

⊙

# The Four Daughters of God

A Study of  
The Versions of this Allegory  
With Especial Reference to those in  
Latin, French, and English

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of  
Bryn Mawr College  
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

BY  
HOPE TRAVER  
1907

---

PHILADELPHIA  
THE JOHN C. WINSTON CO.  
1907

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHART OF VERSIONS .....	Following title page
INTRODUCTION .....	5
I. HUGO AND BERNARD .....	II
<p style="margin-left: 2em;">The importance of Hugo and Bernard, 11. Hugo's use of the allegory prior to that of Bernard, 12. Bernard's version, 15. <i>Vices and Virtues</i>, 18. The <i>Scheirer Rhythmus</i>, 20. Lydgate's <i>Life of Our Lady</i>, 21. Pelbartus's <i>Pomerium Sermonum</i>, 25. Miscellaneous French poems dependent upon Bernard, 27.</p>	
II. THE <i>Chateau D'Amour</i> AND THE GROUP WHICH IT REPRESENTS .....	29
<p style="margin-left: 2em;">The <i>Chateau d'Amour</i>, 29. The <i>Vie de Tobie</i>, 31. <i>Les Quatre Sereurs</i>, 33. Metz MS. 535, 35. Arsenal MS. 3460, 36. B. N. MS. fr. 9588, 37. <i>Cursor Mundi</i>, 39.</p>	
III. THE <i>Meditationes Vitae Christi</i> AND ITS INFLUENCE.....	41
<p style="margin-left: 2em;">The relation of the <i>Meditationes</i> to Bernard, 41. Translations of the <i>Meditationes</i>, 43. Ludolphus's <i>Vita Christi</i>, 44. Kennedy's <i>Passioun of Christ</i>, 46. Examples of the influence of the <i>Meditationes</i> in Germany and Italy, 47.</p>	
IV. THE "PROCESSUS BELIAL" .....	49
<p style="margin-left: 2em;">Introduction, 49. The <i>Merlijn</i>, 50. Caesarius of Heisterbach, 58. The <i>Mascheroen</i>, a revision of the <i>Merlijn</i>, 62. Theramo's <i>Processus Belial</i>, 63. The Provençal mystères, <i>Lo Jutgamen de Jhesus</i> and <i>Lo Jutgamen General</i>, 66. Summary, 68.</p>	
V. DEGUILLEVILLE AND HIS INFLUENCE UPON MERCADÉ AND GREBAN .....	70
<p style="margin-left: 2em;">The <i>Pèlerinage de l'Amé</i>, 71. The <i>Pèlerinage de Jesucrist</i>, 74. Mercadé's <i>Mystère de la Passion</i>, 78. Greban's <i>Passion</i>, 82. Comparison of Deguilleville, Mercadé and Greban, 91. Conclusion, 93.</p>	

	PAGE
VI. THE FRENCH MYSTÈRES SUCCEEDING GREBAN'S .....	96
<i>Viel Testament</i> , 96. The <i>Troyes Passion</i> , 98. <i>Proces de Misericorde</i> , 99. <i>Le Mistère de la Conception</i> , 100. The <i>Valenciennes Passion</i> , 101. The <i>Rouen Incarnation</i> , 103. <i>La Vengeance Nostre Seigneur</i> , 109. Summary, 111.	
VII. THE FRENCH MORALITIES AND GROSSETESTE'S INFLUENCE UPON THEM .....	113
The <i>Gesta Romanorum</i> , 114. <i>L'Amour Divin</i> , 116. The <i>Moralité de Nature</i> , 119. <i>Le Laz d'Amour Divin</i> , 120. Summary, 123.	
VIII. THE ALLEGORY IN THE ENGLISH DRAMA .....	125
The allegory in the <i>Salutation</i> play, compared with that in the <i>Charter of the Abbey</i> , 126. Outline of the allegory in the <i>Castell of Perseverance</i> , 135. The relation between the versions in the <i>Charter</i> , the <i>Salutation</i> and the <i>Castell</i> , 138. The allegory in <i>Respublica</i> , 141. Conclusion, 144.	
IX. MISCELLANEOUS ENGLISH VERSIONS .....	147
<i>Piers Plowman</i> , 147. The <i>Court of Sapience</i> , 152. <i>Jacob's Well</i> and <i>Alphabet of Tales</i> , 158. Giles Fletcher's <i>Christ's Victory</i> , 159. Drummond's <i>Shadow of the Judgment</i> , 162. Summary, 162.	
GENERAL CONCLUSION .....	164
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	167
VITA .....	173

## INTRODUCTION.

The allegory of the Four Daughters of God, founded upon Ps. 74: 11, "Misericordia et Veritas obviaverunt sibi; Justitia et Pax osculatae sunt," enjoyed extraordinary popularity throughout the Middle Ages. It appears in every language and in many forms of literature, and it even became a favorite device for the illuminations of manuscripts, not merely of those which contained the allegory, but also of others more general in character. So well known, indeed, was this allegory that it became almost a mediæval commonplace, so that a mere allusion to it was sufficient to recall the whole story. In the hymns and homilies such allusions are frequent enough; but these, with one or two exceptions, I have not noticed, since they are too slight to affect the development of the allegory. Their only value for my purpose is to attest the widespread popularity of the story.

