of Abraham.

---

154 Alexander Murray, *Religion among the Poor in Thirteenth-Century France*, p. 291.

### ■ 3. Who were the Rich and the Poor of the Lazarus Sermons?

Reading the Lazarus sermons it is easy to understand the mendicant conviction of the dangers of being rich and the blessedness of being poor. However, only rarely do they specify who the sinful rich actually were and what they had done. It seems to have been something that was too obvious to need explicit repetition. Occasionally we may find out something by comparing passages of Lazarus sermons to other material by the same writer. Such is the case with Berthold von Regensburg. He writes that: "*The first group of those rich men who are damned are those who have badly acquired their riches, that is with usury, robbery, fraud or having unjust profit by some other means, or even knowingly keeping riches that were acquired unjustly by someone else.*"<sup>1</sup>

This passage can be compared to another sermon in the same collection: "*The fourth beast is the love of temporal things or avarice and it is in a certain sense the most cruel of them all. It turns princes to tyrants, knights to predators, merchants deceitful and usurers, rustics treasonous, judges unjust, priests simoniacs, the religious property owners, and the poor to thieves.*"<sup>2</sup> We may conclude that when writing about the rich that will be damned, Berthold probably had in mind the merchants (usury and fraud) and the knights (robbery).

Nicolaus de Aquaevilla mentions bailiffs, knights, merchants, prelates and noble women.<sup>3</sup> Peregrinus de Oppeln writes about the merchants in connection with frauds in business, the knights in connection with unjust exactions from their tenants, and the landlords of taverns in connection with false measures.<sup>4</sup> Guillaume Peyrault draws prelates in almost accidentally when he writes: "*Also he was tormented by fear that his brothers whom he loved against the will of God, will be damned. Similarly many prelates will be tormented with worries and fear over their nephews and relatives whom they have loved in a sinful*

1 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42v. "Illorum diuitum qui dampnantur primi sunt qui diuitias habent male acquisitas, scilicet per usuram, rapinam, fraudem uel alio modo iniuste lucrando, uel etiam iniuste acquisita ab alio scienter retinendo."

2 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica IX post festum trinitatis. CLM 5531, f. 69r. "Sed quarta bestia, id est amor terrenorum seu auaritia, quadammodo crudelissima est. Hoc facit principes tyrannos, milites predones, mercatores deceptores et usurarios, rusticos proditores, iudices iniquos, clericos symoniacos, claustrales proprietarios, pauperes fures."

3 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 82v-83v.

4 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 47v-48r.



way.”<sup>5</sup> Guillaume is referring to the nepotism so common amongst the medieval upper clergy.

Then there are cases where the noble status of his sinners can be read between the lines of a sermon. Peregrinus de Oppeln judges from the rich man’s clothing and dogs that he was a member of the nobility. He writes:

*“About the first one note that the consolation of the bad in this world consists in three things the rich man had, that is, temporal riches, of which there was a certain rich man.’ Similarly in secular honours in ‘clothed in purple.’ Similarly in carnal desires in ‘and fared sumptuously every day.’ Fourthly it consists in worldly vanities in ‘the dogs came and licked his sores.’ For he had dogs for the amusement of hunting.”*<sup>6</sup>

Peregrinus does not say it explicitly, but he implies that the sinful rich indeed are noblemen. They have worldly honours, the sign of which is the purple garment normally associated with royalty. They keep dogs for the hunting which was popular leisure time activity amongst the nobility. The Gospel says nothing about hunting, but Peregrinus, who connects the rich man in the parable with nobility in his mind, automatically connects the dogs and hunting too. The case is similar to Guillaume Peyraut’s passage where he refers to the angels who carried Lazarus to the bosom of Abraham: *“Those who do not have horses in this life will be carried by the angels when they die.”*<sup>7</sup> Others, who have horses and do not stand a chance of being carried by the angels, were obviously the nobles, the prelates, and the rich merchants; the people who could afford to travel on horseback.

Similar social messages may well be hidden in other exegetical sermons delivered by the friars. One group worth studying might be the sermons on Matthew 21. *Cum intrasset Jesus Jerosolymam*. This theme was used on the third day of the second Lenten week. These sermons occasionally include the passage where Jesus casts moneylenders out of the Temple. A good example is Antonio Azaro Parmense’s sermon on this theme. He starts with a comment on Jesus’ entry to Jerusalem on (Mt. 21:8-9) and says: *“Note that the nobles, the wise, and the rich did not heed of the Lord, as is the case also today.”*<sup>8</sup>

---

5 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v. “Item in timore damnationis fratrum quos amavit contra Deum, sic torquebuntur prelati sollicitudine et timore nepotum uel consanguineorum quos male amauerunt.”

6 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 47r. “Circa primum notandum quod consolatio malorum in hoc mundo consistit in tribus que habuit iste diues uidelicet in diuiciis temporalibus ibi ‘erat homo quidem diues’. Item in honoribus secularibus ibi ‘induebatur purpura’. Item in uoluptatibus carnalibus ibi ‘et epulabatur cottidie splendide.’ Quarto consistit in mundanis uanitatibus ibi licet ‘et canes ueniebant et lingebant.’ Habebat enim canes ad uenandum iocunditatem.”

7 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3r. “Qui non habent equos in hac uita, angelos habent portitores in morte.”

8 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria tertia seconde hebdomade. UUB. C 347, f. 33v. “Et nota quod nobiles, sapientes et diuites de Domino non curabant sicut nec hodie [...]”

Then he moves on to the actual clearing of the Temple and writes:

*"Seeing the abominations committed in the Temple, Jesus drove out all of them, that is priests, ministers and usurers, they fled, and left behind all their goods where anyone who wanted could have taken them. At that time there were a great many who loved money, that is, the merchants, the powerful and the rich, in the Temple, and Jesus drove them all out with one rope."*<sup>9</sup>

It is interesting to compare this to the actual text in the Gospel: *"And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves, [...]"* Matthew does not mention the rich nor the powerful at all, nor do the other Gospels that mention this incident. Did Antonio simply deduce who the people in the temple were, or did he just mention those that he would have liked to be seen driven out of the temple, that is, the rich and powerful *"who took no heed of the Lord"*?

To penetrate more deeply into the question who the sinful rich, or for that matter, the virtuous poor actually were, we must take a brief look into other sources, mainly different representatives of the *Ad status* genre. Obviously the sinful rich had to be found among the ranks of those who actually were rich and powerful: the nobility, higher clergy and rich merchants. They are also the people named in the Lazarus sermons quoted above.

Now we must see whether they were held to be sinners in other contemporary sources. One must keep in mind that the material analysed below was written to expose and purge vices, not to emphasise virtues. Therefore the picture drawn on the basis of it is inevitably a negative one. Most of the time the writers of pastoral literature over-stressed and exaggerated the sinful side of people rather than praised their virtues. Nevertheless, I believe that this material gives a reasonably accurate picture of the potential sinners and the sins associated with them.

### 3.1 The Noble and the Powerful

#### 3.1.1 Plunderers and Pillagers

Being rich and being noble and powerful were almost automatically connected to each other. The only rich persons who were not from the noble and powerful families were the merchants and usurers of the towns (which is not to say that the merchants could not be from noble families or intermarried with them).

---

9 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria tertia seconde hebdomade. UUB. C 347, f. 33v-34r. "Uidens ergo Ihesus abhominaciones fieri in templo, omnes istos, scilicet sacerdotes, ministros et usurarios, eiecit de templo, qui rebus suis dimissis omnes fugierunt de templo, ut omnes qui uellent accipere possent, et tum hominum multitudo maxima esset [pro erat?] in templo et mercatores, potentes et diuites qui pecunias diligebant, cum uno funiculo omnes eiecit."

Therefore it is only natural to start from the nobility. A good example of abuses connected with them is the following passage in Peregrinus de Oppeln's Lazarus sermon:

*"Then follows the sixth point, that is extortions made by evil knights. God committed the care of his poor to the knights and to the powerful of this world and when they asked John the Baptist what they should do, he responded: 'Do violence to no man'. They take no thought for his advice, but are ever inventing new means to make people give them money."*

Then follows the inevitable comparison to wolves and lambs.<sup>10</sup>

It was a fairly common idea to cite John the Baptist's words (Lk. 3:14) to condemn the liberties taken by the nobility regarding the property of their tenants, travellers and so on. Hugues de Saint-Cher writes:

*"Note that John (the Baptist) gives three pieces of advice to the knights against their three typical sins. The first one is oppression of the poor, against which he says: 'Do violence to no man', that is, by taking violently. Isaiah 3: 'And the spoil of the poor is in your house. Why do you consume my people, and grind the faces of the poor?' The second sin is false accusations, which are often made by the provosts (i.e. French official prévot) and the officials to cheat the rich of their money. Against this he says: 'Neither calumniate any man.' Hosea 5: 'Ephraim is under oppression because he began to go after filthiness.' Leviticus 19: 'Thou shalt not calumniate thy neighbour, nor oppress him by violence.' Isaiah 33: 'Which of you shall dwell with everlasting burnings?' Who 'casteth away avarice by oppression and shaketh his hands from all bribes.' The third sin is exaction against, which he says: 'And be content with your pay.'"<sup>11</sup>*

Bonaventure mentions this habit of the knights in his commentary on Luke although his general tone is much gentler than Hugues'. He says that John wanted to give knights an explicit warning against robbing and therefore said what he said. Bonaventure closes the analysis of this passage noting that it is indeed the common custom of the knights to sin in robbing the poor, and thus

10 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 48r. "Sequitur de sexto scilicet exactionibus quas faciunt mali milites. Deus committit aut pauperes suos militibus et potentibus huius seculi et diffinitum est militibus a Iohanne Bapista quid facerent, [cum] respondit [eis]: 'Neminem concuciat'. Ad ij ipsi non curant modo sed nouos modos pecuniam sibi dandi adinueniunt." The words in brackets are from the BAV. Pal.lat. 446, f. 38r.

11 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*, f. 150v. "Nota quod triplex consilium dat Ioannes militibus contra triplex peccatum eorum. Quarum primum est oppressio pauperum contra quod dicit: 'Neminem concuciat, ui opprimendo.' Esaie cap. tertio c: 'Rapina pauperis in domo uestra. Quare atteritis populum meum, et facies pauperum commolitis?' Secundum est falsi criminis impositio quod saepe faciunt praepositi, et officiales ad emungendam pecuniam a diuitibus. Contra quod dicit: 'Neque calumniam faciatis.' Oseae 5.c: 'Calumniam patiens est Ephraim, quoniam cepit abire post sordes.' Leuit. 19.c: 'Non facies calumniam proximo tuo, nec ui opprimes eum.' Esaie 33.b: 'Quis ex uobis poterit habitare cum ardoribus sempiternis?' Qui 'proicit auaritiam et calumniam, et excutit manus suas ab omni munere.' Tertium est exactio contra quod dicit: 'Et contenti estote stipendiis uestris.'"

John advises them (i.e. the knights of Bonaventure's own age) to abstain from such practices.<sup>12</sup>

The picture drawn from the above-cited material is clear: the powerful, whether they are lay or ecclesiastical does not matter, oppress the ordinary people, with unjust levies and/or outright robbing. In doing so they are assisted by their bailiffs and other satellites. The possibility of the oppressed obtaining justice is nonexistent, since justice is managed by the judges either belonging to the above-mentioned powerful or appointed by them.<sup>13</sup>

Guibert de Tournai complains that the knights and the powerful laymen neglect tithes and other payments to the Church, and furthermore, they violate its immunity. Then he moves on to other parts of the population that are oppressed by the powerful: "Now we see, that just as the wolves devour a carcass and croaking ravens follow them expecting a part of what is left, similarly they despoil the people while officials and bailiffs await their share like infernal ravens."<sup>14</sup>

Guibert also has something to say about the corruption of justice and how it is orchestrated by the powerful:

*"[...] knights are not supposed to receive whatever it is that they get from favouring injustice. Isaiah 1. 'Thy princes are rebellious and companions of thieves', since they connive at other people's robberies. They favour in their countries the plunderers and the Jews from whom they receive part of the prey or occasionally all. 'Everyone loveth gifts' for they are avaricious in extorting and prodigious in spending."*<sup>15</sup>

This text calls for some further comment. The quotations explained and expounded by Guibert are from Isaiah. Guibert's attitude becomes even more obvious if the reader bears in mind that his potential readers, that is, other preachers, were much more familiar with the Bible than is generally common today. These citations could have evoked in the minds of his readers the mental picture of Isaiah's first chapter with the pessimistic description of current corruption. Guibert's condemnation of the abuses of the knights works on two levels, first in his explicit statement, and secondly read between the lines by reflecting on the chapter of Isaiah he quotes. The latter level was probably lost when the sermon was eventually preached to its ultimate audience, that is, to ordinary parishioners.

Referring to having part of the prey, and occasionally all of it, Guibert probably means the taxes imposed on the Jews by most western rulers and

---

12 Bonaventure OFM, *Commentarius in Evangelium S. Lucae*, p. 77.

13 M. Mollat & P. Wolff, *The Popular Revolutions of the Late Middle Ages*, pp. 87-88.

14 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Sermo ad potentes et milites. BN. lat. 15943, f. 121v. "Nunc autem uidemus quod sicut lupi cadauera deuorant et corui crocitantés sequuntur eos aliud de residuo expectantes, ita dum spoliant homines, et prepositi et balliui quasi corui infernales residuum expectantes."

15 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Sermo ad potentes et milites. BN. lat. 15943, f. 122v. "[...] non debent accipere milites quod quid accipiunt ut foueant iniusticiam. Ysa. 1 'Principes tui infideles socii furum', dum aliorum rapine consentiunt. Fouent enim in terra sua feneratoros et iudeos a quibus partem feneratoris et aliquando totum recipiunt. 'Omnes diligunt munera' auari enim sunt in extorquendo, prodigi in expendendo."

magnates. The Jews were obliged to pay heavy taxes to get protection and, on the whole, to be able to carry on with their trade among the often hostile Christian population.<sup>16</sup>

Guibert also confirms the above methods for oppressing the poor:

*"Wishing to devour them the devil makes them play in front of him and to get fat off the blood of the poor, and when they dare not receive openly they do it in secret. Proverbs 21. 'A gift in secret pacifieth anger: and a reward in the bosom strong wrath.' Some of them receive through violence. Ezekiel 22. 'In thee have they taken gifts to shed blood', as is seen in those who steal the goods of the dead. [...] Some receive through the distortion of justice."*<sup>17</sup>

John of Wales waxes almost poetic as he compares the knights and the powerful to the pharaonites, who oppressed the Israelites in Egypt and finally tried to stop them from leaving the country. He states that just as the army of the pharaoh was drowned in the Red Sea, so will they (the powerful) with their bailiffs, ribalds, and satellites be sunk into the fire lake of hell.<sup>18</sup>

Franciscan writers were not the only ones to adopt this view of the nobles and the powerful. The Dominican Humbert de Romans repeats these accusations in his sermon *Ad laicos in castris*: "Note that the castles are made so that the miserable have a sanctuary in a time of persecution [...], but alas they are frequently hideouts for the thieves, predators, and therefore those who receive them are their accomplices in guilt." Humbert says that it was often common for the nobility to protect bandits and let them use their castles as bases from where they could operate. He may also be referring to robber barons. This becomes clear from the following passage: "They are also constructed to protect travellers. [...] But things are quite the opposite in many cases, because not only do they leave the travellers unprotected, but also actively cause them many injuries."<sup>19</sup>

16 See for instance F. Battenberg, *Das Europäische Zeitalter der Juden. Band I: Von den Anfängen bis 1650* (Darmstadt 1990), passim.

17 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Sermo ad potentes et milites. BN. lat. 15943, f. 123r. "Ita dyabolus facit eos ante se ludere et de sanguine pauperum impinguare uolens eos deuorare et quando non audent accipere in aperto, accipiunt in occulto Prov. 21. 'Munus absconditum extinguit iram et donum in sinum indignationem maximam.' Quidam uero accipiunt per uiolentiam Eze. 22. 'Munera acceperunt apud te ad effundendum sanguinem', sicut apparet in illis qui bona defunctorum rapiunt. [...] Quidam uero accipiunt per calumniam."

18 John of Wales OFM, *Summa iustitie*, BL. Sloane 985, f. 77v. "Item tales pauperum oppressores sunt pharaonite, similes pharaoni qui filios Dei crudeliter oppressit et grauiter afflixit, operibus duris luti ac lateris omni que famulatu Exo. primo. Sed eis ad gloriam sibi uero ad penam et ignominiam, et sicut ipse cum suis ob hoc facinore submersus est in Mari rubro, sic isti cum suis baliuis, ribaldis ac satellitibus in rubro stangno infernali demergentur ardente igne et sulphure."

19 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 77. Ad laicos in castris. "Notandum quod castella facta sunt ut miserabiles persone habeant tempore persecutionis in eis refugium [...], sed heu, sunt modo frequenter refugium latronum et predonum et ideo propter huiusmodi reptionem receptantes sunt socii eorum in culpa."; "Item sunt facta ad defensionem transuentium [...], sed econtra fit in multis, quia non solum non defendunt eos, sed frequenter in multis iniuriantur."

Humbert returns to this theme in his sermon *Ad nobiles malos*. He states that one of their habitual sins is violence against the poor, churches, and those who are less powerful. In another sermon, *Ad magnates* he states that one of their common sins is to be unmerciful and harsh to the poor. In the passage in question Humbert actually refers to the Lazarus parable as an example of this attitude!<sup>20</sup> This is yet another piece of evidence allowing us to see how the rich man of the parable was interpreted in the thirteenth century.

If we turn to the late thirteenth-century material, there is more evidence to be found. Johannes von Freiburg mentions all the typical sins of the knights and the powerful. The confessors are told to ask the knights whether they have put tyrannical officials and oppressors of the poor in charge of their lands, whether they have made unjust extortions from their subjects, and whether they have stolen goods from wrecks or otherwise committed robberies.<sup>21</sup>

Bertrand de la Tour in one of his memorial sermons describes what is to be said at the funeral of a good prince. Then he reflects the actual situation and notes: "Alas, not all other princes are like that man. Many of them govern their subjects with a government which is not political or royal, not as a guardian towards his wards, for they oppress them, torment them, rob them, and indeed despoil them and kill them."<sup>22</sup> The general tone of the sermon is by no means hostile towards the powerful. Nevertheless Bertrand felt it necessary to remind his listeners that there are rulers and magnates who are not playing by the rules.

The popular preacher's handbook *Fasciculus morum* gives examples of looting by the nobles as well as of their oppression through legal means. Straight away robbery is described with a strong hint of irony:

*"Notice that among all people the English can be thankful to God for a special privilege they have. For it is said that in Ireland and in Wales one readily finds thieves that steal their neighbors' cows, oxen and other cattle, for which they are openly called 'thieves'. But not so in England, God be praised. But what then? Among us, in fact, the nobles are called shaveldours and rifflers. They break into the treasures of the rich, carry off their goods, drive away their cattle, despoil the religious, and have no qualms of conscience about this but instead rejoice greatly when they can despoil an abbot, prior, or other monk, and they say: 'Surely, it was God's will that we ran into this peasant or monk or friar today.'"*<sup>23</sup>

One cannot but notice that behind the irony there is an uncommonly clear sense of bitterness. This is not merely a literary *exemplum*; instead it has the air of being a straightforward description of real life, or at least as close to a direct description as one could get with pastoral literature. Victims of oppression

20 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 81 *Ad nobiles malos* and sermo 83 *Ad magnates*.

21 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale*. *Ad principes et alios nobiles*. BL Addit. 19581, f. 190v-191r.

22 Bertrand de la Tour, *Sermones de mortuis*. In *exequiis alicuius regis uel magni principis*. Cited in D.L. d'Avray, *Death and the Prince*, p. 146.

23 *Fasciculus morum*, p. 341.

in this particular story are the rich, the monks, and even the friars themselves. The writer of the *Fasciculus morum* was well aware that the oppression was not limited to sacrilege. He writes: "It is indeed a great vileness in a noble bird, who should catch birds of the forest, if he chases after domestic fowl and leaves the others in peace. Thus it is with the powerful men who are girt with the sword in order to fight heretics and pagans, if instead they spoil and ruin the poor in their own country."<sup>24</sup> Of legalised robbing it reads:

"Suppose there is a simple man who does not know the law or how to start a lawsuit, who lives in innocence and simplemindedness. He owns one carucate of land or an acre or perhaps a built-up lot in the village where he lives, which is coveted by someone more powerful than he is, perhaps because it lies close to the latter's house or lands. If the lower-class citizen does not want to sell or make over his property, what I pray will his more powerful neighbour do? Will he not go to the bailiffs or the hundred-court and accuse him of being a thief or murderer or traitor to his town or realm? This way he will come unjustly to the land or have that lower-class citizen hanged, just as such a tyrant once said to a peasant for the sake of the latter's land: 'I swear to God' he said, 'you will either give, sell, or swap that land with me, or else grin at the moon,' That is to say, you will at once be hung by your neck."<sup>25</sup>

Particularly interesting is the way the story is presented here. The writer is speaking directly to his readers. He makes it perfectly clear that he is speaking of something that is already a familiar phenomenon to them; a ruling custom in the land. The style of the text is irony, and it is quite certainly an exaggeration, but nevertheless, it has a genuine feel of bitterness around it. For the writer, the oppressions committed by the noblemen were certainly something more than merely a literary *topos* to be repeated mechanically. The above-cited texts are from Pars IV.v of the *Fasciculus morum*. It is titled *The Members of Avarice: Theft*.<sup>26</sup> The whole chapter is dedicated to the looting and despoiling practised by the knights and their bailiffs.

Often the real target of the preacher and moralist was not the nobleman, but his local representative – the bailiff. This was a common situation in the whole of Christian Europe, and it is not by any means limited to the mendicant sermons. Unlike the knights and the fief holders themselves, the bailiffs were in direct contact with the peasants. They were often from lower-class families themselves. They were the ones who carried out the collecting of taxes and other exactions. Often they were more or less justly suspected of collecting more than was due, and thus enriching themselves from the unjust profit. This common hatred of the bailiffs among the peasantry survived Middle Ages and was a reality until the end of the eighteenth century.<sup>27</sup>

24 *Fasciculus morum*, p. 339.

25 *Fasciculus morum*, pp. 151-153.

26 Wenzel uses the word theft instead of robbery; personally I prefer to use robbery as a translation of *rapina*.

27 F. Graus, *Poveri delle città e delle campagne*, p. 86.

If we take a closer look at the ranks of the bailiffs we find it difficult to say who were the bailiffs in different sermons, since their social background differed from time to time and between different geographical areas. Michael Nordberg has tried to sort out who were the bailiffs (*bailli*) and respectively stewards (*sénéchal*) in late medieval France. His material starts from the early fourteenth century, but it is probably quite similar to the situation in the late thirteenth century. Between the years 1320–1339 82% of all bailiffs were of non-noble origin. Belonging to the nobility was more common in Southern France than in the North.<sup>28</sup>

Nordberg's findings match quite well with several other studies on the matter. Takayama repeats the idea that the seneschals were almost exclusively from the nobility and the bailiffs of bourgeois origin. The reason for this was the difference between these two professions. The bailiffs were merely administrators in the areas controlled directly by the king, whereas the seneschals were a kind of viceroys and accordingly had also military obligations.<sup>29</sup>

The above-mentioned studies concern only the situation in France. The bailiffs or like officials were also known in other parts of medieval Europe, and they were equally hated. In many cases, it is almost impossible to localise different sermons. Thus we can conclude that the word *ballivus* does not necessarily refer to the Northern French *bailli*. The actual term may originate from the *stilus* of a copyist rather than that of the original writer. It is even more likely that writers seeking to address larger audiences throughout Christendom may have chosen to use a word that would be understood everywhere; even though its significance might vary somewhat from place to place.

Therefore the bailiff or the seneschal in pastoral literature or sermons should be understood to mean a person who collects revenues for the king or any other landlord rather than any specific office in any specific geographic area. Even if we cannot determine the actual social standing of the bailiffs in different cases, it can be concluded that they did belong to the category of the rich and powerful. Even in cases where they were not necessarily nobles or even of bourgeois origin, i.e. in cases of lower officials such as *sergeants*, *prévôtes* and assistant bailiffs (*subballivus*), they certainly did belong at least to the élite of the peasantry.

The complexity of identifying who were the bailiffs underlines a more general problem of pastoral sources (especially model sermons). Their scope was to attain more universal appeal rather than merely reflect problems of local importance. Themes chosen were not tied to one place or time, but had wider significance. Officials responsible for collecting taxes and other fees were universally hated and despised – and this is the attitude reflected in mendicant sources.

---

28 M. Nordberg, *Den dynamiska medeltiden* (Stockholm 1984), pp. 201-202.

29 H. Takayama, *The Local Administrative System of France under Philip IV (1285-1314) - baillis and seneschals*. *JMH* 21 (1995), passim. See also F. Lot and R. Fawtier, *Histoire des institutions françaises au Moyen Age*. Tome I. Institutions seigneuriales (Paris 1957), passim.



The *Fasciculus morum* sums up the signs of the times:

*"Therefore it seems to me that now not only the word of Hosea 4 has come true: 'There is no truth, there is no mercy, there is no knowledge of God in the land', etc 'but cursing, lying, killing, theft, adultery, and other evils have overflowed the earth, and blood has touched blood.' but also the word of Jeremiah 5: 'They have refused to receive correction'; and what follows: 'These are poor and foolish,' add: worldly people, 'who do not know the way of the Lord and the judgment of their God. I will therefore go to the great men and will speak to them, and behold these have altogether broken the yoke and have burst the bonds. Wherefore a lion out of the wood has slain them, and a wolf in the evening will spoil them.'*

*Look and see if this prophecy has not come true in our days. I fear it has. For who are greater sinners than our political leaders (here Wenzel seems to be giving a rather anachronistic translation of the original Latin words "Qui enim magis peccatores quam potentes")? Who are greater evildoers than learned men, that is, our churchmen who know the way of the Lord and the judgment of God? Where, I ask, is pride, avarice, lechery, extortion, manslaughter, blasphemy, and the like? Is it not among those who have knowledge and power? They 'have broken the yoke' of the Lord and the law of God, namely that of faithfulness, religion, and order, against God's disposition and will. They have also 'broken the bonds', namely of the love of God and their neighbour, by not fearing God or having respected man. And therefore, certainly the lion will at last strike them of whom Peter 5 says: 'Your enemy goes about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour.' And not only this, but 'the wolf in the evening will spoil them,' namely that rapacious wolf, the devil, will in the evening of death carry them off to hell, according to Job 21: 'They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment they go down to hell.'"*<sup>30</sup>

This chapter can be rounded off by noting that this very same passage of Job (21:13) was also frequently quoted in Lazarus sermons.<sup>31</sup> All these sources were dealing with the same society and with the same problems. The only difference is that the Lazarus sermons were usually less explicit in their condemnation of the powerful of the world than The *Fasciculus morum* and other similar pastoral manuals.

### 3.1.2 Distorted justice

Almost all the cases presented above refer to the impossibility for the poor to obtain justice against their oppressors. It is thus only reasonable to inquire what the sources have to say about judges and lawyers.

<sup>30</sup> *Fasciculus morum*, pp. 197-199.

<sup>31</sup> Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3r; Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 413, f. 248v; Bonaventure OFM, *Sermons de diversis*, p. 374; Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. BL. Royal coll. 9.B.IV, f. 18v.

*The spirit of the wolf often hides under the skin of the lamb. Truly today our judges are similar to birds living off robbery, since no justice is served nor innocence considered, when love is corrupted by hatred or money. They often save the guilty and kill the innocent. Hawk spares another predator, but does not spare the innocent dove or turtledove. Similarly the wolf often gives mercy to the fox, which is a fraudulent animal, but never spares the most innocent lamb. Today we live in a world where the rich and the powerful always find justice, or more likely, injustice prepared for them. But if the poor man has a just cause, he hardly can enter the court, with great pain he manages to get an audience, and rarely finds he justice for himself.*<sup>32</sup>

This lament comes from the Franciscan Servasanto da Faenza. The Dominican Jacopo da Cessole writes in the same spirit; he says that justice in these days can be compared to the spider's web. It cannot do anything to larger and more robust animals, but it is sure to catch the smaller ones. The same holds true for the law. It can bind normal people but has no power over the great and the powerful. Jacopo seems to be hinting that distorted justice was at least one reason for civil wars in the city states of Northern Italy (Italy is not named but the context is obvious).<sup>33</sup> From the point of view of rhetorical expression these passages are exceptional, but the message they try to communicate to readers was a commonplace. Laments over corrupt justice are very common in the mendicant sources of the thirteenth century. Both the judges and the lawyers were accused of taking money and distorting justice. It is all brought neatly together by John of Wales, who quotes Petronius: "*Quid faciunt leges ubi sola pecunia regnat?*"<sup>34</sup>

The judges and the lawyers are both handled in Raymund de Peñafort's *Summa*. He writes that the judges give wrong sentences for two reasons, evil and imprudence. In the first case, the motives are: fear, cupidity, hate, and love. In the case of cupidity they are obliged to return all the money thus gained. The lawyers are prohibited to defend unjust causes, forge documents, produce false witnesses, lie or misuse laws. Furthermore they must always pursue the case of their client as well as they can. They must have moderate fees that are in right relation to the importance of the case, the work needed, the ability of the lawyer, and finally the customs of the area.<sup>35</sup>

32 Servasanto da Faenza OFM, *Liber exemplorum naturalium contra curiosos*. BAV. Chigi. A. V. 155. f. 144v. "Sepe enim sub pelle ovina latet mens lupina. Vere hodie iudices nostri sunt similes avibus viventibus de rapina quia nulla servata iustitia nec considerata innocentia amore corrupto odio vel pecunia nocentibus sepe parcunt et innocentes occidunt. Nam ancipiter parcit ancipitri predatori sed non parcit columbe vel turturi innocenti. Item lupus sepe parcit vulpi fraudulentissimo animali sed nunquam parcit innocentissimo ovi. Tempus est hodie quo divites et potentes semper inveniunt paratam iustitiam sive potius iniustitiam. Sed si pauperes habent iustam causam, vix possunt intrare in curiam, vix impetrant audientiam et raro inveniunt iustitiam."

33 Jacopo da Cessole OP, *Libellus de moribus hominum et officiis nobiliorum super ludo scachorum*. BAV. Vat.lat. 1042, f. 80r. "[...] qui dicit leges similes esse araneorum telis sicut enim illa animalia maiora et valenciora transmittunt, infirmiora non ut muscas retinent et necant, sic legibus infirmiores et populares ligari, maiores uero et potenciores constringi. Ideo ex hoc nascuntur bella civilia, animorum discordia [...]."

34 John of Wales OFM, *Moniloquium*, Firenze Bibl. Naz. II.VI.1. f. 52v.

35 Raymund de Peñafort OP, *Summa de paenitentia*, L. II, T. 5, c. 35, De iudicibus, col. 511. and L. II, T. 5, c. 39 De advocatis, col. 515-517.

Guillaume Peyraut's opinions of lawyer's professional dangers do not differ much from those of his confrere Raymund. A bad lawyer is worse than a prostitute, since he sells the more noble part of his body, namely his mouth. He gives us a selection of misdeeds committed by advocates: taking hopeless cases deliberately, negligence and losing cases because of it, immoderate fees, false documents, laws, witnesses and so on, and finally vainglory. All of these except vainglory are also found in Raymund's *Summa*. The similarities are so great that it is obvious that Peyraut was using Peñaforte as a source.<sup>36</sup>

Hate, fear, love, and desire for reward as reasons for perversion of justice appear likewise in John of Wales' *Communiloquium*. John writes that,

*"Judges ought to take care that they do not pervert justice out of credulity, omission of discussion, brutality of hate, pusillanimity of fear, affection of carnal love, friendship, or cupidity for money. Justice is, as it says in xi causa, questio iii, corrupted in four ways, that is, because of fear, hatred, cupidity, and love."*<sup>37</sup>

To be more precise, the four reasons for perverting justice are to be found in Gratian Quatuor, C. 11, q. 3, c. 78.

So far we have considered texts giving us a hint of what were the possible sins of judges and advocates. However, they do not actually say (even though it seems to be obvious), that these sins were in practice committed. They use also age-old sources: Gratian, Isidore of Seville, etc. There is thus good reason to question whether these texts really have anything to do with the real situation in the thirteenth century. The answer is to be found in the sermons. Jacques de Lausanne writes that nowadays everyone is a fisher and since the big fish like to be in a turbid water, they oppose clarity, that is, the truth. This parable is explained by applying "this to advocates and judges of whom Cassiodorus says splendidly: 'Bribe money is the moth of good government'". In another sermon Jacques laments that there are hardly any who would take care of justice and punishment of evil people; instead the judges and the rulers protect and favour wrongdoers to catch a share of the profits.<sup>38</sup>

The other preachers give us like glimpses of advocates and judges in their work. Guibert de Tournai retells Peyraut's comparison of advocate and prostitute and says that their tongue is like the tongue of the scales, which a little weight (one denarius) is sufficient to tip. A similar comment is made on the judges. There is a species of frogs, which when put to the mouth of a dog, makes it remain silent. Similarly money put into a judge's hand keeps him silent and

- 
- 36 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitis* (Lyon 1585), T. IV, P. II, c. VI. De avaritia advocatorum.  
37 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium* 1.4.1., BAV, Vat. lat. 1018. f. 35v.; J. Swanson, *John of Wales*, p. 85.  
38 Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C. 366, f. 78v-79r. "Applica ad advocatos et iudices unde Cassiodorus dicit optimum verbum: 'Obulo muneris est linea boni regiminis.'"; Item. Sermo in dominica III adventus, f. 9v. "Vix est hodie qui curaret de iustitia et punitione malorum ymo malos fovet et nutriunt dum tamen habeant partem prede."

refrain from just judgement.<sup>39</sup> However, the main argument against lawyers is that they take unjust cases of the rich, but refuse the just cases of the poor. He also compares unjust judges to Pilate, who sentenced Christ and released Barabbas.<sup>40</sup>

The general impression from the sources is that while the profession of the lawyer was considered to be honourable as such, it was so badly practised that occasionally writers hint that it is dangerous for one's soul to become one. Even the very fact that it was necessary to say, as Guillaume Peyraut does: "And note that the profession of the advocate is not bad as such [...].", seems to imply that there may well have been reasons to think otherwise.<sup>41</sup> And so it was. Peyraut himself states that people should refrain from this occupation since it seems to be more corrupt than others. One bad lawyer does more damage than ten thieves or even all the robbers in one country.<sup>42</sup> Hugo de Prato repeats all the statements about the avarice of advocates made by Peyraut, and tells an *exemplum* of a certain rustic entering Naples. He saw all the lawyers there in schools and cried out to God: "Help, all the world is set on fire".<sup>43</sup> Guillaume de Luxi noted in a sermon given at Paris in 1270 that bad lawyers do more harm to the Church than all the heretics put together.<sup>44</sup>

So we know that justice was considered by the friars to be more or less corrupt. The real question, however, is who was responsible for justice, who were the corrupt judges and the lawyers? Guibert de Tournai's sermon *Ad cives rei publicae vacantes* deals with the justice in towns. It attacks the abuse of judicial power and cites scriptures against crooked judgements and bribes. The judicial power in cities was in the hands of the upper bourgeoisie.<sup>45</sup> In the countryside justice was the responsibility of the royal and feudal judges. These

39 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad iudices et advocatos sermo secundus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 93r. The same comparison is also told in an anonymous Franciscan exempla collection, *Tabula exemplorum*, pp. 2 and 35.

40 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad iudices et advocatos sermo primus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 92v-93r.

41 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585) T. IV, P. II, c. 6., p. 158. "Et notandum quod officium advocacionis secundum se non est malum [...]."; Cf. also John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, I.5.1, BAV. Vat.lat. 1018, f. 38v. John cites Cicero's *De officiis* and states that the profession of lawyer is good for the state, when properly conducted. After that, however, he starts complaining about their too fancy clothes and cites the exemplum of advocates in hell, bathing with Nero in molten gold (Tubach 2505). This story was very popular round that time. It also appears in *Speculum laicorum* (18), *Liber exemplorum* (71), and in Guillaume Peyraut's *Summa*.

42 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), Tract. IV, P. II, c. 6., p. 161. "Quarto deberet homines cohibere ab hoc officio, quia prae ceteris videtur esse corruptus."; "Plus enim nocet aliqui quandoque unus malus advocatus, quam possent ei nocere decem fures vel etiam omnes raptores unius patriae."

43 Hugo de Prato OP, *Sermones communes*, BAV. Vat.lat. 4368, f. 60r-v. "Exemplum illius rusticus qui intrans Neapolim et videns scolas plenas iuristis, clamavit Deo: 'Succurrite, quia totus mundus est combustus.'" Hugo's sermons on the vices are mainly based on the *Summa de vitiis* by Guillaume Peyraut. Nevertheless, the *exemplum* does not come from Peyraut, nor is it included in any of the thirteenth-century *exemplum* collections.

44 Cited in L.J. Bataillon, *De la lectio à la predicatio*, p. 570. "[...] hodie aduocati mali per leges suas uexant ecclesiam, plus fere quam omnes heretici."

45 D.L. d'Avray, *Sermons to the Upper Bourgeoisie by a Thirteenth-Century Franciscan*. In *The Church in Town and Countryside*. Studies in Church History, 16. Edited by D. Baker (Oxford 1979), p. 190.

were normally noblemen. Besides the secular justice there was also ecclesiastical justice. This was organised according to the normal hierarchy of the church (diocese, archdiocese, papal curia).<sup>46</sup> The inevitable conclusion is that justice was administered by the upper burgesses, the nobles and the prelates, that is, the very same members of the élite who were considered to be potential sinners – the rich men of Luke 16.

Lawyers or advocates were specially trained legal advisers used in ecclesiastical and royal courts. In France the seigneurial courts did not use advocates. Every man appeared for himself. The royal courts started using them between 1250-1270. Thus in the first part of the thirteenth century the word *advocatus* in French sources such as Guillaume Peyraut's *Summa* means exclusively advocates in ecclesiastical courts. In the latter part of the century some lawyers were trained in secular justice, some in ecclesiastical, and some in both (in *utrisque iuris*).<sup>47</sup>

### 3.1.3 Pride and vanity

The traditional view is that the pride was first and foremost a sin of the nobility. The typical allegorical representation of pride was a mighty person seated on a horse. This person is usually armed with a sword and the horse is depicted wearing armour. Regardless of the origin of the presentation (Prudentius' *Psychomachia*) it was interpreted to stand for a knight. Horse and knighthood were linked together in the Middle Ages, as can be seen in vocabularies of European languages (*eques*, *caballarius*, *cavaliere*, *chevalier*, *caballero*, and *Ritter*).<sup>48</sup>

The essence of the knight's pride lies in the nobility of his family. This was severely reprehended by several authors. Guillaume Peyraut writes that it is plain madness to take pride in nobility, since originally everyone comes from the same father and the same mother, "We do not read that the Lord made one Adam of silver, from whom descend the nobles, and another from mud, from whom descend those not of noble birth; no, he formed just one from mud from whom we all come."<sup>49</sup>

Condemning the pride originating in noble birth seems to have been a popular *topos* amongst the friars. Here the following passage from Servasanto da Faenza is one of the most illuminating examples:

---

46 J-F. Lemarignier, *La France médiévale institutions et société* (Paris 1989), pp. 347-349 and 352.

47 J-F. Lemarignier, *La France médiévale*, pp. 366-367.

48 L.K., Little, *Pride Goes Before Avarice: Social Change and the Vices in Latin Christendom*. *AHR* 1/1971, pp. 31-34.

49 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), T. VI, P. III, cap. 28. *Quod fatuum est de nobilitate generis superbire*, pp. 416-417. "[...] non legitur Dominum fecisse unum Adam argenteum, unde essent nobiles, et unum luteum, ex quo essent ignobiles, sed unicum, et illum de luto plasmavit, ex quo omnes exivimus."; This argument of Peyraut's is also echoed in the Franciscan pastoral handbook *Fasciculus morum*, p. 57.

"The Philosopher taught correctly that nobility is nothing else but old riches. This we know to be true from everyday experience. Is it not so that those who were once bearded rustics are all the time knighted and step up to the rank of count?"<sup>50</sup> A similar tendency is to be found in *Communiloquium* by John of Wales. He writes that preachers ought to teach the noble men not to boast of their nobility, since all men are equally noble in respect of their origin. The only true nobility is the nobility created by virtues.<sup>51</sup> This is precisely the view presented by Humbert de Romans in his sermon *Ad omnes nobiles*.<sup>52</sup> John of Wales also handles the problem of nobility in his *Summa iustitiae*. He repeats Guillaume Peyraut's argument of equality because of the common ancestry of all men. Then he presents an *exemplum* against those who take pride in their family:

"In the game of chess, when the play stops, the kings and the knights are put into the same bag together with the pawns, and there is no difference in their acceptance. Similarly the nobles and the commoners, when the game of this world is over, will be put in one and the same place. Ecclesiastes 3: 'And all things go to one place: of earth they were made, and into earth they return together.'"<sup>53</sup>

Jenny Swanson notes that John of Wales did not seem to have a very high opinion of hereditary nobility.<sup>54</sup> We may add that he was not alone in his opinions. Along with authors already mentioned, the Franciscan brother Malachy of Ireland took the view that boasting of hereditary nobility is a malice against nature. He leaned on the authority of Gregory the Great, who wrote that all men were created equal (as we have seen this was a widely accepted argument).<sup>55</sup>

The pride of nobility also appears in sumptuous clothes ("which was clothed in purple and fine linen"), housing and equipment. An important part of being a nobleman was to look like one. Guillaume Peyraut lists nine things in which the *superbia exterioris* is shown. Four of them can be linked to nobility, although

50 Servasanto da Faenza OFM, *Liber exemplorum naturalium contra curiosos*. BAV. Chigi. A.V. 155, f. 155v. "Bene ergo philosophus docuit quod nobilitas nihil aliud est quam antique divitiae quod ipsa experientia probamus quotidie verum esse. Nonne tota die milites fiunt et ad comitatus ascendunt, qui aliquando rustici barbati fuerunt?"

51 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, 3.3.1 & 3.3.2. BAV. Vat.lat. 1018. ff. 130r-v.

52 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 80. Ad omnes nobiles. "Inter homines quoque licet omnes sint eque nobiles nature tamen ex aliis causis unus dicitur nobilis, alius ignobilis."

53 John of Wales OFM, *Summa iustitiae*. BL. Sloane 985, f. 21r-v. "Reges enim et milites in scacario cum finitur ludus proiciunt in sacculo una cum peditibus nec in hoc distinctio est aut acceptio, sic nobilis cum ignobili finito ludo seculi pergit ad unum locum, Eccl. 3: 'Cuncta subiacent uanitate et omnia pergunt ad unum locum de terra facta sunt et in terram pariter revertentur.'"

54 J. Swanson, *John of Wales*, p. 131.

55 Malachy of Ireland OFM, *Venenum Malachie*. BAV. Vat.lat. 4347. f. 45v. "Item venenum superbie inficit ex generis nobilitate [...] de talis nobilitate gloriari est superbia de malitia contra naturam que omnes gignit equales secundum Gregorium in Pastoralia."; Similar argument is presented also in Sermo cujusdam fratris minoris in cathedra sancti Petri. In M.M. Davy *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-1231*, p. 387-388. "Cum igitur a natura sit paritas, liquidum est eos qui in nobilitate sua, aut scientia aut divitiis superbiunt agere contra naturae et divinae iustitiae veritatem."

not necessarily exclusively to them: horses, honour of family, parties, and buildings.<sup>56</sup> This passage from Peyraut can be compared to Nicolas de Byard's Lazarus sermon: "Thus the decorated equipment of the horses, expensive clothes, and other possessions often provoke the possessor to the sin of pride and make him despise the poor who do not have such things."<sup>57</sup>

Even though neither of the writers explicitly says he is writing about the nobility, this is fairly obvious considering the equipment described. We must acknowledge, however, that some writers accepted high-class clothing as long as they were according to the wearer's age and social standing and the pomp was not exaggerated. A good example is the anonymous Franciscan compiler of the *Fasciculus morum*: "However, clothing that is decent and in accordance with one's state and the customs of one's country is not condemned, but only such as makes a person arrogant and proud and prone to other sins."<sup>58</sup>

The front-line theologians confirmed this opinion. The Franciscan Alexander de Hales took the view that a man can adorn clothes according to the nobility of his person, the customs of the country, or the dignity of his profession as long as the motivation is acceptable.<sup>59</sup> Thomas Aquinas concluded that there is no sin in clothing and other external adornment as long as they are not superfluous in comparison with other people living in the same area. Thomas says nothing of social standing but his words ("*cum quibus aliquis vivit*") can be interpreted to mean social standing. They seem to point to people with whom one is usually in contact, that is, members of the same social group.<sup>60</sup> Such is the case with the Lazarus sermons too. The problem was not that the rich man wore expensive clothes. It was that he was overdressed. He did not use clothes suitable for the rich, but royal or imperial clothes: "Purple, as it is said in the Glossa, is the colour of royal clothing [...]; only the kings and the emperors use this kind of clothing."<sup>61</sup>

One of the main venues for the nobles to show their elaborate clothing and equipment were the tournaments. This was forbidden in the canon law, but nevertheless a common practice judging from the sources. The explicit motive for the ban of the tournaments was the possibility of lethal accidents. The *Liber extra* uses words "*mortes hominum et animarum pericula*".<sup>62</sup> Elsewhere Raymund de Peñafort says: "Because from them usually follow death and

---

56 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), T.VI, P. 3, c.9. "Superbia exterioris". The whole list runs as follows: in corpore, in lectis, in equis, in ornatu, in amplitudine familiae, conviviis, aedificiis, deauratis libris, and in cantu.

57 Nicolas de Byard OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. CLM 16028, f. 124v. "Sic decor equorum, pretiositas uestium, aliarum possessionum sepe in superbia eleuant possessorem et contempnere faciunt pauperes qui non habent."

58 *Fasciculus morum*, p. 53.

59 Alexander de Hales OFM, *Summa theologica*. Secunda pars secundi libri, I.3,T.3.S.III,Q.III De ornatu corporis, c. 1 Utrum peccatum sit in pretiositate vestium.

60 Thomas Aquinas OP, *Summa theologica* IIaIIe, Q.CLXIX,a.1. Utrum circa exteriorem ornatum possit esse virtus et vitium.

61 Nicolaus de Aquavilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 83r. "Purpura sicut dicit Glossa est color regii habitus [...] soli reges et imperatores hec genere uestis utebantur."

62 *Extra* T.13,c.1.

other bad things, they are prohibited in sacred canons.”<sup>63</sup> We cannot know for certain what the other bad things were, that came with the tournaments, but we can make a good guess on the basis of other sources.

The writer of the *Fasciculus morum* points to the useless boasting about corporal strength:

”But notice that some people are strong only in their bodies. This kind of strength is often more a spiritual disadvantage than an advantage, as one can see in people who fight in tournaments or wrestle and the like, where they expose themselves to extreme dangers for the sake of a little vainglory.”<sup>64</sup>

For the preacher it is the vainglory, which constitutes the problem, not the martial exercises themselves. This is confirmed by John of Wales, who laments that the knights of his day spend their time in wantonness, laziness and playing dice, and have become effeminate; furthermore they are more interested in fine clothes and harnesses than practising with arms, or gaining knowledge of military skills.<sup>65</sup> So at least according to John, the knights were not forbidden to practise their military skills – on the contrary.

Jenny Swanson takes the view that John, when speaking of fine clothing and harnesses, is referring to the tendency of armour and accoutrements to become more bulky and showy, and less practical, as the thirteenth century progressed.<sup>66</sup> I however find it unlikely that John would have opposed using up-to-date military equipment. After all, his main concern was the ability of knights to pursue their profession. More likely he simply wanted to condemn exaggerated ornamentation and too fine clothing materials as other contemporary writers did.

Further proof of that the tournaments were not prohibited only because of the element of danger, but because of the attendant vanities, is to be found in some Dominican sources. Guillaume de Rennes writes in his *Apparatus in summam de casibus Raymundi de Penyafort* that participation in tournaments is not a sin unless explicitly prohibited by ecclesiastical authorities. Humbert de Romans goes even further; he states that participation in ”moderate” tournament is to be tolerated if it is done to practise the knightly skills to be better prepared to fight just wars and to defend the Church. After all, fighting was a knight’s profession and he needed practice. The word *moderate* seems to refer to the setting of the tournament. A moderate tournament would be

---

63 Raymund de Peñaforde OP, *Summa de paenitentia*, L.II,T.II. De torneamentis. ”Quia vero exinde mortes et alia mala provenire solent, ideo a sacris canonibus prohibentur.”

64 *Fasciculus morum*, p. 619.

65 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, 1.9.4. BAV. Vat. lat. 1018, f. 51v. ”Et quia hodie multi milites vaccant lasciviis, occiis, aleis et ancupis, sunt effeminati et militia inexperti. [...] Sed hodie multi plus student predictis et ornamentis vestium et armorum quam exercitiis et industriis bellorum et tolleranciis laborum cum tamen oporteat milites incidiores esse armis militaribus quam vestibus.”

66 J. Swanson, *John of Wales*, p. 93.



organised with dull weapons and without flamboyant equipment, masses of spectators, *histriones* and so on.<sup>67</sup>

Humbert's view of immoderate tournaments, nevertheless, remained as negative as that of other writers. He warns noblemen of the "*vitium vanitatis*" including tournaments and hunting.<sup>68</sup> Even though some writers were more tolerant, there still remained general ecclesiastical opposition to them. Johannes von Freiburg, who updated the *Summa* of Raymund, simply states, with the authority of Hostiensis, that tournaments are forbidden because of the risk of death and the danger to souls they cause.<sup>69</sup>

Pride, however, was not the only sin connected with tournaments. Guibert de Tournai condemned them totally in his sermon *Ad potentes et milites*. He proves with examples that knights in tournament lay themselves open to all the seven capital sins. Guibert's text is taken in only slightly abbreviated form from a certain *exemplum* of Jacques de Vitry. Since the original version is edited and commented adequately by Jacques Le Goff, I shall not present the quotation in detail.<sup>70</sup>

The nobility's addiction to vainglory seems to be taken for granted. Humbert de Romans writes in his instructions to Dominican confessors that they should ask nobles, whether they have given money to adulators or *histriones* and what else they have done, suffered or paid for the sake of vain glory.<sup>71</sup> Johannes von Freiburg agrees with him. According to Johannes the confessor's first duty is to ask nobles, whether they have been proud or ambitious, too sumptuous or curious with clothing, food, horses and retinue, dogs, birds (presumably hunting falcons), hunting, and so on.<sup>72</sup>

---

67 Sabine Krüger, *Das kirchliche Turnierverbot im Mittelalter*. In *Das Ritterliche Turnier im Mittelalter. Beiträge zu einer vergleichenden Formen- und Verhaltensgeschichte des Rittertums*. Herausgegeben von Josef Fleckenstein. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 80 (Göttingen 1985), pp. 413-414.

68 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*, sermo 81. Ad nobiles malos.

69 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Summa confessorum*. L.II, t.2 De torneamentis. BN. lat. 3532. "Prohibentur autem torneamenta secundum Hostiensis propter mortes hominum et animarum pericula."

70 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Sermo ad potentes et divites. BN. lat. 15943. f. 121v; J. Le Goff, *Realtà sociali e codici ideologici all'inizio del secolo XIII: un exemplum di Giacomo di Vitry sui tornei*. In J. Le Goff, *L'immaginario medievale* (Roma - Bari 1985), pp. 57-98.

71 Humbert de Romans OP, *Instructiones de officiis ordinis*, p. 361. "Milites inquirendi sunt praecipue de rapinis, et injuriis, de venditione justitiae, de profusione pecuniae causa adulationis, vel histrionatus facta; de vana gloria, et laboribus, et doloribus, quos pro ea habent; et sumptibus quos pro ea faciunt." Humbert's *Instructiones* was a very influential book at the end of the thirteenth century. It enjoyed a sort of semi-official status in the Dominican order. It was copied along with the Dominican constitutions until the nineteenth century; E.T. Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, p. 150.

72 Johannes von Freiburg, *Confessionale*. Ad principes et alios nobiles. BL. Add. 19581, f. 190v.

## 3.2. Prelates

### 3.2.1. Clerical Avarice

“*In vesta di pastor lupi rapaci*” (Dante)

We may set out from clerical avarice or the obtaining of riches sinfully. There seemed to be two especially clerical modes of avarice, namely simony and holding several benefices at the same time. Nicole de Bozon tells an allegorical story of the Devil as a hunter with eight dogs. Two of these dogs, Have and Gyf, chase abbots, priors, knights and other powerful people to the Devil’s net because of their simony.<sup>73</sup>

One cannot find the Pope or his curia in this or almost any other pastoral source. The absence of the papal curia in discussions of simony is one of the most striking details in pastoral literature. Only Servasanto da Faenza recites the old satirical story of the saints Albinus and Rufus and their relics through which anything at all can be obtained in Rome (commonly known from the *Carmina Burana*).<sup>74</sup> Even John of Wales remains strikingly silent about popes in his otherwise very thorough-going analysis of thirteenth-century society. Jenny Swanson points this out: “*We are left wondering whether John had views about the Pope which he felt it wiser to keep to himself?*”<sup>75</sup> Yes indeed, and the question could be extended to other writers as well. The absence of the curia’s corruption in the pastoral literature is curious when compared to satires and chronicles written at the same time. This is probably due to the fact that the chronicles were not meant for wider audiences and therefore contained delicate matters such as denunciation of the curia’s corruption. The *pastoralia* was meant to be published in sermons and in hearing confession, and thus could not include such the offensive material.

Simony was often treated from the legal point of view; for instance the *Fasciculus morum* gives a very thorough-going analysis of what it is and what it is not. It is mainly based on Raymund de Peñafort’s *Summa* and Robert Grosseteste’s *Templum Dei*.<sup>76</sup> In the Lenten sermons of Jacobo da Varazze we find laments on simony: “*One can say that those who sell doves signify simoniacs, who sell gifts of the Holy Spirit, which is a sin of the clergy.*”<sup>77</sup> The Dominican general master Humbert de Romans instructs confessors to inquire of priests whether they have obtained their benefices or orders simoniacally.<sup>78</sup> Johannes von Freiburg emphasises the importance for the confessor to inquire

73 Nicole Bozon OFM, *Les comtes moralisés*, versio latina, p. 233.

74 Servasanto da Faenza OFM, *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis*. Firenze Bibl. Naz. E.VI.1046. f. 106r.

75 J. Swanson, *John of Wales*, p. 143.

76 *Fasciculus morum*, pp. 354-367.

77 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria tertia prime hebdomade, sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 10r. “*Vel potest dici quod per illos qui vendunt columbas signantur simoniaci, qui vendunt dona spiritus sancti quod est peccatum clericorum.*”

78 Humbert de Romans OP, *Instructiones de officiis ordinis*. Cap. XLVI De officio confessoris. p. 362.

of simony from all the members of clerical standing, including the regular clergy, when they come to confession.<sup>79</sup>

Complaints about simony are equally to be found in sermons. An unknown Dominican preacher from Arras expanded Lk. 5:10: "From henceforth thou shalt catch men". He writes that the devil catches men with the seven capital sins. When writing about avarice he mentions five species of it and those men who commit these sins. Not surprisingly simony is presented as a sin of the clergy.<sup>80</sup>

Holding several benefices or *curae animarum* is also frequently mentioned in the sources. This subject was particularly fashionable in the mid 1230's, when it was debated at the University of Paris in the so-called plurality of benefices controversy. This controversy naturally also affected mendicant writing. A good example is Hugues de Saint Cher's postill on the *Apocalypse* called *Aser Pinguis*.<sup>81</sup>

The sin of holding several benefices is especially interesting from the standpoint of the Lazarus sermons, since the damage done was often suffered by the poor. Guillaume Peyraut treats the problem of several benefices in his *Summa de vitiis*. Guillaume gives seven signs of avarice in God's church. At the top of the list we find plurality of benefices (*pluralitate beneficiorum*).<sup>82</sup>

What made the practise even worse was that the money raised by having several benefices was not used to any decent purpose, such as feeding the poor. According to canon law the revenue of the churches, that is, the tithes were, to be divided into three parts (although it was not explicitly stated that these parts were to be of equal size): one for the clergy, one for the building and the repair of the church, and one for the relief of the poor.<sup>83</sup> The crime of the clergy against Lazarus was that the money meant for the relief of the poor was occasionally used to other ends.

Jacques de Lausanne presents his view on the matter:

*"Today there are many in the church who have been promoted and have several benefices. They make one pile of riches in one church, and a second one in another. They do not think of anything else but how they could collect. The money that they are supposed to use for the benefit of the church, and for the use of the poor, they gather in their own piles of riches; however, they get little profit of them. More likely these riches are damage and damnation to them."*<sup>84</sup>

79 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale*, Ad episcopos et alios prelatos, Ad clericos et beneficiatos, Ad sacerdotes parochiales et eorum vicarios et audientes confessiones, and Ad religiosos et claustrales. BL. Addit. 19581, ff. 188r-189v.

80 *Sermones attrabatenses*, dominica V post trinitatem. This sermon is edited in L.J. Bataillon, *De la lectio à la predicatio*, pp. 392-395.

81 R. Lerner, *Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology*, p. 165.

82 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), T. IV, P. II, cap. VII De avaritia ministrorum ecclesiae. p. 188.

83 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, p. 70.

84 Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Compendium moralitatum*. BN. lat. 16490, f. 15r. "Sic hodie sunt multi promoti in ecclesia habentes in ea diuersa beneficia, facientes in una ecclesia cumulum diuiciarum et in alio alium. Non cogitant aliud nisi quomodo possint congregare, ita quod illud quod deberent conuertere in utilitatem ecclesie et in usus pauperi, ponunt tamen in cumulos thesauri qui tamen eis non multum proficiunt immo nocent et sunt ad eorum damnationem."

Malachy of Ireland states that those vicars who hold two parishes are avaricious; he also says that bad prelates take for themselves the part of the church's income that is meant to support the poor and the monasteries.<sup>85</sup> An accusation of holding to themselves the money meant for the poor can be also found in the sermon of brother Philippe, prior of Saint Jacques in Paris.<sup>86</sup> The matter is also mentioned in Johannes von Freiburg's confessor's manual.<sup>87</sup> And, as we have seen, keeping riches for themselves instead of supporting the poor was exactly the vice of rich clerics in Nicolaus de Aquavilla's Lazarus sermon. Numerous other examples could be cited.<sup>88</sup>

When parishes were appropriated by the monasteries, the revenue meant for the poor was also in grave danger. Monasteries often claimed a major part of the parish's income for their own use, and hired a vicar with only a part of the revenue to look after the spiritual and other needs of the parish. This custom, together with the absentee benefice holders, prompted the above-cited protests from the preachers and moralists. Some historians have even taken the view that already by the twelfth century, tithes had ceased to supply any appreciable sum towards poor relief.<sup>89</sup>

Here one must remember an important *caveat*. Even if the sermons and other pastoral writings are filled with descriptions of abuses such as those cited above, it does not necessarily mean that those abuses were a prevailing practice. Preachers and moralists often tended to make the most of the negative sides of life to emphasise the dangers of such behaviour and the importance of virtue.<sup>90</sup> Brian Tierney has made a survey of sources concerning the actual financial realities of the poor relief in thirteenth-century English parishes, and his conclusion is: "When these circumstances are taken into account, it seems that for a parish to have been utterly lacking in poor relief funds must have been very much the exception rather than a rule." Later on he even writes that the poor were better looked after in England in the thirteenth century than ever after before our own time.<sup>91</sup>

85 Malachy of Ireland OFM, *Venenum Malachie*. BAV. Vat.lat. 4347, ff. 54v-55v.

86 Friar Philippe OP, *dominica infesto beati Laurentii*. In M.M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-1231*. pp. 319-320. "Item alii funduntur in vas avaritiae [...]. Spoliati enim clerici pauperes quando sibi retinent quae eis deberent erogare."

87 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale*, Ad sacerdotas parochiales et eorum vicarios et audientes confessiones. BL. Addit. 19581, f. 189v. "Item si res ecclesie male expendit et pauperibus non diuisit."

88 For instance: John of Saint-Giles OP, *Sermo in dominica post Epiphaniam* (12.1. 1231). In M.M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-1231*. p. 291. "[...] et tamen, contra haec omnia, diversas volunt habere prebendas ut sic possint tenere magnam familiam et multos equos, et canes aut hujusmodi."; Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Sermones de tempore*. In octava pasche, UUB. C 366, f. 60v. "Cuius signum est quod redditus unius beneficii, qui valde bene sufficient uni seculari pro se et sex filiis non sufficiet uni clerico qui solus est."; Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica II post festum trinitatis, UUB. C 366, f. 83r; Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de sanctis*, sermo de b. Luca, UUB. C 378, f. 21r. "Mensuram consuetam hominum excedunt eo quod eis singularia beneficia non sufficient."

89 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, p. 73.

90 See B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, p. 91; L.E. Boyle, *Mountaillou Revisited: Mentalité and Mythology*. In *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*. Ed. by J.A. Raftis. Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. *Papers on Medieval Studies* 2 (Toronto 1981), p. 136.

91 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, pp. 97-109.

It is true that Tierney's conclusions differ markedly from those of several other historians and in any case, they are valid only in the case of England. However, they are conclusive enough to remind readers of the medieval sermons that preachers often tended to use extreme cases and aggravate situations to be more effective from the rhetorical point of view. This same applies to other examples in this study, not only to holders of several benefices. The historian's problem is to get behind the clamour of protest to ascertain the normal prevailing practice. This is not, however, an attempt to say that the abuses described in sermons were not real, which they quite probably were. No, I merely say that the preachers and moralists seem to have thought that the holders of ecclesiastical benefices ran a real risk of falling into avarice, and thus stealing the subsistence of the poor.

Besides simony and the holding of several benefices, there were other more or less economic sins associated with the clergy in pastoral writings. All were systematically analysed and condemned in Guillaume Peyraut's *Summa de vitiis*. Here it is enough to name the most important of them: nepotism or *aedificantium sion in sanguinibus* as it was called (mostly giving benefices to one's relatives), serving the Church for money instead of duty ("*avaritia mercenariorum*"), celebrating numerous masses on the same day, promoting minors to ecclesiastical offices and so on.<sup>92</sup>

### 3.2.2. Clerical Vainglory

One is tempted to think that vainglory, the pride of the prelates, and their sinful use of money were similar to that of the nobility; after all most prelates were of noble ancestry. As Alexander Murray has nicely put it, "*Taking the church' in its narrowest sense – as the authorities: that is, bishops and monastic heads – church and nobility were from a sociological angle, in most places and periods of the middle ages, the same. Bishops, abbots, and lay aristocracy, that is to say, were born in substantially the same circumstances.*"<sup>93</sup> This leads us to expect that noble prelates would have been anxious to live according to the standards of their class, and thus also to sin according to their class. There is no doubt that bishops lived in manors or castles and had retinues of armed men just like any other great nobles, but were they considered to be proud and sinful because of this?

We have already run across clerical vainglory when discussing the problem of several benefices. The English Dominican John of Saint-Giles mentioned horses and dogs as reasons for holding several benefices and thereby earning more money.<sup>94</sup> John of Saint-Giles is not the only writer to link clerical avarice

92 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), T. IV, P.II, capitula 7-12.

93 Alexander Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, p. 319. There were naturally differences between various geographical areas. In some places the advantage of being a noble man was higher than in others.

94 John of Saint-Giles OP, *Sermo in dominica post epiphaniam*. In M.M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-1231*, p. 291.

to vainglory. John of Wales writes of the same problem, although mainly citing Bernard of Clairvaux. However, the way John introduces his citation invites us to believe that he considered misdeeds presented by Bernard still relevant in his own days. Bernard's citation is levelled at those priests who love so much money, fine things, costly vestments, and plates made of silver and gold that it prevents them from loving Christ. It is noteworthy that John is speaking of ordinary clergy and when he moves to vices of the prelates, he no longer speaks of vainglory, but the triad of gluttony, lechery and avarice.<sup>95</sup>

Reading John of Wales might lead us to the conclusion that the clerical nobility was not as bound to vainglory as were their secular brothers, if there were not other sources. The Dominican Jacques de Lausanne writes of clerics with large prebends and honours. According to him they neglect their duties because of worldly vanities, they are "faster to collect their dogs than to call the poor."<sup>96</sup> Jacques is here referring to hunting, a favourite sport for noblemen but a vainglorious waste of time from the point of view of the preachers. Antonio Azaro Parmense writes on the theme *Ductus est Ihesus in desertum* and expounds the three temptations of the Lord. He states that the Devil tempts the clergy (especially prelates) with pride and vainglory as he tempted Jesus in the desert.<sup>97</sup>

Vanity is one of the main themes in the discussion of the prelates by Johannes von Freiburg in his *Confessionale*. He too refers to hunting as a form of vanity typical to them. Furthermore he urges confessors to ask prelates whether they have spent their money extravagantly on parties and *histriones*.<sup>98</sup> An example of sumptuous living of the upper clergy is to be found in the *Scala Celi* of Jean Gobi. It is an *exemplum* where a dead friar returns to warn his brother, a member of the secular clergy, against taking an ecclesiastical benefice. Holders of rich benefices are tied with three chains by the Devil – evil, robbery, and ignorance. The first of these includes using vainglorious housing and clothes and letting the poor suffer. Vainglorious housing, clothes, and spending money on prostitutes are particularly emphasised.<sup>99</sup>

Perhaps Jean Gobi indeed had good reason to be concerned about the morals of the upper clergy. Matthew Paris tells an amusing anecdote about a sermon preached by the cardinal Eudes de Châteauroux when the papal retinue was leaving Lyons after the general council. Eudes notes that when the curia rolled in there were only three or four brothels in town. Now that they are leaving there remains only one – starting from the eastern gate of the town and ending

95 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium* 4.2.7. and 4.3.7. BAV. Vat. lat. 1018, f. 99v. and 104r.

96 Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Sermones de tempore*, Dominica III post epiphanie. UUB. C 366, f. 22r. "Uelociiores sunt ad congregandum canes quam ad conuocandum pauperes."

97 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*, Dominica III quadragesime. UUB. C 347, f. 27r-28r. "Dicuntur autem clerici [...] hos maxime temptat de superbia vel vana gloria [...] et precipiter prelatos ecclesiarum."

98 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale*, Ad episcopos et alios prelatos. BL Addit. 19581, f. 188r.

99 Jean Gobi OP, *Scala Coeli*. In *La Scala coeli* de Jean Cobi. Édité par Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu (Paris 1991), nr. 197.

at the western gate.<sup>100</sup> Alas, we do not have any other knowledge of this curious sermon.

Jacopo da Varazze expounds Luke's story of Jesus purging the temple. He writes: "The oxen stand for pride, which is a sin of the nobility and the prelates".<sup>101</sup> Later on he returns to same point, this time preaching on a theme *Super cathedram Moysi* – a theme that practically invites a preacher to handle the duties of prelates:

*"In this present life the Lord wanted some of us to be prelates and some of us subjects, and he gave certain rules for both. For the prelates he gave three rules. The first is to instruct their subjects with words and example. The second is to treat themselves harshly and their subjects mildly. The third is that they should not take glory or be proud of the power given to them. Talkative prelates break the first rule, the superstitious the second, and the ambitious the third. [...] This vice of vainglory is common among the prelates and very difficult to root out."*<sup>102</sup>

Jacopo's conception of clerical pride is different from that of other writers cited. For him it seems to be a question of ambition and pride originating in power, not pride of clothes, horses or manors. This point of view brings us back to John of Wales. He does not mention pride in his list of clerical vices, but he does have a chapter titled *De incommodis et improbitate ambitionis*, and it comes just before the chapter dealing with the election of prelates. After that chapter John handles the situation of the electi; they should not take pride in their office, but seek to be humble.<sup>103</sup> If anything can be judged from the lament of fra Salimbene de Adam, John's instructions were not widely followed. Salimbene writes that the prelates of his days were bound to elevate their heart to pride. Immediately after their election they started to think themselves better than other people.<sup>104</sup>

On the basis of the evidence presented here, there was not much difference between the prelates and the secular nobility when it comes to sinful use of money. The sole difference is that prelates could not take part in tournaments,

---

100 Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora*. In Matthaei Parisiensis Monachi Sancti Albani Chronica Majora. Ed. H.R. Luard. Vol. V A.D. 1248 to A.D. 1259 (London 1880), p. 237. "Amici, magnum fecimus, postquam in hanc urbem venimus, utilitatem et elemosinam. Quando enim primo huc venimus, tria vel quatuor prostibula invenimus; sed nunc recedentes unum solum relinquimus. Verum ipsum durat continuatum ab Orientali porta civitatis usque ad occidentalem."

101 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*, Feria tertia prime hebdomade. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 10r. "Per boves signantur superbi quod est peccatum magnatorum et prelatorum."

102 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*, Feria tertia secunde hebdomade. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 19r-v. "In presenti vita Dominus esse uoluit quosdam prelatos et quosdam subditos, et utrisque certas regulas dedit. A prelati namque dedit tres regulas. Prima est ut subditos uerbis et exemplis instruant. Secunda est quod sibi fortia et subditos leuiora imponant. Tertia est quod de potestate sibi collata non gloriantur nec superbiant. Contra primam regulam faciunt uerbosi, contra secundam superstitiosi, contra tertiam ambitiosi prelati. [...] Illud uitium uane glorie uere prelati est commune et difficile potest uinci."

103 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, 4.3.3-5. BAV. Vat.lat. 1018. ff. 101r-103r. "Nullus ergo se extollat ex tali electione sed magis se humiliet prout ait Bernardus: [...]"

104 Salimbene de Adam OFM, *Cronica*. A cura di Giuseppe Scalia, t. I (Bari 1966), pp. 161-162.

since the shedding of blood was absolutely forbidden to members of the clergy. It seems that this prohibition was also obeyed, since I have not been able to locate sources that mention prelates taking part in tournaments. The point is, however, that the patterns of the negative or sinful behaviour of regular and secular élite were more or less the same.

### 3.3. Do Merchants have a Hope of Salvation?

This is a question put forward by the pupil in Honorius Augustodunensis' *Elucidarium*. The answer is not very encouraging: "A slim one, since they acquire almost all that they own by fraud, perfidy and other dishonest methods."<sup>105</sup> In Honorius' eyes the profession of merchant was inevitably connected with lying and dishonesty. He did not stand much chance of surviving the final judgement. Honorius wrote at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Were his ideas still prevalent (not that we know much about the contemporary importance of his writings) among the thirteenth-century mendicant writers?

The profession of merchant was one of those which were rehabilitated during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The scholastic method made it possible to make the difference between occupations sinful as such (*ex natura*) and others that were sinful under some specific circumstances (*ex occasione*) but otherwise quite legitimate. The merchant's occupation was accepted because of its public utility. No country was self-sufficient in all goods, and therefore a certain amount of trade was necessary. The merchant's profession was accepted as long as he pursued it honestly, that is, without cheating and lying, and his motives were right. He was supposed to gain enough profit to support himself and his family, but not seek to be rich. That would have been avarice.<sup>106</sup>

If we look into the Lazarus sermons we find that the merchant's profession was acknowledged to be honest as such, but certain comments on the cold realities of the thirteenth-century business world were brought forward. Peregrinus de Oppeln writes in a tone very similar to the above general arguments: "Trade as such is good and necessary to human beings, for God ordained that no country will be self-sufficient in everything, but one supports another, and this is done through the mediation of trade." However, immediately after these words he writes that in practice the trade is so pervaded with human malice that many merchants will be damned.<sup>107</sup>

Having described the situation in general, Peregrinus gives an example of typical sins committed in trade. He describes the situation (actually giving the

---

105 Cited in A. Gurevich, *Medieval Popular Culture*, p. 154.

106 J. Le Goff, *Métiers licites et métiers illicites*, pp. 97-99; L.K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, pp. 178-179.

107 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 47v. "Negociatio quidem bona est et hominibus necessaria. Ordinavit enim Deus quod nulla terra sufficiat in omnibus, sed una alterius subueniat et hoc mediante negotiatione sed malicia hominum adeo implevit negotiationem quod multi negociatores dampnantur."



lines of the deceitful merchant), where a merchant cheats his fellow countryman to buy a habit at a price double its actual value.<sup>108</sup> The most annoying thing for Peregrinus seems to have been the oaths in the name of God or Gospel said in the process of trading. Sellers swear that they will not sell for less than so and so. Buyers swear that they will not pay more than so and so and both parties sin in perjury and lying. Peregrinus concludes that it is difficult to sell and buy without sinning.<sup>109</sup>

This short passage dealing with trade and merchants can be compared with other mendicant pastoral materials on the subject. Peregrinus accused merchants of cheating and lying. Next we may try to find out more about their typical sins. In Guillaume Peyraut's *Summa* there is a section titled Avarice of Merchants. What was indeed meant by avarice of merchants in the thirteenth century?

Guillaume mentions eight things: 1. Sell as dearly as possible and buy as cheap as possible 2. lying 3. false oath 4. theft committed by fraud with scales and measures (there are three different methods of cheating in these: when one uses different weights and measures selling with smaller and buying with larger, when one uses correct weights and measures but uses them wrongly, and lastly when one makes merchandise appear to be heavier than it really is). 5. hidden usury 6. show one commodity to the customer and sell another 7. hide the truth, and 8. choose a dark place in order to make inferior merchandise look good (this was especially typical of cloth merchants according to Peyraut).<sup>110</sup> Basically these faults of merchants seem to have been very similar to those presented by Honorius Augustotudensis or for that matter Peregrinus de Oppeln. Almost all were different species of fraud.

108 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis BL. Addit 18340, f. 47v. "Uenit amicus ad eum querens pannum et dicit: 'O bone compater te misit Deus ad me quia optimum pannum habeo quam paulo ante fere alteri uendideram, sed eum tibi reseruati tamen modo duo solidi nos separabant, bona cura erit et illos propter te perdam bone compater, accipe cito ne iste reuertatur.' Sicque mentiendo decipit amicum suum et quod libenter pro uno solido daret, compatri suo duo uendet." The part printed in italics is taken from another manuscript (BL. Royal coll. 8.E.III, f. 66r.) due to the corruption in MS. Addit. 18340. Those interested in the theatrical side of the preaching can compare this passage to a similar example of cheating in Bernardino da Siena's sermons; *Le prediche volgari di san Bernardino da Siena dette nella Piazza del Campo l'anno MCCCCXXVII*. Edite da Luciano Bianchi, vol. secundo (Siena 1884), p. 227.

109 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit 18340, ff. 47v-48r. "Difficile igitur est inter ementes et uendentes non interuenire peccatum, unus iurat quod non dabit nisi pro tanto, alter quod non dabit, tamen sic igitur peccatores mendaciis habundant."

110 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), T.IV, P. II, cap. 4 Fraudibus negotiatorum, pp. 151-152. "De octo malis abundantibus in mercatoribus: 1. Vendere quanto carius possunt, et emere quanto vilius possunt 2. Mendacia 3. Periuria 4. Furtum (per fraudes, quas faciunt circa stateras & pondera et mensuras). In talibus vero tripliciter est fraus. Uno modo, cum quis habet diversa pondera vel diversas mensuras, et vendit ad minorem, et emit ad maiorem. Secundo modo cum quis habet iustam mensuram, et iustus pondus, sed tamen male mensurat vel ponderat, sicut faciunt caupones qui mensuram implent spuma. Tertio modo cum quis procurat ut res quam ad pondus vendere debet ponderosior sit, ut faciunt illi qui lanam madefaciunt. 5. Vendere ad terminum, quod est species usurae palliatae 6. Aliud ostendere, et aliud vendere 7. Verum celare 8. Tenebrosa loca eligere, vel aliter procurare ut res venalis appareat alterius modi quam sit, sicut accidit in mercatoribus, qui tenebras faciunt in locis in quibus debent pannos vendere."

Peyraut's view of the merchant's sins seems to have been widely accepted since we find it adopted by several other writers as well. It is to be found in slightly modified form in *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus* by another Lyons Dominican Étienne (or Stephan) de Bourbon written between 1250-1261.<sup>111</sup> Peyraut's three ways of cheating with scales and measures are borrowed almost *verbatim* by his confrere Antonio Azaro Parmense in his *Sermones quadragesimales*.<sup>112</sup> Peyraut's division is also reflected in *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis* by the Italian Franciscan Servasanto da Faenza.<sup>113</sup>

When we look at those mendicant writers who have formed their opinion without directly borrowing from Guillaume Peyraut we reach the same conclusions. Malachy of Ireland states that the sin of merchants is lying and fraud.<sup>114</sup> The anonymous Franciscan writer of *Determinationes quaestionum circa regulam fratrum minorum* advises preachers to warn certain social groups of specific sins. He gives as an example the merchants and their connection with fraud and lying.<sup>115</sup> Raymund of Peñaforte writes in his *Summa de casibus*:

*"What should the penitential judge do with the merchants, skimmers and other such people, who have for a long time had, I call it not a custom but a corruption that they cannot buy or sell anything without lies, careless oaths and occasional false oaths. In short: they lie to simple people, convincing them that their inferior and corrupt goods are precious."*<sup>116</sup>

These examples should suffice to make the point. Making money out of lying and cheating was still widely considered to be especially a mercantile sin. Yet there seems to be an ongoing change in attitudes towards trade and merchants. At the same time when we are told of cheating and lying as a habit of merchants, we are also assured that it is not impossible to reach salvation being a merchant. In fact the very same writers who lash the habits of merchants in general praise the usefulness of trade practised in a proper way, that is, without lying and cheating. Before moving to his eight vices of merchants, Guillaume Peyraut reminds us: *"One has to note that trade in itself is good and necessary to man."*<sup>117</sup> These words are also repeated by Antonio Azaro Parmense before

111 Étienne de Bourbon OP, *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*, p. 376.

112 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Sermo in dominica II quadragesime. UUB. C 347, f. 46v. "Item in mensuris et ponderibus minorando maiora recipiendo. Secundo cum iustum pondus habendo male mesurant et pondurant sicut faciunt tabernarii qui mensuram implent spumi. Tertio cum procurant ut res tempore venditionis sit ponderosior sicut lanam madidant dum vendunt vel argentum dum ponderant."

113 Servasanto da faenza OFM, *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis*, Firenze Bibl. Nazionale Conv. sopr. E.VI.1046. f. 105r.

114 Malachy of Ireland OFM, *Venenum Malachie*, BAV. Vat. lat. 4347. f. 53v.

115 Anonymous OFM, *Determinationes quaestionum circa regulam fratrum minorum*, p. 359. "Et quibusdam generibus hominum quaedam vitia sunt magis usitata, ut mercatoribus fraus et mendacia, [...]."

116 Raymund of Peñaforte OP, *Summa de paenitentia*, II.8. De negotiis saecularibus. p. 564. "Sed quid faciet iudex paenitentialis de mercatoribus, pellipariis et similibus qui de longa, non dico consuetudine sed corruptela, nec emere sciunt nec vendere absque mendaciis et iuramentis incautis necnon et interdum periuriis et breviter: mentiuntur simplicibus rem vilem vel corruptam pretiosam esse, [...]."

117 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), T.4, P.II, cap. IV Fraudibus negotiatorum. p. 150. "Et notandum est, quod negotio bona est in se et hominibus necessaria."

going on to say that most merchants are no better than robbers or usurers.<sup>118</sup> The same attitude towards trade is to be discovered in Franciscan writers. Guibert de Tournai accepts trade and gathering of wealth as long as it is not motivated by avarice. "Gold and silver make neither good men nor bad men: the use of them is good, and the abuse of them is bad."<sup>119</sup>

Fruitful sources of further evidence as to the opinions of the friars on merchants and trade are the sermons on Jesus and the merchants and moneylenders in the temple (Matth. 21:12-13., Mark 11:15-17, Luke 19:45-46 and John 2:14-16.). The Dominican Giordano da Pisa preached in Florence on 14th March 1305 on the theme *Auferte ista hinc et nolite facere domum patris mei domum negotiationis*. In this sermon he poses the question: "Is trade good or not (la mercatantia è cosa buona o non)?"<sup>120</sup>

The answer is that trade is good and legitimate when conducted properly, and bad and illicit when done badly, but as such, it is good ("[...] *ssi può dire che la mercatantia, ch'è buona da sé [...]*"). According to Giordano, there are four possible ways of sinning in trade. The first of these is simony, that is selling and buying things that should not be sold or bought. The second vice is injustice. This includes all the methods of cheating customers with material, price or measure. It also includes vices of the tongue (falsehood, lies, and perjury). The third is irreverence, and the fourth avarice. Giordano leaves the detailed consideration of the two latter to the same evening and ends his sermon by remarking that these vices are very common in Florence ("Or vedete se la cittade è bene tutta intrecciata in queste malaventure!")

His evening *collatio* starts by explaining what is irreverence in trade. This could be done in three ways, that is doing business in churches or other sacred places, during Sundays and feast days, or while being a member of a clerical order. Avarice in trade is a question of motive, it is illegal to try to gain too much profit. However, this does not mean an absolute prohibition on getting rich. If one manages to gain riches without avaricious motives, it is completely acceptable. Giordano ends this *collatio* by warning his audience of the dangers of this profession. Being a merchant is like being in fire and trying to avoid burning, or stepping into mud and trying to stay clean ("E però così è di pericolo stare nell'arte e nella cittade, come chi stesse nel fuoco e non ardesse, o andasse per loto e non s'infangasse.").<sup>121</sup>

A change from despised and sinful trade to trade accepted and useful for society is clearly seen in these sources. The actual role of mendicants in this

118 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Sermo in dominica II quadragesime. UUB. C 347, f. 46r-v. "[...] negotiatio enim in se bona et necessaria est [...] malicia enim homini adeo implevit fraudibus negotiationem quod multi mercatores non minus sunt mali quam raptores vel usurarii [...]."

119 D.L. d'Avray, *Sermons to the Upper Bourgeoisie by a Thirteenth Century Franciscan*, pp. 194-196. d'Avray's analysis is based on the Guibert's sermon *Ad cives communiter viventes* (theme: *Qui amat divitias fructum non capiet ex eis*, Eccles. 5:9). The whole sermon is transcribed in his *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 260-271.

120 Giordano da Pisa OP, *Quaresimale Fiorentino 1305-1306*. Edizione critica per cura di Carlo Delcorno (Firenze 1974), sermo lii, pp. 268-272.

121 Giordano da Pisa OP, *Quaresimale Fiorentino 1305-1306*, sermo liiii. pp. 273-274.

process of change is open to debate, but one thing is certain: it can be found in their writings, not only university theological, but also in pastoral. Even though the occupation of the merchant had become universally acceptable, as we have seen, there remained several severe spiritual dangers in it. Therefore the real question is not whether it was possible to be a merchant without sinning (the answer to that was yes), but whether merchants were usually considered to be sinners.

We have seen that some writers do make the connection between merchant and avarice (cheating, fraud) almost automatically. Similarly the standard methods of cheating were repeated almost mechanically whenever the subject of merchants was taken up. I nevertheless feel that they were dealt with more positively in pastoral literature than, for instance, knights. The general tone seems to be to stress the possibilities instead of the dangers in doing business.

Occasionally the bad spending habits of the urban rich are emphasised in the sources. Humbert de Romans mentions them in his sermon *Ad maiores civitatis*. He reprehends the upper bourgeoisie for using their fortunes to live too delicately (and here comes the point) *as the rich man who was clothed with purple fine linen and who fared sumptuously every day*. Humbert exhorts those rich to be careful lest they be buried with the rich man of the parable in hell.<sup>122</sup>

### 3.4 The Poor as Good Christians

#### 3.4.1 The Poor and the Sick

The Lazarus sermons gave three principal reasons for the saintliness of the poor. These were: poverty itself, supporting it without complaining, and perseverance in the temptations that poverty brings with it. In this chapter we shall look into these virtues and how they were connected to the poor in *ad status* materials. We may start with Guibert de Tournai, who wrote four sermons addressed *Ad pauperes et afflictos*.

The central message of these sermons is the exhortation to be patient and not to envy others. Recompense will eventually follow in heaven. In the first of these sermons he cites Augustine:

*"Where the eternal salary is given, the tribulations that in this world seemed long, appear to be short and easy to bear. And this is the reason why they ought to bear their tribulations, be they sent by the Lord or imposed on them as a penance, since having suffered small affliction they will receive much good, having suffered in small things be it in form of insults or being*

---

122 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 74 *Ad maiores civitatis*. "Alii sunt qui non solum vitam otiosam sed nimis delicatam ducunt cum divite evangelico induto in purpura et bysso et epulantes quotidie splendide et ideo timeant ne cum ipso sepeliantur in inferno."

*despoiled of goods, or bodily anguish, they will receive many good things, grace in the present life, glory in the future.*"<sup>123</sup>

For Augustine earthly tribulation was the primary form of "purgatory". The penitential process was first and foremost a matter of this world.<sup>124</sup> Earthly tribulation could of course take the form of poverty, disease or hard physical labour.

In the second sermon Guibert stresses that the tribulations the poor and the sick suffer, are not a sign of God's hate but of his love. He writes that most of the saints from the days of Abel till the present have suffered tribulation with the sole exception of Solomon, who lived amongst riches.<sup>125</sup> After these come the three sermons *Ad leprosos et afflictos*. They are very similar to those on the poor, in fact the third uses as its theme the text *Factum est ut moreretur mendicus et portaretur ab angelis in sinum Abrahe*, Lk. 16:22. This sermon is a fairly common Lazarus sermon save for the fact that it is more concerned with the beggar than with the rich man. As a matter of fact, all of Guibert's sermons for the poor and the sick are very similar to the Lazarus sermons.

The general scheme of Guibert's *Ad leprosos et abiectos* sermons constitutes temptation, perseverance and eternal reward. Even the theme chosen for these sermons is very informative, *Dominus temptavit illos et invenit eos dignos*, Wis. 3:5. This is exactly the same passage Guibert cited already in the above translated passage in the first sermon *Ad pauperes et afflictos*. Having stated his theme, Guibert immediately drives home the central lesson: "'Temptation is the life of a man in this world.' Job 7. But let them know that as there is no lack of temptation, similarly there will be no lack of remedy." The rest of the sermon seeks to warn the audience of the different ways in which they are tempted and how to resist them.<sup>126</sup>

Guibert's strategy of using Job as an example of the man who bears patiently his disease and other trials finally to obtain reward, was a natural solution when preaching to the sick and the poor. In many ways the book of Job was an ideal source for the Lazarus sermons. Job himself was an archetype of the patient poor and sick man. He was in one respect an Old Testament counterpart to Lazarus, and furthermore, he was also an archetype of the virtuous rich man. Before his misfortunes Job was an extremely rich man who constantly

123 Guibert de Tournai, *Sermones ad status. Ad pauperes et afflictos, sermo primus*. BN. lat. 15943, f. 100r. "Ubi merces eterna retribuetur breue et leue uidebitur quod in tribulationibus seculi longum uidebatur et hoc est causa cur debent sustineri tribulationes siue a Domino mittantur, siue per penitentiam iniungantur quia 'in paucis uexati in multis bene disponentur,' 'in paucis uexati' siue sit contumelia uerborum siue spoliatio rerum siue angustia corporum, 'in multis bene disponentur.' In presenti per gratiam, in futuro per gloriam." The biblical citation is from Wis. 3:5.

124 J. Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory* (Aldershot 1990), p. 70.

125 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status. Ad pauperes et afflictos, sermo secundus*. BN. lat. 15943, f. 103r. "Quantum ad primum non est tribulatio signum diuini odii sed amoris, omnes enim sancti ab Abel usque hodiernum diem tribulati sunt, solus Salomon in deliciis uixit."

126 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status. Ad leprosos et abiectos, sermo primus*. Edited in N. Bériou et F-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus*, pp. 129-135. "'temptatio est uita hominis super terram.' Job VII. [...] Sed sicut non deficiunt temptamenta, ita non deficiunt remedia."

behaved according to the norms the Church set for the rich. All this put together caused the book of Job to be extensively quoted in Lazarus sermons.

Job's archetypal nature did not escape the ever-observing mind of Humbert de Romans:

*"Likewise they suffer everything patiently, being comforted by the example of the very same Job, as it says in the last chapter of James: 'You have heard of the patience of Job.' Good indeed is such an example to follow! For if Job, who was like a king, a very rich man, and almost innocent, so patiently bore losing so great a fortune and his own sons, and so grave and vile sickness 'from the sole of his foot even to the top of his head,' then how much more should others, who do not suffer from equal conditions, be patient in their smaller misfortunes!"<sup>127</sup>*

Guibert's second sermon *Ad leprosos* is on the same theme. After citing it he notes that temptation is a sign of close familiarity with God. There are four reasons why God tempts us. He likes to put his friends on trial, purge those who have been on trial, make humble the purged, and give the crown to the humble. These temptations are withstood with voluntary poverty and temperance, and through patience. Guibert stresses that only those who have been tempted and found to be good can actually obtain salvation. Therefore one should not despair in adversities, since in the long run they are for one's own good. He reminds us (citing Augustine) that even the slightest of the punishments in purgatory is far worse than anything imaginable in this world.<sup>128</sup> The general message is that the lepers and the outcast are in fact happier than those who do their penance in purgatory instead of through adversities in this world.