The most systematic attempt which has hitherto been made to trace the growth of this allegory appears in an excellent comparative study of a few of the versions by the late Professor Heinzel.<sup>1</sup> This, in a general way, I have used as the basis for my own work. He divides his material into four classes. In the first and third classes is treated the strife of the Four Daughters, arrayed two against two, concerning the redemption of man, a strife which is appeased when the Son of God offers to take man's place and suffer in his stead. In the second class, which he calls the "Processus Belial," is introduced the additional motive of a dispute with the Devil. The fourth class differs from the others in making the Four Daughters engage in controversy over the question of man's creation, not of his redemption.

<sup>1</sup>R. Heinzel: *Vier Geistliche Gedichte* ZfdA., XVII: 43-56 (1874).

K. Raab<sup>2</sup> has also studied the allegory in his article, *Ueber Vier Allegorische Motive*, and Professor Scherer,<sup>3</sup> in continuation of Heinzel's investigation, has traced its origin to the Rabbinical *Midrash*. Many other scholars have made valuable lists. Of these the most helpful have been those in the special studies by Petit de Julleville,<sup>4</sup> Rothschild,<sup>5</sup> Creizenach,<sup>6</sup> Hartmann,<sup>7</sup> Roediger<sup>8</sup> and d'Ancona,<sup>9</sup> and in the more general works of Gröber<sup>10</sup> and Goedeke.<sup>11</sup>

My own study of the allegory does not cover the whole field. In collecting versions I found my material multiplying so enormously that I was forced, most reluctantly, to limit myself for the present, with a few exceptions, to the discussion of the development of the allegory from the Latin into French and English. This was the more possible since the versions in other literatures, although extremely interesting, are for the most part so isolated from those here studied that they have exerted no influence upon them. I hope before long, however, to publish the result of my work upon these other examples. I have tried to make my collection of versions as complete as possible, yet in the case of an allegory which enjoyed such extraordinary popularity, some versions must have been overlooked.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>2</sup>K. Raab: *Ueber Vier Allegorische Motive*. Program zu Leoben, 1885.

<sup>3</sup>W. Scherer: *Die Vier Töchter Gottes*, ZfdA., XXI: 414-416 (1877).

<sup>4</sup>Petit de Julleville: *Les Mystères*, Paris, 1880.

<sup>5</sup>Rothschild: ed. *Le Viel Testament*, 1878.

<sup>6</sup>Creizenach: *Gesch. des neueren Dramas*, Halle, 1893.

<sup>7</sup>Hartmann: *Scherer's Rhythmus von der Erlösung*, ZfdA., XXIII: 173-189.

<sup>8</sup>Roediger: *Contrasti Antichi*, Firenze, 1887.

<sup>9</sup>d'Ancona: *Origini del Teatro Italiano*, Roma, 1891.

<sup>10</sup>Gröber: *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1902.

<sup>11</sup>Goedeke: *Grundriss zur Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung*. Dresden, 1884-1905.

<sup>12</sup>After the presentation of this dissertation, the following versions were brought to my attention by Professor Brown: Trinity Coll. Camb. MS. 1149, fol. 320, *De Misericordia, Veritate, Justitia et Pace* (13th century, after 1248), and Royal MS. 8 G. vi, part 6, *De concordia*

In its origin the allegory is Jewish rather than Christian, making its first appearance not later than the tenth century in the *Midrash*. In this rabbinical commentary the story is connected with the heavenly council concerning the creation of man. When it was transferred to Christian mythology, the allegory developed along two distinct lines. According to one—Heinzel's fourth class—the theme of the dispute was still the creation of mankind. This form of the story is followed by the German versions described by Heinzel and Scherer. The other branch of the allegory—which spread far more widely,—transferred the occasion of the dispute from the creation to the redemption. This modified form of the story was introduced by Hugo of St. Victor (1097-1141), and shortly after was further elaborated by Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153), whose treatment of the allegory furnished the basis for almost all of its subsequent development. In one or two instances, however, later writers have followed, not Bernard, but the earlier work of Hugo. Examples of this reversion are the German *Aneenge*, a poem of the twelfth century, and more striking, the *Merlijn* by Jacob van Maerlant (ca. 1260), which, combining with this allegory another commentary of Hugo's, effected a union of two contests originally separate: that between the Virgin and the Devil, and that between Mercy and Justice. The story, so combined, Heinzel in the article to which I referred, has named the "Processus Belial."