Humbert de Romans' approach to the poor is similar. He writes that the poor should be satisfied with their present condition and not try to improve it by sinful measures such as stealing. They ought not to complain and certainly not to blaspheme against God because of their adversities. Humbert consoles them by listing a good many of the anti-rich passages in the *Bible*, including the Lazarus parable.<sup>129</sup> John of Wales points out that the poverty is not to be poor, but to be poor and desire to be rich. If one is content with what one has he is rich, no matter how little money or goods he has. Therefore the poor ought to be happy with whatever it is that they have and alleviate their poverty by meditating on the dangers of being rich. If one were obliged to crystallise John's advice to the poor with one word, it would be patience.<sup>130</sup> Jenny Swanson points out that John's vaguely sympathetic attitude to the genuine poor is

---

127 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermo ad leprosos*. Edited in N. Bériou et F-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus*, p. 162.

128 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. *Ad leprosos et abiectos*, sermo secundus. Edited in N. Bériou et F-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus*, pp. 136-145.

129 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 81 *Ad pauperes*.

130 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, 3.4.2. *De admonitione pauperum*.

characteristic of the thirteenth century.<sup>131</sup> One might add that it is especially characteristic of the mendicants of that century.

### 3.4.2 The workers

Another group who generally received sympathy from the mendicant preachers were the manual workers – *laboratores*, even if they are rarely mentioned in Lazarus sermons. The mendicant social ethos, presented as a hypothesis, included an ideal picture of both the poor and those who work. Therefore we have to look into other material in order to verify this hypothesis as it applies to labourers. There are three categories of workers who frequently appear in the sources: farmers, agricultural labour, and urban workers (mainly artisans). The latter category is slightly complicated, since sometimes they were treated in terms similar to those used of merchants and sometimes as workers. This reflects the actual situation. The wealthier artisans were not much poorer than the merchants.

The basic idea found in the Lazarus sermons was that manual labour was considered to be a penance and thus it had a sanctifying effect on the worker. This penitential role of labour is noted in Nicolas de Gorran's *Distinctiones*: "*Labour: Good labour can be divided in many ways. The first division is built around penitence and it is threefold. The first part is contrition in heart. [...] The second is confession of mouth. [...] The third is satisfaction in work. This is the work of the monks or peasants who till the soil.*"<sup>132</sup> Nicolas here connects hard physical labour with the threefold process of penitence. It is presented as one of the methods of satisfaction. This was no novelty in the thirteenth century. The idea of penitential labour had already been current for centuries.<sup>133</sup> Nevertheless, the almost casual comparison between the monks and the peasants gives us some idea of the value of toil in the eyes of a mendicant brother.

Guibert de Tournai has two sermons addressed *Ad agricolas et rurales*. He begins the first one saying:

*"Work is penitence imposed upon Adam and his sons, Gen. 3. 'In the sweat of thy face etc.' As the priests work in their churches, the monks in monasteries, similarly the farmers work in the field and with that labour they perform the penitence imposed on them by God, gain their sustenance, and have eternal life.*"<sup>134</sup>

131 J. Swanson, *John of Wales*, p. 134.

132 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Distinctiones*. Labor. BL, Royal coll. 9.B.IV, f. 170v. "Labor: Bonus labor distinguitur multiplex. Primus penitentium et hic triplex, primus contritionis in corde. [...] Secundus confessionis in ore. [...] Tercius satisfactionis in opere. Hic est labor monachi uel rustici terram curantis."

133 J. Le Goff, *Métier et profession*, pp. 172-173.

134 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad agricolas et rurales, sermo primus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 135r. "Labor est penitentia iniuncta Ade et filiis suis Gen. 3. 'In sudore uultus tui etc.' Sicut enim clerici laborant in ecclesiis, monachi in claustris sic agricole in agro et ex labore isto penitentiam sibi iniunctam a Deo faciunt et inde uictum acquirunt et uitam eternam habebunt."

There seems to be no difference in the theology of work between Franciscan Guibert de Tournai and Dominican Nicolas de Gorran. Both were convinced that physical labour undertaken in the fields was of a penitential nature.

Guibert's sermon resembles the positive stereotype of medieval peasants presented in research. The peasants were seen as better Christians. They were closer to the original human beings created by God in Paradise and closer to God himself than more powerful members of society. Sometimes they were idealised up to the point where they ceased to be mere men. Their humanity was of higher, saintly type.<sup>135</sup>

Jacques Le Goff notes that Genesis 3:16-19, cited above in Guibert's sermon, was the most frequently commented and popular passage about work in the Old Testament. He emphasises the role of work as a curse and punishment of God after the original sin.<sup>136</sup> Stressing the punitive aspect he fails to see the possibility of salvation through work – the penitential aspect of this citation. The sources in this study put the emphasis strongly on the penitential and sanctifying nature of manual work. It is not seen as punishment, but as a possible means of regaining what was lost at the Fall. To be fair one must note that this "new spirituality of work" is noted in another article by Le Goff. According to him the late twelfth and the early thirteenth century saw the breakthrough of the new, more positive attitude towards physical labour. Writers of Bible commentaries rushed to stress the importance of the fact that the creation of world by God was work. It was also underlined that Adam did work in Paradise (Gen. 2:15-16).<sup>137</sup>

Guibert's second sermon opens with a similar statement: "*Man is born to labour, as in Ecclesiasticus 7 [7:16]: 'Hate not laborious works or husbandry ordained by the most High.' since the idle call those who work rustics, even though they are more noble than themselves.*" The rest of the sermon is dedicated to reasons why work is useful. It is useful to discipline one's flesh, to educate children, to gain sustenance, to be able to give alms, to resist temptation, to be purged of one's guilt, to imitate the holy fathers, and last but not least, to gain access to eternal life. This last point is painstakingly reasoned with several biblical citations such as Ecclesiasticus 51:35. "*I have laboured a little and have found much rest to myself.*"<sup>138</sup>

This sermon repeats the idea of the sanctifying effects of manual labour. Furthermore it says that those who work are more noble than those who live in idleness. Although Guibert does not explicitly say who are the idle he is referring to, one may assume that they are nobles, since he emphasises that workers are

---

135 P. Freedman, *Sainteté et sauvagerie, deux images du paysan au Moyen Âge*. *AËSC* 3/1992, pp. 540-541; A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, pp. 238-239.

136 J. Le Goff, *Le travail dans les systèmes de valeur*. In *Le travail au Moyen Âge. Une approche interdisciplinaire*. Édité par Jacqueline Hamesse et Colette Muraille-Samaran (Louvain-La-Neuve 1990), pp. 11-12.

137 J. Le Goff, *Métier et profession*, pp. 172-173.

138 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad agricolos et rurales, sermo secundus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 136v. "Homo ad laborem natus est unde Ecclesiasticus 7: 'Ne oderitis laboriosa opera et rusticationem ab altissimo creatam' quia ociosi uocant rusticos eos qui laborant cum tamen nobiliores sint eis."



more noble than they. In these two sermons work (and to be more precise, manual work) is certainly idealised. It is seen as a necessary basic requirement for living. Guibert cites the apostle Paul's second epistle to Thessalonians 3:10 "[...] if any would not work, neither should he eat."<sup>139</sup> He also treats physical labour as a means to achieve salvation. In this respect Guibert follows the same line of tradition as Honorius Augustotudensis in his *Elucidarium*.

These same matters were brought up by Aquinas in his commentary on the *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*. According to him there are three advantages in work: it secures physical sustenance, it protects against idleness, and it helps one to govern one's passions.<sup>140</sup> The main difference is that Thomas does not say explicitly that manual work is a way of achieving salvation, but then again, he was writing for a learned audience, whereas Guibert had workers themselves in his mind. Thomas' point of view is that manual work helps to establish conditions that make salvation possible. Nevertheless, it is not enough to guarantee it. Guibert, having a different, less educated audience in mind, wanted to present his message in a more down to earth manner.

It had been a common custom of the mendicant movement from the very outset to attack the idleness. Saint Francis himself wrote in his Testament: "I have worked with my hands and I firmly wish that all my brothers should work at some honourable trade. And if they do not know how, let them learn." Thus for Saint Francis poverty did not mean idleness and living off the goodwill of others. Brothers were encouraged to work with their hands. The request for alms was only an alternative, though completely honest, way of acquiring life's necessities when working failed to produce enough.<sup>141</sup> Even if the importance of specifically manual work as a Franciscan practice soon diminished (and never prevailed in the Dominican order), the importance of work remained, only it was interpreted to include mental work as well. Therefore virtuous poverty simply could not mean living without work save in those cases where physical inability made work impossible.

It was left to the Dominican Guillaume Peyraut to put laziness into the systematical classification of the sins. He placed it in the system of the seven capital sins as a subspecies of sloth. Peyraut's view was that everyone is obliged to work and failing to do so is automatically sinful. Peyraut's views were echoed by numerous followers, although the meaning of work differed between different social strata. Members of the clergy were obliged to preach, pray, feed the poor and so on, whereas the workers were supposed to do manual work.<sup>142</sup>

---

139 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad agricolos et rurales, sermo secundus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 136v. "Est etiam utilis ad filiorum educationem et uite proprie sustentationem, secundum illud Apostoli II Thess. 3: 'Qui non laborat, nec manducet.'"

140 Ph. Delhayé, *Quelques aspects de la doctrine thomiste et néo-thomiste du travail*. In *Le travail au Moyen Âge. Une approche interdisciplinaire*. Édités par Jacqueline Hamesse et Colette Muraille-Samaran (Louvain-La-Neuve 1990), pp. 165-166.

141 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, p. 11; D. Flood, *The Domestication of the Franciscan Movement*. *Franziskanische Studien* 60 (1978), pp. 313-314.

142 S. Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth: Acedia in Medieval Thought and Literature* (Chapel Hill 1967), pp. 91-94.

The writer of the *Fasciculus morum* agrees with Peyraut that it is important to work to be able to resist the sin of sloth:

*"In order to overcome and uproot sloth, liveliness or busyness in honourable and good works now enters the ring. But notice that holy and honourable activity is of two kinds, active and contemplative, that is, temporal and spiritual. The first kind occurs in physical work which people undertake in due season and for various necessary purposes, such as plowing, sowing, reaping, brewing, baking, tailoring, sewing, building houses, and the like."*<sup>143</sup>

The important difference between the *Fasciculus morum* and the above-cited texts is that here the holiness of labour is connected not only to agricultural labour, but to other occupations as well. These activities are noted under the heading *Holy Activity (De occupatione sancta)*. This heading implies that work was seen as a positive measure, not only as a way to fight idleness. This is certainly Guibert de Tournai's approach. He underlines the good effects of physical work, not the damage done by being idle.

Guibert's sermons *Ad artifices et mechanicos* follow the pattern set in sermons to the farmers. Even the very theme of the sermons is chosen to underline the importance of work (Sir. 51:38 "*Operamini opus vestrum ante tempus et dabit vobis mercedem vestram in tempore suo.*") The theme is presented in such a tone as to give the impression that it suffices to work hard to obtain salvation. Guibert cites *Genesis* again to prove that man is intended for work and then goes on to cite the dangers of idleness. Idleness leads to unclean thoughts, inept levity (that is vain games and so on), and temptation.<sup>144</sup> The second sermon concentrates on the need to work while there is still time and on the rewards to be gained from timely labour, that is the "*dabit vobis mercedem vestram*" -part of the theme. The ultimate reward of course is eternal salvation.<sup>145</sup> The third category of Guibert's sermon to workers, namely the sermons *Ad ancillas et servos* (three of them), do not put the emphasis on the need for hard work even though this *topos* is mentioned. The main point in these sermons is obedience towards masters.

Humbert de Romans has similar views of the value of work. His work ethos is presented in the sermon *Ad laicos in villis*. Humbert starts his sermon with a negative example: "*Note that there are certain people who live in this world on sin, be it usury or theft or robbery or fraud or lies or other means of bad acquisition and keeping, and these are for the major part the rich of the secular world.*"<sup>146</sup> Since we have seen above who were the secular rich who gained

143 *Fasciculus morum*, p. 423.

144 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad mechanicos et artifices, sermo primus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 137v-138r.

145 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad mechanicos et artifices, sermo secundus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 140r-141v.

146 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 78 Ad laicos in villis. "Notandum quod sunt quidam in hoc mundo qui vivunt de peccato, utpote de usura vel furto, vel rapina vel fraudibus vel mendaciis vel aliis male acquisitiis vel habitis, et isti pro magna parte sunt divites mundi seculares."

their fortune by robbery, usury, fraud and so on, there is no further need to go into detail. Humbert continues:

*"Yet there are others who live off just work but not their own, but of others. While the peasants go to work, they spend their time in idleness. They are mainly rich clerics and the religious, and therefore they often burst into grave crimes. Of that Ezekiel 16: 'Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom, pride, fulness of bread and so on.'"*<sup>147</sup>

In this passage Humbert actually calls into question the lifestyle of the old monastic orders and rich prelates. He probably did not mean the Mendicants, since they were not living in idleness according to his standards. Preaching and hearing confessions were regarded as work.

Then he passes to a truly acceptable and saintly way of life. His description uses more or less all the passages in the *Bible* which were generally used in recommending physical labour:

*"There are others who live off just labour and they are farmers who live in the villages. Their lifestyle is recommended in Ecclesiasticus 7: 'Hate not laborious works, nor husbandry ordained by the most High.' Again note that this is the life we were meant to live from the beginning of this world. Genesis 3: 'Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.' This is also the life of Paul in the primitive church: Acts 20: 'These hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me.' We are also taught to live thus in I Thessalonians 4: 'Work with your own hands, as we commanded you' and later 'If any would not work, neither should he eat.'"*<sup>148</sup>

After the authority of the Apostle, Humbert moves on to desert fathers. Then he comes to the *topos* (familiar from Guibert de Tournai) of work as a penance imposed by God to Adam and his sons:

*"And note that it is also penitence imposed in the beginning on man by the supreme priest Gen. 3: 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.' This is also an occupation that guards man from many sins he would commit were he left idle, as an unattended field produces weed Gen. 2: 'And the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden of joy to dress it and to guard it', that is to guard man from sins in this way."*<sup>149</sup>

---

147 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 78 Ad laicos in villis. "Alii autem sunt qui vivunt de iusto sed non de labore proprio imo de alieno intrantes in labores agricolarum quibus laborantes ipsi morantur in otio et ipsi pro magna parte sunt clerici et religiosi ac divites et ideo frequenter prorumpunt in gravia scelera. Iuxta illud Ezechie 16: 'Hec fuit iniquitas sodome, superbia, saturitas panis etc.'"

148 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 78 Ad laicos in villis. "Alii sunt qui vivunt de iusto labore et isti sunt agricole habitantes in villis ad cuius vite commendationem dicitur Eccl. 7: 'Ne oderis laboriosa opera et rusticationem ab altissimo creatam.' Item notandum quod hec est vita ad quam ducendum sumus ab initio in hoc mundo positi Genesis 3: 'Emisit Dominus Adam de paradiso voluptatis ut operaretur terra de qua sumptus est.' Hec est enim vita quam in primitiva ecclesia ducebat Paulus Act. 20: 'Ad ea que mihi opus erant et his qui mecum sunt ministraverunt manus iste.' Et iterum ducendam docebat Thes. 4: 'Operamini manibus vestris sicut precipimus' et post 'Et si quis non vult operari, non manducet.'"

149 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 78 Ad laicos in villis. "Et nota quod hec est penitentia a principio imposita homini a summo sacerdote Gen. 3: 'In sudore

Humbert goes on to list certain obligations of the farmers, such as regular church attendance, giving alms according to their means, paying their dues to the church and their temporal lords, and so on. Then he presents an *exemplum* of the pious farmer who manages to exorcise a demon, even though it was impossible for a hermit of holy reputation. The hermit asks the farmer who he is, and the farmer replies describing himself with characteristics of an ideal farmer (honest, faithful to his wife, hard working, praying and praising God all the time). Humbert finishes his argument: "*Happy are the farmers who lead such or a similar life. More of them seem to be saved than from the other groups of the laity.*"<sup>150</sup> On the whole, Humbert's sermon is a proper eulogy of agrarian life and farm work.

This impression becomes even stronger when one looks to his instructions to Dominican confessors, where he writes that the farmers are martyrs of God if they work with the right intention. He gives three examples of what he means by this. They are to fulfil the penance imposed on men by God (Gen. 3.), subdue the flesh to avoid laziness, and gather money to be able to give alms.<sup>151</sup>

The latter part of Humbert's sermon *Ad laicos in villis* is, when considering the message and not the exact wording, almost like a replica of John of Wales' admonitions to preachers concerning the workers. He too instructs them to prefer work to idleness or begging, pray to God in working, and pay tithes and give alms to the poor according to their means. If they so do, they can count on God's mercifulness and will be accepted by Him. Then follow the already familiar *exemplum* of the farmer and the hermit.<sup>152</sup> John's approach to manual labour and workers is as positive as Guibert's and Humbert's. All these friars make it perfectly clear that being a worker and working hard are not only deterrents of sin, but indeed as such virtuous things.

Not only were the workers considered to be better "Christians" they were also socially useful. Several writers go out of their way to point out that they are an important part of society's structure. Guibert de Tournai refers to the householder in Matthew 20 who sent different labourers to his vineyard. Then he says that God has wisely organised the republic of the Church in such a manner that one is subordinate to another and people supplement each others'

---

vultus tui vesceris pane tuo.' Item hec est occupatio que custodit hominem a multis peccatis que faceret si esset otiosus, sicut terra otiosa facile geminat herbas malas Gen. 2: 'Posuit Dominus hominem in paradysum voluptatis ut operaretur et custodiret illum', scilicet hominem per hunc modum a peccatis."

150 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 78 Ad laicos in villis. "Felices agricolae qui talem vitam vel similem ducunt. Plures de talibus videntur salvari quam de alio genere laicorum."

151 Humbert de Romans OP, *Instructiones de officiis ordinis*. Cap. XLVI De officio confessoris, pp. 362-363.

152 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, I.10.3. BAV. Vat.lat. 1018. f. 54v. "[...] et malent manibus laborare quam ociose uiuere uel mendicare et ut laborando Deum orent et inuocent et ut ecclesie soluent decimas et oblaciones et helemisinas prout possunt faciunt. Si hec fecerint sperare possint de misericordia Dei et uere tales sunt accepti Deo." The exemplum in question is Tubach no. 1600.

weaknesses. Guibert continues: "[...] without different artisans and their work the community of this world could not survive."<sup>153</sup>

John of Wales' approach is more subtle. He uses the comparison between the human body and society to prove his point. Workers are the feet of the body and their function is to support the other parts by producing necessities that are required to keep life going.<sup>154</sup> The whole first book of *Communiloquium* is built around this physiological simile. The ruler is the head, officials and judges represent the ears, the king's council is the heart, soldiers the hands and, as stated, workers the feet. None of the parts can survive without others. According to Jenny Swanson John took this simile from the pseudo-Plutarchan *Institutio Traiani*.<sup>155</sup> The idea of society presented as a human body was reintroduced into western thinking by John of Salisbury in his *Policraticus*.<sup>156</sup> Since the *Policraticus* was one of John of Wales' favourite sources, it could be that he took the idea from there instead of the *Institutio Traiani*. Later this analogy was used by several other writers; here it is enough to note Jacopo da Varazze.<sup>157</sup>

The importance of the workers is also stressed by Jacopo da Cessole in his allegorical presentation of the game of chess. He writes:

*"Thirdly the readers should know that pawns are put before the noblemen on the chessboard in the first square, for in a certain way they are the crown of the nobility. What would the right hand tower do, who is the vicar of the king, if there were not a farmer whose task it is to take care of the production of food? What would the knight do, if there were not a blacksmith before him who prepares the harness, horseshoes, and saddle? What would be the value of the knight without a horse or knightly adornment, hardly nothing. He would be worth the pawn or even less. How would the nobles manage without clothes, if there were not those who make and sell textiles and merchandise? What would the kings and queens and others do without doctors? The pawns bring glory and life to the nobility. You knight or other nobleman, do not despise the ordinary people, but know that in this game they are placed before the nobility."*<sup>158</sup>

153 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad mechanicos et artifices, sermo primus. BN. lat. 15943, f. 137v "[...] sine diuersis artificibus et eorum operibus non sustineret ciuitas huius seculi."

154 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, L.10.1. BAV. Vat.lat. 1018, f. 54v. "[...] opus enim pedis est corpus sustentare et supportare necessaria vite preparando."

155 J. Swanson, *John of Wales*, p. 68.

156 J. Le Goff, *Métier et profession*, pp. 173-174.

157 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica XXIII post festum trinitatis. Sermo tertius (Venice 1497), f. 133r.

158 Jacopo da Cessole OP, *Libellus de moribus hominum et officiis nobiliorum super ludo scachorum*. L. IV, c. I. BAV. Vat.lat. 1042, f. 109v. "Circa tertium sciendum est quod populares statuuntur ante nobiles iuxta campum et ipsa quadra primo, quia populares quadammodo sunt corona nobilium nam dexter rochus qui est regis uicarius, quid posset facere nisi ante eum situatus esset agricola cui cura est temporalia ad uictum ministrare? Quid miles faceret nisi ante se fabrum haberet qui frena calcaria et cellas pararet? Quid ualet sine equo miles aut sine hiis que ad ornatum militis pertinent, certe nichil quam enim popularis et forte nimis posset ualere. Qualiter sine uestibus nobiles uiuerent si deessent qui pannos aut merces uenderet aut faceret? Quid reges aut regine facerent aut ceteri sine medicis? Gloria ergo nobilium ac uita populares sunt. Ne ergo tu miles aut nobilis populares despicias ante nobiles in hoc ludo populares noueris situatos."

Jacopo's book has been explained by referring to the unstable social and political situation of late thirteenth-century Northern Italy. According to J.K. Hyde, his motivation was to underline the common interests and mutual dependence of the *popolo* and nobility.<sup>159</sup> Hyde's article is a special study of civic unrest in Northern Italy and thus it is quite understandable that Jacopo's book appears to him as an attempt to find a solution to these pressing problems. This may have been the case (certainly pacifying turbulent city states was the main cause of friars during the Alleluia movement of 1233, not to mention later sermons of Bernardino da Siena). It is, however, interesting to note that similar texts were written in different circumstances in England and France, also that the popularity of Jacopo's *Libellus* was not limited to Italy. Its message was found to be interesting and relevant all over Europe.

Yet another presentation of society and the different functions of its members is presented in Jacques de Lausanne's *Compendium moralitatum*. Jacques speaks of the church, but everyone belonged to it, so it is really the same thing as society. Those who did not belong to the Church were also cast out of society. He compares the Church to a crown with four gems. The first of them stands for the kings and princes, whose duty it is to defend the Church against its visible enemies. The second gem means the priests and the religious, who defend the Church against its invisible enemies. The third stands for the doctors and the preachers who defend it against false doctrines and heretics. The last presents the farmers, who defend the Church against thirst and hunger by taking care of temporal things.<sup>160</sup>

All these three analogies of society (body, game of chess, and crown) have one thing in common. They all stress the importance and equality of the common workers in society. They have their own place in the system and they are as important for its functioning as the upper social groups.

Mendicant preachers were well aware of the fact that fulfilling their part in society did not bring much temporal profit to the poor. Jacques de Lausanne notes that those who feed others and do most of the work end up with the smallest part of profits: "[...] *they work more, and get less for it, they have hardly enough to eat.*" He adds that in other world it will be different; those who have worked will reap the greatest harvest. He says that so ought things to be in this world as well: "*In the just marketplace, those who claim share of profit are to take a share of the labour as well.*"<sup>161</sup>

159 J.K. Hyde, *Contemporary Views on Faction and Civil Strife in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Italy*. In *Violence and Disorder in Italian Cities, 1200-1500*. Edited by Lauro Martines (Berkeley - London 1972), p. 302.

160 Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Compendium moralitatum*. BN. lat. 16490, f. 15r. "Ecclesia est quasi corona que coronatur Christus in qua sunt quattuor lapides. Primum lapis in parte anteriori sunt reges et principes qui debent defendere eam ab hostibus visibilibus. Secundus lapis in parte posteriori sunt sacerdotes et religiosi qui sua oratione defendunt eam ab hostibus inuisibilibus. Tertius lapis est in parte dextera, sunt doctores et predicatorum qui eam defendunt ab erroribus et hereticis. Quartus ad sinistram lapis sunt agricole qui defendunt ecclesiam ab esurie et siti ministrando temporalia per eorum labores."

161 Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica II post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 366, f. 89r. "[...] plus laborant et minus lucrum reportant, uix habent qui commedant."; "In iusta mercatione particeps in lucro debet esse particeps in labore."

If one puts together everything said in this chapter, the picture is clear. Poverty and work are both as such good and virtuous things. Poverty, sickness and other temporal misfortunes are imbued with virtue because they are a sign of God's love. God tempts those who he loves, and if they stand the trial without lapsing into sin, they are to be rewarded with eternal life. All these things nicely confirm the picture drawn from the Lazarus sermons.

Manual work is virtuous essentially because it is a penance given to men by God through Adam. It was imposed on him when he was expelled from Paradise. Doing penance meant atoning for one's sins. Therefore a diligent farmer or worker could very well hope that he had repaid his debt to God through his work. On the other hand work also guarded man from sinful thoughts and actions. The logical conclusion was that putting all his effort into work, man stopped sinning more. At the same time he also compensated for his former sins. Thus it is no surprise that in ecclesiastical writings the concept of *sanctus rusticus* began to appear alongside the more established concept of *sanctus pauper*.<sup>162</sup>

---

162 F. Graus, *Poveri della città e delle campagne*, p. 75.

## ■ 4. Et videtur quod non – Objections to Hypothesis

In the preceding chapters it was pointed out how the mendicant preachers and the writers of pastoral literature commonly held the opinion that the poor and the workers were better Christians than the rich, the noble and the powerful. It was argued that this was more or less the general attitude of the friars, and in this respect there was no real difference between Dominican and Franciscan writers.

If there were differences in opinion concerning poverty, they are more likely to be found between texts produced within university circles on the one hand and the simpler pastoral material on the other. The real difference was not between the Dominicans and the Franciscans, but rather between Aquinas and Humbert de Romans or between Bonaventure and Guibert de Tournai, that is, between academic and popular writers. Nor would the differences seem to be geographical. Even though there were certain divergences of governmental system, level of urbanisation, and the social status of the different standings in different areas, there are no great differences in general tone say, between the German Berthold von Regensburg, the Italian Servasanto da Faenza, the British John of Wales, or the French Guillaume Peyraut. At least this is the implication of the sources analysed above. But is this the whole truth? Are there other ways to analyse and explain the Lazarus sermons and other contemporary material?

This chapter presents several counterarguments to these thesis. Some of them might appear to be too obviously wrong, even rather naïve, nevertheless I feel that it is important to present them here, since many of them have been circulating in previous research (some even in books by well-respected historians), and not all of them have been rebuked by other historians. All the arguments presented in this chapter will be annulled later on. They serve here only as possible alternative explanations. To put it briefly, in this chapter I am working as a devil's advocate against my own conclusions.

### 4.1. The Dead Weight of Tradition

It has been proposed that the mendicant social ethos, supporting the poor and the innocent against the violence and the oppression of the rich and the powerful, is the core message of the Lazarus sermons. Reading these sermons gives such an impression, but is that due to the original ideas and opinions of the preachers,



or were they merely operating within the framework laid down by the Gospel and the earlier exegetical tradition? Could the Lazarus parable really have been interpreted or presented in a tone neutral towards the rich and the powerful? It might conceivably be that the writers were prisoners of their own source material.

Starting from the Gospel text itself one notes that the Gospel of Saint Luke is through-out hostile to the rich and the economically better-off people. There are several passages which condemn riches and raise serious doubts as to the possibility of salvation for the wealthy. Besides the Lazarus parable there is Jesus' sermon on the mount, which says in Luke 6:24-25. "*But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep.*" Furthermore there is the parable of the sower who went out to sow his seed in Luke 8:14 "*And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection.*"

The message of the gospel is crystallised in Luke 18:22-25:

*"Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him: 'yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me'. And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich. And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said: 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God. For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.'"*

Apart from these more famous passages there are yet others (Luke 12:16-21, 16:13).

Given the general tone of the Gospel and especially the Lazarus parable, how could the sermons have taken a different attitude to the rich and riches? The writers might have tried to interpret it allegorically as did some of the Fathers (Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Bede), who generally interpreted the rich man to mean the Jews. Another possibility is that they might have dropped this theme altogether and chosen another, less controversial one, as Bonaventura did in his official Sunday sermon cycle.<sup>1</sup> Franciscans might have used their own lectionary, which had different reading for the day, and others might have used the epistle text instead of the Gospel. If we look into the model sermon collections we find that some important Franciscan writers did precisely that. A good example is Pierre de Saint Benoît, who is not included in this study – not because of his unpopularity, for his sermons were copied widely, but because he did not comment on Luke 16.<sup>2</sup> The fact remains, however, that the allegorical interpretation was not very fashionable among the sermonists of the thirteenth century, and the themes of the sermons normally

1 Bonaventura OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica prima post pentecosten. In this sermon Bonaventura uses Lk. 6:36 Estote misericordes, sicut Pater vester misericors est.

2 J.B. Scneyer, *Repertorium IV*, 789 (no. 92).

followed the Sunday gospels noted in lectionaries. For this reason most of the friars did preach and write on the Lazarus parable.

As we have seen, from the beginning the interpretation of this biblical passage was more or less anti-rich. Front row theologians, such as Aquinas and Bonaventure could in their commentaries on Luke present more moderate, modern and less anti-rich interpretations, but the less progressive friars who wrote model sermons usually restricted themselves to patristic sources, and had what one might characterise as a less innovative approach. It can be argued that they took their anti-rich interpretations from the sources, not from their personal experience or from real life. It is tempting to say that their personal feelings were subjugated to the exegetical tradition in preaching.

#### 4.2. Turning the Tables – the Virtuous Rich and the Sinful Poor

Furthermore it can be said that given the huge range of sources, the selection analysed here may very well be biased. Surely there must be mendicant material more benevolent to the rich and the powerful. It may be that the sources used are not representative of mendicant thinking, or they may even be biased. Even leaving aside the possible bias due to incompetence of research, there is a good possibility that sermons on some other pericope might turn out to be more favourably disposed to the rich and powerful. Therefore we need to look at the sources from a different angle; look for a different interpretation.

Was there a possibility of being rich and good or of noble birth and good? Was there indeed a possibility of being poor and sinful or being a worker and a sinner? There certainly was. We have already remarked the more scholastic commentaries on Saint Luke by Aquinas, Bonaventure and Nicolaus de Lyra. They, and several others who wrote in the same tone, were stressing the possibility of the rich being righteous and obtaining salvation, not the difficulty of it. Even where they acknowledge the difficulties, as a whole the tone is more encouraging than reprehensive towards the rich.

The exegetic interpretation more favourable to the rich, taking the sinfulness out of just being rich and connecting it with different particular sins committed by rich or any other persons, eventually also found its way into some of the thirteenth-century model sermon collections and influenced to their interpretation of the Lazarus parable. Guillaume Peyraut writes:

”About the second point, note that someone is called rich either because he has riches or because he loves them. The rich in the first sense of the word are not despised by God, since He is rich himself, Job 36: ‘God does not despise the rich for He is rich himself.’ Similarly Abraham was rich and yet he was at rest, Gen. 17 (in fact 13:2): ‘And Abraham was very rich.’ But the rich in the second sense of the word will be excluded from the kingdom of heaven, Matth. xix: ‘It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man enter into the kingdom of God.’”<sup>3</sup>

3 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangelis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. nv. ”Circa secundum notandum quod diues dicitur aliquis uel quia diuitias

This passage was not only influenced by the thirteenth-century exegetics, it was practically copied from the commentary on Luke by Hugues de Saint-Cher.<sup>4</sup>

The Dominican Jacopo da Varazze starts his sermon on the theme *Homo quidam erat dives* stating that: *He was not reprehended because he was rich, but because he sinned with his riches in three things. Firstly holding them avariciously. Secondly expending them in vanity. [...] Thirdly loving them too much.*<sup>5</sup> This passage reminds us of Aquinas' *Catena aurea* cited above in the second chapter, which of course is no surprise, since as we have seen, Jacopo used Thomas' commentary on Luke as one of his sources when writing this sermon.

Jacopo's confrere Antonio Azaro Parmense shares his view: "*He was a rich man, that is, he owned riches and loved them fervently. Observe that having riches is not bad as long as they are justly obtained and used for good as Abraham did.*"<sup>6</sup> Hugo de Prato Florido wrote that the rich man was not damned because he was rich, for, as it is said in *Genesis*, Abraham was extremely rich and yet he was saved. The same holds for other *Old Testament* patriarchs.<sup>7</sup> Clearly, using Abraham and other fathers as a model of a good rich man was a common method for those who accepted the possibility of being good and rich at the same time. It would have been difficult to deny Abraham's goodness or his richness.<sup>8</sup>

Giovanni da San Gemignano points out that Christ's words about the camel and the eye of the needle do not refer to all rich men, but to those who love their riches too much, or do not make restitution of unjustly acquired riches. He also writes that Jesus did not simply say *woe unto you that are rich* (Lk. 6:24), but he added *for ye have received your consolation* meaning, according to Giovanni, those who use their riches exclusively for their own pleasure.<sup>9</sup>

---

habet, uel amat. Diuitem primo modo Dominus non abiicit, cum ipse sit potens, sic Abraam diues fuerat qui tamen in requie erat Gen. 17: 'Erat Abraam diues ualde.' Sed diuites secundo modo a regno Dei excluduntur Matth. 19: 'Facilius est camelum intrare foramen acus quam diuitem intrare in regnum celorum.'"

4 This particular passage from Hugues' commentary is quoted above on pages 29-30.

5 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*, Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22r. "Non autem reprehenditur ex eo quod dives erat: sed quia circa diuitias tripliciter peccabat. Primo eas auare retinendo.[...] Secundo eas uane expendebat. [...] Tertio ipsas diuitias nimis amando."

6 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. London BL. Add. 28684, f. 107r. "Erat dives id est habebat diuitias et ardentem amabat eas. Iuxta quod nota quod habere diuitias non est malum dum iuste acquisite fuerunt et eis bene quis usatur sicut Abraham."

7 Hugo de Prato Florido, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. cc5v-cc6r. "Ubi nota quod diues in quantum diues non damnatur quod patet ex hoc euangelio. Nam Abraham ualde diues fuit Gen. xiii: 'Erat Abraham diues ualde in possessione auri et argenti.' Et tamen non est damnatus, sed in requie collocatus. Similiter antiqui patres ualde diuites fuerunt, qui omnes sunt saluati."

8 D.L. d'Avray, *Sermons to the Upper Bourgeoisie*, p. 195.

9 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 58v. "Ad quartum incontrarium dicendum quod illud uerbum Domini intelligitur de diuite qui nimium affectum ponit in diuitiis uel de eo qui illicite acquisitas non restituit, tali enim magis impossibile est intrare in regnum Dei quam camelo intrare per foramen acus quia istud repugnat nature, illud gratie. Ad quintum dicendum quod Deus non comminatus est simpliciter: 'Ue diuitibus' sed diuitibus qui habent consolationem suam in hoc mundo, id

Berthold von Regensburg takes the view that it is possible for a rich man to be a good Christian and obtain salvation, but at the same time he makes it quite clear what is the more common destiny for them: "Be it so, that most of the rich are damned and most of the poor are saved, however, it is not so with everyone." The subtitle of his sermon (*De divitibus et pauperibus tam bonis quam malis*) tells all. Berthold is not willing to accept a black and white division into good and bad simply on the basis of wealth.<sup>10</sup> In all these cases the emphasis is on the possibility of salvation for the rich, not on the difficulty, not to mention impossibility.

Even the very same writers who were the first to condemn the vicious life of the rich and the powerful were willing to admit that there were exceptions. Berthold von Regensburg thought that most of the poor will be saved and most of the rich will be damned, but he did not leave it there; instead he added the important words "but not all."<sup>11</sup> The good ones when talking about the rich were those who shared their wealth generously with the poor, did not use it in vanities, and did not fall into temptation of pride, but paid back to God (presumably with praying), from whom all good things come.<sup>12</sup>

The most sophisticated argument for the possibility to be rich without sinning comes from Giovanni da San Gemignano. He writes:

"About the first, that is, about the example of the rich man, note that even though there were three reasons for his damnation, that is, riches because he was rich, pompousness because he was clothed in purple and fine linen, and delights because he fared sumptuously every day, yet since the riches were the cause of pompousness and delights, it is asked whether it is a sin to have riches [...]."

Here Giovanni launches into a full-scale *quaestio* with its arguments and counterarguments, which though it is extremely interesting, is far too long to be reproduced here *in extenso*. His conclusion is that it is not sinful to have riches, since it is quite natural for a man to possess exterior things such as riches. This is argued by quoting Aristotle's *Politics*. Giovanni remembers also the more traditional *patriarchs of the Old Testament topos* and mentions that too.<sup>13</sup>

est, qui diuitiis utuntur solum ad consolationem et delectationem suas mundanas sicut faciebat iste diues qui in deliciis uiuebat et de pauperes non curabat."

- 10 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis. London BL. Harley 3215, f. 42r-42v. "Licet enim multi diuites dampnentur et pauperes multi saluentur tamen non omnes."
- 11 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de domenicis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42v. "[...] non tamen omnes."
- 12 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de domenicis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42v. "Secundum genus diuitum est qui saluantur. Illi sunt qui iusta bona sua cum pauperibus proposse parciuntur [CLM 5531, f. 48v. fideliter diuidunt] et in malos usus non expendent nec inde superbiunt sed regraciantur de ipsis Deo omni bonorum largitori."
- 13 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pa.l. lat. 466, f. 57v. "Circa primum, scilicet circa exemplum diuitis nota quod licet tria fuerunt ei dampnationis causa, scilicet diuitie quia erat diues, pompe quia induebatur purpura

Thus there are a good number of sources in the Lazarus sermons confirming the possibility of being both rich and virtuous. If we look into other mendicant sources of the time, we find an abundance of similar passages. We have already cited Humbert de Romans' sermon *Ad malos nobiles*. He has another about nobles not yet mentioned – *Ad nobiles devotos*. The very existence of this sermon proves that Humbert thought it possible to be a nobleman and live virtuously. And not only possible, but also reasonably common, since otherwise it would have been a waste of parchment to include that sermon in his collection.<sup>14</sup> Another interesting example is his sermon *Ad mulieres nobiles*. Here Humbert presents Saint Mary Magdalen (after her conversion naturally) as a model for noble women, and emphasises her supposedly noble ancestry.<sup>15</sup>

Even Jacques de Lausanne, whose writings are mostly full of anti-noble and anti-rich lamentations over the corruptness of the times, accepts the possibility of virtuous noblemen. He writes that carnal nobility is occasionally pleasing to God. His point is that since noblemen run a greater risk than others of falling into the sin of pride, they also please God more when they manage to overcome the temptation.<sup>16</sup> A good group of sources where mendicants actually praise princes and nobles are the memorial sermons. It was customary to say something positive on the deceased whenever it was possible without actually lying. d'Avray presents several examples of virtuous princes and nobles (Edward I of England, Philip IV of France and the Angevin rulers Charles I, Charles II, and Robert the Wise) in mendicant memorial sermons.<sup>17</sup>

Bertrand de la Tour presents the justification for being rich in his sermon *In exequiis alicuius regis seu magni principis*:

*"Through these spiritual riches he justly acquired temporal riches when he was alive, kept them justly, distributed and dispensed them justly, and also justly ordered and arranged their distribution. And it is certain that in such a man temporal riches are fruitful."*<sup>18</sup>

Bertrand's sermon presents the common method whereby it was allowed that rich men might be righteous. They were supposed to feed the poor and support the Church with their riches, not to hold them or use them vainly.

---

et bysso et delicie quia epulabatur cotidie splendide, tamen quia diuitie fuerunt causa pomparum et deliciarum, queritur hic tamen de diuitiis, scilicet utrum habere diuitias sit peccatum, et uidetur quod non. [...] Respondeo dicendum quod absolute loquendo habere diuitias non est peccatum quia possessio rerum exteriorum, sicut sunt diuitie, naturaliter competit homini, sicut probat Philosophus in primo Politice, semper enim inferiora sunt propter perfectiora unde homo licite potest habere res exteriores scilicet diuitias et eis uti per rationem et uoluntatem quasi propter se factis, unde et sancti uiri diuites fuerunt sicut Abraham et ceteri patriarche."

14 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 82 *Ad nobiles devotos*.

15 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 105 *Ad mulieres nobiles*.

16 Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Compendium moralitatum*. BN. lat. 16490, f. 28v-29r.

17 General discussion of the praise in memorial sermons, D.L. d'Avray, *Death and the Prince*, pp. 65-67. Individual examples are presented in the second chapter *Individuals*.

18 Bertrand de la Tour OFM, *Sermo duodecimus qui potest fieri in exequiis alicuius regis seu magni principis*. Cited from D.L. d'Avray, *Death and the Prince*, p. 131 and 243. "Per istas spirituales diuitias ipse temporales diuitias iuste acquisiuit dum uiueret, iuste retinuit, iuste distribuit et dispensauit, iuste etiam distribui mandauit et ordinauit. Et certe, in tali homine diuitie temporales sunt fructuose."

Those sermons that accept the possibility of being rich and virtuous are not limited to memorial sermons. For instance Guibert de Tournai and Nicolas de Byard allowed such a possibility.<sup>19</sup> Giordano da Pisa preached that many people endangered their souls in obtaining riches, but he continued: "*But if you are good and you use your wealth to please God, He would give them to you in abundance as He did in the Old Testament to many who were extremely rich.*"<sup>20</sup> Here we have the already mentioned defensive *topos* for being rich, although this time the name of Abraham is not mentioned.

Giordano's sermon is interesting. It takes the position that God distributes temporal wealth according to the spiritual strength of the people. He does not give riches to those who would be endangered by them, that is, to those who could not bear the riches without falling into different sins connected with them. His logic seems to imply that those who are rich are actually better Christians, since they have passed God's evaluation. They are strong enough to resist the temptations brought along by riches.

Some historians have noted and analysed sources presenting noblemen and the rich as potentially virtuous instead of hopelessly sinful. One of the most important contributions to the problem involved here is included in Alexander Murray's book *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*. Murray is not satisfied with saying that noblemen had a possibility of being virtuous; he actually states that they were considered to be more virtuous than other people *ex natura*. It is true that Murray is not writing about the rich in general, but exclusively noblemen; however, these two groups were to a large extent overlapping. Taking a calculated risk of oversimplifying, I would summarise his arguments as follows.

Murray does not deny the existence of anti-noble material presented earlier in this study. He writes that "*theologians were the more ready to explore the moral effects of the noble condition, frequently to its detriment. Generalisations were made, and believed. [...] In genres of literature most given to the art-broadly, didactic genres-the main drift of generalisation is, on the topic of the noblemen, in one direction. It is against noblemen.*" He proposes, however, that the criticism in these sources was not always serious. The critics can be shown not fully to have believed what they said.<sup>21</sup>

There are several reasons for this. First he remarks that most of the critics were themselves of noble ancestry. Were they really keen to judge their own kin? The second, more important point is about the definition of nobility. In many cases the basis of criticism was that those who are criticised have not been behaving as noblemen should; in fact they are not real nobles. Should they behave according to their standing they would be quite all right, and if anything, more praiseworthy than commoners. Normally the last sentence was

---

19 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 214-215; See also D.L. d'Avray, *Sermons to the Upper Bourgeoisie*, pp. 195-196.

20 Cited and translated in D.R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence*, p. 126.

21 A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, pp. 332-335.

presented the other way round. A bad nobleman was more reprehensible than a bad commoner, since he had the moral advantage of having virtuous ancestors.<sup>22</sup>

This refers to the idea that socialisation via parents' example was even more important in the thirteenth century than it is now, since there were generally no other institutions such as schools to take care of it. Berthold von Regensburg says this in contemporary language: "A boy cannot do anything, but what he has seen his father doing; whatever the father does, the son will do the same. 'What manner of man the ruler of a city is, such also are they that dwell within.'"<sup>23</sup> A sin committed with a virtuous example before one's eyes was a sin committed under aggravating circumstances.

Then Murray turns to the question of whether the nobles in fact were perceived as better Christians than commoners. He argues that this was indeed the case. Most of the saints who died between the years 900 and 1500 were of noble ancestry, or at least from patrician families (the exact percentage depends on the methods used in calculation). This seems to imply that noblemen were more likely to become saints than commoners, and thus they were better Christians.<sup>24</sup> Murray's view is supported by the already classical study of André Vauchez, who writes that most saints were indeed of noble families and that richness and earthly power were considered to be signs of God's favour.<sup>25</sup>

Murray recognises the three most common charges against the nobility, that is, pride, reckless self-indulgence and violence. He accepts too that the externals of nobility (rank, wealth and physical strength and power) indeed presented some moral dangers to the nobility (as their critics were keen to write). However, for that very reason, a specifically noble ethic or honorary code existed to offset those dangers; an ethic that formed at least one factor in the nobleman's conduct. It is true that noblemen were rich, but their behavioural code required them to be magnanimous in spending too, especially when it came to giving alms to the poor. Military strength and power were channelled to the defence of justice. Finally the dignity of noble birth was tamed with humility and affection shown towards the church. Whenever a nobleman failed to pay his respects to the Church it was considered to be a scandal. As a counterweight to the oppression of the poor and robbery, the military profession offered a possibility of just wars, crusades and perhaps even martyrdom through them.<sup>26</sup> All these possibilities for exercising virtue were almost exclusively restricted to the noblemen. Yes, there were potential dangers in being a noble man, but it was the very overcoming of them that really made the nobles better Christians. The externals of nobility were the temptation and rising above them was the virtue.

---

22 A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, pp. 334-336.

23 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de sanctis. Sermo de beata Elizabeth*. UUB. C 371, f. 31r-v. "Non potest filius a se facere quicquam nisi quod uiderit patrem facientem quecumque enim ille fecerit haec et filius similiter facit. 'Qualis rector ciuitatis, tales habitantes in ea.'"

24 A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, pp. 337-349.

25 A. Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Age* (Roma 1988, first published 1981), pp. 204-209.

26 A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, pp. 353-355 and 375.

Thus we have seen that there is ample evidence to show that it was indeed possible to be rich and virtuous. If we turn to the other side of the coin, we find that there are also several examples of not so saintly or virtuous poor and workers. It has been stated above that Humbert de Romans' sermon *Ad laicos in villis* was a kind of eulogy for agrarian life. He thought that with certain reservations farmers were acceptable to God. However, Humbert's book can be interpreted in a totally different manner, and indeed it has been, as we shall see.

The idea of a saintly peasant tilling his soil to fulfill a God-given penance and thus sanctifying himself is somewhat strange when it is compared to several other sources treating of peasants. In fact, there were two competing stereotypes of the peasant in medieval society: the devout son-of-the-soil and the brutal, sinful savage. Both of these stereotypes have survived to our days.

The survival of the savage brute stereotype is evident from the Catalanian proverb still known in this century: "A peasant is the animal that most resembles a human being."<sup>27</sup> The same idea is captured in a Tuscan proverb: "The country is for producing animals, the town for producing men."<sup>28</sup> The country was considered to be a place that was closer to the nature. This could have been interpreted in two different ways. The first view was that nature means brutality and barbarity as opposed to the civilisation in cities. The second was that nature meant original creation of God and natural basic, Christian values as opposed to the Sodom and Gomorrah of the cities. This dualistic nature of opinions concerning peasants is widely documented in research.<sup>29</sup>

What then must we think of Humbert de Romans' eulogy for the farmers? Here we may turn once again to Alexander Murray, for he has not limited his contribution to evaluating noblemen and their religious position, but also studied religion among the poor in thirteenth century France, using Humbert de Romans as his source. Murray cites the above-mentioned passage about the saintly peasant who manages to exorcise a demon. The *exemplum* ends with the words: "Happy those peasants who lead such a life". Alexander Murray does not leave it there; instead he asks how many did and answers by presenting an impressive collection of quotations concerning the sins of the poor. The poor and the workers are seen as superstitious, avaricious, lazy churchgoers, blasphemers, envious and so on. All these examples were taken from the very same book by Humbert de Romans.<sup>30</sup>

His final conclusion concerning the poor of the thirteenth century is that "like most preachers when talking of actualities, Humbert was more concerned with vice than with virtue, yet it is clear, whatever his bias, that there was plenty of vice to be concerned with. His subjects were not uniform models of

---

27 P. Freedman, *Sainteté et sauvagerie*, p. 539.

28 *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe. I The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages*. Ed. by M.M. Postan (Cambridge 1971), p. 431.

29 See P. Freedman, *Sainteté et sauvagerie*, passim.; A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, pp. 237-242.

30 A. Murray, *Religion among the Poor*, passim.



piety.”<sup>31</sup> This gives us an impression of not so saintly workers and poor. Other sources can be viewed from the same angle as that from which Murray has read Humbert’s sermons. It can thus hardly be said that the poor and the workers were perceived as better Christians than noblemen.

Murray’s analysis of Humbert’s views of the sinful poor is competent and thorough-going. I feel it is important nonetheless to point out that certain sins mentioned by Humbert were exact counterparts of those primary virtues of the poor (patience and perseverance) that have been adduced earlier in this study:

*”But again we must note that if their life is to please God, they should not murmur because he has made them poor and workers in this world. This is what a certain man did who felt his work to be endless punishment and cursed Adam, because due him he had ended up in such a misery. And many people curse the day when they were born to this kind of work (i.e. agriculture).*

*They should also take care that they do not have any evil in them that would make them unacceptable to God, like the first farmer Cain, who was malevolent. Also they should do good works according to their standing, come to their parish church in time, give churches and their temporal masters what is due, and use their substance according to their means for charity.”*<sup>32</sup>

These typical sins of the poor generally and farmers in particular can be compared to those adduced in another fairly popular work of Humbert’s - *Instructiones de officiis ordinis*. It has a chapter where Humbert advises Dominican confessors on questioning confessing farmers. He writes that they should ask whether the farmers work out of temporal cupidity, whether they render unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s, and to God the things which be God’s, that is, pay their tithes to the Church and their obligations to temporal lords. Also they are to be asked about false testimonies, usurpation of other people’s lands, envy, and accusing their neighbours before their lords.<sup>33</sup>

Humbert de Romans was not the only mendicant who described the typical sins of the poor and those who work. John of Wales’ *Communiloquium* gives a list, although the number of sins described is fewer than in Humbert’s works. John mentions explicitly fraud, theft, lying and sensual gratification, and leaves the rest for the reader to fill in; presumably taking them to be familiar enough

31 A. Murray, *Religion among the Poor*, p. 324.

32 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 78 Ad laicos in villis. ”Sed iterum notandum quod ad hoc quod talis vita placeat Deo non debent tales murmurare contra Deum de hoc quod eos facit pauperes et laborantes in hoc mundo, sicut faciebat quidam qui quando in labore suo sentiebat penas assidue maledicebat Adam quia per eum pervenerat ad talem miseriam, et multi maledicunt diei nativitatis sue quando ad huiusmodi laborem nati sunt. Item debent cavere ne aliquam malitiam habeant in se que reddat vitam eorum Deo inacceptam, sicut habuit primus agricola Cain qui fuit malignus. item debent secundum statum suum dare operam ad bona facienda, veniendo tempore suo ad ecclesiam suam, reddendo ecclesiis et dominis debita de substantia sua secundum possibilitatem suam exponendo in pios usus.”

33 Humbert de Romans OP, *Instructiones de officiis ordinis*. Cap. XLVI De officio confessoris, pp. 362-363.

to the active preachers and confessors who were the potential readers of his book. After naming these sins, he adds that they should furthermore work with the right intention and avoid idleness.<sup>34</sup>

Berthold von Regensburg is quite in agreement with Humbert de Romans and John of Wales. As stated, the second part of the division in his Lazarus sermon handled the good and the bad poor. He writes:

*"Similarly there are three species of the poor, the first of whom are damned, the second are saved, and the third will have great honour in heaven. The first species are those who blaspheme when God does not do them good, and who get angry with God, as if He were their steward. Furthermore they take unjust profit in the little that is possible for them and steal grain or goods from others, envy those who are richer, and make profit through sin like prostitutes."*<sup>35</sup>

The primary sin for him also seems to be lack of patience; it leads the bad poor into sinful ways of trying to change their God-given position in society.

By far the largest catalogue of sins typical to farmers is to be found in Johannes von Freiburg's ever valuable *Confessionale*. According to him confessors ought to ask farmers about the orthodoxy of their beliefs, whether they pay their tithes, whether they break the Feasts by working or even worse with dances, whether they envy their neighbours, whether they steal, pay their obligations to their secular lord, whether they boast, quarrel, drink excessively, curse, lie, make oaths and perjure, practise divinations, or have vain or false opinions.<sup>36</sup> Sins typical of other manual workers according to Johannes were cheating at working (work when they are supervised and laze when they are not), spend their time in idleness, and be impatient in their work.<sup>37</sup>

#### 4.3. Pauperes cum Lazaro or Pauperes cum Petro?

Even if the theory that the poor were held to be better Christians than the rich were to be accepted, it would still leave open the question what exactly is meant by the word poor in this context. As we have seen, there were those who were poor by necessity and those who accepted poverty voluntarily. It is obvious that in certain cases virtuous poverty does not mean any poverty whatsoever, but only voluntary poverty. Brian Tierney notes that medieval men were quite

34 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*. I.10.3. BAV. Vat.lat. 1018, f. 54v. "Ad primis ergo sunt admonendi homines laborantes quod sint a peccatis immaculati scilicet a furtis et fraudibus et mendaciis, voluptatibus et ab aliis que solent tales concomitare et ut ordinata intentione laborent et malint manibus laborare quam ociose uiuere."

35 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de domenicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42v "Similiter sunt tria genera pauperum, quorum primi dampnantur, secundi saluantur, tercii magnum premium in celo habebunt. Primi sunt qui blasphemant cum Deus non benefacit eis et irascuntur Deo ac si uillicus eorum sit. Item qui iniuste lucrantur etiam parua que possunt et qui gramiam [pro granarium?] furantur uel homini uel qui aliis ditioribus inuident uel illi qui cum peccato lucrantur ut meretrices."

36 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale*. Ad rusticos BL. Addit. 19581, ff. 191v-192r.

37 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale*. Ad laboratores BL. Addit. 19581, f. 192r.

capable of distinguishing between holy voluntary poverty and squalid involuntary want. According to him theologians were quick to point out that the latter was not likely to be productive of higher moral virtues; more likely it gave rise to temptations to theft and perjury.<sup>38</sup>

The idea of voluntary poverty as a supreme virtue can be detected in Guibert de Tournai's sermon *De sancto Francisco*, where he discusses the relation between property and holiness. The passage is worth citing *in extenso*:

*There are some people who are so attracted to temporal riches, that they are willing to break God's commandments to have and keep them. There are others who are not affected by them in such a manner that they would commit mortal sins, but who do not acquire wealth without love, or lose it without sorrow. In them the burning pain in losing is as great as the love in possession. There are others who possess without love and lose without grief, but who nevertheless do not reject the right of possessing.*

*There are others who add to this that they do not want to possess nor are they able to do so. And yet they do so because even if they do not want or can possess privately, they can do so as a community. There are others who add to all this perfection that they cannot possess anything either as individuals or as a community. These people rise higher from the ground and when they open their eyes they do not see anything, because they do not think that anything temporal really exists; such was Saint Francis and his true imitators, even though some who cannot see this purity or cannot believe it to be possible argue against them and backbite at them. But the sun is not to blame if you cannot see its clarity.<sup>39</sup>*

Guibert obviously thinks that true perfection is to be attained only via voluntary poverty and preferably in the Franciscan manner, that is without having any property even in common. To him it is not enough simply to be poor, one has to enjoy one's poverty, and it must be the consequence of a rational decision.

More or less the same ideas are found in other writers too. Humbert de Romans cites Bernard de Clairvaux: "*Poverty is not virtue, but love of poverty is.*" In Humbert's hands Bernard's words are interpreted in such a manner that poverty certainly was the state best suited to achieving holiness, but only so long as the poor themselves realised and recognised this fact and loved poverty

---

38 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, p. 11.

39 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de sanctis*. De sancto Francisco sermo primus. UUB. C 378, f. 11v. "Sunt enim quidam qui sic afficiuntur ad temporalia quod pro ipsis optinendis uel retinendis transgrediuntur Dei mandata. Sunt alii qui non afficiuntur ad ea ut modo transgrediuntur mortaliter tamen non possident sine amore nec perdunt sine dolore, in quibus tantum urit dolor si admittantur quantum haberet amor si possideantur. Sunt alii, qui sine amore possident sine dolore perdunt tamen potestatem possidendi a se non abiecerunt. Sunt alii qui supra hoc addunt possidere nolle et possidere non posse. Sed quidam sic quia in proprio possidere nec uolunt nec possunt tamen in communi possidere possunt. Sunt alii qui ultra omnem hanc perfectionem addunt nichil posse possidere nec in proprio nec in communi et isti maxime surrexerunt de terra et apertos habentes oculos nichil uident quia nichil esse quod terrenum est reputant, qualis fuit beatus Franciscus et eius veri imitatores licet quidam qui puritatem hanc uidere non possunt aut fieri posse non credunt obloquantur et detrahunt. Sed non est culpa in sole si non possis claritatem solis uidere."

because of it. If a poor man was all the time trying to get rich, he was not in a virtuous state of mind.<sup>40</sup>

This opinion is confirmed by Nicolaus de Lyra, who comments on Matthew 5:3 which as we have seen was generally interpreted to refer to poverty concerning temporal wealth. He writes that poverty as such is nothing more than lack of riches and goods, and it is not virtuous. He continues that poverty in spirit, that is, voluntarily accepted poverty, is a perfect virtue.<sup>41</sup> Nicolaus' commentary can be compared to Aquinas' *Catena aurea super Matthaei evangelium*, which says that the poor in spirit are the humble and those who fear the Lord. Furthermore they are poor because of the Holy Spirit, that is, voluntarily poor.<sup>42</sup> This was the view already taken by the *Glossa ordinaria*.<sup>43</sup>

There is every reason to suppose that this distinction between poverty as such and love of poverty was well known and generally accepted. The popular manual *par excellence*, Guillaume Peyraut's *Summa de virtutibus*, makes the same distinction. Guillaume cites Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, who urges that the poor of spirit are not to be confused with simply poor or plebeian poor, who are poor by necessity, not by praiseworthy choice. Guillaume rounds off his analysis by saying that there are two requisites for poverty of spirit, humility and denouncement of temporal wealth.<sup>44</sup>

Similar ideas can be found in the Lazarus sermons too. François de Mayronnes writes that voluntary poverty is very precious in the eyes of God. He adds that perfection does not consist in poverty alone; one should also follow Christ and this is done by mendicancy.<sup>45</sup> What François implies is that true perfection is to be achieved only by belonging to mendicant orders, not by simple poverty.

Here we come to the problem presented by Michel Mollat. Is it the case that those who were poor, sick and wretched were automatically connected with those who suffered similar hardships out of their own free will, that is, pilgrims and the religious?<sup>46</sup> In the light of these passages it seems obvious that the poor who were supposed to be better Christians were not conventional poor at all. They were first and foremost mendicant brothers. Upon closer inspection Lazarus the beggar turns out to be brother X the mendicant. If we use Mollat's division, those poor that are being praised in sermons are the religious, not "*les pauvres proprement dits*". They are *pauperes cum Petro*, not *pauperes cum Lazaro*.

40 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*. Sermo 86 Ad pauperes. "Et nota sicut dicit beatus Bernardus: 'Paupertas non est virtus sed amor paupertatis.'"; A. Murray, *Religion among the Poor in Thirteenth-Century France*, s. 307.

41 Nicolaus de Lyra OFM, *Postilla super totam Bibliam*, super Matthaum (Venice 1488), caput 5. "Igitur beati pauperes spiritu quia paupertas absolute sumpta non dixit nisi carentia divitiarum et honorum, quod non est virtuosum, [...]. Sed paupertas spiritus scilicet voluntarie assumpta ad liberius sequendum Christum, illa est virtus excellens seu perfecta."

42 Thomas Aquinas OP, *Catena Aurea Super Matthaei evangelium*, V.1.

43 *Glossa ordinaria*, Mt. 5.

44 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de virtutibus* (Lyon 1571), V.3. De paupertate spiritus.

45 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117r. "Quarta conclusio est quod uoluntaria paupertas est Deo multum grata. [...] Quinta conclusio est quod perfectio non consistit totaliter in paupertate, sed est in sequela Christi, hoc autem fit per mendicitatem."

46 M. Mollat, *La notion de la pauvreté au Moyen Age: position de problèmes*, p. 5.

D.R. Lesnick has put forward an interesting view on the matter of actual versus voluntary poverty. According to him, neither Franciscans or Dominicans of late thirteenth-century Northern Italy were too concerned about the problems of the poor. The Franciscans, who were supposed to be the champions of the poor, invested little, if any, energy in analysing working-class poverty or the life situations of the poor. The late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Northern Italian Franciscans themselves were from a financially comfortable class living in a world of widespread economic prosperity. Therefore they felt no great pain of poverty themselves, nor was there a vast mass of chronically impoverished and emarginated workers to prod their consciences. The economic situation in Northern Italy remained good until the fourteenth century. The demand for labour was consistently high and the cost of food low. Therefore there simply were not substantial numbers of "les pauvres proprement dits".<sup>47</sup>

Lesnick agrees with the sources cited in the previous subchapter which connected sanctifying poverty with religion. According to him poverty meant for the Italian Franciscans an ideal condition to be assumed voluntarily by members of the religious orders or by pious laymen. Rather than a pressing social problem, (voluntary) poverty was a path to salvation.<sup>48</sup> It can be argued that Lesnick's ideas were equally valid for other regions where the economic situation remained reasonably favourable until the end of the thirteenth century.

André Vauchez is of the opinion that the late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century discussion of poverty among the Franciscan order was strictly an inside affair. It was a question of voluntary poverty and did not have any relevance to the laity apart from the Franciscan tertiaries. Vauchez bases his conclusions on the actual discussion between conventuals and spirituals such as it can be read in surviving sources. Unlike Lesnick, he does not argue his case with the social situation of the late thirteenth century.<sup>49</sup>

#### 4.4. The Humble Franciscans and the Aristocratic Dominicans

It has been said that there were certain fundamental differences between the two mendicant orders. Franciscans were committed to apostolic poverty. For them poverty had an absolute value. Dominicans on the contrary used poverty only as a method of getting closer to their audiences; for them it was a means, not an end. Saint Dominic had noticed that the Cistercian mission against the heretics was failing because the habits, clothes and socioeconomic level of the preachers were too alien to the audiences. The ultimate demonstration of this difference of basic attitudes towards poverty was the struggle over poverty between Pope John XXII and the Franciscan order led by Michele da Cesena.

---

47 D.R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence*, pp. 16, 23, and 146.

48 D.R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence*, p. 23.

49 A. Vauchez, *Le peuple au Moyen Age: du "Populus Christianus" aux classes dangereuses. In Aspects of Poverty in Early Modern Europe II. Les réactions des pauvres à la pauvreté. Études d'histoire sociale et urbaine*. Ed. Thomas Riis (Odense 1986), p. 15.

The Dominican order took the side of the Pope in this controversy, whereas the poverty-loving Franciscans backed their minister general as long as they possibly could without risking excommunication.

Another major difference was the social origins and clientele of the two orders. D.R. Lesnick has studied late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Florence. According to him the Franciscan order was overwhelmingly composed of the sons of the broad urban class of artisans, craftsmen, shopkeepers and professionals who had recently immigrated to the city, or to put it more briefly – the *popolo*. Dominicans respectively were recruited mostly from the Florentine patriciate and old nobility. They were markedly a *popolo grasso* order.<sup>50</sup>

The recruiting of the friars is a somewhat neglected area of study. William A. Hinnebusch and Herbert Grundmann took the view that Dominicans were recruited from the middle classes and the lower nobility whereas most Franciscans represented the rich bourgeoisie and the nobility. John B. Freed has analysed the origins of the German friars. Both orders in Germany drew their members from the patriciate of the towns and from the lower nobility. Dominicans seem to have been somewhat more selective. In the latter half of the thirteenth century both orders became more selective and concentrated on persons who already had an adequate basic schooling. This naturally directed the emphasis towards the upper social classes, who could afford such a schooling. However, Freed remarks that the evidence is clearly too fragmentary to make any conclusive statements.<sup>51</sup> Putting this information together one gets the picture that Friars Preachers were slightly more of an upper class order than Franciscans. It is true that the evidence presented by Lesnick is hardly convincing, but nevertheless these arguments must be taken into consideration.

According to Lesnick these differences in recruiting were also reflected in preaching and in the social message of the friars. The Dominicans, whose audience consisted of more sophisticated members of the *popolo grasso*, used the scholastic method of preaching, whereas the Franciscans chose a more concrete mode of preaching, labelled by Lesnick "*sermo humilis*". It was more appropriate for ministering to their primary lay audience of urban shopkeepers, artisans and professionals. Most of the Franciscan's lay audience would in any case have little or any of the formal education necessary to appreciate the scholastic sermon.<sup>52</sup>

Considering these differences in attitude towards poverty, social origin, and clientele it would be logical to assume that there must inevitably have been differences between these two orders in attitude towards the poor and workers. One is tempted to assume that the Dominicans would have a more positive view of the rich and the powerful, and that they would certainly be less enthusiastic about the sanctifying effects of poverty, hardship and manual labour.

---

50 D.R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence*, pp. 46 and 65.

51 J.B. Freed, *The Friars and German Society in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1977), pp. 111-128.

52 D.R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence*, pp. 94-95.

If they were indeed a *popolo grasso* order, fiery sermons against the rich and riches would have been quite embarrassing for their supporters.

The case of the Franciscans is quite the contrary. Being the spiritual friends and allies of the *popolo*, they could have attacked the corruption and sins of the ruling elites as hard as they could without seriously damaging relations with their supporters. The reason for this was that there was a practically continuous power struggle, often open warfare, between the *popolo* and the ruling elites.

#### 4.5. The Conflict between Reality and Mendicant Writings

Finally there remains one important question to be asked. If the mendicant attitude was indeed hostile towards the rich and the powerful, if they really idealised poverty and hard manual work, and if they really were concerned with the social unfairness of society, why did things not change for the better? After all, the more or less universally accepted conclusion among historians has been that the mendicant orders were the most influential and dynamic force in thirteenth-century opinion forming. Almost all the *avant-garde* theologians were mendicants. Their sermons were arguably the most important means of communication in the thirteenth century. Several popes belonged to the Dominican and Franciscan orders, not to mention bishops and cardinals. Many friars held important posts as confessors and advisers to the kings and princes of Latin Christendom.

All these people and means of communication ought to have secured better socio-economic conditions, or at least more humane treatment for the extremely poor. They should have been able to secure greater social respectability and a better position for the workers too. In real life the situation was actually quite the opposite. Already from the beginning of the eleventh century, discordant notes began to be heard regarding the virtuousness of poverty, and from the beginning of the fourteenth century on, the words poor, work-shy, idle, vagabond and criminal were often treated as synonyms. The poor came to be feared and despised as dangerous people. By the time of Villon, the idea of poverty was seen in a totally negative light. It was nothing more than disgrace and misery.<sup>53</sup>

The negative development of the economic situation together with the unfavourable attitudes described by Mollat and Graus brought with them the relative failure of the ecclesiastical poor relief arrangements at the end of the Middle Ages; a situation which one may add continued long after the Middle Ages.<sup>54</sup> If the idealising of the poor in mendicant sermons had been sincere and carried out in practice, that is, also outside model sermon collections, in actual preaching situations, surely the development would have been different

---

53 M. Mollat, *La notion de la pauvreté au Moyen Age: position des problèmes*, pp. 5-6; M. Mollat, *Les pauvres de la société médiévale*, p. 77; F. Graus, *Poveri delle città e delle campagne*, pp. 77-78.

54 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, p. 64.

despite the declining economic situation? Yet the mendicant preaching did not seem to have had any long-term effects on opinions on the poor and the poverty. Naturally this is not to propose that they could have influenced in such a manner that the degree of poverty and suffering due to it would have diminished if not vanished. No, but one would have expected attitudes towards the poor to have been at least a little less hostile and perhaps even compassionate. Why was this not so?

One possible effort at explanation has been to deny the influence and power of the mendicant orders. The harsh anti-rich and anti-powerful tone of the mendicant pastoral literature has given room for theories that characterise the mendicants as forerunners of socialism. The East-German historians Ernst Werner and Martin Erbstösser have actually proposed that the apostolic life movement, part of which the friars certainly were, was a medieval movement of social protest disguised in religious garb. The exploited classes expressed their discontent in the words of the gospels. The friars, especially the Franciscans, were individuals poor by birth as well as by choice who protested against their poverty by idealising it. On the practical level the early Franciscan movement took the side of the *minores* in the ongoing struggle against the *majores*; *minores* meaning the bourgeoisie of the towns and *majores* the powerful.<sup>55</sup>

Werner's and Erbstösser's explanation is based totally on the assumption that the mendicants were not the single most influential group of opinion-makers. Rather they were a minority. They were a powerless and hardly influential voice of the oppressed classes fighting a losing battle on behalf of the people against the ruling classes. Werner's and Erbstösser's theory leaves no room for sanctifying or virtuous poverty, no matter whether it was voluntary or not. The sanctity in poverty is seen only as a means of protesting against the unjust social system.

Werner and Erbstösser were not the first historians to perceive the political side of Saint Francis' apostolate. Paul Sabatier had already written about it in his classical biography of the saint:

*"Il était du peuple, et le peuple se reconnut en lui. Il en avait la poésie et les aspirations; il en épousa les revendications, et le nom même de son institut eut d'abord un sens politique: il y avait à Assise, comme dans la plupart des villes d'Italie, les Majores et les Minores, le popolo grasso et le popolo minuto; il se mit résolument avec le derniers."*<sup>56</sup>

Sabatier saw (one might even say was obsessed with) the Franciscan order, and especially Saint Francis personally, as a minority fighting a losing battle over the idea of poverty and the evangelical life against the corrupted system

---

55 E. Werner & M. Erbstösser, *Kleriker, Mönche, Ketzer. Das religiöse Leben im Hochmittelalter* (Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1994), p. 408; J.B. Freed, *The Friars in the German Society*, pp. 109-110.

56 P. Sabatier, *Vie de S. François d'Assise* (Paris 1894), p. ix.



of the Church. The notion of class consciousness of the early Franciscan order was also accepted by André Vauchez, although he was quick to point out that it vanished very soon along with the clericalisation of the order.<sup>57</sup>

Another solution to this problem would be to assume that these sermons were never spoken out in the form they were written. This can be argued with a little mind play. If these sermons truly represent the preaching of the friars as it was eventually practised in front of live audience, one would have expected there to have been more general unrest, rioting and peasant revolts. Sermons such as Nicolaus de Aquaeuille's Lazarus sermon were bound to raise the consciousness of the poor and the repressed. Even if the sermons did not exactly call the poor to arms, they nevertheless pointed out to them loud and clearly the unfairness of the existing system. Yet we know that the major popular revolts came only in the latter half of the following century. Even the famines of 1315–1317 did not provoke any serious revolts.<sup>58</sup>

It is therefore reasonable to assume that these model sermons do not represent the actual message delivered from the pulpits to general audiences. The actual sermons, and thus the very social message of the friars, must have been somewhat toned down and self-censored. Thus it could be argued that the occasionally harsh opinions expressed in sermons and other mendicant writings do represent mendicant opinions, but that these opinions were never transmitted to the larger, lay audiences because some amount of self-sensorship was practised by the preachers who used model sermon collections and other preaching aids.

---

57 A. Vauchez, *Le peuple au Moyen Age: du "Populus Christianus" aux classes dangereuses*, p. 15.

58 M. Mollat & P. Wolff, *The Popular Revolutions of the Late Middle Ages*, pp. 11 and 92. The opinion of Mollat & Wolff that there were hardly any peasant revolts before the latter half of the fourteenth century is not more generally accepted. Werner Rösener argues that there were in fact several peasant revolts already in the thirteenth century, some of them quite important, although not in the same category as Jacquerie or the English rising revolt of 1381; W. Rösener, *Peasants in the Middle Ages*, pp. 243-248.

## ■ 5. Et videtur quod sic

The foregoing chapter was dedicated to presenting alternative readings of the sources and alternative hypotheses and theories based on these readings. These may be roughly summarised as follows: 1. The exegetical tradition and the very essence of the Gospel of Luke were the most important factor in determining what the friars actually wrote and preached about (Lk. 16:19-31), not their own individual ideas, nor any "mendicant social ethos". 2. There are several sources that do not condemn the rich and the powerful and on the other hand, there are also several sources that present the poor and those who work in a less idealised manner (if not as potentially dangerous sinners).

3. Those poor that are idealised in the sources were actually members of religious communities, not the ordinary poor. 4. There must have been differences in social thinking between the middle class-oriented Franciscan order and the more upper-class and sophisticated Dominicans. 5. There could hardly have been any real pro-poor and pro-humble social ethos given that the mendicant orders were the most important opinion-makers in the thirteenth-century Church and society. Were they really sincere, it would have brought upon substantial improvement in the living conditions and social respectability of the poor, which never happened. Furthermore, if they truly preached as the model sermon collections allow us to believe, it would have caused social unrest and again there was none. Thus it is more than likely that they toned down their message when actually delivering it. The first five of these questions will be dealt in this chapter, while the last one, the answer to which includes an answer to why mendicants preached and thought as they did, will be left for the following main chapter, since it needs to be dealt with more extensively.

### 5.1. The Real Role of the Tradition in Sermons

The importance of the exegetical tradition cannot be denied. The writings of the fathers were widely read and used as such and especially through different intermediaries such as the *Glossa ordinaria* and different *florilegiums*. It just so happens that the influence of patristic writings from secondary sources is well documented on the part of one of the Lazarus sermons used in this study. Father Louis-Jacques Bataillon uses Jacopo da Varazze's Lazarus sermon *Mortuus est dives* as an example of Jacopo citing patristic sources via the *Catena aurea* of Thomas Aquinas.<sup>1</sup>

1 L.-J. Bataillon, *Jacopo da Varazze e Tommaso d'Aquino*, pp. XVIII, 22-23.

It is also true, that the nature of Luke's Gospel and especially Lk. 16 is very much anti-rich and anti-powerful. These aspects certainly led preachers and writers of the model sermons in a certain direction. However, as can be seen from Bonaventure's or Aquinas' commentaries on this text, there would have been alternative interpretations and less radical approaches. Furthermore, it would have been possible to choose a less controversial theme to preach upon. For Franciscans it would have been Lk. 6:36 *Estote misericordes*. This was the pericope for the sermons on the first Sunday after Whitsun. The Franciscan writers of model sermons could very well have picked up that theme instead of the more anti-rich Luke 16:19-31, yet in many cases they chose not to do so.<sup>2</sup>

The sermons on Luke 6:36 are not very different from the Lazarus sermons. Both underline the importance of mercifulness. The difference lies in emphasis. Sermons on the theme *Mortuus est dives* tend to focus on the dark side, that is unmercifulness and its punishment, whereas sermons on *Estote misericordes* tend to emphasise the positive value of mercy and its rewards. It can therefore be argued that the choice of the theme to be preached on was itself an expression of opinion. It would not be quite comfortable for a person who accepts wealth and values highly the rich to choose *Mortuus est dives* for a theme.

It was emphasised earlier that despite the possible alternative readings it was a common custom to preach on the gospel text, which in most cases was inevitably the Lazarus parable; nevertheless, preachers could have chosen to treat the gospel differently. Most of the extant sermons emphasise the role of the rich man and his sins in the parable. They give much less consideration to Lazarus and his virtues. There is no reason whatsoever why this could not have been the other way round.

Furthermore, citing patristic sources does not mean that the writer has no personal opinion on the subject. More correctly one can say that it is a common custom to choose those authorities that reflect our own opinion, and use them to confirm it. It can thus be argued that friars cited anti-rich and anti-powerful passages from earlier exegetics precisely because they wanted to condemn the abuses of the rich and powerful, and what is more important, do it with the backing of proper authorities.

This methodological problem has been encountered by other historians as well. Alexander Murray has dealt with it in connection with medieval money satires. He says that it is true that there is very little originality in them and that they mostly were based on classical models such as Horace, Juvenal and Persius. The fact is, however, that writers of satires could choose their models. What drew them to Horace and others were the analogical social conditions. Murray nicely turns the objection on its head: Horace's satire was taken up because of its contemporary relevance.<sup>3</sup>

---

2 One reason for not using it was probably the fact that the Dominican or Parisian liturgy was in use in most places. Using Franciscan readings would have limited their potential audiences.

3 A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, pp. 74-75.

Jenny Swanson argues that John of Wales' *Communiloquium* can be used as a source for his personal ideas, although it is almost exclusively put together from citations of other writers. Her argument is worth citing *in extenso*:

*"To attempt to reach one man's mind through the words of others may seem futile. But in that case I would suggest a simile between John preparing a section of Communiloquium and a person selecting an outfit of clothes. The individual may not have designed or made all the garments and accessories involved, but the combination of items and the way in which they are worn conveys a distinctive impression of the wearer – and is meant to do so."*<sup>4</sup>

Even if there were no personal, distinctively thirteenth-century or mendicant features in the Lazarus sermons, it would be possible to use them as sources for the mendicant social ethos. Luckily, this is not the case. Even a short comparison between, say, Nicolaus de Aquaevilla's sermon and patristic sources cited at the beginning of the second chapter, reveals the difference between these source groups. The anti-rich lamentations in the mendicant sermons are much more explicit and bitter than any in the patristic commentaries, which were not, as we have seen, totally anti-rich.<sup>5</sup> Another major difference is the actual naming of the social groups. Saint Augustine may reprehend the rich, but he leaves it to his readers to decide who these sinful rich might be, whereas Nicolaus de Aquaevilla uses categories such as knights.

Drawing all this together one can say that without doubt the exegetical tradition and the essence of the pericope had some influence on the Lazarus sermons, both as regards the actual message and the ways of expressing it. Nevertheless it would be wrong to say that mendicants did not follow their own ideas and opinions on society when expounding Lk. 16. This was demonstrated in the third main chapter of this study. The sources used in these chapters were purposely selected from outside the commentaries on Luke's parable. Yet the message in them is essentially similar to that of the Lazarus sermons. Therefore one cannot say that these sermons were merely echoing the thoughts of Luke and early fathers who commented on the *Gospel*.

## 5.2. Possibility vs. Probability

The second counter-argument against the original hypothesis of sinful rich and virtuous poor comprises those sources which give a slightly different picture of the rich and powerful as well as of the poor and those who work. Not always were the rich and the powerful assumed to be bad and sinful. Neither were the poor and workers automatically assumed to be good Christians. This has become evident from the more academic writings of Bonaventure and Aquinas, but also from the standard pastoral sources. This observation, however, does not

4 J. Swanson, *John of Wales*, p. 65.

5 B. Smalley, *The Gospels in Schools*, pp. 42-44.

falsify the basic hypothesis that mendicants tended to think that the poor, the sick and those who worked were better Christians than the nobles, the rich and the powerful. It has not been stated that the mendicant social ethos was monolithic and uncompromising in this respect.

There were personal differences. Some writers were more militant and perceived the distinction between good poor and sinful rich in more absolute terms, while others left the door open to exceptional cases. Aquinas and Bonaventure, as seen, thought that poverty was a useful or optimal condition for salvation, but not the only possible one, nor absolutely sanctifying in all circumstances. Most mendicant writers thought that it was extremely difficult for the rich to obtain salvation, but only the most extreme among them were ready to say that it was impossible, and they were not numerous; in fact none of the 35 sermons used as a main corpus of sources in this study takes this extreme view.

The only sermon known to me that makes this kind of statement was held by an anonymous Franciscan friar in Paris on the 21st of January 1231. As an extreme opinion, his central message is worth repeating here: "*Behold! There is nothing between the rich man and hell.*"<sup>6</sup> Even this sermon becomes more understandable when put into the right context. Unlike the Lazarus sermons used as a main corpus of sources in this study, this was not a model sermon, but an actual sermon preached live in front of an audience. One might assume that the preacher was somewhat carried away by the heat of the situation. Had he written a model sermon later on the basis of his sermon, he might have reconsidered its wording.

The real difference between different preachers was not whether they thought that rich men go automatically to hell, or whether they thought that they have the same chances of salvation as everybody else. The actual scale of opinions moved between different probabilities of salvation for the rich, where the emphasis was put, on the possibility or on the difficulty of salvation. It varied from the almost absolute condemnation of the rich and riches to the moderate attitude of Bonaventure and Aquinas, who did not see riches as a serious obstacle to salvation. Therefore it is not difficult to find an occasional passage where someone rich is presented in a positive light.

The picture of the poor and those who work as potential sinners is indeed a more difficult one, since it appears in the sources much more frequently than that of the virtuous rich man. There is no doubt whatsoever that the catalogue of sins connected with peasants and workers presented in Johannes von Freiburg's *Confessionale* reflects the actual social reality and situations commonly encountered by father confessors.<sup>7</sup> Evidently the poor and workers were not *a priori* good Christians. There were dangers to overcome before they could be called such.

---

6 Sermo cuiusdam fratris minoris in festo beatae Agnetis 21.1. 1231. In Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens*, p. 385. "Ecce nihil est medium inter divitem et infernum."

7 Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale. Ad rusticos & Ad laboratores*. BL. Addit 19581, ff. 191v-192r.

These findings, however, do not sink the original hypothesis that the rich and the powerful were more often considered to be potential sinners than not, and that the poor, the sick and the workers were considered to have a good chance of salvation. The important point here is not whether the rich could have been virtuous, nor is it whether the poor could have been sinners. The real crux is whether they were generally held to be so by the mendicant writers. It is important to see the difference between possibility and probability.

A man could have been both rich and virtuous but he was probably not. Therefore it is important to take another look at those sources that present the rich and the powerful in a positive context. Berthold von Regensburg wrote that most of the rich will be damned, but not all. This can be seen to support the general hypothesis of the badness of the rich. The continuation: "*but not all*" is merely a statistical bias that does not have any effect on the general conclusion. It only leaves the door open for the rare exceptions to the rule.<sup>8</sup> This tendency can be perceived in almost all of those passages that were used to prove that the rich and the powerful were occasionally presented as virtuous.

As noted before, Giovanni da San Gemignano includes a whole *quaestio* ("*utrum habere diuitias sit peccatum*") in his Lenten sermon. His answer was no. Nevertheless, right after presenting his view that on a theoretical level the owning of riches is a natural thing for a man, and thus not sinful, he returns to the cold facts of everyday life:

*"However, it so happens that men sin in having riches in five ways. Firstly in acquiring them when it is done in an illicit manner, like stealing, through usury or robbery or simony or in any other such manner. And because it happens only rarely that large fortunes are acquired legally or even without mixing legally acquired property with illicit profits, therefore Augustine says: 'Every rich man is either unrightful or owns unrighteously.'"*<sup>9</sup>

Thus in real life, rarely is a rich man found whose riches would be rightfully gained – never if Augustine's argument was to be believed. It is therefore obvious that Giovanni had the same ideas about the rich as other mendicants. With the *quaestio* he only wanted to leave open the theoretical possibility of being rich and virtuous.

The attitude towards the poor and those who work was exactly the opposite. An overwhelming majority of the mendicant sources tend to underline their potential sanctity, not their sinfulness. One must, however, acknowledge that the tendency is not as clear as it is in the case of the rich. A good example of this general tendency are the *ad status* sermons of Guibert de Tournai. He

---

8 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42v.

9 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 57v. "Contingit tamen habere diuitias quinque modis peccare circa eos. Primo in acquirendo in quantum per modos illicitos acquiruntur ut per furtum uel usura, uel rapina, uel symonia et huiusmodi et quia raro contingit quod magne diuitie licite sint acquisite uel non saltem mixte cum aliquo illicito lucro, dicit Augustinus quod: 'omnis diues aut iniquus est aut habens iniqui.'"

analyses both the rich and the poor. The relevant parts have been presented and analysed above, but a brief summary here will make the point more obvious.

Let us start with the sermon *Ad potentes et milites*. According to address the powerful and knights are not too keen to hear mass. They do not attend to sermons, nor do they pay what is due to the Church. Furthermore they commit violations against the immunity of the churches, spend their time in feasting and enjoyment, completely neglect military discipline and exercises, oppress the poor and let their bailiffs and servants take whatever is left to them. If this was not enough they go to tournaments and thus inflict great damage on others and themselves, they backbite at the innocent and religious, they listen to flatterers, give their money and what is left from their banquets to *histriones* (jesters, bards, actors, dancers and so on) instead of to the poor, they take bribes, pervert justice, and allow robbers and Jews to operate in their territory. There is hardly anything positive said about them in the whole sermon.<sup>10</sup>

Guibert's attitude towards the knights is not at all exceptional. Humbert de Romans seems to have thought that an overwhelming majority of the knights were no good. Those parts of his sermons *Ad laicos in castris* and *Ad nobiles malos* that describe the sins of the knights are full of revealing little words like: "*frequenter*", "*in multis*", and "*solent*".<sup>11</sup> Alexander Murray seems to think that Humbert's conclusion was that some knights are bad, others good.<sup>12</sup> However, reading these sermons one is tempted to think that the sermon *Ad nobiles devotos* was meant to be presented only as a model of behaviour, not to reflect the general situation of the nobility; so great is the number of negative comments on noblemen in preceding sermons. *Ad nobiles devotos* does not say anything at all about the frequency of the devout noblemen, it merely enumerates the virtues expected of them (humility, chastity, generosity and fidelity towards God). Humbert is much less dedicated when writing about the good noblemen than when chastising the sinful ones.<sup>13</sup>

David d'Avray has analysed Guibert's sermons to the upper bourgeoisie, that is, to the rich in the towns. He says that much of the sermon *Ad cives communiter viventes* reads like a forceful diatribe against riches. He goes on to say that Guibert nevertheless leaves open the possibility to be rich and virtuous at the same time. Riches are a hindrance to a bad man, but a help to a good man. The general tone of this sermon is slightly anti-rich, and Guibert allows the possibility of a virtuous rich man under certain circumstances: his wealth must not be ill-acquired, he must remain humble, and he must give alms from his riches.<sup>14</sup> Compared to what he had to say about the knights, Guibert's view of the rich bourgeoisie is more positive, although not outright pro-rich. It at least accepts the possibility of salvation for the rich under the right circumstances.

10 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. *Ad potentes et milites sermo*, BN. lat. 15943, f. 120v-123v.

11 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*, S. 77 *Ad laicos in castris* and S. 81 *Ad nobiles malos*.

12 A. Murray, *Reason and Society*, p. 232.

13 Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*, S. 82 *Ad nobiles devotos*.

14 D.L. d'Avray, *Sermons to the upper Bourgeoisie*, pp. 194-196.

This is confirmed by a brief glance at another sermon of Guibert's; we find that he first writes:

*"I Tim. VI: 'For they that will become rich fall into temptation and into the snare of the Devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which drown men into destruction and perdition. For the desire of money is the root of all evils.' He does not say those that are, but those that desire become rich, because the possession is not forbidden but inordinate love which incites to temptation and into the snare of the Devil."*

Here again the first impression is that Guibert legitimises being rich. That may well be, but a few lines later he bursts into a lament over how *only few* manage to escape the spiritual dangers of wealth.<sup>15</sup>

Guillaume Peyraut's case is quite similar. Reading his sermon where he makes a difference between two meanings of the word rich, i.e. to have riches and to love them, one gets the impression that he is trying to legitimise being rich. That is exactly what he does on a theoretical level. After a few lines, however, he returns to the subject and lets us know that the practice is somewhat different from the theory:

*"And note, be it so that it is not bad to obtain riches; they are, however, an occasion for sin, because according to Seneca: 'It is a great achievement to share a tent with riches and remain uncorrupted.' Eccl. xi: 'If thou be rich thou shalt not be free from sin.'"*<sup>16</sup>

Again we are led to understand that the actual number of the virtuous rich is not overwhelming.

Summa summarum, what these preachers are saying is that on a theoretical level it is quite possible to be rich and virtuous, but in practice most men fall into temptation with their riches. Rare are the exceptions to this rule. If this is the case with actual sources, what then have we to think about Alexander Murray's theory of the noblemen as better Christians?