Though Bernard's version was the basis of most of the succeeding work, it was Grosseteste<sup>18</sup> and Bonaventura who, by their redactions, supplied the particular forms followed by the later versions. In the narrative forms of the story the Grosseteste type usually appears, in the dramatic versions

*Misericordiae et Veritatis*, etc. Unfortunately, I have not been able to see these versions, or to learn more about them, so that I cannot tell whether they would change any of the relationships I have assumed or strengthen them by further illustration.

<sup>18</sup>See notes on Grosseteste, Ch. II, n. 1, and Bonaventura, Ch. III., n. 2.

the Bonaventura type, although this distinction is not always maintained. Moreover, the debate scene in the dramas, with the exception of the Italian mystery play by Belcari (fifteenth century) and the English dramatic versions, utilized other elements besides those furnished by Bonaventura. The principal elements thus added are, first, the devil motive, which is used most fully in *Merlijn* and the German plays, and second, the introduction, as arbitrator of the dispute, of a new figure, Sapience, a character invented by the French poet Deguilleville in his *Pèlerinage de Jesucrist* (1388). Meanwhile, more and more theological argumentation had crept in until in Greban's *Mystère de la Passion* (1450) the action is buried under a load of dialectic. These are the chief additions amid a score of minor variations.

On account of the complexity of influences which affected the development of the allegory, I have found it difficult to adhere strictly to chronology. The arrangement which I have adopted is briefly as follows: After tracing the progress of the allegory from the *Midrash* to Hugo and Bernard, I have considered first those versions which seem to have been written from direct knowledge of Bernard, then those coming through the intermediate channels of Grosseteste and Bonaventura. At that point, it was necessary to break the continuity of the discussion in order to trace the history of the devil motive which played an important rôle in the French and German drama, and to take account of the new elements introduced by Deguilleville.

I then continued the study of the allegory in the French and English mysteries and moralities, showing how in these dramatic versions the influence of Grosseteste and Bonaventura persists. The last chapter describes a number of miscellaneous English versions. I have added also a chart showing the relationship of the versions studied (see frontispiece) and a list of books and articles used in the preparation of this monograph.

It would not be possible for me adequately to express

my gratitude to all those whose assistance and encouragement have made my task a pleasant one. I can only acknowledge my recognition of the constant kindness I have met. I wish especially to thank Professor Schick of Munich, Dr. Carleton F. Brown of Bryn Mawr College, and Mr. G. H. Gerould, formerly of Bryn Mawr College, now of Princeton University, for their never failing interest and suggestion, and the last two for their incalculable help in the criticism and revision of my manuscript. It is to Professor Schick of Munich that I owe the deepest gratitude. Interested by the beginning which I had made in tracing the growth of the allegory, he magnanimously placed at my disposal the material on the subject which he had himself collected after his attention had been directed to it in the course of his study of Lydgate. His extraordinary kindness and whole-hearted interest from that day to this have been my greatest encouragement. I wish also to thank the library authorities in Munich and Paris for their courtesy and help; M. Sepet of the Paris Library and Professor Foulet of Bryn Mawr College for the suggestions they made concerning some of the French versions, and Prof. DeHaan of Bryn Mawr College and Miss Steele-Smith of Newnham College for help in translating the Dutch poems.





## CHAPTER I.

### HUGO AND BERNARD.

#### SECTION I. IMPORTANCE OF HUGO AND BERNARD.

The introduction of the allegory of The Four Daughters of God into Christian theology is closely connected with the rise of mysticism. In the first years of the twelfth century, this new influence, with its wealth of symbolism and its beauty of imagery, was profoundly affecting the teachings of the Church. The earliest, as well as the fullest, expression of mysticism is to be found in the writings of two theologians: Hugo of St. Victor (1097-1141) and Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153). Both of these men, through the austerity and purity of their lives, the depth and keenness of their thought, and their marvellous eloquence, exerted an enormous influence, not only upon their own generation, but throughout the Middle Ages.

In the case of Hugo, this influence is not, perhaps, so apparent. From the middle of the thirteenth century, his reputation, at first unrivalled, was obscured, at least in the great schools like those of Paris, by the greater popularity of Bernard; though in scattered monasteries, and particularly among the Victorines, he continued to hold his place.<sup>1</sup>

Into the general question, whether Hugo is to be regarded as supplying to Bernard the first impulse toward mysticism and the main outlines of the doctrines which he elaborated, it is not necessary for us here to enter.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Nouvelle Biographie Générale*; Hugo de S. Victor.