Murray has stated that the criticism levelled at noblemen in mendicant (and other) sources was fainthearted, since the critics can be shown not to have fully believed what they said. Murray implies that most of these critics were themselves of noble ancestry and therefore were not seriously expected to criticise other noblemen. This may be true of the sources he has used, and it may well equally be true of the sources analysed in this study. However, this

---

15 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Ad leprosus et abiectos, sermo primus. In N. Bériou et F.-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus*, pp. 131-132. "De primo I Thi. VI: Qui uolunt diuites fieri incidunt in temptationem et in laqueum dyaboli et in desideria multa inutilia et nociua que mergunt hominem in interitum et perditionem. Radix enim omnium malorum est cupiditas. Non dicit qui sunt, sed qui uolunt fieri diuites, quia non prohibetur possessio sed inordinata affectio, incidunt in temptationem et in laqueum dyaboli."

16 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex euangelis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n2r. "Et notandum quod licet habere diuitias non sit malum, tamen occasio est malorum quia secundum Senecam: 'Multum est diuitiarum contubernio non corrumpi.' Eccl. xi: 'Si diues fueris, non eris immunis a delicto.'"



cannot be said with certainty since a large part of the most important mendicant writers are practically unknown to us. Occasionally it is not even possible to say whether the writer of some best-seller sermon cycle was a Franciscan or Dominican friar. In most cases the ancestry of the writers is well beyond our knowledge.<sup>17</sup>

Even if we accept that the writers of these sermons were of noble ancestry, it does not prove that they were not serious when criticising other noblemen. Joining a mendicant order meant in a sense denying one's ancestry and leaving behind one's social privileges. It meant following in nakedness him who is naked, i.e. Christ. It is only natural that friars, who in their daily responsibilities often came into contact with the poor and their problems, should have been the first ones to speak when it came to criticism of their noble oppressors.

Second, a more serious argument of Murray's is that those nobles criticised in the sources were not real noblemen at all. They were criticised because they did not behave as real nobles ought to do. This is essentially true, but it does not mean that nobles were considered by the friars to be better Christians. The criticism of the friars was not directed against the ideal of nobility. They were more concerned with social reality and as seen before, in that reality knights and other noblemen were seen in a negative light. It is a matter of indifference whether the noblemen would have been better Christians if they had behaved according to the code of conduct for noblemen. The fact remains that the friars thought that in most cases they did not.

Murray argues for his views that nobles were in fact better Christians than commoners by pointing out that most of the saints who died between 900 and 1500 were of noble ancestry. He himself presents three objections to his figures. However, these concern only the mathematical side of the theory.<sup>18</sup> What is left unquestioned is whether or not these saints can be used at all as evidence of Christian opinions regarding the nobility. The total number of saints analysed by Murray is 72. The time-span in question is 600 years. The number of noblemen or otherwise upper-class saints is 62. This is certainly not a quota big enough to draw any firm conclusions as to the true religious quality of the medieval nobility. André Vauchez makes this perfectly clear when he writes that even though most saints were indeed members of the nobility, all nobles were obviously not saints (on the contrary, if the evidence presented above is to be taken as a representative of the common state of affairs).<sup>19</sup>

---

17 For more information on the preachers used as sources in this study, see for instance L.-J. Bataillon et N. Bériou, "G. de Mailly" de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs. *AFP* LXI (1991); L.E. Boyle, *The Summa confessorum of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teaching of St. Thomas and some of his Contemporaries*. In L.E. Boyle, *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200-1400* (London 1981), pp. III, 246-247; D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, p. 155; A. Dondaine, Guillaume Peyraut. *Vie et oeuvres. AFP* Vol. XVIII (1948); T. Kaeppli, Pour la biographie de Jacques de Cessole. *AFP* XXX (1960); T. Kaeppli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi* 3 vols. (Roma 1970-1980); G. Meesserman, *Le opere di fra Antonio Azaro Parmense*, p. 20; P.L. Oligier, *Servasanto da Faenza O.F.M. e il suo "Liber de virtutibus et vitiis"*. In *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, vol. I. Per la storia della teologia e della filosofia (*Studi e testi* 37; Roma 1924).

18 A. Murray, *Reason and Society*, pp. 339-341.

19 A. Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Age*, p. 208.

Furthermore two other points are left unquestioned in this analysis of saints. The first is that the saints were not always canonised because (or solely because) of their religious merits. More often than not political motives played their part in canonisation decisions. One can also question whether the poor or peasants had even a theoretical possibility of being canonised, no matter how good Christians they were.

Murray also states that there existed a specifically noble ethic meant to offset the dangers connected with nobility. Being rich was countered by being magnanimous, military strength was used to defend justice, and honours and dignity were balanced with reverence and obedience towards the Church in general and different religious institutions in special. All this is true in principle. A nobleman was supposed to do all these things.

If we look into the Lazarus sermons and other mendicant sources, we do not get the impression that noblemen were all that keen on giving alms and supporting the poor of Christ. The knightly virtue of magnanimity had often deteriorated into extensive spending on vanities. Such extravagance was not a virtue. It was a sin of prodigality. According to Guillaume Peyraut, magnanimity (*liberalitas*) is to share ones' riches with the poor in the form of alms. Prodigality (*prodigalitas*) is to spend it in vanity. He mentions especially *histriones* and other dishonest people.<sup>20</sup> Spending their money on *histriones* and *joculatores* was one of the most common targets of the accusations made by mendicant preachers against the nobles and prelates.<sup>21</sup>

Even a cursory glance through the mendicant sermons reveals that knights were not well known for their enthusiasm to defend justice. No, instead they were in most cases presented as either selling and distorting justice themselves, or allowing this to happen within their jurisdiction.<sup>22</sup> It is true that nobles made significant donations to the Church; however, these were often made off wealth acquired by unjust methods, like the robbery and oppression of the poor. This practice was anonymously condemned by the mendicant preachers.<sup>23</sup>

20 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), Tractatus IV, p.5, c.1. De distinctione prodigalitatit a libertate.

21 See for instance Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de sanctis*, Sermo de apostolis Petro et Paulo. UUB. C 371, f. 174r. "...quidam bonos et derident et malos laudant quales sunt mimi, ioculatores et multi in curis dominorum ipsis applaudentes cum male faciunt."; Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. Sermo ad potentes et milites. BN. lat. 15943, f. 122r. "...sed nutriunt hystriones dantes panem filiorum canibus ranas Egypti nutrientes, etiam reliquias ciborum consumunt quas pauperes debent manducare et reliquias uestium dant eis quas pauperes sicut et ciborum reliquias debent habere..."; Humbert de Romans OP, *Instrukiones de officis ordinis*, cap. XLVI. De officio confessoris, p. 361. "Milites inquirendi sunt...de profusione pecuniae causa adulationis, vel histrionatus facta..."; Johannes von Freiburg OP, *Confessionale*. Principes et alios nobiles. BL. Addit. 19581, f. 190v. "Si histrionibus sua dedit superflue."

22 See chapters 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.

23 See for instance Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Compendium moralitatum*. BN. lat. 3788, f. 2r. "Abhominabilis est Deo elemosina uel oblatio facta de rapina." Jacques clarifies that this means "elemosine uel oblationes usurariorum et aliorum qui de rapina uiuunt."; Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. Lambeth Palace 480, p. 118. "Item cum dant de iniusta possessione Eccl. 34: 'Qui offert sacrificium de substantia pauperum quasi qui uictimat filium in conspectu patris.'...Proverb. 3: 'De primiciis frugum tuarum', non alienarum da pauperibus."

Besides, according to Guibert de Tournai, many nobles did not even bother to take care of their regular payments to the Church, not to mention any additional donations. Instead they oppressed and violated churches and their liberties.<sup>24</sup> Again Murray has it completely right concerning the ethics of the nobility. However, there was a major difference between noble principles and ordinary practice. At the least, mendicant writers saw knights as proud, violent robbers and oppressors, who greatly harmed the poor as well as the Church, not as humble and benevolent protectors of them.

We may move on to consider the case of not so virtuous poor. Guibert's four sermons *Ad pauperes et afflictos* give a very positive impression. They are completely dedicated to the praise of poverty. Their message is: Be patient in worldly tribulations and you will reap the benefits in eternal life. There are simply no negative remarks concerning the poor.<sup>25</sup> Not even as much as there are positive comments on the rich in sermons to the upper bourgeoisie. This is the most convincing point. The rich are accepted to be good if they manage to fulfil certain conditions. The poor on the other hand are assumed to be good as long as they do not fall into certain temptations. The *a priori* assumption is that the poor are expected to be good and the rich are expected to be sinners.

Guibert's sermons *Ad agricolas et rurales* are not as positive as those for the poor. The first of them is dedicated to the possible vices of the peasants. The second is about the benefits of manual labour. The last is about obtaining eternal life. Guibert's view of the peasants seems to be that there are some professional hazards involved, but should they manage to overcome them, the road to eternal life is wide open.<sup>26</sup> This is almost similar to his attitude to the upper bourgeoisie. The difference lies in the fact that according to Guibert riches were dangerous for bad men, but hard manual work was good for any man, especially for the bad, since manual work was seen as a way of doing penance.

Drawing these considerations together one can say that there certainly were pious noblemen and other rich who lived according to the moral codes presented by the Church. There were also the poor, the workers and peasants who were not always saintly and were occasionally not even good. The fact remains, however, that despite the occasional appearance of exceptional cases, the wide majority of the sources presented the rich and powerful as potential sinners and the poor, workers and peasants as potential good Christians.

Being rich and being a member of the nobility were often, at least implicitly, referred to as reasons for being sinful and damned. Poverty and manual work on the contrary were hardly ever presented as being dangerous to the soul (there are some exceptions, like Giovanni da San Gemignano, who points out that non-voluntary poverty causes dangers for both body and soul, and John of

---

24 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*, *Ad potentes et milites sermo*. BN. lat. 15943, f. 121r. "...decimas enim et oblationes debitas et alia iura ecclesiastica in periculo animarum suarum detinent, emunitates ecclesiarum uiolant..."

25 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. *Ad pauperes et afflictos* (four sermons), BN. lat. 15943, f. 100r-106v.

26 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*. *Ad agricolas et rurales* (two sermons), BN. lat. 15943, f. 134v-137r.

Wales, who notes that poverty is not automatically virtuous and can even be dangerous, since it leads those who are weak to true poverty, that is to envy and avarice).<sup>27</sup> The danger in being rich is to love too much one's position and riches – one could even say that it is richness itself. The only danger in being poor is not to accept one's poverty. Love of poverty is absolutely virtuous. In order to be saved, a rich man was supposed to behave like a poor man, to be like a poor man in the midst of riches.<sup>28</sup>

Analysing the sources more carefully we find that the virtuous rich man is in fact precisely that – a poor man in the midst of riches. Even though he is rich, it is against his true will. He really would not like to be rich, but dutifully assumes the burden of riches to be able the better to help those who are poor and in need of protection and sustenance. Even though they are rich, deep inside they remain poor. Berthold von Regensburg writes:

*"The third group of the rich are those who are not only saved, but who will receive great glory in heaven, like Job, Nicholas, Martin, and many others. These are they who have riches not for themselves or their relatives, but for the poor, so that they could give them as much as possible. Were it only for themselves, they would rather be poor and none of them is rich of his own will, but because of love of doing good things [...]."*<sup>29</sup>

Thus even the common *topos* of Old Testament patriarchs used in defending the right to be rich turns out to be somewhat ambivalent as to the possibility of being rich and virtuous. It is surely possible, but were these rich men in fact rich? According to Berthold they were merely poor men who held riches against their own will to please God.

Such is the opinion of Antonio Azaro Parmense too. He writes:

*"He who wishes to serve God has to be poor or similar to the poor, for he is not poor who does not love the poor like king David, who said: 'But I am a beggar and poor.' If the rich man lives in abstinence and gives alms generously he may well be called poor as is the case with Saint Martin, Saint Oswald, Saint Henry the emperor and his wife Cunegund."*<sup>30</sup>

27 John of Wales, *Communiloquium*, 3.4.2. De admonitione pauperum. BAV. Vat.lat. 1018, ff. 82v-83r; Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 58v. "Ad secundum dicendum quod sicut ex paupertate non uoluntaria secuntur pericula tam spiritualia quam corporalia..."

28 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, p. 215.

29 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 42v. "Tercii diuites sunt qui non tamen saluantur sed magnam gloriam habebunt in celo ut Job deinde Nicolaus, Martinus et multi alii. Illi sunt qui diuitias habent non pro se uel parentibus sed tamen propter pauperes ut possint illis multa largiri quia quantum pro se ipsis libentius essent pauperes nec aliqua sua delectatione trahuntur ad hoc ut habeant diuitias sed tamen amore benefaciendi..."

30 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. CLM 2774, ff. 147v-148r. "Qui Deo uult seruire debet esse pauper uel similis pauperi, non enim ille est pauper qui non amat eam ut Dauid qui dixit: 'Ego mendicus sum et pauper', unde cum diues in abstinentia uixerit et elemosina large erogauerit bene pauper dicitur ut patet de sancto Martino et sancto Oswaldo, et sancto Henrico imperatori et uxore eius dicta Kunigundis."

What Antonio is actually saying is that the rich saints of the past were in fact poor.

### 5.3. Virtuous and even more Virtuous Poverty

It could also be argued that the poor who are being praised in the sources were in fact the voluntary poor, i.e. the religious. This is true up to a point. The religious, especially the mendicants, were keen to underline the importance of apostolic poverty and their own order's achievements in this field. In some cases, as we have seen, the praise was indeed meant for the voluntarily poor.

If we take a closer look into Saint Bernard's key phrase: "*Poverty is not virtue, but love of poverty is*", we perceive that it does not exclude *les pauvres proprement dits*. It was quite possible to be poor through necessity and still love one's poverty and be happy with one's position. Rejecting riches could mean giving away one's riches but also not desiring to have them. The latter way of rejecting them was open to the actual poor. They only had to be happy in their poverty. Nicolas de Gorran wrote: "*In this present gospel three things are noted. Firstly the merit connected with being a beggar, for poverty, be it voluntarily assumed or patiently tolerated, is meritorious because it is penance.*"<sup>31</sup> There is no question that Nicolas means the ordinary poor when he is says "*patiently tolerated*". This is the fact with Pierre de Reims as well:

*"Next it is said: 'and likewise Lazarus evil things', and that in plenty because he was not only poor but a beggar, that is the beggar of crumbs in which we note extreme poverty, but he was blessed for 'blessed are the poor etc. [...]. And note that poverty makes us to be in abundance of virtues II Cor. 8: 'and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality.'"*<sup>32</sup>

Considering the way Lazarus' poverty is described before the quotation '*blessed are the poor*' it is extremely difficult to think that Pierre could have meant anything else than *les pauvres proprement dits*.

Another source that leaves very little room for speculation is Guibert de Tournai's Lazarus sermon. He compares poverty to merchandise:

*"And note that poverty is called bad in such manner as in the metaphor about the merchant who calls the goods he is buying bad in Ecclesiasticus (in fact the passage is Prov. 20:14): 'It is nought, it is nought, saith every buyer: and when he is gone away, then he will boast.' Similarly poverty is*

31 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BL. Harley 755, f. 18r. "In presenti implicantur tria, primo meriti status ibi mendicus, paupertas enim uoluntaria assumpta uel patienter tolerata propter penitentiam meritoria est."

32 Pierre de Reims OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BAV. Burghes. 343, f. 27r. "Sequitur quod Lazarus recepit similiter mala scilicet abundanter, quia non solum erat pauper, sed et mendicus, id est, micarum mendicus in quo maxima notatur egestas, sed beatus, quia 'beati pauperes etc'. [...] Nota quod paupertas uirtutibus habundare facit ii Cor. viii. 'et altissima paupertas habundauit in diuitias simplicitatis eorum.'"

*seen to be bad, but when we buy the eternal kingdom with it and get our share of it, then it appears to be glorious.*"<sup>33</sup>

It is less likely that the voluntarily poor, i.e. the religious, would have called their poverty bad and left it unappreciated, whereas it is more than likely that many of *les pauvres proprement dits* were not particularly enthusiastic about their poverty and needed to be reminded of its benefits.

Antonio Azaro Parmense deals with the problem of different kinds of poverty in his second Lazarus sermon. He writes that there are three kinds: voluntary, by necessity, and simulated. He writes that voluntary poverty for the sake of God is always good. The poverty by necessity is good if it is borne with patience; however, if the poor complains to God of his situation, is impatient, and craves after worldly goods, then his poverty is evil. Simulated poverty is always evil.<sup>34</sup> Antonio does not explain what he means by simulated poverty, but it is obvious that he refers to the hypocritical habit of trying to look poorer than one actually was for the sake of people's praise. Even the very fact that someone could be suspected of simulating poverty proves that it did have spiritual values.

Accepting the sanctifying effects of normal poverty did not necessarily diminish the glory of voluntarily accepted poverty. Guibert de Tournai thought that it was the highest possible sanctity to not possess anything, not even in common (by which he of course meant to be a Franciscan brother). However, if the passage is read more closely, Guibert obviously admits that it is virtuous to be poor and be happy in one's poverty, i.e. not to want any possessions. This is obvious from the fact that after describing these poor he moves on to describe friars and uses the words: "There are others who add to all this perfectness..."<sup>35</sup>

Guibert's contemporary Franciscan Berthold von Regensburg took the same view. He describes three types of poor men in his sermon: firstly those who will be damned, secondly those who will be saved, and thirdly those who will in addition to being saved receive great glory in heaven. The second group consists of the ordinary poor:

*"The second poor are those who will be saved, that is those who patiently tolerate their poverty and even though they would not mind being richer,*

---

33 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Roma Angelica 819, f. 119v. "Et nota quod appellatur paupertas malum ad metaphoram mercatoris qui merces uocat malas secundum illud Ecc: 'Malum est, malum est dicit omnis emptor et postquam recesserit, tunc gloriabitur.' Sic modo paupertas uidetur mala, sed cum ex ea enimus regnum eternum et in propriam nostram recessimus, tunc apparebit gloriosa."

34 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. CLM 2774, f. 148v. "Est enim triplex paupertas, prima uoluntaria [...], secunda necessaria uel coacta [...], tertia simulatoria uel ypocrita [...]. Prima paupertas scilicet uoluntaria propter Deum, semper est bona. Secunda paupertas scilicet necessaria si est cum patientia et iustitia, etiam est bona, si autem cum murmura contra Deum et cum impatientia et iniustitia, scilicet cum nimis appetitu rerum iustarum et iustorum est mala, ymo est martirium Dyaboli. Tertia scilicet simulatoria semper est mala [...]."

35 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de sanctis*. De sancto Francisco. Sermo primus. UUB. C 378, f. 11v. "Sunt alii qui supra hoc addunt [...]."

*they would rather stay poor than attain riches against the will of God; that is by theft, fraud, or sinning otherwise.*"<sup>36</sup>

Again there is no doubt that these people are *les pauvres proprement dits*. Were they religious, they would not like to be richer.

The religious are not totally forgotten in Berthold's sermon. They are the third group of the poor: "The third poor are those who are not only saved, but who will also receive great glory in heaven. These are the poor in spirit who are voluntarily poor, who even if they could have riches without sin do not want to have them."<sup>37</sup> Berthold agrees with the traditional exegesis of the *Glossa ordinaria* and Aquinas in interpreting the poor in spirit to mean the religious. However, dividing the poor into three categories of which two are saved, he managed to admit the virtuousness of the ordinary poor, and at the same time underline the superb spiritual benefits of religion. Judging from the general tone the religious he was thinking about were the mendicants.

Furthermore it is an undeniable fact that some of the virtuous poor praised in the mendicant sources were without any doubt normal poor, poor by necessity. This is true of Guibert de Tournai's sermons *Ad pauperes et afflictos* and Humbert de Romans' sermon *Ad pauperes*.<sup>38</sup> Such is also the case with John of Wales' positive statements on the poor in his *Communiloquium*.<sup>39</sup>

It is equally difficult to believe that Nicolaus de Aquaevilla was referring to the religious when speaking of the poor of the Christ dying in hunger and freezing to death in winter. It is somewhat difficult to imagine Benedictine monks dying of hunger. The latter main division of his sermon (three reasons why Lazarus was carried by angels to the bosom of Abraham) seems likewise to refer to the ordinary poor, since it underlines those hardships of poverty that were quite alien to the religious, who despite their voluntary poverty enjoyed a reasonably comfortable life.<sup>40</sup>

Even if some of the poor in the mendicant sermons and pastoral manuals can be interpreted to mean the religious, this does not prove the basic hypothesis to be wrong. It does not explain the praise of those who work, that is, peasants and other manual workers. Therefore one can conclude that despite occasional exceptions, the poor praised in the Lazarus sermons and other pastoral material were *les pauvres proprement dits*. Part of the glory of the *vita apostolica*,

36 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 43r. "Secundi pauperes saluantur qui scilicet patienter ferunt paupertatem suam et licet libenter essent ditiores tamen potius uolunt pauperes esse cum uoluntate Dei quam diuites contra Dei uoluntatem uidelicet furto uel fraude uel alio modo quod sit peccatum."

37 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 3215, f. 43r. "Tercii pauperes non tamen saluantur sed magnam habebunt gloriam in celo. Isti sunt pauperes spiritu id est libenter et uoluntarie qui etiam si possent sine peccato habere diuitias nollent habere."

38 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*, *Ad pauperes et afflictos* (four sermons), BN. lat. 15943, f. 100r-106v; Humbert de Romans OP, *Sermones ad diversos status*, S. 81 *Ad pauperes*.

39 John of Wales OFM, *Communiloquium*, I.10.3. BAV. Vat.lat. 1018, f. 54v.

40 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 82r-84v.

normally connected with the religious, was also transferred to the conventional poor and workers. The fact that the voluntarily poor were considered to be perfect and saintly does not alter the equal fact that ordinary poverty and hardship were considered to be spiritually sanctifying. Possibly they were not as virtuous as those living in voluntary poverty, but nevertheless in significant measure.

It has been suggested that there were two competing images of the peasants in circulation. It is curious that mendicant preachers, as seen, generally decided to choose the image of the hard working and saintly peasant. In only very rare cases do we get a glimpse of the rather stupid, uncivilised brute which was the other side of the coin. It is time to take a closer look at these two stereotypes of the peasant. Who were the propagators of the half-animal half-man topos?

Murray and Freedman have found their anti-rustic quotations in essentially non-religious sources (Philip Harvengt, Count of Flanders, parody prayer, satire, courtly and troubadour poetry, Dante, Petrarch, the *Carmina Burana*, French fables, and German satire poetry).<sup>41</sup> All these, and most other sources that present the stereotype of the stupid and brutish peasant, were products of lay culture, or from the point of view of the Church – counter-culture. The people who wrote such material were not usually clerics, other members of the intellectual élite, court troubadours, and goliardic poets. Sometimes they were also people living in towns which were rapidly growing in number and population.

Murray notes that the phrase "*rural and bestial men*" could easily slip from a townsman's pen.<sup>42</sup> In that sense the despising of peasants could be seen as a sign of the developing self awareness of the urban class. The positive attitude taken by the mendicants towards the peasantry can be seen as evidence against the often voiced opinion that the mendicants were essentially an urban movement. It is true that their convents were located in towns, but that does not necessarily mean that their apostolate was not carried into the surrounding countryside. After all, the huge majority of the population still lived in rural areas.<sup>43</sup>

Putting aside the city dwellers, in many cases the most outspoken opponents of the peasantry were themselves outsiders and condemned in the eyes of the Church. The professions of *Goliard*, *histrion*, or *joculator* were strictly forbidden by the Church. Their practitioners were not allowed to receive communion nor were they absolved from their sins unless they dropped their profession altogether.<sup>44</sup>

According to Murray the idea of a virtuous peasant life was essentially ascetic and monastic. The nearer an author was to the monastic tradition, the more

---

41 A. Murray, *Reason and Society*, pp. 238-242; P. Freedman, *Sainteté et sauvagerie*, p. 540.

42 A. Murray, *Reason and Society*, p. 238.

43 See D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 39-41.

44 J. Le Goff, *Métiers licites et métiers illicites*, pp. 100-101; E. Faral, *Les jongleurs en France au Moyen Age* (Paris 1910), pp. 290-291; Thomas de Chobham, *Summa Confessorum*. Ed. F. Broomfield (Louvain - Paris 1968), p. 291.



likely he was to present peasants as models of a good Christian.<sup>45</sup> It is undoubtedly true that the idea of the virtuous peasant indeed originated in monastic circles, as did almost all the basic ideas of Christianity during the Dark Ages. However, in the thirteenth century it seems that the line between the stereotypes of saintly peasant and brute was not drawn between monastic writers and others. More likely it was between mainstream ecclesiastical writers and others. It is possible to argue that most members of the intellectual élite did belong to the clergy, but then again how many serious academics really wrote texts despising peasants? It seems to be that some of these satiric texts have indeed been born within university circles, but I find it unlikely that they represent the opinion of the academic majority. Their unofficial status and wide disapproval are reflected in the fact that most of these satires and other anti-peasant writings are anonymous.

One is tempted to envisage a reasonably solid consensus among the clergy that peasants were to be presented as potentially good or even model Christians as long as they did not fall into those sins considered to be typical of them (envy, laziness, neglecting tithes and so on). One might even question whether there really existed two popular stereotypes of peasants amongst the clergy. The image of the stupid brute is put forward in sources that are to be found in print (and have been so for a long time), whereas more common eulogies of peasant life often remain less well known to modern readers. These works are often found in manuscripts or early prints only. Another difference is that works such as the *Carmina Burana* have been vigorously studied due to their interest from the point of view of literature, whereas less interesting pastoral manuals like Johannes von Freiburg's *Confessionale* have often been neglected.

Yet the fact is that the *Carmina Burana* survives in one single manuscript and there is no proof of it having any influence whatsoever during the Middle Ages. John of Freiburg's *Confessionale* survives in more than 150 manuscripts and it enjoyed lasting popularity among preachers and confessors. Nevertheless, one must remember that poetry was also circulated in oral form, and thus its popularity cannot be evaluated on the basis of written evidence only. Nonetheless one feels that its importance has been overemphasised in research.

Paul Freedman writes: "the best known examples of grotesque and comical peasants are to be found in French fables and German satirical poems."<sup>46</sup> The key words are best known. They are well known to researchers not because of their popularity and importance in their own time, but because of their literary values. The point is that quite possibly there really were not two competing stereotypes of peasants at all. It could be that the sources that present the negative image of peasants were not only written by marginal people, but enjoyed marginal popularity as well. Be that as may, the conclusion remains that the mendicant attitude to peasants was not only homogeneous from one writer to another, but was also the common position of the Church.

---

45 A. Murray, *Reason and Society*, pp. 238-239.

46 P. Freedman, *Sainteté et sauvagerie*, p. 540.

#### 5.4. The Homogeneity of the Mendicant Orders

The argument that there ought to be differences in social thinking between the two mendicant orders because there were differences in the social origins of their membership and in their general attitude towards poverty, is a very interesting one. It can, however, be demonstrated to be no longer valid. There are a number of statements concerning the mendicant orders in general and specifically the differences between the Franciscan and Dominican orders. Often these stereotypical ideas are repeated from one source to another without pause for critical thought.

A good example of these more general fix idées is that the mendicant orders were concentrated in towns and were essentially urban.<sup>47</sup> It may be that most of their convents were indeed in towns, but it is more doubtful whether their activities were as urban-centred otherwise. The mere fact that more than 90% of the population of thirteenth-century Europe lived outside towns ought to ring some alarm bell in the mind of any serious historian. If the clientele of mendicant orders was indeed as urban as has been proposed over the years, why (as amply evidenced in this study) are their *ad status* materials as well as sermons filled with references concerning peasants and country life?

More specific ideas regarding differences between the mendicant orders that are relevant to this study can be summarised in the following arguments: The Franciscans originated from lower classes than the Dominicans, their preaching was more simple, and they were more dedicated to apostolic poverty than the Dominicans, who used poverty merely as a means to obtain credibility among their audiences. Often these statements have been presented without any real evidence to support them.

The social origins of these orders have not been adequately studied. The only sources of information we have are the studies of J.B. Freed concerning Germany and D.R. Lesnick concerning Florence. Both conclude that the Dominicans recruited from slightly more upper-class men than the Franciscans. Lesnick states that the Dominicans were a *popolo grasso* order and the Franciscans mainly from the *popolo*. Freed adds that the evidence is of such fragmentary nature that it makes it impossible to draw any firm conclusions. Even if we accept these results as valid concerning the whole of Western Europe in the thirteenth century, we may wonder whether the social origins of the friars had that much to do with their social opinions. One must remember that many social revolutionaries in history have originated from the ruling upper classes. One might even say that lower-class revolutionary leaders have been rare exceptions.

Lesnick's connection between the social origins of the friars and their clientele seems to be a bit hasty. Could it really have been so that Florentine *popolo grasso* gathered in the Piazza Santa Maria Novella to hear Dominican sermons and at the same time the ordinary *popolo* went to Santa Croce after the services

---

47 For the latest authoritative presentation of this thesis, see J. Le Goff, *Les ordres mendiants*. In *Moines et religieux au Moyen Age*. Présenté par Jacques Berlioz (Paris 1994), pp. 229-234.

of the Friars Minor? A more plausible hypothesis is that the audiences were in most cases more or less mixed and that no specifically Dominican or specifically Franciscan audiences existed. From what we know of the preferences of medieval audiences it can be argued that most of the people went to the place where the best available preacher was giving a sermon, no matter from what order he was.

Those friars whose works constitute the corpus of sources in this study are extremely difficult to put into any particular social category. It can only be assumed that in most cases they were people who already before they joined the order had obtained a reasonable education. This would have made it possible for them to proceed in their studies well enough to be able to write popular books. That would mean that they were probably from better-off families, either bourgeoisie or nobility. Therefore, we cannot accept the argument that those who were from middle- or upper-class families tended to have less enthusiastic opinions about the poor and those who work; after all Saint Francis himself was a son of a wealthy merchant. The fact is that there seems to have been a common social ethos of mendicant writers no matter what their social origins were.

The idea that Franciscan preaching was the more simple *sermo humilis* when compared to academic Dominican preaching with its philosophical and theological subtleties has often circulated unquestioned in research. Lesnick's study of preaching in Florence is an excellent example of this tendency to hold to old assumptions uncritically. Lesnick has not used a single Franciscan sermon because according to him there are no extant Franciscan sermons from Florence. All his conclusions on the nature of Franciscan preaching are based on Giovanni de Caulibus de Sancto Gemignano's *Meditationes vitae Christi*. The fact is that these *Meditationes* are not sermons and it is open to discussion whether they were even used as sermon materials as Lesnick proposes.<sup>48</sup>

Lesnick's use and selection of sources have already been deprecated by other historians. It has been pointed out that Servasanto da Faenza's sermons were quite probably preached live in Florence and edited in the form they exist in today by the preacher himself in his later years. These sermons would have been the only proper basis for any generalisation about Franciscan preaching at Florence in the thirteenth century. It just so happens that Servasanto's sermons are far from the *sermo humilis* type. They include a substantial element of philosophical language and argument. Furthermore it has been quite conclusively proved that there simply were no major differences in form between Franciscan and Dominican sermons. Divisions and distinctions, the evident signs of "scholastic" sermons, were commonplaces in all mendicant sermons.<sup>49</sup>

48 D.R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence*, pp. 136-146.

49 D.L. d'Avray, *Philosophy in Preaching: The Case of a Franciscan Based in Thirteenth-Century Florence (Servasanto da Faenza)*. In *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages*. Philological Studies in Honor of Siegfried Wenzel. Edited by R.G. Newhauser and J.A. Alford (Binghamton, New York 1995), pp. 266-268; A. Thompson, *Revival Preachers and Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy. The Great Devotion of 1233* (Oxford 1992), pp. 14-15; L.-J. Bataillon, *La predicazione dei religiosi mendicanti del secolo XIII nell'Italia Centrale*. In *La prédication au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France et Italie*, p. XII, 694.

Even a cursory glance at mendicant sermons reveals that the Dominicans valued the spiritual benefits of poverty as highly as did the Franciscans. This holds equally true with other kinds of material. Beryl Smalley has noted that Hugues de St. Cher's postills have "greater tenderness towards poverty" than in any of his Franciscan contemporaries' works. This is also manifested by the popularity of the story about the donation of Constantine and how the poison (i.e. temporal wealth) came to the Church thereby. This story is told in Hugues' commentary on the Apocalypse *Aser pinquis* and can also be found in Guillaume Peyraut's *Summa de vitiis* and Jacques de Lausanne's *Compendium moralitatum*.<sup>50</sup>

Thus we have examined three frequently recycled differences between the two mendicant orders and found that they cannot be accepted as such. It remains to ask: If there were no major differences in recruiting to the orders, social standing of the sermonists, preaching, or in the general approach towards the poverty, why should there have been differences in the social thinking of the Dominican and Franciscan orders? If the everyday life, environment, and principal working methods of the mendicants were reasonably similar, then why not the social thinking?

The firm tenet in this study is indeed that there were no major differences in the handling of themes such as poverty, earthly power and richness between the two mendicant orders, and thus we can safely write about a common mendicant social ethos. There are differences between different sources, but they are not between Franciscans and Dominicans, but between the sources put together in the university for an official publication such as the theological works of Bonaventure and Aquinas on one hand and pastoral writings of rank and file friars on the other.

One important thing must nevertheless be kept in mind about these differences. They were not in the first place differences between men of various capabilities (even though it is natural that Aquinas and Bonaventure operated on a different level from most writers of popular manuals). They were essentially differences due to different fora of publication and different motives in writing. Theological books were part of the discussion inside university circles, and that is where they were meant to be read and commented upon. Model sermon collections and other pastoral manuals were meant for different, wider audiences.

I may present two examples of what I mean. Bonaventure's *Commentarius in Evangelium S. Lucae* is written in a very different style and level than his sermon preached in the 1270's in front of a live audience (probably in Saint Jacques, Paris). The social message (support for the poor, condemnation of the rich and riches) is presented loud and clear in the latter whereas it is by and large totally absent from his Bible commentary on the same passage of Saint

---

50 R. Lerner, *Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology*, pp. 172-174; Jacques de Lausanne OP, *Compendium moralitatum*. Ecclesia. BN. lat. 3788, f. 15r.

Luke. Similar comparisons can be made between this *reportatio* sermon and Bonaventure's officially published Sunday sermons.<sup>51</sup>

Another good example are the often cited *Ad status* sermons of Guibert de Tournai as well as his sermon on the theme *Fili recordare quia bona recepisti*. They are very similar to other mendicant model sermons in their style, language, and conclusions on relevant themes. Yet we know that Guibert was one of the front-line Parisian academics of his time. He was the Franciscan regent master in the theological faculty, probably between 1259-1261.<sup>52</sup> Sadly none of his more scholarly works, if he indeed wrote any, have survived or have been identified. Therefore we cannot make a similar comparison between his theological and his pastoral writings as in the case of Bonaventure. nonetheless we know that despite his successful career in the university, he wrote popular treatises on poverty and the dangers of richness in a manner similar to other popular writers.

In the light of these two examples the only possible conclusion is that the differences concerning poverty and attitudes towards the rich and powerful were not so much due to personal opinions of the writers but to intended audiences. When writing exclusively for university audiences, matters were presented in a more sophisticated and veiled manner, whereas when writing to less educated clergy and ultimately through them to larger audiences, things were kept more simple, that is more black and white.

---

51 Bonaventure, *Commentarius in Evangelium s. Lucae*, pp. 413-425; Saint Bonaventure, *Sermons de diversis*, pp. 371-385; *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermones dominicales*, passim.

52 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 144-145.

## ■ 6. Focus on the Other World

### 6.1. Conservative Radicals

The last major objection to the theory of a common mendicant social ethos is the difference between this putative assumed social ethos and the social realities of the thirteenth century. The mendicants probably did not preach publicly in the same manner as they wrote in their model sermons.

It is not unreasonable to assume that the actual sermons preached before live audiences may have been quite different from the model collections. After all, they were only intended to facilitate the task of the preacher, not to be read out loud. The problem is that we do not actually know how the model sermon collections were used. No *reportatio* has survived of sermons clearly using a given model collection and therefore we do not really know how slavishly preachers used such collections. If we look into other preaching materials, we occasionally find instructions to leave harsher parts of the story untold when preaching to lay audiences (particularly in connection with sexual sins). I have, however, not seen such instructions in model sermon collections by mendicants.

One way of establishing whether the general tone of model sermon collections was similar to that of actual sermons is to compare them to surviving *reportationes* of live sermons. If we compare those Lazarus sermons that were used as principal sources in the present study to a *reportatio* of Saint Bonaventure's sermon on the theme *Fili recordare, quia recipisti bona in vita tua*, we find that there is no remarkable difference in the general tone and attitude of these sermons. Bonaventure's sermon is every bit as hostile towards the rich, if not more hostile, than model sermons.<sup>1</sup> The same holds true for Giordano da Pisa's Lenten sermons.<sup>2</sup> We may thus conclude that the actual mendicant sermons were not radically different from the model sermons.

Another problem is the failure of these sermons to change society in a direction more compassionate towards the poor. Historians have presented a good number of possible solutions to this problem. Raoul Manselli, for example, had an interesting suggestion, only for him it was not a problem of the thirteenth century particularly, but of the whole Middle Ages. Manselli writes that on a theoretical level the Church always without hesitation took the side of the poor. The quantity of exhortations to help the poor and take care of their sustenance as well as the admonitions against the rich to limit their profits and

---

1 Saint Bonaventure, *Sermons de diversis*, pp. 371-377.

2 Giordano da Pisa, *Quaresimale Fiorentino 1305-1306*, passim.

give from their surplus to the poor could easily fill a library (one example of these writings mentioned by Manselli is Gregory the Great's homily on the Lazarus parable). They are "a sad monument of human egoism." The Church was universally respected and powerful, and yet, substantially unable to change the structures of society. This led to a tragic failure to improve the living conditions and social status of the poor.<sup>3</sup>

Brian Tierney has proposed that the real reason why medieval thinkers did not condemn the established organisation of society and try to remodel it in a more equal and just direction was the "rather obvious one that, on the whole, in that particular historical and economic context, the existing hierarchical structure was the best adapted to promote the general welfare and to sustain the complex and brilliant culture of the high Middle Ages."<sup>4</sup>

Manselli's and Tierney's theories are certainly good explanations for the contrast between sermons and social reality. Manselli feels that churchmen were generally aware of the social problems, but unable to change them. Tierney on the other hand writes that theologians felt that they already lived in an optimal system where there admittedly were violence and suffering of the poor, but that all in all, any change would only have made it worse.

However, on closer examination of the Lazarus sermons the difference between them and the social reality becomes irrelevant. Even though the friars' sermons were occasionally courageous and sometimes even radical, they were not really propagating revolution nor even fundamental change in this world. The focus of the Lazarus sermons was essentially on the world to come. This tendency is also noted by Michel Mollat, who writes that preachers rarely called for reform. When addressing the poor they advised them to remain patient and consider the spiritual advantages in poverty.<sup>5</sup> Mollat's view seems to be that in those few cases where mendicants noticed something to complain about in current society and how it was run, they preferred to stay quiet.

Lis and Soly put the emphasis on the idea of the poor man as an important vehicle of salvation for the rich. According to them:

*"the 'social contract' of the High Middle Ages came to this: since to be saved the rich needed the poor, the poor had the duty to remain poor, while the rights attached to their status implied the duty of submission to the rich. Did not Christ, the apostles, and St Francis cheerfully endure their poverty? Hence widows, the sick and lame, and beggars who accepted their lot were seen as the chosen of God, and the poverty of underpaid wage labourers was noted with approval (if at all)."*

Similarly, according to them the Lazarus parable was interpreted as portraying poverty as a virtuous condition.<sup>6</sup>

---

3 R. Manselli, *Evangelismo e povertà*. In *La concezione della povertà nel Medioevo*. Antologia di scritti a cura di Ovidio Capitani (Bologna 1983), pp. 162-164.

4 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, pp. 22-23.

5 M. Mollat, *Les pauvres au Moyen Age*, p. 160.

6 C. Lis & H. Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe*, p. 22.

If one looks more closely at the interpretations of Mollat, Lis, and Soly one observes that the part concerning the virtuousness and utility of poverty is understood correctly (if not occasionally overstressed), but the other side of the coin is left unexplained. There certainly were a number of mendicant writers who took the view that the riches of the world indeed were not fairly distributed. Similarly it is true that the Lazarus sermons emphasised the virtue of poverty, but at the same time, as seen above, they spend much more parchment and ink on discussing the abuses committed by the rich and the powerful. The poverty of the underpaid wage labourers was noted, and not always with approval. It was considered to be unjust but more or less inevitable in this world burdened by original sin.

Jean Delumeau has suggested the real reading of the Lazarus sermons in his study of the *dance macabre*. He asks whether the poor and other less fortunate interpreted the *dance macabre* as a future revenge, and whether they saw in it anything else but the constant teaching of Christianity which opposed the destinies of the sinful rich man and Lazarus after death. Delumeau ends his analysis saying that the *dance macabre* indeed promised equality, but only after death. For the present it merely conserved carefully the existing hierarchies and ordained people to their proper place.<sup>7</sup>

This observation can easily be adapted to sermon material. There is no lack of examples underlining equality *post mortem*. Here I confine myself to one, albeit an elegant and eloquent one. Konrad Holtzner writes about the Last Judgement in his sermon on the second Sunday after the Holy Trinity: "[...] equally He will judge the pope and poor priest, equally the emperor and shepherd."<sup>8</sup> This picture of pope, poor cleric, emperor and shepherd in judgement brings to mind all the familiar pictures of the *dance macabre* where the different standings are all led to dance by death.

F. Graus comes to a conclusion similar to Delumeau's, although he is not referring to the Lazarus parable, but to the exaltation of poverty in general. He writes that this did not pose any threat to the ruling classes, since the recompensation was promised to the poor only after death. Even the analogy between the society and different members of the body can be interpreted within this conservative scheme. We have seen earlier that this analogy was used to prove the importance of the poor and those who work in society. Different parts of society were to support each other and make the system work efficiently. Looking from a different angle, this meant also putting people into a Godgiven position that could not be altered, and thus supporting existing social structures and making society monolithic.<sup>9</sup>

---

7 J. Delumeau, *Le péché et la peur. La culpabilisation en Occident (XIIIe-XVIIIe siècles)* (Paris 1983), pp. 98-99. "Elles promettent l'égalité mais après la mort. Quant au présent, elles conservent soigneusement les hiérarchies en place et ordonnent les personnages en fonction d'elles."

8 Konrad Holtzner OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica II post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. BAV. Burghes. 180, f. 109r. "...eque iudicabit papam et pauperem clericum, eque imperatorem et pastorem."

9 F. Graus, *Poveri delle città e delle campagne*, pp. 75-76.



Another historian to take such a view is Robert Fossier, although his discussion is not about popular pastoral works, it is restricted to the university theology. He writes that the social thought of the thirteenth century never reached the level of philosophical theory, and gives two reasons for this. Firstly, university men mostly came from the upper ranks of society and out of a class solidarity they were not ready to attack the dominant classes. Another reason is that they were mostly members of the clergy and thus affected by the patristic idea of the transitoriness of this world. It was important to make sacrifices in this world to reach the kingdom of heaven where all will eventually be equal. A logical consequence of this idea was that they condemned all violent attempts to change the existing system.<sup>10</sup>

There is yet another historian who has reached almost the same conclusion as Delumeau, namely G.R. Owst. He suggests that preachers, while denouncing the abuses of the rich and the powerful, "were unconsciously formulating a revolutionary charter of grievances. With one hand they were really instructing the rebels of tomorrow how to present their case and prepare for the struggle, while, with the other, they sought to restrain them from taking any action in the matter. Everyone can guess which hand was likely to prevail." Owst is of course referring to the peasant revolts of the late fourteenth century. According to him "the preaching not merely of friars, but of other orthodox churchmen of the day was ultimately responsible."<sup>11</sup> The only problem in this explanation is that similar rhetorics had been used by preachers for generations before the outbreak of peasant revolts. Why did not the other hand prevail earlier? Nevertheless, Owst's general idea is right; he understood correctly the dual nature of the mendicant preachers. They were at the same time radicals and conservatives, both attacking the upper classes of society in an unheard-of manner and protecting the existing system.

Returning to Delumeau, he proves that the *dance macabre* was essentially a mendicant enterprise. Some presentations of the *dance* include a picture of the friar in the pulpit. Others can be linked to the mendicant orders through other sources. He underlines that the *dance macabre* was a sermon in the form of a picture. Its main goals were not aesthetic but didactic.<sup>12</sup> It can be argued that the friar-sponsored *dance macabre* of the late Middle Ages was a logical continuation of the mendicant sermons of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The forms of expression changed but the message remained the same.

The emphasis put on the world to come and the strong urge to refrain from active resistance was the only possible solution for the friars. All governments, even bad ones, ruled with the divine mandate. Rebellion or revolution would have been an act of pride and thus one of the capital sins.<sup>13</sup> The importance of

10 R. Fossier, *Histoire sociale de l'Occident médiéval*, p. 338.

11 G.R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in medieval England*, pp. 295-304.

12 J. Delumeau, *Le péché et la peur*, pp. 100-102.

13 Rebellion (rebellio) is mentioned as a progeny of the sin of pride in Bernard de Clairvaux's *Tractatus de gradibus humilitatis et superbiae*, PL 182, col. 957-969. Bernard was cited by Jean de la Rochelle OFM in his *Summa de vitiis*, cap. 166. UUB. C 235, f. 61r, Alexander de Hales OFM, *Summa theologica*, Tomus III, p. 508, and Pseudo Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum morale* (Graz 1964), col. 1005-1018. This latter work is dated to late thirteenth century; *SOP*

obedience is underlined in Bonaventure's *Collationes de decem preceptis*. He interprets the fourth commandment to include all authorities, including temporal rulers (princes, barons, and counts are explicitly mentioned) who can be called father due to their authority.<sup>14</sup> Bonaventure was by no means the only one to interpret the commandment to include ecclesiastical and temporal authorities. This was the common position taken in nearly all the sermons on the Ten Commandments.<sup>15</sup>

Vincent de Beauvais states that the contemporary system of government with a king and his subjects was initially bad. It was the consequence of original sin and corruption brought along with it. However, in this corrupted world the interests of the people are better served if there is a ruler who sees that the laws given by God are respected. Therefore God has given the authority to the rulers and they are to be obeyed.<sup>16</sup>

A similar idea is to be found in the Dominican Pierre de la Palude's sermon on the occasion of the flood in Paris in 1316. Pierre's sermon, given at the end of span covered here, crystallises everything said above about the spiritual values of poverty, work and patience. According to Pierre, different hardships such as lower social position, sickness and crop failures were either punishment for one's sins or temptation sent before the eternal reward, and in both cases people were instructed to be patient. Pierre preached that the floods of 1316 were the sign of God to the arrogant people of Paris. They were urged to follow the example of the peasants; be happy with what they got, pray, and work hard. A man was supposed to avoid rebellion in any circumstances, for such an action would incur a yet heavier punishment, nothing else.<sup>17</sup>

It seems that the belief in the system as God-given and legitimate was also common outside mendicant and in general clerical circles. There were some social disorders in thirteenth-century France. The peasants were unhappy about various taxes and other exactions they had to pay. An interesting point is that they did not demand abolition of these payments, only fixing their amount to a certain unchangeable level. The system as such was considered to be legitimate. Only the chaotic and arbitrary nature of different payments was condemned.<sup>18</sup>

The rejection of rebellion and revolution combined with the strong emphasis on patience and staying in one's place and discharging one's duties without complain was one of the essential messages of the mendicant preachers. In

---

IV, no. 3986. Furthermore Gregory the Great placed disobedience in the list of sins originating from vainglory; Gregory the Great, *Liber Moralium sive expositio in Job*, PL 76, col. 621. This classification was adopted by many friar writers, for example Jean de la Rochelle OFM, *Summa de vitiis*. BAV. Vat. lat. 4293, f. 86v, Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Summa de vitiis* (Lyon 1585), T.VI, p.2, c.36 De quibusdam vitiis quae procedunt ex superbia, and John of Wales OFM, *Moniloquium*, I.3.10. Firenze Biblioteca Nazionale II.VI.1, f. 24r.

14 Bonaventure OFM, *Collationes de decem praeceptis*. Opera Omnia, tomus V, p. 524.

15 S. Vecchio, Il decalogo nella predicazione del XIII secolo. *Christianesimo nella storia* 70 (1989), p. 51.

16 Vincent de Beauvais OP, *De morali principis institutione*. Ed. Robert J. Schneider. Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievalis 137 (Turnhout 1995), pp. 17-18.

17 J. Dunbabin, *A Hound of God. Pierre de la Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church* (Oxford 1991), pp. 54-55.

18 R. Fossier, *Histoire sociale de l'Occident médiéval*, p. 244.

most cases this message of the mendicant preachers has to be read between the lines, but often it is also written out explicitly. Judging from the evidence given by Aldobrandino da Toscanella, the problem of the unequal distribution of goods and poverty was also perceived and voiced by the audiences.

Aldobrandino writes that the parable of dives and Lazarus answers three questions, the third of these being most interesting from our point of view:

*"Thirdly it answers to the imprudence of those who say that God acts unjustly when the bad prosper and the good are unfortunate. This is done to take away all excuses from the bad and to compensate them for the good things they may have done. The parable shows that things He gives to the bad are vile and that he reserves eternal things for the good."*<sup>19</sup>

Nicolas de Byard writes that evil men prosper not because of God's ignorance or lack of power, but because of his great patience. God expects that some of the sinful rich might in the end repent and change their evil ways. In this God acts like a farmer who does not cut down his vineyard if it has been unfruitful for two years, but expects things to get better.<sup>20</sup>

François de Mayronnes and Hugo de Prato Florido also contributed their share in solving the problem of the earthly success of the evil men. François de Mayronnes writes that no one should be scandalised by the fact that evil people prosper in this world. Instead they should think more carefully and realise that the success of this world is temporal and bound to vanish away. Like many other writers of Lazarus sermons, he seals his argument by citing Job: *"They spend their days in wealth. And in a moment they go down to hell."*<sup>21</sup> Hugo de Prato Florido wrote that temporal goods were a reward to the evil rich for the few good things they may have done in their life, but which are not enough in comparison to their sins to buy them eternal reward. Similarly poverty was a punishment imposed on Lazarus for the sins he may have committed, but which were not serious enough to endanger his salvation. Therefore at the end of the day, when both men were dead, the rich man was to be punished and Lazarus to be rewarded. Hugo finishes off with: *"And this is why evil men are often prosperous in this world and the good will have to suffer adversities."*<sup>22</sup>

19 Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BAV. Ottob. lat. 557, f. 125v. "Tertio respondet temeritati hominum qui dicunt quod Dominus iniuste agit dum mali prosperantur et boni infortunantur quia hoc fit ad tollendam excusationem malis et ad compensanda si aliqua bona fecerit in presenti, et ad ostendendum quod hec vilia sunt, scilicet qui dat malis, et bonis reservat eterna."

20 Nicolas de Byard OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. CLM 16028, f. 124v. "[...]hoc non sit ex impotentia dicitur uel ignorantia sed ex maxima misericordia eos ad penitentiam expectante. Agricola enim statim uineam suam non extirpat si duobus annis fuerit inferecunda."

21 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117r. "Tertia conclusio est quod nullus scandalizari debet in malorum prosperitatibus, sed respiciat eorum nouissima et inueniet eorum temporalem et cadutam prosperitatem cito transiuram[...]dicente propheta: 'Ducunt in bonis dies suos et subito ad inferna descendunt.'"

22 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd2r. "[...]bona temporalia que recipisti in uita tua fuerunt premium omnis boni quod fecisti et similiter mala que sustinuit Lazarus patienter fuerunt sufficiens pena omnis mali

Obviously there had been persons who had complained that God is unjust when He allows the bad to be rich and successful in this world. Preachers were forced to react to these complaints. Aldobrandino and Hugo de Prato Florido took a very novel position, stating that even these bad people may have done something good in their life and therefore they are compensated with temporal goods. The truly good, however, are compensated with eternal goods while the bad ones will hear that they have received their goods in their lifetime. Therefore those who complain against God's distribution of power and wealth in this world are imprudent fools.

Judging from François de Mayronnes sermon one might even say that a certain amount of poverty in society was considered to be a natural and positive thing:

*"The sixth conclusion is that the Lord God could have made everyone rich had He so wanted, but He wanted, and not without cause, that there should be poor men. Firstly there would be those who would be put to the proof by the misery of poverty for the sake of greater glory. For poverty itself is a sign of divine love. Secondly there were to be material for the rich to exercise mercy. Where there is no misery, nor is there room for mercy."*<sup>23</sup>

This passage combines the earlier idea of the Church that the poor were a means of salvation for the rich, and the mendicant idea of virtuous poverty.

Turning their expectations to the world to come did not mean that the mendicants were not at all interested in positive changes in current society. The harsh judgement of the rich and of powerful oppressors was without doubt meant to correct these people and improve the actual situation of the poor. However, this was to be done on the basis of free will (*liber arbitrium*), and if nothing happened, the next step was to wait for the consolation in heaven and the punishment of the oppressors in hell or purgatory.

There is no lack of practical examples of mendicant brothers actually doing something for the benefit of the poor and the oppressed. Both Franciscans and Dominicans acted as voices of conscience to those kings, princes and magnates whose confessors they were, and indeed to a large body of followers who belonged to the so-called third orders. A good example of this indirect work of the mendicants on behalf of the poor was Saint Elisabeth of Hungary, a Franciscan tertiary who was committed to charity. In fact, the essential asset that made her a saint was her compassion towards the poor. This is clearly stated in the canonisation bull of Gregory XI.<sup>24</sup>

---

quod fecit. Et immo non restat aliud nisi ut tu puniaris pro peccatis tuis et Lazarus premietur pro meritis suis, quia in alia uita nec tu pro peccatis es punitus, nec ipse pro meritis remuneratus. Et inde est quod frequenter mali prosperentur in uita ista et boni aduersa patiantur."

23 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117v. "Sexto conclusio est quod Dominus Deus omnes homines si uoluisset diuites fecisset, sed uoluit non sine causa esse pauperes. Primo ut qui sustinent misericordiam paupertatis ad maiorem gloriam probarentur. Nam ipsa paupertas est signum dilectionis diuine. Secundo ut sint diuitibus materia exercendere pietatis. Ubi enim non est miseria, ibi non habet locum misericordia."

24 A. Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Age*, pp. 433-435.

Another major contribution to the welfare of the poor and the oppressed was the influence of the mendicant orders, especially friars minor, on King Louis IX of France. They guided his social conscience, not only in giving alms, but also in trying to remove certain structural reasons for the sufferings of the poor. Franciscan brothers acted in commissions set by the king to enquire into miscarriages of justice by bailiffs (the first commission worked during years 1247-1248 and the second in 1260).<sup>25</sup> Leaving the kings and nobility aside we find that on a more grassroot level friars executed wills (in which they were usually chosen to distribute alms to the poor on behalf of the deceased person) and helped in many other ways as intermediaries between the better-off almsgivers and the poor.<sup>26</sup> The thirteenth century was a heyday of founding charitable institutions intended for poor relief.<sup>27</sup> It would be interesting to know how many of those institutions were founded with the help of the mendicant orders or at least on their inspiration.

E.T. Brett is one of the historians who have drawn attention to attempts of the mendicant orders to bring some relief to the desolate life of the poor: "[...] in the High Middle Ages the friar orders, more than any other orthodox element of society, championed the cause of the downtrodden, and although they failed to bring about a wholesale amelioration of mankind, only the most myopic could deny that they did, at least to some extent, improve the condition of the poor." He too uses Louis IX's actions as a proof of mendicant influence.<sup>28</sup>

Not infrequently mendicant brothers also rose to the office of bishop, or even to the see of archbishop or pope. In these offices they were able to carry out concrete work on behalf of the poor and the oppressed. The role of mendicant bishops as champions of the poor and oppressed remains as a whole unstudied, but the information we have on a few individual cases such as Eudes de Rigaud and John Pecham allows us to form a tentative hypothesis that they indeed tried to look after the interests of the poor. For instance John Pecham not only promulgated legislation on the care of the poor, but also insisted on its being obeyed.<sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, mendicants did in their sermons underline the duty of the better-off to help their poorer neighbours. In the Lazarus sermons this was usually done either with quotations from Matthew 25:45 and Luke 16:9, or referring to Gregory the Great, who wrote: "This rich man was not reprehended for taking away goods of others, but for not giving of his own."<sup>30</sup> Guillaume Peyraut adds

---

25 M. Bourin-Derruau, *Temps d'équilibres, temps de ruptures. XIIIe siècle*, p. 189.

26 M. Mollat, *Les pauvres au Moyen Age*, pp. 155-157. Paradoxically they probably also unintentionally damaged the position of the poor, since they lived by mendicancy, and money and goods given to them might otherwise have gone to the poor.

27 C. Lis & H. Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe*, p. 24.

28 E.T. Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, p. 166.

29 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, pp. 102-103.

30 Gregory the Great, *Homily 40*. PL 76, col. 1304. "Hic autem dives iste non abstulisse aliena reprehenditur, sed propria non dedisse." This passage is cited in many Lazarus sermons: Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangelis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n2r; Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I festum trinitatis. Sermo Secundus (Venice 1497), f. 75r.

to these words of Gregory the common idea that by keeping to himself more than he actually needs for his own sustenance, a man robs the poor, who were lawfully entitled to the surplus of the rich.<sup>31</sup>

This idea originated in canonical law. *Decretum Gratiani* and its *Glossa Ordinaria* use phrases like: "Feed the poor. If you do not feed them, you kill them." "Our superfluities belong to the poor." "Whatever you have beyond what suffices for your needs belong to others." "A man who keeps to himself more than he needs is guilty of theft."<sup>32</sup> Guillaume Peyraut also cites the above-mentioned influential passage of Matthew: "Firstly because the rich man did not recognise God in the poor man. Matth. xxv: 'Ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.'"<sup>33</sup>

Berthold von Regensburg explains the mammon of unrighteousness in Jesus' parable of the rich man and his steward (Lk. 16:1-11): "Luke: 'If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust', mammon is interpreted as riches, for riches are given to us for that specific reason that they be faithfully paid to the poor."<sup>34</sup> Aldobrandino da Toscanella approaches Luke's text in a similar context: "The poor man was made by God to help the rich, for he has in heaven what the rich man has on this earth and therefore the rich should make themselves friends of the unjust mammon." Even though Aldobrandino uses the term *unjust mammon* (*mammona iniusta*) instead of *unrighteous mammon*, he clearly refers to the same gospel passage as Berthold.<sup>35</sup> This was the method of mendicant preachers to present the age-old idea that the poor were useful for the rich, who could give alms to atone for their sins.<sup>36</sup>

Antonio Azaro Parmense writes that the rich are already on their way to hell. The only way they can save themselves from God's punishment is to be merciful towards the poor in words, deeds and alms so that the poor can intervene for their benefit when the day of the final judgement comes.<sup>37</sup> The idea is same

31 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangelis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n2r. "Hieronymus: 'Aliena rapere conuincitur qui ultra necessitatem sibi retinere comprobatur.'" The same passage in Jerome is quoted by Hugo de Prato Florido in his Lazarus sermon; Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. cc6r.

32 B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, p. 37.

33 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangelis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. nv. "Primo quia diues in paupere Deum non agnouit. Math. xxv: 'Quod uni ex minimis meis non fecistis et mihi non fecistis.'" It is worth noting that Gregory the Great used this passage of Matthew at the end of his Lazarus homily noting: "Pensate quod ipsa per se Veritas dicit: Quandiu fecistis uni de his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis."; *Homily 40*, col. 1312.

34 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dōnicis*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 3215, f. 42v. "Lucas: 'Si iniquo mammona fideles non fuistis quod uerum est quis credet uobis'. Mammona interpretatur diuicie quia diuicie ad hoc precipue dantur ut fideliter pauperibus erogentur."

35 Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BAV. Ottob. lat. 557, f. 125. "...pauperem enim fecit Dominus propter diuitem quia ille habet in celo, iste enim habet in terra et immo facere debent amicos de mammona iniusta."

36 B. Geremek, *Geschichte der Armut*, p. 29.

37 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. CLM 2774, f. 149r. "Immo ut diuites ista mala euadant, debent esse misericordes ad pauperes uerbis et factis et elemosinis ut pauperes pro eis intercedant et eos ad sempiterna tabernacula recipiant id est in regnum celorum."

as in the case of unrighteous mammon. The poor were seen as intercessors (very much like saints) who had the power of saving the rich from the flames of hell.

Sometimes mendicant preaching even provoked straightforward action against rich oppressors. The Dominican Giovanni da Fidanza preached in Bologna during the great devotion of 1233. His sermon was directed against the usurers and those who exploited the people of God during times of dearth. This sermon provoked a riot during which an angry mob burned down the house and records of one of Bologna's most infamous usurers. He himself narrowly escaped lynching by fleeing the city.<sup>38</sup>

Having said all this, one still has to remember that the most important goal in the friar's apostolate among the poor and the oppressed was not to help to improve their living conditions in this world; the actual mission was to spread the message of the Gospel. The core of this message concerning the poor and the rich can be summed up in two words – reward and revenge, and both were to be received after death.

## 6.2. Reward

It has already been noted that the general message in the Lazarus sermons was that Lazarus was saved and carried to the bosom of Abraham for several reasons. One thing in common among all the mendicant writers is the emphasis placed on patience. It was seen as the most important virtue of the poor and distressed. They were required to bear all their miseries and hardships with patience and perseverance; after all, they were only temporal setbacks.

Nicolaus de Aquavilla's Lazarus was transported to the bosom of Abraham because he was poor, because he bore his poverty happily, and because he persevered until the end. Of patience Nicolaus writes: "*Secondly because he bore his poverty happily and, as we read, accepted all bad things without ever complaining, and this is something that pleases God very much, [...]*"<sup>39</sup> The true virtue of Lazarus was not piety. Neither the Gospel nor any preacher ever make any remarks on his religious attitudes, praying or the like. The sole virtue of Lazarus and with him the poor in general, was patience and perseverance in one's proper place until the end. In this respect the Gospel as well as the mendicant preachers of it were extremely conservative. Their goal, if not necessarily a conscious one, was to maintain the *status quo* in society.

Occasionally this was done by idealising poverty, and not only poverty of spirit but also the actual poverty of the masses. The suffering and hardships of the poor are presented as almost a joyful experience. We have already seen good examples of this. Here it suffices to mention Jacopo da Varazze's passage where he compares Lazarus to gold, a pearl and a star.<sup>40</sup>

38 A. Thompson, *Revival Preachers and Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy*, p. 53.

39 Nicolaus de Aquavilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis, BL Harley 102, f. 84v. "Secunda ratio est quia letatur paupertatem suam et mala sua accepit unde legimus ipsum nunquam murmurasse et hoc est unum quod multum placet Deo, [...]"

40 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. This passage is cited *in extenso* in p. 62.

The whole idea of poverty and sickness as temptations to be suffered to eventually win the favour of God seems to be taken from the book of Job (perhaps this is one of the reasons why quotations from the book of Job are astonishingly frequent in these sermons). Guibert de Tournai writes:

*"God allows this temptation to fall upon Thobias in order to present his patience as an example for posterity, and such is the case with Saint Job too, who was tempted with four things, the loss of goods, heritage, and servants, slander from his wife, the inappropriate words of his friends, corporal pain. These temptations are signs of close friendship with God."*<sup>41</sup>

The essential idea is that Lazarus and Job were both models of behaviour for good Christians. Following their example one would end up in paradise and thus eventually be rewarded for all the temptations and hardships in this life.

What then is the reward like? This is the weak spot in most sermons and other texts. Franciscans writing about the *"vitia et virtutes, poenam et gloriam"* did exactly as Saint Francis had told them, that is *"cum brevitare sermonis"*, at least when handling the glory part. The same holds for the Dominican preachers. Descriptions of paradise and remuneration for the poor are mostly vague.

In the Lazarus sermons the description of the reward starts from the moment of death. It is the divider between on the one hand unhappy life filled with trouble and strife, and on the other peaceful existence in paradise with the saints and Christ. When Lazarus dies he is carried to the bosom of Abraham by angels. Guillaume Peyraut writes that those who do not possess horses in this life are carried by angels after death.<sup>42</sup> For him the key idea is the removal of physical hardship. No longer is the leprous<sup>43</sup> beggar forced to limp while others ride by on their horses. Jacopo da Varazze considered this transportation more as a sign of Lazarus' new dignity. He cites Chrysostomus and tells his hearers that one angel would have been quite enough to carry one poor man. More were used for the sake of reverence. Jacopo compares this to the ceremony where newly consecrated bishops are carried.<sup>44</sup>

---

41 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*, Ad leprosos et abiectos sermo secundus. Ed. in N. Beriou et F.-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus*, p. 136-137. "Hanc temptationem ideo permisit Dominus euenire Thobie ut posteris daretur exemplum paciencie eius, et sicut sancti Job qui quadrupliciter temptatus est, rerum et heredum et familiarum dampno, uxoris conuicio, amicorum improprio, corporis supplicio. Sunt enim hee temptationes signa magne familiaritatis cum Deo."; See also *Ad leprosos et abiectos sermo tertius*, p. 150, where Guibert presents Job's patience in adversities and his words "the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away" as an example for the lepers to follow.

42 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangelis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3r. "Qui non habent equos in hac uita, angelos habent portitores in morte."

43 Although the gospel does not specify the nature of Lazarus' sickness it was commonly held to be leprosy. This idea was already presented by Origen and other early fathers. Nicole Bériou, *Les lépreux sous le regard des prédicateurs*, p. 35.

44 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "Propter reuerentiam sicut episcopi in manibus portantur quando intronizantur, propter letitiam, Chrysostomus: 'Sufficiebat ad portandum unus angelus pauperem, sed propterea plures ueniunt ut chorum letum faciant.'"



The carrying by the angels was first and foremost a matter of honour. In this world only men of eminent position were carried by others or horses. Thus the idea was that the poor man was to enjoy a specific honour in the other world. He would be a nobleman in heaven, so to speak. This is implicit in the words which Giovanni de San Gemignano uses to describe the transportation of Lazarus: "Secondly He (i.e. God) gives him honorary escort 'and was carried by the angels', that is, he who first had been abandoned by the people."<sup>45</sup>

The death of Lazarus is a natural death. This is compared to the death of the rich man who dies threefoldly. Besides natural death he suffers two other deaths, the death of guilt that separates one's soul from God, and the death of hell ("mors gehenne") which deprives one's soul of the vision of God and from contact with the saints.<sup>46</sup> The death of nature only separates Lazarus' soul from his body and in a certain sense it is not death at all, but the gate to eternal glory.<sup>47</sup> These sources promise the complete change for the righteous poor immediately after their natural death, which is not something to be afraid of. For them it is merely a transition to a better world where they will receive their reward.

Another approach to presenting the reward of the patient poor and workers was to compare their earthly sufferings to the situation in afterlife. Death is a turning-point after which everything becomes like a mirror image of what it used to be. This is the method of Guibert de Tournai in his third sermon to the lepers:

*"This poor man and beggar Lazarus was given eternal rest because of his pains, grace because of scorn, a refreshing spring because of his thirst, everlasting delights of heavenly tables because of his hunger, glory because of his vile clothes, and because he first lay in poverty outside the rich man's door, he is finally served by angels who carry him to heaven [...]."*<sup>48</sup>

- 
- 45 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 59v. "Secunda ei dedit conductum honorabilem 'et portaretur ab angelis', qui scilicet primo fuerat a hominibus derelictus."
- 46 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "Secundo describitur status istorum in morte, quia uterque mortuus, quia uterque de mundo raptus sed differenter, nam diues mortuus est morte culpe, qua separatur anima a Deo, postmodum mortuus est morte nature qua separatur anima a corpore suo, tandem morte gehenne qua separatur anima a Dei uisione et beatorum consortio. Lazarus mortuus est unica morte, scilicet morte nature."; Guillaume Peyraut has a rather similar passage about the threefold death of the rich man; Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. N2r. See also Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super evangelium secundum Lucam*, f. 232r; François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117v; Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd1r.
- 47 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n2r. "Nota bonorum mortem esse quasi quandam portam per quam transitur ad gloriam..."
- 48 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones ad status*, Ad leprosos et abiectos sermo tertius. Ed. in N. Beriout and F.-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus*, p. 146. "Pauper iste Lazarus et mendicus pro doloribus recepit requiem, pro despectu gratiam, pro siti refrigerii fontem, pro fame celestis mense delicias sempiternas, pro pannorum uilitate gloriam, et qui prius ad ianuam diuitis iacebat pauper tandem exultantium angelorum ministerio defertur in celum [...]" His actual Lazarus sermon in the *De tempore* collection has an almost identical passage in it; Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Roma Angelica 819, f.

Guibert's promises are of a concrete nature. The persevering poor and sick are to receive rest, grace, drink, food, glory and service of angels. All this must have been a good offer for those who were below the subsistence level or worked hard to keep themselves just above it.

Antonio Azaro Parmense says that the poor were forced to endure patiently the lack of temporal property for which they will be compensated with the eternal kingdom. The eternal kingdom in Antonio's sermon is presented as extreme richness, in fact, he emphasises that the poorer the poor are in this world, the richer they will become in heaven. Furthermore the poor have to bear contempt for which they will be compensated with honour. Lastly they have to stand patiently oppression in this world, for which they will be compensated with eternal life.<sup>49</sup>

Aldobrandino da Toscanella also points out the change from one extreme to the other in the poor man's situation: "*The poor man changed from misery to glory, from poverty to well-being, from world to heaven.*"<sup>50</sup> The opposition between these pairs of concepts (misery/glory, poverty/well-being, and world/heaven) is underlined by using *asyndeton*, a rhetorical device that draws attention more effectively to these word pairs. Aldobrandino's approach was repeated by other writers.<sup>51</sup>

Using extremes together, and extremes they indeed were, that is the rich man and Lazarus (they were the extreme cases already in the original gospel text and even more so in its medieval commentaries, which left no stone unturned in their effort to prove that there simply could not be anyone more miserable than Lazarus), was a common method in classical rhetoric. Guibert de Tournai notes this method in very first words of his Lazarus sermon: "*Because the example carries larger weight than the words and opposites are clearer when shown together, therefore Lord [...].*"<sup>52</sup> Thus the idea was to present the rich man and Lazarus as opposite cases before and after death. Lazarus, the archetype of good poor man suffered everything in this world and received his

---

119v. "[...] qui signantur in tribus quia curabitur infirmitas in sinu Domini pietatis, remunerabitur uilitas ex reuerentia angelici seruitii, paupertas ex obtentu iudicarie potestatis [...]."

49 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. CLM 2774, f. 147v. "Consolatur autem Dominus pauperes propter triplicem defectum que hic patiuntur. Primo propter defectum rerum temporalium pro quo eis promittit regnum eternum [...] unde quanto hic pauperiores sint, tanto illic ditiores [...]. Secundo propter despectum pro quo eis promittit celestem honorem [...] tertio propter patientiam quis pauperes subplantatur quasi mortui a diuitibus, et sic quasi mortui sunt in mundo pro quo promittit eis uitam perpetuam. Dicit Matth: 'Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam quoniam ipsorum est regnum celorum.'"

50 Aldobrandino de Toscanella OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo tertius. BAV. Ottob.lat. 557, f. 127v. "Circa uero mendicum facta est mutatio de miseria in gloriam, de paupertate in bonitatem, de mundo in celum."

51 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd1r. "[...] ibi: 'Factum est autem ut moreretur mendicus', qui fuit de paupertate ad diuitias, de afflictione ad delitias, de contumelia ad honorem, de labore ad requiem, de morte ad uitam translatus. Unde mors fuit finis omnium malorum suorum et initium omnium bonorum."

52 Guibert de Tournai OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C. 413, f. 248r. "Quoniam magis exempla quam uerba imprimunt et opposita iuxta se posita magis elucescunt, ideo Dominus [...]"

reward in afterlife and the rich man on the contrary. Peregrinus de Oppeln uses the same scheme. He writes that after the miseries in this life the poor are carried by angels, who are well-deserved companions for them. Furthermore the chosen ones are not served only by the angels but also by Christ himself!<sup>53</sup>

The general idea in these descriptions is some kind of *world turned upside down topos*. This was a convenient way of presenting paradise to audiences, since they were already familiar with this kind of metamorphosis from the carnivals where the normal order of existence was temporarily turned upside down. For instance in the *festa stultorum* anyone could be chosen king for one day. Peter Burke writes about the world turned upside down in connection with carnivals in early modern Europe. He writes that it was

*"a reversal of the relation between man and man, whether age reversal, or other inversion of status. The son is shown beating his father, the pupil beating his teacher, servants giving orders to their masters, the poor giving alms to the rich, the laity saying Mass or preaching to the clergy, the king going on foot while the peasant rides, the husband holding the baby and spinning while his wife smokes and holds a gun."*<sup>54</sup>

This is exactly the way many preachers chose to present the turning of tables between the rich man and Lazarus. One may assume that the medieval carnival was not essentially different from that described by Burke. Whether it actually gave the preachers a model for presenting their message, is something we cannot prove. However, it certainly gave their audiences a model through which it was easier to understand what was preached.

The important difference between the carnival and death was the fact that this time the change was to last eternally. The tradition of the carnival was not the only, or even the most important source (if indeed at all) of inspiration for the *world turned upside down topos*. It is already to be found in the Bible. Matthew 19:30 (see also Matth. 20:16, Mark 10:31, and Luke 13:30): *"But many that are first shall be the last; and the last shall be first."*

This *world turned upside down topos* can be seen in many sermons. Guillaume Peyraut writes that anyone who saw Lazarus while still alive was bound to think how unhappy, hated by God and totally worthless to receive anything good the beggar was. And yet, Guillaume says, he was good enough to receive the kingdom of heaven. Of the rich man he says exactly the opposite.<sup>55</sup>

---

53 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 48v. "Nunc autem hic consolatur' sed finita miseria portatus est ab angelis. Ecce optima societas, portabatur post tantos labores quod defecerat et hoc in sinu Abrahe id est eterna requie. Nec hoc sufficit quod angeli seruiant electis immo et ipse Christus curam exhibet sanctis electis."

54 P. Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London 1978), pp. 188-189.

55 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangelis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3r. "Qui uidisset pauperem in illa uita, miserum reputasset eum infidelem et Deo exosum, omni bono indignum, qui tamen dignus erat regno celesti."; "Qui uidisset diuitem in illa prosperitate reputasset eum felicem et dilectum a Deo, et tamen Deus habebat eum odio ad mortem."

Guillaume is opposing the old habit of connecting poverty and sickness with sin and God's wrath. This was the common, though old-fashioned attitude; the mendicants had to fight to legitimise poverty.<sup>56</sup> He proposes that people ought not to think that those who prosper are also good Christians; on the contrary, temptations and tribulations were the true sign of God's love. Other writers were even more explicit in presenting this *topos*. Luca da Bitonto says that this world values only the rich, but God values the poor and that is why he called them blessed. Gerard de Mailly is even more explicit: "Let it so be that in this world the rich are preferred to the poor; in the future it will be the other way round."<sup>57</sup> It is difficult to know where this *topos* originates; however, it can already be seen, as can many other *topoi* of Lazarus sermons, in fully developed form in the Postill of Hugues de Saint-Cher: "Lazarus used to be in torment and the rich man in luxuries, now it is the other way round [...] Lazarus used to beg from the rich man, but now it is the other way round."<sup>58</sup>

What did this turning the tables actually mean to the audiences of the sermons? The poor, the sick, and those who laboured were bound to be given due compensation for their earthly sufferings. This meant that what they were to receive in the other world was the exact mirror image of their conditions or sufferings in this world. They were to be rich and healthy and they were to have rest and to be served by others. In the thirteenth century being rich meant having people to serve you; hence the preachers deduced from the fact that Lazarus was carried to the bosom of Abraham by the angels that the chosen ones will be served by the angels in paradise. It was the prestige of being served by others that counted. These were promises that were calculated to keep the people calm and patient amid their earthly sufferings.

### 6.3. Revenge

*Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.*

(The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romans 12:19).

Even though the preachers had little to say about the reward for the persevering poor, they balanced this shortcoming with truly explicit and detailed descriptions of the sufferings of the rich man. Some preachers even dedicated whole sermons to this topic, as for example Konrad Holtzner and Jacopo da Varazze, who both wrote sermons on the theme *Mortuus est dives et sepultus est in inferno*.

<sup>56</sup> M. Mollat, *Les pauvres au Moyen Age*, p. 158.

<sup>57</sup> Luca da Bitonto OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BN. Nouv. acq. lat. 410, f. 194r; Gerard de Mailly OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 351, f. 85v. "Licet enim in presenti uita pauperibus diuites preponantur in futuro erit econtrario."

<sup>58</sup> Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Postilla super Evangelium secundum Lucam*, f. 232v. "Solebat enim Lazarus esse in tormentis, diues in delitiis, nunc autem econuerso. [...] Solebat enim Lazarus mendicare a diuite, nunc autem econtrario."

It seems to be normal to human nature to be more detailed and interested when describing negative things. The punishment of the rich man and its detailed descriptions were important to appease the poor people among the audiences who desired some kind of vengeance for their sufferings. It was simply not enough to know that things will be better if one remains patient; one needed also to know that his oppressors would be duly punished when the time was ripe.

Konrad Holtznicker's second Lazarus sermon is especially interesting from the point of view of the rich man's punishment. The whole structure of this sermon is built around four different aspects of his punishment: actual physical pains, seeing the blessed, from desperation of being without any hope of remedy, and in damnation of his friends.<sup>59</sup> All these and several other means of punishment are presented in the Lazarus sermons. Since the arrangement of the description of punishment differs from sermon to sermon, I have decided to present the punishments of the rich man in a sort of chronological order starting from the moment of death.

The revenge of the poor (executed by God) starts at the very moment of death. Preachers turn every stone to make it absolutely clear what happens to the social position and riches of the sinful rich man. The message is obvious. No matter how rich one is, one must say good bye to riches at the moment of death. Death is the great leveller. Jacopo da Varazze drives this home with an interesting similitude:

*"We have to expend temporal goods usefully, since they are not our own but God's given to us to be distributed to his poor. That they are not our own is apparent in death, for we cannot carry them with us. When a dog follows two men one does not know which one it belongs to, but when the men depart from each other, the dog follows its master; similarly man and the world are like two persons and to whom the riches belong is not known in life, but becomes apparent in death; riches remain in the world when man goes away. Therefore it is said in Job i: 'Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither.'"<sup>60</sup>*

This argument of Jacopo's about the ownership of temporal goods (including the similitude of two men and dog) is repeated almost verbatim in a Lenten

---

59 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. BAV. Burghes. 180, f. 107r. "Mortuus est diues et sepultus est in inferno Luc. xvi. Ab hoc loco usque in finem in presenti euangelio describitur pena dampnati diuitis quadrupliciter uidelicet ab inferiori in profunditate tormentorum, a superiori in uisione beatorum, ab interiori in desperatione remediorum, ab exteriori in dampnatione amicorum."

60 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22r. "Debemus quidem bona temporalia utiliter expendere cum sint non nostra sed a Deo ad dispensandum nobis commissa ipsis pauperibus. Quod enim non sint nostra propria patet in morte, quia nobiscum eas portare non possumus, quando enim canis duos homines sequitur cuius sit ignoratur, sed quando homines ab inuicem separantur tunc canis dominum suum sequitur, sic quasi duo persone sunt homo et mundus, et cuius sunt diuicie hominis uel mundi in uita non apparet sed in morte, diuitie remanent in mundo et homo nudus recedit de mundo. Et propterea dicitur in Job i: 'Nudus egressus sum de utero matris mee: nudus reuertar illuc.'"

sermon of Giovanni da San Gemignano. Later on Giovanni returns to the punishment of the rich man and makes it clear that being despoiled of his riches was one important part of the punishment.<sup>61</sup> By the latter half of the thirteenth century the similitude of two men and a dog seems to have been common property amongst the Dominican order judging from the way it appears in Nicolas de Gorran's *Distinctiones*. Nicolas assumes that the story is familiar to his readers and notes it only with words: "The exemplum of the dog following two men".<sup>62</sup>

Earlier, Pierre de Reims had informed his readers of what happens to the temporal riches of sinners after the death. He compared the relation of the rich man and his money to matrimony. Matrimony was supposed to last until death and only then came separation. Such is the case with the rich man and money for Job says (1:21): "Naked came I out of my mother's womb and naked shall I return thither."<sup>63</sup>

Also Peregrinus de Opelein notes the pain of losing one's riches. He writes that among the sufferings of the rich man were the loss of his temporal riches and extreme poverty, so extreme that he was forced to beg a single drop of water from Lazarus and even that was denied to him. The same idea is presented by Hugo de Prato Florido.<sup>64</sup> For the last time the rich man is able to enjoy his riches when he is buried by his relatives. According to Antonio Azaro Parmense, his body was buried with great honours. At the same time, however, his soul was buried by demons with many indignities.<sup>65</sup> As in the case of Lazarus, death was the crucial moment of transition. In Antonio's sermon this point is particularly clearly presented. While still in this world the rich man is being buried according to the customs of his social position; in reality he is already being transported by demons to hell. For him the wheel of fortune had turned at the moment of death.

It is noteworthy that Peregrinus' sermon includes details not mentioned in the Gospel. Luke tells us that Lazarus was carried by the angels, but he does not say that the rich man was carried away by the demons. The same element

61 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 57v-58r. and 59v. "Secundo ostenditur diuina equitas in punitione diuitis cui primo abstulit diuitiarum comoditatem unde mortuus est diues, tunc enim suis diuitiis fuit ualde expoliatus. Ps: 'Dormierunt sompnum suum etc'."

62 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Distinctiones*. Diuicie. BL. Royal coll. 9.B.IV, f. 130v. "Exemplum de cane sequente duos uiros."

63 Pierre de Reims OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BAV. Burghes 343, f. 27r. "[...] quia habuit diuitias quasi uxorem, lex enim matrimonii est ab uxore non posse separari usque ad mortem, set in morte sit diuortium, quia ut dicit Job: 'Nudus egressus sum de utero matris mee etc.'"

64 Peregrinus de Opelein OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 48r. "O qualia et quanta sunt que ipsum cruciant. [...] Cruciat autem omnium rerum omissio, erat enim diues. [...] Item cruciat extrema mendicitas que in hoc apparet quia guttam ut refrigeret linguam non obtinuit [...]."; Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd1r. "[...] nam transiuit de diuitiis ad paupertatem, immo ad summam mendicitatem quia in indigentia omnium bonorum constitutus unam guttam aque petiit et non potuit habere."

65 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 268, f. 39r. "In hoc cimiterio sepeliuntur parochiani Dyaboli. Corpus diuitis fuit sepultus a parentibus cum honore, anima uero cum multo opprobatio a demonibus fuit sepulta, [...]."

is also mentioned by Konrad Holtznicker: "Also he will be transported by demons Isaiah 22: 'Behold, the Lord will cause thee carried away, as a cock is carried away'"<sup>66</sup>

There are several explanations for this addition. Firstly it was a fairly general belief that the battle for the soul of the deceased will be fought at the moment of death. As Aaron Gurevich points out, this belief has a biblical basis in Jesus' words to the thief crucified at the same time as himself (Lk. 23:43): "Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." Another biblical source is - the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. In the works of Gregory the Great, Bede, St. Boniface and many others there are stories where angels and demons gather around the deathbed of a sinner to calculate his merits and sins. After the struggle, the soul of the deceased is immediately taken away, either by the angels or by the demons, to the appropriate place.<sup>67</sup> Another explanation is that it simply fitted to the rhetorical scheme of the sermons. The destinies of the rich man and Lazarus were compared to each other and shown to be mirror images; thus if Lazarus was carried by angels, the rich man simply had to be carried by demons. Konrad's quotation from Isaiah was merely to find biblical authority for this rhetorical presentation.

The gospel does not actually say anything about the funeral of the rich man, although as seen, Antonio Azaro Parmense automatically assumed that it was held according to his social standing. According to Guillaume Peyraut, it is not mentioned because it simply was not important what happened to the rich man's body. The truly important funeral was that of his soul. Guillaume cites Jeremiah (22:19):

"'He shall be buried with the burial of an ass.' The burial of an ass is such that the master keeps the hide and the meat is eaten by the worms. The bones are left to the rain and hail. Similarly external goods, which are compared to the hide, are inherited by sons and occasionally earthly lords too. The worms keep the meat virtually, for they eat it. The soul, which is compared to bones because of its perversity is left to the rain and hailstorm of hell."<sup>68</sup>

Guillaume was not the only one to cite this passage from Jeremiah in this context. In fact the burial of an ass was quite a common *topos* among the Lazarus sermons.<sup>69</sup>

66 Konrad Holtznicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. BAV. Burghes. 180, f. 107r. "Item exportatur a demonibus Ysa. xxii: 'Ecce Dominus asportari te facit sicut asportatur gallus gallinacius,'"

67 A. Gurevich, *The Origins of European Individualism* (Oxford 1995), pp. 106-107.

68 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangelis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v. "Sepultura asini sepelietur.' Sepultura asini talis est: dominus pellem retinet et uermes carnes comedunt, ossa ad pluviam et grandinem remanent, sic bona exteriora que per pellem intelliguntur filii et quandoque dominus terrenus. Uermes carnes retinent ad litteram qui carnes comedunt. Anima que per peruersitatem ossibus comparatur pluie et grandini infernali assimilatur."

69 See for instance Hugues de Saint-Cher OP, *Sermones de evangelis dominicalibus*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. Roma Angelica 715, f. 72r; Nicolaus de Aquaevilla

*The world turned upside down topos* already noted in connection with the reward for the righteous poor was naturally important in the descriptions of the punishments for rich sinners. Things are turned upside down for the rich also. The situation of the rich man after death was a mirror image of his life in this world, and what is even more important, it was a mirror image of Lazarus' destiny after death too. Both of these aspects are registered in Hugo de Prato Florido's Lazarus sermon.<sup>70</sup> Gerard de Mailly writes: "*Let it so be that in this world the rich are preferred to the poor, in the future world it will be on the contrary.*" He supports his case with a parallel from natural history:

*"The example of the fisherman who lets little fish go back to the water and chooses large ones. Little fish avoid being caught because of the holes in the net; in a similar way the humble and the poor slip away from the net of the devil, but big ones remain in his vessel [...] since he can hold them through their greatness."*<sup>71</sup>

Another good example of this is the treatment of the rich man's punishments in Guillaume Peyraut's sermon. He writes:

*"'Lifting up his eyes.' Here is shown their condition after death and this especially in three ways: change in their positions, God's just revenge, and the perversity of the rich man's presumption. About the first note that he who used to be above was now below, which is noted from 'Lifting up his eyes.'"*<sup>72</sup>

An interesting point is that Peyraut does not take this passage to mean the physical formation of the other world (best known from Dante's *Divina Commedia*) in which the place where Lazarus and Abraham were situated was naturally above the place of the rich man.

Some preachers thought that Lazarus and Abraham were situated in the upper level of hell, where their existence was quite reasonable.<sup>73</sup> This was of course

OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84r; Konrad Holtzner OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. BAV. Burghes. 180, f. 107r; Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v; Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd1r.

70 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd1r. "Secundo ponitur transitus diuitis qui fuit per omnia in contrarium (that is compared to Lazarus)."

71 Gerard de Mailly OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Arundel 329, ff. 132r and 133r. "Licet in presenti uita pauperibus diuites preponantur, in futuro erit econtrario." "Exemplum de piscatore qui pisces paruos reddit in aquam et grossos eligit. Parui enim pisciculi euadunt per maculas rethis, eodem modo rethe diaboli humiles et pauperes elabuntur sed grossi remanent in uasa eius [...] habent enim magnitudinem per quam potest eos tenere."

72 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de euangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v. "'Eleuans autem oculos'. Hic ostenditur status eorum post mortem et attendit hic tria, scilicet statuum mutationem, uindictam Dei congruentem, presumptionem diuitis perseuerationem. Circa primum nota quod diues qui solebat esse supra fuit infra quod notatur ibi 'eleuans oculos'."

73 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v; Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 268, f. 39.



because they died before the redemption of Christ. The upper part of hell was the Limbo of the Fathers. This idea may be taken from Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job* (although it was also Bonaventure's view).<sup>74</sup> Some preachers, however, simplified things for the sake of their audience and wrote that they were in paradise.<sup>75</sup> This was Saint Augustine's idea. According to him the bosom of Abraham meant none other than paradise.<sup>76</sup> In both cases, if the rich man wanted to see Abraham and Lazarus, he was obliged to look upwards because of the geography of hell. This was, however, not the way Guillaume Peyraut chose to see things. He interpreted the lifting of the eyes in a social context. The rich man, who once was above Lazarus in the social hierarchy, was now put below him. The first had come last and the last had come first.

To make this even more clear Peyraut continues: "*Also he had to beg from whom others had been begging. How hard it is to suffer the torment for him who was accustomed to delights, demotion for him who used to be honoured, and poverty for him who was in such abundance.*"<sup>77</sup> This is also the idea of Nicolaus de Aquaevilla when he notes that the rich man who denied a crumb of bread to Lazarus was forced to beg a drop of water from him.<sup>78</sup> Also Giovanni da San Gemignano presents the begging theme: "*Fifth He gave him inestimable mendicance for he begged a drop of water saying: 'Father Abraham, send Lazarus etc.' See how the miserable rich man was forced to beg a drop of water from him whom he had denied crumbs of bread!*"<sup>79</sup> What would be a better way to describe the change of situation than referring to the begging of the rich man.

Another way to conciliate the poor through the future punishment of their oppressors was to make an explicit connection between sins and punishments following them. This tendency was already referred to in the second main chapter. The whole idea of this *topos* was crystallised in Chrysostomus' words: "*Ubi peccatum, ibi pena*", so it is only right to call it with these words.<sup>80</sup>

As noted in the second chapter, this idea was normally presented when commenting on the fact that the rich man wanted to cool his tongue and thus,

74 J. Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, pp. 89-90 and 253.

75 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 48v; Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BL. Harley 755, f. 18r; Nicolaus de Aquaevilla, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84v.

76 J. Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, p. 70.

77 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v. "Item mendicabat a quo solebant alii mendicare. O quam grave erat sustinere cruciatum ei qui assueuerat deliciis et deiectionem ei qui fuerat in honore et tantam indigentiam ei qui fuerat in tanta abundantia."

78 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis, BL. Harley 102, f. 84r. "O quanta tormenta et quantam penam et quantum dolorem habebat diues iste qui guttam aque ad refrigerandum linguam petebat a Lazaro et tamen guttam aque non accepit."

79 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 59v-60r. "Quinto dedit ei inestimabilem mendicitatem quia petiuit guttam aque dicens: 'Pater Habraham, mitte Lazarum etc.' Ecce ab eo cui negauerat panis micas compellitur miser diues petere aque guttam."

80 These words of Chrysostomus are cited in Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de evangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v.

presumably, it was his tongue that suffered most from the flames of hell. There are, however, other ways of presenting this *topos*. Jacopo da Varazze writes:

*"This rich man sinned in the amount of his riches and therefore he is punished with extreme poverty, for he did not ask balm nor a vase of water, nor a handful of water, but a finger dipped in water and even that he could not get, because, as it is said in James ii: 'He shall have judgement without mercy, that hath shown no mercy.'"*<sup>81</sup>

Interestingly this passage implies once again that being rich is a sin in itself. Because he was rich he was punished with poverty. Jacopo continues:

*"Secondly he sinned in the variety of his clothes and was therefore punished with several punishments. He had two different sets of clothes; that is those made of purple and those made of linen, and therefore he has two different punishments that are mentioned in Job xxiv: 'Drought and heat consume the snow waters' thus he who was clothed in purple which has the colour of fire, is clothed with clothes of fire, and because he was clothed in linen, which has the colour of snow or bright, he will be clothed with snow. When the rich man is in an ardently burning fire he is clothed in purple, when he is in frigid snow, then he is clothed in bright coloured linen."*<sup>82</sup>

Here the *ubi peccatum ibi pena topos* is brought to another, more symbolical level. The rich man is punished with elements represented in the colours of his sinfully sumptuous clothes. The connection between the crime and the punishment is made obvious to the sinner by making him wear the instruments of his sin while being punished.

This passage is also significant for it seeks to elucidate what were the punishments of the rich man in hell in easily understandable language. We are told that he (and after him other evil rich men) was punished with burning fire and freezing snow. The first is mentioned in the Gospel, while the second is the result of the preacher's original deduction. Since the rich man sinned in clothes with cold, bright colours, it was only natural that he should be punished with cold. The *ubi peccatum ibi pena topos* worked for medieval preachers in a similar manner to a mathematical equation. It was possible to use it to produce information not mentioned in the actual Gospel text. When this new information

---

81 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "Peccauerat quidem iste diues in diuitiarum ubertate, immo punitur in extrema paupertate, nam non petebat balsamum neque situlam aque, nec manum plenam aqua, sed tamen minimum digitum in aqua intingi: et tamen non potuit obtinere, quia sicut dicitur Jac. ii: 'Iudicium sine misericordia fiet ei qui non fecerit misericordiam.'"

82 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo primus (Venice 1497), f. 22v. "Secundo peccauerat in uestium uarietate, immo punitur penarum diuersitate. Habuerat enim duo mutatoria uestium, scilicet purpuram et byssum, et immo modo habet duo mutatoria penarum de quibus dicitur Job xxxiii: 'Ad calorem nimium transeat ab aquis niuium' qui enim induebatur purpura que habet colorem igneum modo induitur ueste ignea, et qui induebatur bysso que habet colorem niuium seu candidum, modo induitur uestimento niuis. Quando igitur diues est in igne ardentissimo, tunc indutus est purpura, quando est in niue frigidissima, tunc indutus est bysso candida."

was transmitted to readers it was presented as being as true and binding as the actual text of Saint Luke.

Nicolas de Gorran finds details of the punishment elsewhere in the Bible, namely in the Apocalypse. He connects rich sinners with those people who receive the mark of the beast on their foreheads (Apoc. 14:9-10). Their punishment, as we read from the Bible is: "[...] *he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone [...]*."<sup>83</sup> The linking of the sinful rich and receiving the mark of the beast implies that Nicolas also had the opinion that being rich was as such sinful.

Sometimes we gain a picture of the amount of pain suffered by the rich man by reading between the lines. Guillaume Peyraut tells us that the rich man suffered so much from the flames that he was forced to ask Lazarus to bring him a drop of water on his finger. On the finger of the leper, that was! The need of water was so bad that the rich man was willing to take it from the hand of leper. Guillaume adds that for the last thousand years the rich man has been asking this and been denied and will be denied forever.<sup>84</sup>

However, there was a certain limit to expanding the Gospel text to describe the punishments of the rich man. Those preachers who wanted to give truly horrific details of the pains of hell had to rely on other material. Peregrinus de Oppeln describes several punishments of the rich man on the basis of the Gospel. He then notes that the rich man (being a nobleman) had dogs for hunting. Hunting was considered to be a useless vanity and as such was also sinful. Therefore the rich man deserved some kind of punishment for keeping dogs. There is no clue in the gospel for it says only: "*moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.*" Peregrinus solves this problem with an *exemplum*:

*"A certain holy man saw a knight burning in hell and he was seen sitting on the saddle of a burning horse and holding a falcon in his hand. The holy man asked the rider who he was. He answered that the horse is the devil and he rides with him because of the vain glory he had from riding and because he spent too much time with his falcon. The falcon in his hand is another devil who ate from his hand and yet made him suffer as great pain as if his heart was torn out of his stomach. The holy man saw also others who tried to play dice and chess with demons."*<sup>85</sup>

- 
- 83 Nicolas de Gorran OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 755, f. 18v. "Apoc. xiiii: 'Si quis accepit ymaginem bestie cruciatur igne et sulphure.'"
- 84 Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales ex evangeliiis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v. "Notabile uero est quod guttam aque petiuit super digitum Lazari qui fuerat ulceribus plenus, tunc non erat ita indignantis nature ut esse solebat, mille anni sunt quod eam peciit lingua eius, et adhuc igne cruciatur nec tamen adhuc obtinuit, nec unquam obtinebit."
- 85 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 48v. "Pro canibus uero quos habuit ad uenandum et auibus ostenditur pena in cantico Moysi cum dicitur 'deuorabunt eos aues morsu amarissimo et dentes bestiarum' id est demonum, 'mittam in eos, per que enim quis peccat per hec et torqueretur' unde legitur quod quidam sanctus uidit quendam militem ardere in inferno et uidebatur sedere in igneo equo et tenentem falconem in manu et dixit equitanti quid hoc esset. Respondit equus iste diabolus est qui currebat cum eo propter gloriam quam habuerat in equitando et quia cum falcone se libenter occupabat. Falco qui in manu tenebat erat alter diabolus qui comedebat de manu et tamen dolorem faciebat ei ac si cor eius de uentre extrahetur. Uidit autem alios qui cogebantur ludere cum demonibus ad aleas et ad scacos."

Some preachers did not bother to describe the punishments of sinners in detail. They were happy to assure their readers that they are terrible beyond any human description. Nicolaus de Aquaevilla writes about hell:

*"Surely there are endless and most cruel torments and sinners should be very much afraid of them, for as Saint Bernard says: 'There is an intolerable pain, incomparable stench, horrible fear, and death of body and soul without any hope of forgiveness or mercy, as it is sung in the church: 'In hell there is no redemption.'"*<sup>86</sup>

The only concrete detail in this description is the bad smell of hell. Even its quality and the reasons for it are left to the imagination of the audience.

Along with different physical pains the rich man was punished on a mental level. He had to sustain the psychological pain of seeing Lazarus and other elect in the bosom of Abraham. The eye contact between the damned and the saved was one of the most important themes for the preachers. In this they followed Gregorian tradition. Gregory the Great noted in his Lazarus homily that until the last judgement the damned and the blessed are able to see each other. The damned are thus punished not only with the pains of hell, but also by seeing the joy of the elect. After the last judgement the damned lose sight of the blessed whereas these are still able to see the damned and seeing what they have been able to avoid makes them even more happy in paradise.<sup>87</sup>

Some preachers are happy merely to say that the rich man suffered from seeing Lazarus in the bosom of the Abraham.<sup>88</sup> Others were keen to discuss this further and quoted Gregory the Great extensively. Antonio Azaro Parmense asks how it is possible that a spirit sees, since it does not have a physical body or its senses. He answers that it sees spiritually. Then he goes on to state that those who are at rest and those who are in hell see each other. This is confirmed by citing Gregory. He writes that after the last judgement the damned will not see the blessed any more since it would be impious to show paradise to them. The blessed, however, will still see the damned and take pleasure from seeing divine justice taking place. Antonio ends with a quotation from Psalm 57: *"The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance."*<sup>89</sup> Hugo de Prato

---

86 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM, *Sermones dominicales*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Harley 102, f. 84r. "Certe in inferno sunt infinita tormenta et crudelissima et hec habent multum timere peccatores quia sicut dicit beatus Bernardus: 'Ibi est dolor intollerabilis, fetor incomparabilis, timor horribilis, mors anime et corporis sine spe uenie et misericordie' unde cantatur in ecclesia: 'In inferno nulla est redemptio.'"

87 Gregory the Great, *Homily 40*, PL 76, col. 1308-1309.

88 For instance Guillaume Peyraut OP, *Sermones dominicales de euangeliis*. Dominica I post festum sancte trinitatis (Tübingen 1499), f. n3v; Peregrinus de Oppeln OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL. Addit. 18340, f. 48r; Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 59v.

89 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. UUB. C 268, f. 39v-40r. "Secundum est quod hii qui sunt in inferno et qui sunt in requie uident se mutuo. Respondeo quod secundum Gregorium usque ad diem iudicii et mali uident bonos ut de ipsorum gloria magis torquantur et boni malos ut de penis quas misericorditer euaserunt Deo gratias agentes amplius gratulentur. Post diem uero iudicii mali ultra non uidebunt bonos, quia tolletur impius ne uideret gloriam Dei, et boni semper uidebunt malos ut iustitiam diuinam super commendent quia 'letabitur iustus cum uiderit uindictam.'"

Florido points out the possibility of seeing through one's spirit and imagination too. He is keen to emphasise the torment caused by the joy of the elect to the damned.<sup>90</sup>

Here we see the important difference between the thinking of Gregory the Great and that of the mendicant preachers. In Gregory's text the righteous are happy because they managed to avoid the punishments of hell themselves. In Antonio Azaro Parmense's sermon they are happy mostly because they enjoy seeing the vengeance of God. This difference emerges in the quotation from Psalm 57 cited above. This may seem to be a trivial detail but it is not. The ultimate audience of the model sermons were the people who consisted mostly of the poor, the sick and the workers. The joy over the punishments of rich sinners was a message directed to these people to keep them happy in this life waiting for the retribution, and what is more important, their vengeance in the future. Not all audiences consisted of the poor, but the same message worked to scare the better-off sinners into amending their ways. Which function was more important was finally decided by the actual preachers using the model sermon collections. They were the ones who knew what the audience was likely to be and what its needs were.

The same view is taken by Jacopo da Varazze. He cites Chrysostomus' commentary on the words *between us and you there is a great gulf fixed*: "We can see, but we cannot cross it. We see what we have managed to avoid; you see what you have lost. Our joy increases your torments and your torments increase our joy."<sup>91</sup> Then he goes on, citing the aforementioned passage from Gregory. The whole idea of these passages seems to be joy in vengeance.

This presupposed joy of the blessed over the torments of the damned makes one wonder; did the preachers not see any contradiction between the Christian virtue of compassion and these orgies of revenge? Berthold von Regensburg did consider this problem. He writes:

*"Then the evil men, who did not have mercy on the poor of Christ in this world, desire to have from the poor at least a small alleviation to their torments, but they will not receive it, just like the rich man who begged to have a drop of water from Lazarus and received none for he had denied crumbs of bread from him when he was hungry. This is so because the saints are so filled with God's justice that they cannot be persuaded to any*

---

90 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd1v. "Dicit autem beatus Gregorius quod usque ad diem iudicii anime damnatorum uident sanctorum animas in gloria, nec de hoc aliquam gloriam habent, sed tormentum, quia non uident gloriam eorum sed cognoscunt per intellectum ipsos esse in loco ubi omnes apparent eis gloriosi. Sicut si uiderem quoddam palacium in quo crederem esse magnum gaudium et ibi scirem esse inimicos meos tormentarer ex hoc et non gauderem."

91 Jacopo da Varazze OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade quadragesime. Sermo secundus (Venice 1497), f. 23r. "Chrysostomus super illud: 'Inter nos et uos chaos firmatum est', dicit sic: 'Uidere possumus, transire non possumus, et nos uidemus quod fugimus, et uos uidetis quod perdidistis, et nostra gaudia accumulunt uestra tormenta, et uestra tormenta accumulunt nostra gaudia.'"

*compassion towards the damned. He shall have judgement without mercy that hath shown no mercy.*"<sup>92</sup>

Hugo de Prato Florido's psychology of the elect is very similar to that of Berthold. He writes that the elect have a twofold will. According to human nature they will have compassion on the damned, especially on their former friends. However, in their rational will, which is always in perfect understanding with the will of God, they can only have joy in the fulfilment of divine justice.<sup>93</sup>

Berthold's and Hugo's explanation is that under normal circumstances the blessed would have been moved by the terrible destiny of the damned. They would have felt compassion towards them, and if they could, they would have helped. In paradise, however, the chosen ones are so inebriated with divine justice that they cannot feel any compassion towards the damned. They can only have the joy of their misery and - what is best - do it without problems of conscience. These rhetorics opened an interesting window on the future for the poor, the sick, the workers and the oppressed. Not only were they going to be saved and released from their problems at the end of their mortal life, but they were to have their revenge as well. That was the message of the *dance macabre* according to Jean Delumeau, and that certainly was the message of the Lazarus sermons.

Konrad Holtzicker adds a further dimension to this issue of the rich man seeing Lazarus and his mental sufferings arising from this sight. He makes the habitual remark about the increase of suffering due to the vision of the blessed. Then he quotes appropriate passages from Gregory. The novel idea in Konrad's sermon is that he pays attention to the fact that according to Gregory the damned will not see the blessed any more after the final judgement. He writes about the judgement: "*Then for sure, the damned will see the last glimpse of the blessed. For after that day, the damned will not ever see their saved fathers, mothers, wives, husbands or children.*"<sup>94</sup> Thus Konrad makes the point that the mental sufferings of sinners are increased by the fact they will be eternally separated from their families and loved ones.

---

92 Berthold von Regensburg OFM, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*, Dominica I post festum trinitatis. BL Harley 3215, f. 43r. "Tunc mali qui hic misericordie opera non fecerunt pauperibus Christi desiderant ibi uel minimam tormentorum scilicet alleuacionem ab eis sibi obtineri et non potuerunt, sicut et diues guttam aque per Lazarum sibi peciit dari et non obtinuit sicut ipse ei micas panis hic esurienti negauerat, quia sancti tunc tanta Dei iustitia pleni erunt quod nulla compassione ad ipsos dampnatos flecti possent. Iudicium sine misericordia erit ei qui non facit hic misericordiam."

93 Hugo de Prato Florido OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis (Nürnberg 1483), f. dd2r. "Est autem sciendum quod in bonis duplex uoluntas est, scilicet nature et rationis. Secundum uoluntatem nature compatiuntur damnatis et maxime suis amicis et secundum uoluntatem rationis quam conformant in omnibus uoluntati diuine non compatiuntur, sed congaudent de pena eorum sicut de iusticia Dei. Ps: 'Letabitur iustus cum uiderit uindictam.'"

94 Konrad Holtzicker OFM, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo secundus. BAV. Burghes. 180, f. 107r. "Hoc aget penam reproborum uidere gloriam beatorum [...] Tunc certo ultimo uidebunt reprobi bonos. Post illum enim diem nec saluatam patrem, nec matrem, nec uxorem, nec uirum, nec filiam dampnatus uidebit in eternum."

The theme of the rich man's family is often commented on accompanying his petition concerning his five brothers (Lk. 16:27-31). Some preachers speculate on the motives of the rich man in asking Abraham to help his brothers. Some, like Aldobrandino da Toscanella, propose that his sufferings would have increased from knowing that his brothers had ended up with a fate similar to his own.<sup>95</sup> The point in common is that none of the preachers accepts that the rich man would have been genuinely concerned for about his brothers. All the motives presented rise from personal gain (or fear of the personal loss) for the rich man.

The final seal and addition to the descriptions of pain and suffering in hell was the emphasis put on their eternal duration and immutability. Preachers never tired repeating the endlessness of the punishment and lack of any hope of redemption. For example Giovanni da San Gemignano writes: "*Sixth He gave him the pain without remedies. [...] Seventh He gave him the immutability of the pains when he said: 'Between us and you, etc.' showing that it is impossible to move from the pains to eternal glory.*"<sup>96</sup> François de Mayronnes also emphasises the unchangeable nature of the rich man's punishment: "*The third conclusion is that not a bit of suffering of the damned is relaxed by God's mercy.*"<sup>97</sup>

---

95 Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP, *Sermones de tempore*. Dominica I post festum trinitatis. Sermo primus. BAV. Ottob. lat. 557, f. 125r-v. "Quia dicit habeo quinque fratres pro quibus rogabat ne pene sua ex eorum societate cresceret."

96 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. BAV. Pal.lat. 466, f. 60r. "Sexto dedit ei penarum irremediabilitatem.[...] Septimo dedit ei penarum immutabilitatem cum dixit: 'Inter nos et uos etc.' ostendens quod de penis illis ad gloriam moueri uel transiri non potest."

97 François de Mayronnes OFM, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade (Venice 1491), f. 117v. "Tertio conclusio est quod per misericordiam Dei nichil relaxatur de pena damnatorum."

## ■ 7. Respondeo quod sic – Conclusions

The first main objective in this study was to establish whether there was a specific mendicant social ethos; that is, whether the rich and the powerful were held to be potential sinners and the poor and the humble potentially better Christians likely to obtain salvation. Analysing a corpus of 35 mendicant sermons written between the second quarter of the thirteenth century and the first quarter of the fourteenth century, and comparing the results to other mendicant writings of that time, it became clear that this indeed was the case. The very division of the Lazarus sermons is often built around this basic assumption. In many cases they were divided into primary parts describing the life and eternity of "*Lazarus and other good poor men*" and "*the rich man and other evil men*". In the actual contents of the sermons and other pastoral writings this tendency becomes even more apparent.

Whether this ethos was specific to the mendicants, or more generally a Christian one, remains a difficult question. The idea of taking the side of the poor in social conflicts and sympathising with them in general was not a novelty invented by the thirteenth century mendicants. That was and has been the basic attitude of the Christian church throughout its history (at least on a theoretical level) – yet the sermons and other writings of mendicant brothers arguably present this ethos more frequently, intensively and concretely than Christian writers of any century before or after that time.

Already the early Fathers were commenting on the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. They either interpreted it allegorically as referring to the Jews, or took a very uncompromising view towards the rich. The best example of the latter approach are the three sermons on the Lazarus parable by Petrus Chrysologus. Scholastic theology brought with it a change of position towards the rich. Attention was directed to reasons and motives, not to a person's standing. Thus the category of the sinful rich had to make room for the categories of those who had gained their wealth rightfully and those who had done it illicitly. That, however, was the theoretical side of the matter. In practice, the rich were often seen, as before, hopelessly sinful.

In the case of the rich and the powerful the mendicant social ethos is extremely easy to see. They were a priori considered to be in a state of spiritual danger. The scale of opinion amongst the mendicant writers varied from those who thought that being rich meant almost certainly losing the kingdom of heaven to those who thought that even though being rich included dangers, it was possible to avoid them as long as one took care to avoid the typical sins of the rich.



The rank and file friars tended to be more hostile towards the rich and riches than university theologians, whose opinions were often very moderate. However, this division is not valid in all cases, since there are examples of university theologians who when writing for popular audiences chose equally condemning attitudes towards riches. In the case of Bonaventure, we have the example of a front-row theologian who in his academic writings assumed the moderate attitude towards riches and in his live sermon condemned them almost totally. The obvious conclusion is that the outspoken message of a friar was more dependant on the forum where he wrote and the likely readership of his texts than on his person. Thus people wearing their university man's hats tended to write carefully considered and moderate opinions, while the very same people wearing their popular writer's hats tended to express themselves more categorically and freely.

The sins that endangered the soul of a rich man were numerous. Some of them were of a spiritual nature, such as loving one's riches and pride. Even these spiritual sins could take visible or concrete forms; for example when the pride appeared in various belongings of the rich man such as horses, residence, and military equipment, or when the noble man boasted about his family. Other sins were of a more practical nature: obtaining one's riches by different sinful means (theft, robbery, simony, usury, oppression of the poor and so on), keeping them avariciously (i.e. not sharing them with the poor in the form of alms), and spending them vainly. The most commonly named means of doing so were using superfluous clothing as well as drinking and eating too much and too sophisticated food, which, as often remarked, eventually led to the sin of lechery.

One of the most dangerous and common sins was oppression of the poor. In the Lazarus sermons this is occasionally mentioned explicitly and more often to be read between the lines, though only rarely do these sermons openly name the oppressors. However, comparison to other mendicant sources gives a clear enough picture of the current situation. The lords and their bailiffs and other servants are presented as greedy oppressors making unjust exactions. The legal system was unable and unwilling to protect the poor. Judges were corrupt and lawyers too avaricious to take the cases of simple people. The ecclesiastical lords were no better. They were presented as using the income of the churches for their personal needs instead of taking care of the poor and the sick. From time to time these complaints were so loud that the reader gets the impression that there was a conspiracy of the rich and the powerful to oppress and rob the poor. None of the potentially wealthy and powerful classes of society was left unblamed in these writings. The nobility, the prelates (who usually came from the ranks of the nobility), and rich merchants, all had their equal share of reproach.

The case of the poor (in the wider sense of the word) is not as clear as that of the rich and powerful. It is obvious that the friars sympathised with them and thought that they had better chances of salvation than the rich. However, there were writers who equally saw spiritual dangers in poverty as well. The most

widespread assumption, however, was that the poor were on their way to salvation, unless they were thwarted by some of these spiritual dangers. They were different from the rich, who were thought to travel on a perpetually slippery surface, all the time in danger of slipping and falling into the pit hell.

Save for the few exceptions, the Lazarus sermons do not handle those who work, but are concentrated mainly on the poor and the sick. This is understandable due to the nature of the Gospel. Lazarus was hardly an image of a hard-working labourer. The gap left by the few vague references in the sermons, however, is more than adequately filled by the evidence in other pastoral material. There were two possible ways to approach manual work. Either it was seen as a punishment of God following original sin, or as a virtuous and penitential action useful for one's salvation. The mendicants chose to adopt the latter possibility. In their pastoral writings, all manner of hardships in this life, be they poverty, hunger, sickness or hard manual labour, were considered to be virtuous and treated in a very similar way. They were seen to be a purgatory in this world. Suffering in this life released one from punishments on the other side.

The image of the poor and those who work, even though there are some romantic and idealised descriptions, remained generally realistic. The vices and shortcomings of these people were well known to the mendicant preachers and confessors, as is obvious from their pastoral writings, especially confessors' manuals. The sins of the poor listed in these books were numerous and without doubt they were written down on the basis of real-life experiences. Yet, in spite of these dangers in poverty, the overall impression remains very positive. As long as the poor managed to remember and practise the two virtues connected with them by most writers, they were safe. These virtues were patience and perseverance. The existing social situation was seen to be God's design and those who were on the losing side, the poor, the workers, the sick and other downtrodden people, were supposed to bear their tribulations patiently as their archetypes Job and Lazarus had done before.

Through patience and perseverance, rejecting riches by rejecting avarice and not even wanting to get rich, the actual poor by necessity could be compared to the spiritual élite, i.e. the religious who were voluntarily poor. If the poor were patient and managed to overcome the temptation of avarice, then the spiritual glory traditionally connected to voluntary poverty and living in religion was transferred to them as well; voluntary poverty, however, was still considered to be the state of utmost perfection. It is important to observe that the greater part of the Lazarus sermons were devoted to the problems of the actual poor, the poor by necessity, not to the voluntary poor.

One of the most significant devices in the Lazarus sermons was the tendency to present Job and Lazarus as archetypes and role models for the poor and the downcast. The most important feature in Job was his absolute righteousness. He was the archetype of the good Christian, and yet he was tempted with almost all the possible misfortunes a man can suffer. The didactic significance of Job, which was often transferred to Lazarus also, was that he had suffered

everything despite being good, and it was done with the permission of God. Therefore, those who suffer in this world were not necessarily bad; they were merely tempted by God for greater rewards. Some mendicants even took the extreme view that extensive suffering in this world was a sign of God's favour, not of his anger and vengeance.

The basic didactic importance of Lazarus' character lies in the degree of his suffering, and most of all, in his patience. Mendicant preachers did not spare their efforts to show that Lazarus had suffered everything it is possible to suffer in this world. Yet he had remained patient and persevered until the end. Several preachers underline the fact that according to the Gospel Lazarus never complained against God despite all his sufferings. The Gospel does not in fact say that he did not complain, but that was not the way the preachers decided to see it. They also used the Gospel's words: "*And it came to pass that the beggar died*" to underline that his sufferings and patience lasted until the very moment of death, for he died as a beggar.

We may indeed speak of a mendicant social ethos, since there were no differences between the sermons of the Franciscan and Dominican friars. The Dominicans were equally sympathetic to the poor and poverty and they attacked and rebuked the abuses of the rich and the powerful with equal ferocity, occasionally even more fiercely than their Franciscan confreres. This is no great surprise, since modern historical research has done much to disprove older stereotypes concerning the differences between these two orders. Leaving aside the differences in theological thinking between Bonaventure and Aquinas, by the middle of the thirteenth century, the day to day life of the friars preachers and minors was very similar. They walked in the same surroundings and worked with the same people; thus it should not come as a surprise that they should react similarly to the same social problems and abuses.

Having established that there indeed was a common mendicant social ethos, we may pass to the actual motives behind these sermons and other writings. At the beginning one has to note that the current social situation, that is, the almost universally present high number of people who had problems in sustaining themselves and their families or who were even forced to beg for a living, was the driving force behind these sermons. In many cases the tone of the writings is too bitter towards the oppressors of the poor to be merely a literary topos. Even in cases where one is clearly dealing with an age-old quotation or commonplace, it is to be noted that such commonplaces were not used for the fun of it, but because they were valid in presenting the current reality.

Taking this into account we may safely say that the Lazarus sermons and other pastoral writings were a response to the social realities of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Yet, due to the nature of these writings, they cannot be tied to any particular time and place. Hence the sermons written during the relative prosperity of the early thirteenth century are not significantly, if at all, different from those written in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, when economic deterioration had set in in most parts of Europe. Another interesting point is that there are no major differences between preachers coming

from different parts of Europe. Jacopo da Varazze, an inhabitant of prosperous Genova, writes in a similar tone to Berthold von Regensburg, who lived in Germany and preached all around the eastern parts of the Holy Roman Empire, devastated a few years before by the Mongols.

The basic idea of the model sermon writers was to concentrate on those problems that were universally valid in all Christendom and would probably continue to be so in years to come. Model sermon collections were written for constant use over an extensive period of time, not to respond current issues. The actual sermons preached live were another matter, which alas, save for the few exceptions, is beyond our reach. Poverty, sickness as well as the abuses and common sins of the rich and the powerful were clearly issues of universal appeal and were likely to remain such in the near future.

We have seen that the mendicants had a clear idea of the social problems of their time. Their solution, however, was not to try to change the system in a more socially just and equal direction. This is not to say that they did not do anything on behalf of the poor, but that the improvements were to be made within the boundaries of the existing, God-given system. Their basic attitude was that there is a reason for everything in this world. If God so wanted, he could have arranged everything in a such manner that there would be no poverty and suffering, yet He chose not to do so.

There were two reasons for the existence of poverty. The first was that the poor could be tempted for greater glory in heaven. The second is that their existence improves the chance of salvation for the rich, as François de Mayronnes wrote: *"Where there is no misery, there is not mercy either."* The idea was that the presence of the poor allowed the rich to give alms and thus act virtuously and compensate for some of those sins almost inevitably (as we have seen) connected to richness. The rich were given a chance to make themselves *"friends from the mammon of unrighteousness"*.

Thus taking care of the poor and sick and giving alms to them were in the first place seen as acts that helped the rich themselves, not so much the poor. It can be argued that the real objective of the mendicant sermon was on the one hand to help, both the few just rich and the numerous righteous poor, to achieve their salvation. On the other it was to discourage sinners and scare them into changing their evil ways. The improvements in the temporal well-being of the poor, the sick, and the oppressed were appreciated, but if they were not achieved voluntarily, the friars were not willing to pursue matters further. Surely they were happy if the poor were fed and clothed, but in the contrary case, the greatest damage was done to the souls of the unmerciful rich, not to the poor who died of hunger.

In the case of a conflict of interests between the rich and powerful oppressors and the poor, mendicant preachers took the side of the poor, but only up to a point. They harshly condemned the abuses committed and urged those who were better off to take care of the poor and the sick. Yet beneath this radical and occasional strongly worded surface, their sermons were essentially rather conservative than revolutionary. Even though they clearly condemned the rich

and their abuses, they equally clearly urged the poor and the oppressed to remain calm and bear everything patiently. Rebellion would have been a grave sin (in the system of the seven capital sins, it was presented as a subspecies of pride, the gravest of all sins).

This is exactly why Lazarus was described as having all the possible sufferings on earth one could imagine. He was a leper, unable to support himself through work, homeless, penniless, forced to beg crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, despised by all and sundry, and totally deprived of human compassion. To put it briefly, he was a suitable role model for even the poorest and the lowliest oppressed. No one was able to think that he was worse-off than Lazarus, and yet he did not complain or rebel against God or secular rulers. He was patient until the very end.

Equality, compensation, and even revenge, all these were promised to the poor, sick and the oppressed, but – only after death. In the present world it was important to follow the example of Lazarus and his Old Testament mirror-image Job. The poor were promised recompense in the form of eternal life, dignity and sufficient food and drink. The last promise was argued from Apocalypse 7:16 "*They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more.*"

Along with compensation they were promised vengeance. Several preachers went to great lengths to explain to their audiences why God allows all the unjust things to happen and evil men to prosper. Some wrote that God did not wipe them out immediately because of his grace. He wanted to give them a chance to repent and mend their ways. Others wrote that all this is to tempt the just, but the vengeance will surely come in the other life and nothing will be forgotten. Naturally these words can also be understood as a message to the rich urging them to repent and make restitution before it is too late.

Nevertheless, the vindictive general tone in the descriptions of the sufferings of the rich makes it obvious that the message was meant not only for rich sinners, but equally for the consolation of the poor. The various torments of hell are usually described at great length, and many details remain similar from sermon to sermon. The rich will lose their beloved earthly possessions, be carried to hell by demons, and be there tormented in numerous ways. Besides physical pains (which often are in some relation to their sins according to *ubi peccatum ibi pena topus*) due to extreme coldness and flames, they have to endure numerous mental sufferings.

They will suffer because they will see the poor and the oppressed in glory, while they themselves are reduced to beg in their turn. One of the most common ideas presented in these sermons is the complete turning of the tables. Life after death is presented, with meticulous attention to detail, as a mirror image of life in the present world. The first will come last and the last will come first. The beggars will be in joy with the saints, while the rich will be begging, in vain, for a drop of water. Furthermore the rich will suffer because of the hopelessness of their situation. In hell there is no hope of remedy. All this is promised to the poor as a free spectacle to increase their joy in paradise, for they will see the sufferings of the damned forever. Several preachers quote

Psalm 57 in this context: "*The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance.*" The possibility of the compassion of the blessed towards the damned is ruled out, since the blessed cannot be but happy at the carrying out of divine justice. The ultimate audience of this part of message had to be the poor and the oppressed, otherwise it would have made no sense to underline their joy at the moment of vengeance.

One could say that the object was to scare sinners into repentance. This, as pointed out, was certainly true, but for that purpose it would have been adequate to describe the punishments for them. The underlining of the joy awaiting the righteous when they finally see the revenge carried out seems to be a part of the message that is meant for the benefit of the poor and the oppressed among the audiences.

The motive of the mendicant preachers was to console the poor and the oppressed and scare rich and powerful sinners. They were not concerned with changing society in this world. In practice this led to teaching which was bound to enforce the existing *status quo*. The poor and the oppressed were discouraged from seeking any change in their situation. It would, however, be projecting modern attitudes on history to think that this was done cynically to keep the masses quiet and satisfied. The friars were not consciously playing for the ruling élite even though the outcome of their sermons was of a conservative nature. They were in the first place interested in the salvation of their audiences and thus strongly against any action that would have endangered this ultimate objective, action that would be rejected as a sin.

If the rich and powerful were willing to improve the conditions of the poor within the existing system, fine; if despite the sermons they were not willing to do so, nothing more was to be done. For after all, as Berthold von Regensburg wrote of the poor: "*After reasonable tribulation, they receive the reward that cannot be estimated or measured.*" What was this brief and vanishing earthly life when compared to eternity. It simply was not worth the trouble to try to change the existing system of society, since earthly life and its quality were so utterly unimportant considering the whole span of human life from the moment of birth to eternity.

## ■ Abbreviations

AÉSC	Annales Économies Sociétés Civilisations
AFH	Archivum Franciscanum Historicum
AFP	Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum
AHR	American Historical Review
BAV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
BL	British Library, London
BN	Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina
JMH	Journal of Medieval History
MSS	Medieval Sermon Studies
CLM	Codex latinus Monacensis, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München
OFM	Ordinis Fratrum Minorum
OP	Ordinis Praedicatorum
PL	Patrologiae cursus completus: Ser. Latina
UUB	Uppsala Universitets Bibliotek

# ■ Bibliography

## MANUSCRIPTS:

- Anonymous, *Sermones de tempore*. BL Addit. 15831.
- Aldobrandino da Toscanella, *Expositio decalogi (Sermones 29)*. BAV. ottob. lat. 1610.
- Aldobrandino da Toscanella, *Sermones de tempore*. BAV. Ottob. lat. 557.
- Aldobrandino da Toscanella, *Sermones quadragesimales*. CLM 4321.
- Antonio Azaro Parmense, *Sermones de tempore*. BL Addit. 28684; CLM 2774; CLM 3088; UUB. C 268.
- Antonio Azaro Parmense, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Roma Angelica 1067; UUB. C 347.
- Berthold von Regensburg, *Sermones rusticanus de dominicis*. BL Harley 3215; CLM 5531; CLM 8738; CLM 12520.
- Berthold von Regensburg, *Sermones rusticanus de sanctis*. UUB. C 371.
- Gerard de Mailly, *Sermones de tempore*. BL Arundel 329; BN lat. 3738; CLM 15748; UUB C. 351.
- Giovanni da San Gemignano, *Sermones de tempore*. BL. Addit. 24998.
- Giovanni da San Gemignano, *Sermones quadragesimales*. BAV. Barb. lat. 728; BAV. Pal. lat. 466; CLM 5531.
- Guibert de Tournai, *Sermones ad status*. BN lat. 14943; BN lat. 15943.
- Guibert de Tournai, *Sermones de tempore*. Roma Angelica 819; CLM 6953; UUB. C 413.
- Guibert de Tournai, *Sermones de sanctis*. UUB. C 378.
- Guillaume Peyraut, *Sermones dominicales super evangelia*. BL Arundel 365.
- Hugo de Prato Florido, *Sermones communes*. BAV. Vat. lat. 4368.
- Hugo de Prato Florido, *Sermones decalogo preceptorum*. BAV. Vat. lat. 4368.
- Hugo de Prato Florido, *Sermones de tempore*. CLM 18277.
- Hugues de Saint-Cher, *Sermones de epistolis et evangelis dominicarum*. CLM 28471.
- Hugues de Saint-Cher, *Sermones de evangelis dominicalibus*. Roma Angelica 715.
- Jacopo da Cessole, *Libellus de moribus hominum et officii nobiliorum super ludo scachorum*. BAV. Vat. lat. 1042.
- Jacopo da Varazze, *Sermones de tempore*. BL Harley 3218.
- Jacques de Lausanne, *Compendium moralitatum*. BN lat. 16490.
- Jacques de Lausanne, *Sermones de tempore*. UUB. C 366.
- Jean de la Rochelle, *Summa de vitiis*. BAV. Vat. lat. 4293; UUB. C 235.
- Johannes von Freiburg, *Confessionale*. BL Addit. 19581; BN lat. 3532.
- John of Wales, *Communiloquium*. BAV. Vat. lat. 1018.
- John of Wales, *Moniloquium*. Firenze Biblioteca Nazionale II. VI. I.
- John of Wales, *Summa iustitie*. BL Harley 632; BL Sloane 985.
- Konrad Holtznicker, *Sermones de tempore*. BAV. Burghes. 180; CLM 2946; Lambeth Palace 480.
- Luca da Bitonto, *Sermones de tempore*. BN Nouv. Acq. lat. 410.
- Malachy of Ireland, *Venenum Malachie*. BAV. Vat. lat. 4347.
- Maurice de Provins, *Distinctiones*. BAV. Vat. lat. 980.
- Maurice de Provins, *Distinctiones*. BAV. Vat. lat. 980; BL Royal 9.E.III.
- Nicolas de Byard, *Sermones de tempore*. BN 12419; CLM 9588; CLM 13585; CLM 16028.
- Nicolas de Byard, *Summa de abstinentia*. UUB. C 230.
- Nicolas de Gorran *Distinctiones*. BL Royal 9. B. IV.
- Nicolas de Gorran, *Sermones de tempore*. BAV. Vat. lat. 963; BL Royal 9. B. IV.
- Nicolas de Gorran, *Sermones quadragesimales*. BAV. Vat. lat. 963; UUB. C 18.
- Nicolaus de Aquaevilla, *Sermones dominicales*. BL Harley 102; BL Harley 1660; Harley 4661; BL Royal 5. F. XVII.
- Peregrinus de Oppeln, *Sermones de tempore*. BAV. Pal. lat. 446; BAV. Pal. lat. 465; BL Addit. 18340; BL Addit. 28684; CLM 8208; Royal 8. E. III.
- Pierre de Reims, *Sermones de tempore*. UUB. C 369; BAV. Burghes. 343; BL Addit. 13968.
- Servasanto da Faenza, *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis*. Firenze Biblioteca Nazionale Conv. soppr. E. VI. 1046.
- Servasanto da Faenza, *Liber exemplorum naturalium contra curiosos*. BAV. Chigi. A. V. 155.



## PRINTED SOURCES:

- Anonymous (Pseudo-Vincent de Beauvais), *Speculum morale* (Graz 1964).
- Anonymous OFM, *Determinationes quaestionum circa regulam fratrum minorum*. In S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia. Tomus VIII (Quaracchi, Firenze 1898).
- Anonymous OP (Pseudo-Aquinas), *Sermones dominicales*. In Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Opera Omnia. Tomus XV (Parma 1864).
- Alexander de Hales, *Summa Theologica. Secunda pars secundi libri*. In Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales ordinis minorum Summa theologica. Tomus III (Quaracchi, Firenze 1930).
- Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*. In Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis opera, pars IV. Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam, fragmenta in Esaïam. CCSL 14 (Turnhout 1957).
- Augustine of Hippo, *Quaestionum evangeliorum liber secundus: Quaestiones in Evangelium secundum Lucam*. PL 35.
- Beda Venerabilis, *In Lucae evangelium expositio*. PL 92.
- Bernard Clairvaux, *Tractatus de gradibus humilitatis et superbiae*. PL 182.
- Biblia latina cum Glossa ordinaria*: Facsimile Reprint of the Editio princeps, Adolph Ruch of Strassburg 1480/1481. Vol IV (Turnhout 1992).
- Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Editionem*. Recensuit et brevi apparatu instruxit Robertus Weber OSB. 2 Vols. (Stuttgart 1975).
- Boethius (Ps.), *De disciplina clericorum*. PL 64.
- Bonaventura, *Collationes de decem praeceptis*. In S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia. Tomus V (Quaracchi, Firenze 1891).
- Bonaventura, *Commentarius in evangelium Lucae*. In S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia. Tomus VII (Quaracchi, Firenze 1895).
- Bonaventura, *Sermones dominicales*. Ed. J.G. Bougerol. Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi, cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 27 (Grottaferrata, Roma 1977).
- Bonaventura, *Sermons de diversis*. In Saint Bonaventure, *Sermons de diversis*. Nouvelle édition critique par Jacques Guy Bougerol. Volume I (Paris 1993).
- Bruno Astensis, *Commentarius in Lucam*. PL 165.
- Corpus Iuris Canonici*. Editio lipsiensis secunda post Aemili Ludouici Richter. Curas ad manu scriptorum et editionis Romanae fidem recognouit et adnotatione critica instruxit Aemilius Friedberg. Two Volumes (Graz 1959).
- Davy, M.M., *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-1231. Contribution a l'histoire de la prédication médiévale*. Études de philosophie médiévale XV (Paris 1931).
- Fasciculus morum. A Fourteenth-Century Preacher's Handbook*. Edition and Translation by Siegfried Wenzel (Pennsylvania State University Press 1989).
- François de Mayronnes, *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales* (Venice 1491).
- Friedberg, E., *Corpus juris canonici. Pars secunda, Decretalium collectiones* (Leipzig 1881).
- Giordano da Pisa, *Quaresimale Fiorentino 1305-1306*. Edizione critica a cura di Carlo Delcorno (Firenze 1974).
- Gregory the Great, *XL homiliarum in evangelia libri duo*. PL 76.
- Gregory the Great, *Liber moralium sive expositio in Job*. PL. 76.
- Guillaume Peyraut, *Sermones dominicales ex epistolis et evangelis atque de sanctis* (Tübingen 1499).
- Guillaume Peyraut, *Summa de virtutibus*. In Summae virtutum ac vitiorum. Tomus primus Gulielmo Peraldo Episcopo Lugdunensi Ordinis Praedicatorum auctore (Lyon 1571).
- Guillaume Peyraut, *Summa de vitiis*. In Summae virtutum ac vitiorum. Tomus secundus Gulielmo Peraldo Episcopo Lugdunensi Ordinis Praedicatorum auctore (Lyon 1585).
- Hervieux, L., *Les fabulistes latins. T. 4. Eudes de Cheriton et ses dérivés* (Paris 1896).
- The Holy Bible*. Douay Version. Translated from the Latin Vulgate (London 1956).
- Hugo de Prato Florido, *Sermones de tempore* (Nürnberg 1483).
- Hugues de Saint-Cher, *Postilla super evangelium secundum Lucam*. In Ugonis de Sancto Charo s. Romanae Ecclesiae cardinalis Opera Omnia. Tomus VI. In Evangelia secundum Matthaeum, Marcum, Lucam, Johannem (Köln 1621).
- Humbert de Romans, *Instructiones de officiis ordinis*. In B. Humberti de Romanis quinti praedicatorum magistri generalis opera de vita regulari. Edita curante Fr. Joachim Joseph Bertier. Vol. II (Roma 1889).
- Humbert de Romans, *Sermones ad diversos status* (part of his *De eruditione praedicatorum*). In Humberti quinti magistri generalis sacrosancti ordinis praedicatorum magistri Sermones ad diversos status (anno 1507, sine loco).
- Jacopo da Varazze, *Sermones quadragesimales et sermones de tempore* (Venice 1497).
- Jean Cobi, *Scala Coeli*. In *La Scala coeli* de Jean Cobi. Édité par Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu (Paris 1991).
- Lecoy de la Marche, A., *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, dominicain du XIIIe siècle* (Paris 1877).
- Nicolaus de Aquaevilla, *Sermones dominicales* (Paris 1519).

- Nicolaus de Lyra, *Postilla super totam Bibliam* (Venice 1488).
- Nicole Bozon, *Les comtes moralisés, versio latina*. In *Les comtes moralisés de Nicole Bozon frère mineur*. Par Lucy Toulmin Smith et Paul Meyer (Paris 1889).
- Petrus Chrysologus, *Sancti Petri Chrysologi Collectio sermonum*. Pars II. Cura et studio Alexandri Olivari. CCSL XXIV, A (Turnhout 1981).
- Le prediche volgari di san Bernardino da Siena dette nella Piazza del Campo l'anno MCCCXXVII*. Edite da Luciano Bianchi. Vol. secundo (Siena 1884).
- Raymund de Peñafort, *Summa de paenitentia*. Curantibus Xaverio Ochoa et Aloisio Diez (Roma 1976).
- Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*. A cura di Giuseppe Scalia, t. I (Bari 1966).
- Le Speculum laicorum*. Edition d'une collection d'exempla en Angleterre à la fin du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Par J.Th. Welter (Paris 1914).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Catena aurea super Lucae evangelium*. In *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici Opera Omnia*. Tomus XII (Parma 1862).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Catena aurea super Matthaei evangelium*. In *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici Opera Omnia*. Tomus XI (Parma 1860).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica. II<sup>lle</sup>*. In *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Opera Omnia*. Tomus X. II<sup>lle</sup> a quaestione CXXII ad quaestionem CLXXXIX (Romae 1899).
- Thomas de Chobham, *Summa confessorum*. Ed. F. Broomfield (Louvain - Paris 1968).
- Vincent de Beauvais, *De morali principis institutione*. Ed. by Robert J. Schneider. Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievals 137 (Turnhout 1995).

## LITERATURE:

- Bataillon, L.-J., *Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons*. In *La prédication au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993).
- Bataillon, L.-J., *De la lectio à la praedicatio: Commentaires bibliques et sermons aux XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. In *La prédication au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993).
- Bataillon, L.-J., *Iacopo da Varazze e Tommaso d'Aquino*. In *La prédication au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993).
- Bataillon, L.-J., *Intermédiaires entre les traités de morale pratique et les sermons: les distinctions bibliques alphabétiques*. In *La prédication au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993).
- Bataillon, L.-J., *La predicazione dei religiosi mendicanti del secolo XIII nell'Italia Centrale*. In *La prédication au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993).
- Bataillon, L.-J., *Les sermons attribués à saint Thomas: Questions d'authenticité*. In *La prédication au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France et Italie* (Aldershot 1993).
- Bataillon, L.-J., *Les textes théologiques et philosophiques diffusés à Paris par exemplar et pecia*. In *La production du livre universitaire au Moyen Age. Exemplar et pecia* par L.-J. Bataillon, B.G. Guyot et R.H. Rouse (Paris 1988).
- Bataillon, L.-J., *The Tradition of Nicholas of Bayard's Distinctiones*. *Viator* 25 (1994).
- Bataillon, L.-J. & Bériou, N., "G. De Mailly" de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs. *AFP* LXI (1991).
- Battenberg, F., *Das Europäische Zeitalter der Juden. Band I: Von den Anfängen bis 1650* (Darmstadt 1990).
- Bériou, N., *Les lépreux sous le regard des prédicateurs d'après les collections de sermons ad status du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. In N. Bériou et F.-O. Touati, *Voluntate Dei leprosus. Les lépreux entre conversion et exclusion aux XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Spoleto 1991).
- Blaise, A., *Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (Turnholt 1975).
- Bourin-Derruau, M., *Temps d'équilibres, temps de ruptures XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. *Nouvelle histoire de la France Médiévale* 4 (Paris 1990).
- Boyle, L.E., *Mountaillou Revisited: Mentalité and Mythology*. In *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*. Ed. by J.A. Raftis. *Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Papers on Medieval Studies* 2 (Toronto 1981).
- Boyle, L.E., *The Summa confessorum of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teaching of St. Thomas and some of his Contemporaries*. In L.E. Boyle, *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200-1400* (London 1981).
- Brett, E.T., *Humbert of Romans. His Life and Views of a Thirteenth-Century Society*. *Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Studies and Texts* 67 (Toronto 1984).
- Burke, P., *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London 1978).
- The Cambridge Economic History of Europe I. The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages*. Ed. by M.M. Postan (Cambridge 1971).
- Cameron, R., *A Concise Economic History of the World. From Paleolithic Times to the Present* (New York - Oxford 1989).
- Casagrande, C. and Vecchio, S., *I peccati della lingua: Disciplina ed etica della parola nella cultura medievale* (Roma 1987).
- Cenci, C., *Il commento al Vangelo di S. Luca di Fr. Constantino da Orvieto*, O.P. Fonte di S. Bernardino da Siena. *AFH* 74.
- Charland, Th.M., *Artes praedicandi. Contribution à l'histoire de la rhétorique au Moyen Âge* (Paris and Ottawa 1936).
- Cipolla, C., *Before the Industrial Revolution. European Society and Economy, 1000-1700* (London 1980).

- La concezione della povertà nel Medioevo.* Antologia di scritti a cura di Ovidio Capitani (Bologna 1983, first published 1974).
- D'Avray, D.L., *Death and the Prince. Memorial Preaching before 1350* (Oxford 1994).
- D'Avray, D.L., *Method in the Study of Medieval Sermons.* In *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons. Essays on Marriage, Death, History, and Sanctity* by Nicole Bériou and David L. d'Avray. Biblioteca di Medioevo Latino 11 (Spoleto 1994).
- D'Avray, D.L., *Philosophy in Preaching: The Case of a Franciscan Based in Thirteenth-Century Florence (Servasanto da Faenza).* In *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages. Philological Studies in Honor of Siegfried Wenzel.* Edited by R.G. Newhauser and J.A. Alford (Binghamton, New York 1995).
- D'Avray, D.L., *The Preaching of the Friars. Sermons diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford 1988, first published 1985).
- D'Avray, D.L., *Sermons to the Upper Bourgeoisie by a Thirteenth-Century Franciscan.* In *The Church in Town and Countryside. Studies in Church History*, 16. Edited by D. Baker (Oxford 1979).
- Delhay, Ph., *Quelques aspects de la doctrine thomiste et néo-thomiste du travail.* In *Le travail au Moyen Âge. Une approche interdisciplinaire.* Édités par Jacqueline Hamesse et Colette Muraille-Samaran (Louvain-La-Neuve 1990).
- Delumeau, J., *Le péché et la peur. La culpabilisation en Occident (XIIIe-XVIIIe siècles)* (Paris 1983).
- Dondaine, A., *Guillaume Peyraut. Vie et oeuvres.* AFP XVIII (1948).
- Dondaine, A., *La vie et les oeuvres de Jean de San Gimignano.* AFP IX (1939).
- Duby, G., *L'économie rurale et la vie des campagnes dans l'Occident médiéval II* (Paris 1977).
- Dunbabin, J., *A Hound of God. Pierre de la Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church* (Oxford 1991).
- Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté.* Recueil édité sous la direction de Michel Mollat, 2 vols. (Paris 1974).
- Faral, E., *Les jongleurs en France au Moyen Age* (Paris 1910).
- Feld, H., *Franziskus von Assisi und seine Bewegung* (Darmstadt 1994).
- Flood, D., *The Domestication of the Franciscan Movement.* *Franziskanische Studien* 60 (1978)
- Fossier, R., *Histoire sociale de l'Occident médiéval* (Paris 1979).
- Fossier, R., *La terre et les hommes en Picardie jusqu'à la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Paris - Louvain 1968).
- Freed, J.B., *The Friars in the German Society in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1977).
- Freedman, P., *Sainteté et sauvagerie, deux images du paysan au Moyen Age.* *AESC* 3/ 1992.
- Geremek, B., *Geschichte der Armut. Elend und Barmherzigkeit in Europa* (München und Zürich 1988).
- Gieben, S., *Il «Rudimentum doctrinae» di Gilberto di Tournai con l'edizione del suo «Registrum» o tavola della materia.* In *Bonaventuriana. Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol ofm.* A cura di Francisco de Asis Chavero Blanco OFM. Vol. 2 (Roma 1988).
- Glorieux, P., *L'enseignement au Moyen Age. Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, au XIIIe siècle.* *Archives Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* année 43 (1968).
- Graus, F., *Poveri della città e poveri delle campagne.* In *La concezione della povertà nel Medioevo.* Antologia di scritti a cura di Ovidio Capitani (Bologna 1983, first published 1974).
- Gurevich, A.I., *Medieval Popular Culture. Problems of Belief and Perception* (Cambridge 1990).
- Gurevich, A.I., *The Origins of European Individualism* (Oxford 1995).
- Hall, T.N., *A Basic Bibliography of Medieval Sermon Studies.* In *MSS* 36 (1995).
- Hanska, J. & Ruotsala A., *Berthold von Regensburg, OFM, and the Mongols - Medieval Sermon as a Historical Source.* *AFH* 89 (1996).
- Hyde, J.K., *Contemporary Views on Faction and Civil Strife in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Italy.* In *Violence and Disorder in Italian Cities, 1200-1500.* Edited by Lauro Martines (Berkeley - London 1972).
- Jacob, G., *Die lateinischen Reden des seligen Berthold von Regensburg* (Regensburg 1880).
- Kaeppli, T., *Pour la biographie de Jacques de Cessole.* AFP XXX (1960).
- Kaeppli, T., *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, 4 vols. (Roma 1970-\*\*\*\*).
- Krüger, S., *Das ritterliche Turnier in Das kirchliche Turnierverbot im Mittelalter.* Beiträge zu einer vergleichenden Formen- und Verhaltensgeschichte des Rittertums. Herausgegeben von Josef Fleckenstein. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 80 (Göttingen 1985).
- Leff, G., *The Bible and Rights in the Franciscan Dispute over Poverty.* In *The Bible in Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley.* Edited by Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood. *Studies in Church History.* Subsidia 4 (Oxford 1991).
- Le Goff, J., *The Birth of Purgatory* (Aldershot 1990, first published in France 1981).
- Le Goff, J., *Métier et profession d'après les manuels de confesseurs du Moyen Age.* In

- J. Le Goff, *Pour un autre Moyen Age* (Paris 1977).
- Le Goff, J., *Métiers licites et métiers illicites*. In J. Le Goff, *Pour un autre Moyen Age* (Paris 1977).
- Le Goff, J., *Les ordres mendiants*. In Moines et religieux au Moyen Age. Présenté par Jacques Berlioz (Paris 1994).
- Le Goff, J., *Realtà sociali e codici ideologici all'inizio del secolo XIII: un exemplum di Giacomo di Vitry sui tornei*. In J. Le Goff, *L'immaginario medievale* (Roma - Bari 1985).
- Le Goff, J., *Le travail dans les systèmes de valeur*. In *Le travail au Moyen Âge. Une approche interdisciplinaire*. Édité par Jacqueline Hamesse et Colette Muraille-Samaran (Louvain-La-Neuve 1990).
- Lemarignier, J-F., *La France Médiévale: institutions et societe* (Paris 1989).
- Lerner, R., *Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology in the Revelation Commentaries of Hugh of St. Cher*. In *The Bible in Medieval World. Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*. Edited by Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Oxford 1985).
- Le Roy Ladurie, E., *Histoire du climat depuis l'an mil* (Paris 1967).
- Lesnick, D.R., *Preaching in Medieval Florence. The Social World of Franciscan and Dominican Spirituality* (Athens, Georgia 1989).
- Lis, C., & Soly, H., *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe* (New Jersey 1979).
- Little, L.K., *Pride Goes before Avarice: Social Change and the Vices in Latin Christendom*. *AHR* 1/1971.
- Little, L.K., *Religious Poverty and Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (New York 1983, first published 1978).
- Lot, F. and Fawtier R., *Histoire des institutions françaises au Moyen Age. Tome I. Institutions seigneuriales* (Paris 1957).
- Manselli, R., *Evangelismo e povertà*. In *La concezione della povertà nel Medioevo*. Antologia di scritti a cura di Ovidio Capitani (Bologna 1983, first published 1974).
- Meersseman, G., *Le opere di fra Antonio Azaro Parmense O.P. nella Biblioteca Nazionale di Monaco Baviera*. *AFP* X (1940).
- Mollat, M., *La notion de la pauvreté au Moyen Age*. In M. Mollat, *Études sur l'économie et la société de l'Occident médiéval XIIe-XVe s.* (London 1977).
- Mollat, M., *Les pauvres au Moyen Age. Etude Sociale* (Paris 1978).
- Mollat, M., *Les pauvres et la société médiévale*. In M. Mollat, *Études sur l'économie et la société de l'Occident médiéval XIIe-XVe s.* (London 1977).
- Mollat, M. and Wolff, P., *The Popular Revolutions of the Late Middle Ages* (London 1973).
- Moorman, J., *A History of the Franciscan Order. From its Origins to the Year 1517* (Chicago 1988, first published 1968).
- Murray, A., *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1991, first published 1978).
- Murray, A., *Religion among the Poor in Thirteenth-Century France: The Testimony of Humbert de Romans*. *Traditio* XXX (1974).
- Nordberg, M., *Den dynamiska medeltiden* (Stockholm 1984).
- O'Carrol, M., *The Lectionary for the Proper of the Year in the Dominican and Franciscan Rites of the Thirteenth-Century*. *AFP* XLIX (1979).
- Oliger, P.L., *Servasanto da Faenza O.F.M. e il suo "Liber de virtutibus et vitiis"*. In *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, vol I. *Per la storia della teologia e della filosofia*. Studi e testi 37 (Roma 1924).
- Owst, G.R., *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters & of the English People* (Cambridge 1933).
- Owst, G.R., *Preaching in Medieval England. An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period c. 1350-1450* (Cambridge 1926).
- Postan, M.M., *Medieval Agrarian Society in its Prime: England*. In *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*. Vol. I. *The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages*. Edited by M.M. Postan (Cambridge 1971).
- Rösener, W., *Peasants in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1992).
- Sabatier, P., *Vie de S. François d'Assise* (Paris 1894).
- Schneyer, J.B., *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters. Für die Zeit von 1150-1350* (Münster 1969-1990).
- Schönbach, A.E., *Studien zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Predigt. Die Überlieferung der Werke Bertholds von Regensburg II. Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 152 (Wien 1906).
- Smalley, B. *The Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1983, 3rd revised edition).
- Smalley, B., *The Gospels in the Schools, c. 1100-c. 1280* (London 1985).
- Smith, L.T., *English Popular Preaching in the Fourteenth-Century*. *The English Historical Review*, vol. VII (1892).
- Swanson, J., *John of Wales. A Study of the Works and Ideas of a Thirteenth-Century Friar* (Cambridge 1989).
- Takayama, H., *The Local administrative System of France under Philip IV (1285-1314) - Baillis and Seneschals*. *JMH* 21 (1995).
- Thompson, A., *Revival Preachers and Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy. The Great Devotion of 1233* (Oxford 1992).
- Tierney, B., *Medieval Poor Law. A Sketch of Canonical Theory and its Application in England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959).

- Titow, J.Z., *English Rural Society 1200-1350. Historical Problems: Studies and Documents 4* (London 1969).
- Torrel, J-P., *Initiation à la saint Thomas d'Aquin. Sa personne et son oeuvre* (Fribourg, Suisse 1993).
- Tubach, F.C., *Index exemplorum. A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales*. FF. Communications No. 204 (Helsinki 1981).
- Vainionpää (Hanska), J., *Seitsemän kuolemansyntiä 1200- ja 1300-lukujen saarnamateriaaleissa*. Yleisen historian lisensiaatintutkielma (unprinted, Tampere 1994).
- Vauchez, A., *Le peuple au Moyen Age: du "populus Christianus" aux classes dangereuses*. In *Aspects of Poverty in Early Modern Europe II. Les réactions des pauvres à la pauvreté. Études d'histoire sociale et urbaine*. Ed. Thomas Riis (Odense 1986).
- Vauchez, A., *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Age* (Roma 1988, first published 1981).
- Vecchio, S., *Il decalogo nella predicazione del XIII secolo. Christianesimo nella storia 10* (1989).
- Wenzel, S., *The Sin of Sloth: Acedia in Medieval Thought* (Chapel Hill 1967).
- Werner, E. & Erbstösser M., *Kleriker, Mönche, Ketzer. Das religiöse Leben im Hochmittelalter* (Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1994).

## ■ Appendix

Model sermons used as primary sources.

This appendix is a catalogue of the most important primary sources used in this study. They are arranged according to names of preachers. In those cases where there are several sermons from one preacher they are numbered (*sermo primus*, *sermo secundus* and so on) according to their order of appearance in Schneyer's *Repertorium*. The following information is given under each entry:

1. Name of preacher.
2. Name of collection.
3. Number of sermon.
  - A. Number of the sermon in Schneyer's *Repertorium*.
  - B. Incipit of the sermon according to Schneyer.
  - C. Number of the manuscripts in Schneyer's *Repertorium*. In the case of the Dominican preachers, more complete lists of manuscripts are to be found in Kaeppli's *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevii*. When additional information is available outside Kaeppli, it is given in foot notes.
  - D. Dating of the collection or sermon if possible.
  - E. Special comments on sermon when necessary.
  - F. Manuscript/*incunabula* edition principally used in this study.

### Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP

*Sermones de tempore.*

#### Sermo primus

- A. I,229/102.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – In hoc evangelio tangitur avaritia divitis, patientia pauperis et iustitia iudicis...
- C. 58
- D. Late thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup>
- E. -
- F. BAV. Ottob. lat. 557.

---

1 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, p. 155. d'Avray mentions Aldobrandino in his catalogue of thirteenth century writers of sermons and preaching aids. Dating to late thirteenth, if not to early fourteenth century is obvious from the fact that Aldobrandino worked as a lector in various Italian Dominican convents between 1287 and 1292; Schneyer I, p. 222.

### Sermo secundus

- A. I,230/103.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Quaecumque terram istam inhabitant, tria habent in se, habent modum vivendi, sicut patet in hominibus...
- C. 58.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. BAV. Ottob. lat 557.

### Sermo tertius

- A. I,230/104.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – In tota serie huius evangelii dominicalis quattuor principaliter continentur. Et primum est circumstantia conditionis...
- C. 58.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. BAV. Ottob.lat. 557.

### *Sermones quadragesimales*

#### Sermo unicus

- A. I,236/174.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Dominus in hoc evangelio, in quo tractatur de divite epulante, quattuor principaliter ad nostram instructionem proposuit...
- C. 21.
- D. See above on sermones de tempore.
- E. It is doubtful whether this sermon actually exists in complete form anymore. Schneyer has given the incipit and explicit according to CLM 4321 manuscript in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. What he did not notice is that the text of the sermon breaks off after a few lines. The rest is an interpolation from some text dealing with hell and purgatory. The text is the following:

*"Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur in purpura et bysso etc. Dominus in hoc euangelio in quo tractatur de diuite epulante IIIor principaliter ad nostram instructionem proponit. Et primum est excessus crudelitatis ibi 'Homo quidam erat dives' cuius crudelitas ostenditur contra Lazarum mendicum. Secundum est successus uarietatis ibi 'Factum est ut moreretur mendicus.' tertium est cruciatus penalitatis ibi 'Mitte Lazarum ut intingat' etc. Quartum est affectus carnalitatis ibi 'Rogo ergo te pater ut mittas eum in domo' (here the sermon terminates and other text begins) Descendit ad inferos. Postquam dictum est de inferno constanter dicendum est de purgatorio, circa quod IIIor principaliter querere debemus...."*<sup>2</sup>

---

2 Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP, *Sermones quadragesimales*. Feria quinta secunde hebdomade. CLM 4321, f. 17r.

It just might be that some other manuscript given by Schneyer would include the sermon in extenso, however I have felt it unnecessary to hunt them all down. I did check the following manuscripts: CLM 3597, CLM 8715, CLM 8720, BAV Ottob.lat. 1610, and BAV. Pal.lat. 157. None of these carried the *Sermones quadragesimales* of Aldobrandino. Instead they all included his other work *Tractatus de duodecim articulis fidei*. The same is probably true concerning most of the other manuscripts in Schneyer's *Repertorium*. Thus, even if there eventually might be a complete version of this sermon, there would be far too few copies of it to be included in this study.

## Antonio Azaro Parmense OP

### *Sermones de tempore.*

#### Sermo primus.

A. I,296/96.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – In hac prima dominica post octabas pentecostes incipit unum de quattuor temporibus...

C. 139.

D. Late thirteenth or early fourteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

E. As noted by J.B. Schneyer, there are two versions of this sermon in circulation. The alternative version, Schneyer I,305/205, is nothing but an abbreviation of this sermon. It lacks the kind of prologue incorporated in the longer recension. Otherwise both versions of this sermon are identical. Schneyer does not indicate which manuscripts carry the abbreviated version and which the whole sermon. He only records that the abbreviation is to be found in the 1515 Paris edition. Nevertheless, there are manuscripts that carry the shorter version too, such as BL 28684; UUB C 268 and UUB. C 359. In fact, the München manuscript is the only one I have seen with the longer recension. Therefore one may well ask which version of the sermon is the variant and which the original?

F. CLM 2774.

#### Sermo secundus.

A. I,296/97.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Hoc evangelium Dominus proposuit duplici de causa, primo ad consolationem bonorum pauperum...

C. 139.

D. See above.

E. -

F. CLM 2774

---

3 Antonio was still alive in 1314. Also the manuscript tradition of his sermons starts from the early fourteenth century. However, he was born already in the 1240's, so it is well possible that he wrote his sermon already in the late thirteenth century. G. Meersseman, *Le opere di fra Antonio Azaro Parmense*, pp. 20-21.



*Sermones quadragesimales.*

Sermo unicus.

A. I, 292/41.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) - Hoc evangelium exponitur dominica I. post festum sanctae trinitatis, sed legitur in quadragesima...

C. 24.

D. See above on Sermones de tempore.

E. In most manuscripts this sermon consists of only a few lines which advise the reader to turn to Antonio's *De tempore* collection. There is however another manuscript tradition where the full sermon follows after the above incipit, namely Schneyer III,240/226 by Jacopo da Varazze (fuller details of that sermon, see below). At what time the sermon was interpolated into Antonio's *Quadragesimales* collection remains unknown. One thing is certain, however, it is a question of a different tradition, not of a single manuscript. I have personally noted this interpolation in manuscripts UUB 347, ff. 55v-57r and Roma Angelica 1067, ff. 62r-63r.

Berthold von Regensburg OFM

*Sermones rusticanus de dominicis.*

Sermo unicus.

A. I,475/34.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc. 16,19) – Epistola tota est de caritate Dei et proximi. Sed qui hanc non habet damnatur...

C. 55.

D. Shortly before 1255.<sup>4</sup>

E. -

F. BL Harley 3215.

Gerard de Mailly OP

*Sermones de tempore.*

Sermo unicus.

A. II,487/54.

B. Pater Abraham, miserere mei (Luc. 16,24) – Sicut vulgariter dicitur Qui escive (estorne) de son dignier (diner) meus est a souper. Quod manifeste

---

4 According to A.E. Schönbach, Berthold's *Rusticanus de sanctis* and *Rusticanus de communi sanctorum* collections were put together shortly after his *Rusticanus de dominicis* collection; A.E. Schönbach, *Studien zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Predigt. Fünftes Stück: Die Überlieferung der Werke Bertholds von Regensburg*. II. p. 43. As we have been able to prove, *Rusticanus de sanctis* was written between 1255-1260, probably closer to 1255; J. Hanska & A. Ruotsala, Berthold von Regensburg, OFM, and the Mongols - Medieval Sermon as a Historical Source. AFH 3-4/1996, pp. 428-429. Thus *Rusticanus de dominicis* was quite likely written shortly before 1255.

apparet in divite et Lazaro...

C. 46.

D. Before 1273.<sup>5</sup>

E. -

F. UUB. C 351.

## François de Mayronnes OFM

*Sermones de tempore.*<sup>6</sup>

Sermo unicus.

A. II,68/55.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Secundum quod dicit Isidorus de summo bono: Graviter in Deum delinquant, qui divitias a Deo concessas...

C. 35.

D. Before 1325.<sup>7</sup>

E. -

F. Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales (Venezia 1491).

## Giovanni da San Gemignano OP

*Sermones quadragesimales.*

Sermo unicus.

A. III,736/186.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) - Tres errores circa vitam humanam invenimus, qui divinae providentiae maxime adversantur. Primus est eorum, qui dicunt, quod sicut homo in primo prosperantur ita et in alio...

C. 23.

D. 1304-1314.<sup>8</sup>

E. -

F. BAV. Pal. lat. 466.

## Guibert de Tournai OFM

*Sermones de tempore.*

---

5 L-J. Bataillon et N. Bériou, «G. de Mailly», p. 23. This article has also a more complete list of manuscripts including Gerard's sermon collections.

6 Despite the name given by Schneyer, this collection also includes lenten sermons.

7 This was his dying year; J. Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order. From its Origins to the Year 1517* (Chicago 1988), p. 390.

8 A. Dondaine, *La vie et les oeuvres de Jean de San Gemignano*. AFP IX (1939), pp. 145-146.

Sermo unicus.

A. II,286-287/53.

B. Fili recordare, quia recepisti bona (Luc. 16,25) - Quoniam exempla magis quam verba imprimunt et opposita juxta se posita magis elucescunt...

C. 112.<sup>9</sup>

D. Before 1261.<sup>10</sup>

E. -

F. UUB. C 413.

Guillaume Peyraut OP

*Sermones de evangelii dominicalibus.*

Sermo unicus.

A. II,539/85.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc. 16,19) - Ex hoc, quod nomen Lazari exprimitur, videtur esse narratio rei gestae, nihilominus tamen parabola fuit...

C. 57.

D. 1236-1259.<sup>11</sup>

E. According to manuscript BL Arundel 365 there seem to have been three sermons which have been put together in the early printed editions:

1. Homo quidam erat dives etc. - Ex hoc, quod nomen Lazari exprimitur...cui noluerunt plus resurrectionem credere. BL Arundel 365, ff. 63r-64v.

2. Homo quidam erat dives etc. - Exemplum dictum est contra avaros phariseos...detrahitur quidquid accedit uanitati. BL Arundel 365, ff. 64r-66r.

3. Erat quidam mendicus nomine Lazarus - Hic ostenditur impietas divitis et tanguntur septem...humiliare debeas quia quis sit Christus ignoras. BL Arundel 365, ff. 66r-68v.

However, I have not checked other manuscripts of Peyraut's sermons and thus it is impossible to say whether there originally were three shorter sermons or just one long.

F. Sermones dominicales ex evangelii (Tübingen 1499).

---

9 Schneyer gives a common list of manuscripts for both *sermones de sanctis* and *sermones de tempore* (with the exception of Paris' Bibliothèque Nationale, where they are given separately); thus this figure probably includes many manuscripts that carry only sanctoral and therefore the actual amount of *sermones de tempore* manuscripts is considerably smaller.

10 Guibert wrote these sermons at the request of Pope Alexander IV who died 25th of May 1261; S. Gieben, *Il «Rudimentum doctrinae» di Gilberto di Tournai con l'edizione del suo «Registrum» o tavola della materia*. In Bonaventuriana. Miscellanea in onore di Jacques Guy Bougerol ofm. A cura di Francisco de Asis Chavero Blanco OFM. Vol 2 (Roma 1988), p. 631.

11 A. Dondaine, Guillaume Peyraut. Vie et oeuvres, p. 204.

## Hugo de Prato Florido OP

### *Sermones de tempore.*

#### Sermo unicus.

A. II,748/77.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc. 16,19) – Boethius in (libro) de consolatione: Nota, quod ante oculos nostros situm est sufficit intueri, sed rerum exitus prudentia metitur...

C. 42.

D. Before 1322.<sup>12</sup>

E. -

F. Sermones de tempore super evangelia et epistolas (Nürnberg 1483).

## Hugues de Saint-Cher OP

### *Sermones de evangeliiis dominicalibus.*

#### Sermo primus.

A. II,762/60.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc. 16,19) – Narrata historia nota quod dicit homo quidam...

C. 40.

D. Before 1263.<sup>13</sup>

E. -

F. Roma angelica 715.

#### Sermo secundus.

A. II,762/61.

B. Factum est ut moreretur mendicus (Luc. 16,22) – Notandum est, quod mors bonorum est optima...

C. 40.

D. See above.

E. -

F. Roma Angelica 715.

### *Sermones de epistolis et evangeliiis dominicarum.*

#### Sermo unicus.

A. II,774/255.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc. 16,19) – Ostenditur in hoc evangelio virtus eleemosinae et damnum avaritiae...

C. 45.

---

12 This was his dying year; J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium II*, p. 741.

13 This was his dying year; J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium II*, p. 758. However, it is reasonable to assume that Hugues wrote his sermons much earlier when he was active in Paris university circles.

- D. See above *Sermones de evangeliis dominicalibus*.
- E. -
- F. CLM 28471.

## Jacopo da Varazze OP

### *Sermones de tempore.*

#### Sermo primus.

- A. III,227/86.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Saepe Dominus illud quod docebat verbo postmodum confirmabat exemplo...
- C. 352.
- D. 1265-1298.<sup>14</sup>
- E. -
- F. *Sermones quadragesimales et sermones de tempore* (Venezia 1497).

#### Sermo secundus.

- A. III,227/87.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Verificatum est in istis duobus quod dicitur: Dives et pauper obviaverunt sibi...
- C. 352.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. *Sermones quadragesimales et sermones de tempore* (Venezia 1497).

#### Sermo tertius.

- A. III,227/88.
- B. Mortuus est autem dives (Luc. 16,22) – Juxta dictum Sapientis: Non quod situm est ante oculos sufficit intueri...
- C. 352.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. *Sermones quadragesimales et sermones de tempore* (Venezia 1497).

### *Sermones quadragesimales.*

#### Sermo primus.

- A. III,240/226.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Secundum beatum Augustinum status hominis triplex consideratur...
- C. 189.

---

14 Jacopo often cites Aquinas' *Catena Aurea*; L-J. Bataillon, *Jacopo da Varazze e Tommaso d'Aquino*, passim. Therefore these sermons were written between the publication of Thomas' commentaries (Matthew before October 1264, other three gospels between 1265-1268) and the death of Jacopo in 1298; J-P. Torrel, *Initiation à saint Thomas d'Aquin. Sa personne et son oeuvre* (Fribourg, Suisse 1993), p. 494.

D. 1286?<sup>15</sup>

E. This sermon is merely a somewhat different (i.e. slightly abbreviated) version of the sermo primus in de tempore collection. The basic division is the same.

F. Sermones quadragesimales et sermones de tempore (Venezia 1497).

#### Sermo secundus.

A. III,240/226a.

B. Mortuus est autem dives (Luc. 16,22) – Postquam Dominus describit divitis vitam, subjunxit eius poenam...

C. 189.

D. See above.

E. This sermon is an abbreviated version of the sermo tertius in de tempore collection.

F. Sermones quadragesimales et sermones de tempore (Venezia 1497).

### Jacques de Lausanne OP

#### *Sermones de tempore.*

#### Sermo unicus.

A. III,79/305.

B. Fili recordare, quia recepisti bona (Luc. 16,25) – (Si) persona non potens (potest) beneficium retribuere sive recompensare, saltem debet recorsari...

C. 105.

D. Before 1322.<sup>16</sup>

E. -

F. UUB. C 366.

### Konrad Holtnicker OFM

#### *Sermones de tempore.*

#### Sermo primus.

A. I,759/181.

B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc. 16,19) – Dicitur Eccli. 31,8 Beatus dives, qui inventus est sine macula. Certe dives iste de triplici macula hic reprehenditur...

C. 119.

D. Before 1279.<sup>17</sup>

---

15 This year of composition is given in three manuscripts (Lincoln Cathedral 44, London Lambeth Pal. 23, and Oxford Bodl. Libr. Laud. lat. 94). All these manuscripts are however from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and probably of English origin. Since the year 1286 is not mentioned in any continental manuscripts and we do not know where it comes, it must be considered to be far from conclusive evidence; T. Kaeppli, *Scriptores II*, p. 365.

16 This was his dying year; J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium III*, p. 54.

17 Konrad died on that year; J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium I*, p. 748.

- E. -
- F. Lambeth Palace 480.

Sermo secundus.

- A. I,759/182.
- B. Mortuus est autem dives (Luc. 16,22) – Ab hoc loco usque ad finem in praesenti evangelio describitur poena damnati divitis quadrupliciter videlicet ab inferiori in profunditate tormentorum...
- C. 119.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. BAV. Burghes. 180.

Sermo tertius.

- A. I,759/183.
- B. Mitte Lazarum, ut intingat (Luc. 16,24) – Misera lingua inflammabitur igne in inferno, quae malitia inflammabatur in mundo...
- C. 119.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. BAV. Burghes. 180.

Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM<sup>18</sup>

*Sermones dominicales.*

Sermo unicus.

- A. IV,192/33.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et inducatur (Luc.16,19) – Dives iste quasi per reprobationem a Deo ignarus suo nomine non nominatur...
- C. 56.
- D. Before 1274.<sup>19</sup>
- E. -
- F. BL Harley 102.

Nicolas de Byard OP<sup>20</sup>

*Sermones de tempore.*

---

18 I have counted Nicolaus de Aquaevilla among the Franciscans even though there seems to be some doubt on this attribution; D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, p. 151.  
19 L.-J. Bataillon et N. Bériou, «*G. de Mailly*», p. 14, n. 29.  
20 Nicolas is identified as a Dominican in Stephanus de Salaniaco's *De quatuor quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignivit*. This book was later amplified by Bernard Gui. Father Bataillon notes that there are some indications that Nicolas might have been a Franciscan, but not knowing of this evidence I prefer to trust to *De quatuor quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignivit*. After all, its writers were almost contemporaries of Nicolas (Stephanus de Salaniaco died in 1291, Bernard Gui 1331); L.-J. Bataillon, *The Tradition of Nicholas of Byard's Distinctiones*. *Viator* 25 (1994), p. 246.

Sermo primus.

- A. IV,238,111.
- B. Homo quidam erat dives et induebatur (Luc.16,19) – Si leonis ferocitas visa catuli flagellatione edomatur, non est mirum, si unus peccator visa damnatione alterius...
- C. 71.<sup>21</sup>
- D. Before 1272-1276.<sup>22</sup>
- E. -
- F. CLM 16028.

Sermo secundus.

- A. IV,238/112.
- B. Fili recordare, quia recepisti bona (Luc. 16,25) – Dicitur quod bonus demandeor bon escondiscor. Ideo dives de quo loquitur evangelium hodiernum...
- C. 71.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. BN 12419.

Nicolas de Gorran OP

*Sermones de tempore.*

Sermo primus.

- A. IV,266/168.
- B. Factum est ut moreretur mendicus (Luc. 16,22) – Sicut in bivio sic homines sunt in hoc mundo, cuius una via lata et spatiosa...
- C. 103.
- D. Before 1295.<sup>23</sup>
- E. -
- F. BL Royal 9. B. IV.

Sermo secundus.

- A. IV,266/169.
- B. Fili recordare quia recepisti bona (Luc. 16,25) – Solent iudices in dandis sententiis praesignare causas latonis sententiae...
- C. 103.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. BL Royal 9. B. IV.

---

21 This figure also includes Byard's *Sermones de sanctis et de communi sanctorum*. Therefore it is impossible to say how many of these manuscripts actually carry *sermones de dominicis*.

22 Nicolas' De dominicis collection appears in the Paris stationers' list which dates from the years 1272-1276; L-J. Bataillon, *Les textes theologiques et philosophiques diffuses a Paris par exemplar et pecia*. In *La production du livre universitaire au Moyen Age, Exemplar et pecia* par L-J. Bataillon, B.G. Guyot et R.H. Rouse (Paris 1988), p. 155; D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, pp. 275-277.

23 Nicolas died in that year; J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium IV*, p. 255.



*Sermones quadragesimales*

- A. IV,275/308.
- B. Pater Abraham miserere mei (Luc. 16,24) – Misericordiam Dei quidam non petunt nec accipiunt ut desperantes...
- C. 103.
- D. See above.
- E. -
- F. UUB. C 18.

Peregrinus de Oppeln OP

*Sermones de tempore.*

Sermo primus.

- A. IV,554/76.
- B. Fili recordare quia recepisti bona (Luc. 16,25) – In verbis praemissis quattuor intimantur nobis. Primo malorum in hoc mundo consolatio...
- C. 186.
- D. Before 1305.<sup>24</sup>
- E. These two Lazarus sermons by Peregrinus are almost verbatim identical. There are different incipits and the first one is slightly shorter than the latter. Moreover, they were not copied together (at least in manuscripts I have consulted); thus it seems obvious that we are dealing with two versions of one sermon rather than with two different sermons.
- F. BAV. Pal. lat. 465.

Sermo secundus.

- A. IV,554/77.
- B. Fili recordare quia recepisti bona (Luc. 16,25) – Dicit Augustinus quod multi timent malam et vilem mortem et non respiciunt mortem sanctorum...
- C. 186.
- D. See above.
- E. See above.
- F. BL Addit. 18340.

Pierre de Reims OP

*Sermones de tempore.*

Sermo unicus.

- A. IV,728/58.
- B. Fili recordare quia recepisti bona (Luc. 16,25) – Recepisti, inquam, non sicut alveus aquas effundit, sed sicut concha...

---

24 D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, p. 154, n. 1.

C. 43.  
D. Before 1247.<sup>25</sup>  
E. -  
F. UUB. C 369.

---

25 Pierre died in that year; J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium IV*, p. 724.

## ■ Name index

- Aldobrandino da Toscanella OP 37n, 51, 56n, 61, 147-148, 150, 154, 167, 182-184  
 Alexander de Hales OFM 79  
 Ambrose, S. 28, 105  
 Antonio Azaro Parmense OP 32-33, 38, 42, 54-55, 60, 65-66, 86, 90, 107, 132-134, 150, 154, 158-159, 160n, 164-165, 184-185  
 Aristotle 78, 108  
 Augustine of Hippo, S. 28, 53, 92-94, 105, 124, 161  
 Bede 28, 105, 159  
 Bernard of Clairvaux 86, 115-116, 133, 164  
 Bernardino da Siena OFM 89n, 102  
 Berthold von Regensburg OFM 12n, 15, 21, 23, 36, 42-43, 53n, 60-62, 64, 104, 108, 111, 114, 126, 130n, 132, 134-135, 150, 165-166, 172, 174, 185  
 Bertrand de la Tour OFM 70, 109  
 Boethius (pseudo) 37-38  
 Bonaventure OFM 15, 21, 30-32, 35, 67, 73n, 104-106, 123-125, 140-142, 146, 161, 169, 171  
 Boniface, S. monk and apostle of Frisia 159  
 Bruno Astensis, Abbot of Monte Cassino 29  
 Cassiodorus 75  
 Charles I, King of Sicily 109  
 Charles II, King of Sicily 109  
 Chrysostomus 152, 161, 165  
 Constantine, Roman Emperor 140  
 Constantino da Orvieto OP 30, 47  
 Cunegund, wife of Henry II 132  
 Dante Alighieri 82, 136, 160  
 Dominic, S. 117  
 Edward I, King of England 109  
 Elisabeth of Hungary, S. 148  
 Étienne de Bourbon OP 12n, 90  
 Eudes de Châteauroux 86  
 Eudes de Rigaud OFM 149  
 Francesco Petrarca 136  
 Francis of Assisi, S. 97, 115, 120, 152  
 François de Mayronnes OFM 23, 35, 47, 54, 56n, 61-62, 116, 147-148, 153n, 167, 172  
 François Villon 119  
 Gerard de Mailly OP 44, 52, 54-55, 156, 160, 185-186  
 Gerhoh von Regensburg 13  
 Giordano da Pisa OP 91, 110, 142  
 Giovanni de Caulibus de Sancto Gemignano OFM 139  
 Giovanni da Fidenza OP 151  
 Giovanni da San Gemignano OP 33, 35-36, 44, 107-108, 126, 131, 153, 158, 161, 164n, 167, 186  
 Gratian 75, 150  
 Gregory XI 148  
 Gregory the Great 28, 30, 39-40, 46-48, 50-53, 78, 105, 143, 149-150, 159, 161, 164-165, 166  
 Guillaume de Mailly, see Gerard de Mailly OP  
 Guillaume de Rennes OP 80  
 Guibert de Tournai OFM 23-24, 35, 37n, 42, 62, 68-69, 73n, 75-76, 81, 84n, 91-101, 104, 110, 115, 126-128, 130n, 131, 133-135, 141, 152-154, 186-187  
 Guillaume Peyraut OP 34, 37-39, 40n, 49-50, 51n, 52n, 53-54, 56, 62, 64-65, 73n, 75-79, 83, 85, 89-90, 97-98, 104, 106, 116, 128, 130, 140, 146n, 149-150, 152, 153n, 155-156, 159-161, 163, 164n, 187-188  
 Henry II, S., Holy Roman Emperor 132  
 Honorius Augustotudensis 88-89, 97  
 Horace 123  
 Hostiensis 81  
 Hugo de Prato Florido OP 33, 37n, 43, 47, 51, 55, 57, 76, 107, 147-148, 150n, 153n, 158, 160, 164-166, 188  
 Hugues de Saint-Cher OP 23, 29, 31, 33, 40n, 48-49, 51, 55-56, 58, 67, 83, 107, 140, 153n, 156, 159n, 188  
 Humbert de Romans OP 11, 24, 69-70, 78, 80-82, 92, 94, 98-100, 104, 109, 112-115, 127, 130n, 135  
 Isidore of Seville 75  
 Jacopo da Cessole OP 74, 101-102  
 Jacopo da Varazze OP 23, 31, 33-34, 40n, 43, 49, 51, 52n, 54, 56-57, 62, 82, 87, 101, 107, 122, 149n, 151-152, 156-157, 160n, 162, 165, 172, 189-190  
 Jacques de Lausanne OP 75, 83, 84n, 86, 102, 109, 130n, 140, 190  
 Jacques de Vitry 81  
 Jean Gobi OP 86  
 Jean de La Rochelle OFM 146n  
 Jerome 150n  
 Johannes von Freiburg OP 24, 70, 81-82, 84, 86, 114, 125, 130n, 137  
 John XXII 117  
 John Pecham OFM 149  
 John of Saint-Giles OP 84n, 85  
 John of Salisbury 101  
 John of Wales OFM 24, 51n, 69, 75, 78, 80, 82, 86-87, 94, 100-101, 104, 113-114, 124,

131-132, 135, 146n  
 Juvenal 123  
 Konrad Holtznicker OFM 34, 38, 46-50, 53,  
 57, 130n, 144, 156-157, 159, 166, 190-191  
 Louis IX, King of France 17, 149  
 Luca da Bitonto OFM 40n, 42, 59, 156  
 Malachy of Ireland OFM 78, 84, 90  
 Martin of Tours, S. 132  
 Mary Magdalen, S. 109  
 Matthew Paris 86  
 Maurice de Provins OFM 41, 43  
 Michele da Cesena OFM, Franciscan General  
 Minister 117  
 Nicolas de Byard OP 40n, 43, 79, 110, 147,  
 191-192  
 Nicolas de Gorran OP 12n, 33, 36, 38, 41- 43,  
 73n, 95-96, 133, 158, 161n, 163, 192-193  
 Nicolaus de Aquaevilla OFM 12n, 39, 40-51,  
 55-56, 58-61, 63-64, 84, 121, 124, 135, 151,  
 160, 161n, 164, 191  
 Nicolaus de Lyra OFM 31, 41, 106, 116  
 Nicole Bozon OFM 11, 82  
 Origen 152  
 Oswald, S. 132  
 Ovid 17  
 Peregrinus de Oppeln OP 23, 35, 37-38, 44-  
 46, 56-57, 64-65, 67, 88-89, 155, 158, 161n,  
 163, 164n, 193  
 Persius 123  
 Petronius 74  
 Petrus Chrysologus 28, 53, 168  
 Petrus Ravennatensis, see Petrus Chrysologus  
 Philip IV, King of France 109  
 Philip Harvengt, Count of Flanders 136  
 Philippe OP, prior of Saint Jacques 84  
 Pierre de la Palude OP 146  
 Pierre de Reims OP 23, 43, 59-60, 133, 158,  
 193  
 Pierre de Saint-Benoît OFM 21, 105  
 Plutarchos (pseudo) 101  
 Prudentius 77  
 Raymund de Peñaforte OP 74-75, 79-82, 90  
 Robert Grosseteste 82  
 Robert the Wise, King of Sicily 109  
 Salimbene de Adam OFM 15, 87  
 Servasanto da Faenza OFM 15, 51n, 74, 77,  
 82, 90, 104, 139  
 Stephan de Bourbon, see Étienne de Bourbon  
 Thomas Aquinas OP 21, 31-32, 41, 60, 79,  
 97, 104, 106-107, 116, 122-125, 135, 140,  
 171  
 Vincent de Beauvais OP 146