<sup>2</sup>Carl Horstmann (*Richard Rolle of Hampole*. London, 1896. I, p. ix) asserts that Hugo was "the real founder of mediæval mysticism, Bernard being dependent upon him for the essential features of his mystic views," but it is perhaps safer with Liebner (*Hugo von St.*

## SECTION II. HUGO'S USE OF THE ALLEGORY PRIOR TO THAT OF BERNARD.

In the case of the allegory of the Four Daughters of God, at all events, it seems clear that the priority belongs to Hugo rather than to Bernard. Bernard's version, which occurs in his famous sermon on the Annunciation, did not appear until 1140 A. D.,<sup>3</sup> only one year before the death of Hugo. On the other hand, Hugo's version, contained in his Annotations on certain Psalms,<sup>4</sup> must have been in existence almost twenty years earlier, since the allegory, copied word for word as Hugo gives it, is found in a compilation entitled *Deflorationes Patrum Sanctorum*<sup>5</sup> by Wernher von Ellersbach, Abbot of St. Blasien. Wernher introduced the parable in the homily on the text, "Estote misericordes sicut et pater vester misericors est." Inasmuch as Wernher died in 1126, this homily could not have been written much later than 1121. In this way the date of Hugo's version may be fixed years before Bernard's sermon.<sup>6</sup>

*Victor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit*, Leipzig, 1832, p. 264) to argue only mutual relations and influence.

<sup>3</sup>See Richard Heinzel: *Vier Geistliche Gedichte. Excurs über den Mythos von den vier Töchtern Gottes*, Zfda., XVII, 43-51, and P. L. Jauschek: *Xenia Bernardina*, Vindobonae, 1891, IV: p. iv.

<sup>4</sup>*Opera Hugonis de S. Victore. Miscellanea, Lib. II Annotationes in quosdam Psalmos David. Cap. LXIII, in Migne: Patrologia. CLXXVII: pp. 621-625.*

<sup>5</sup>*Libri Deflorationum sive excerptionum ex Melliflua diversorum Patrum signanter Augustini, Hieronymi, Ambrosii, Gregorii, Hilarii, Chrysostomi, Maximi, Origenis, Remigii, Cassiodori, Bedae, Alcuini aliorunq; doctorum orthodoxorum doctrina. Super evangelia de Tempore per Anni Circulum.. Per reverendum Patrem Dominum Wernerum Abbatem Monasterii S. Blasii Martyris et Pontificis in Nigra Silva, etc., in Migne: Patrologia, CLVII: 1039.*

<sup>6</sup>It is but fair to state that Teuber (P. B. Teuber: *Ueber die vom Dichter des Aneenge benützten Quellen. PBB. XXIV: 249-360 esp. p. 334*) believes Wernher was the original author and Hugo the copyist, since the former, he says, always names his sources when borrowing, and mentions none here. But Cruel (see R. Cruel: *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*, Detmold, 1879, pp. 144-5) gives a number of instances where Wernher appropriated thoughts from Honorius Augustodunensis, Hugo, or others, without acknowledgement

On general grounds there would be nothing impossible, of course, in supposing that both Hugo and Bernard, with the mystic's love of allegory, may have turned for suggestion to the imagery of the Orient and have come upon this parable in the *Midrash* independently.<sup>7</sup> There is one slight circumstance, however, which seems to indicate that Hugo alone drew his allegory directly from the *Midrash*. This is the fact that Hugo uses the twelfth verse as well as the eleventh of the eighty-fourth Psalm and that he introduces the phrase, "Mercy and truth have met together," in connection with their strife, and not at the time of their reconciliation. In both these particulars he agrees with the *Midrash* and differs from Bernard and other writers.

Before proceeding to examine the details of the allegory as it is presented by Hugo and Bernard, it will be well to have before us an outline of the parable in the *Midrash*.<sup>8</sup> From the translation into German made for Professor Scherer, it may be given as follows:

Rabbi Simon said: that when God would create Adam, a number of parties were formed among the angels. Some said "Create him"; others, "Create him not." Therefore we have Psalm 84: 11<sup>9</sup>: "Mercy and truth thrust at one

of his indebtedness. Cruel adds that he rarely quotes his sources, except where it is superfluous.

There can be no doubt, I think, that the prior use of the parable belongs to Hugo rather than Wernher, for the latter does not even claim originality for his work, but calls it a compilation.

On a *priori* grounds, moreover, it is more natural to assume that the simple annotations on a psalm should precede their application in a sermon,—an argument which, were there no dates to decide that matter, would also be of force as proving Hugo's priority to Bernard. In the latter case, the comparative simplicity of his treatment as against Bernard's more developed form, would be another point in his favor.

<sup>7</sup>This is the view of Heinzel (p. 47).

<sup>8</sup>*Midrash Rabba, Genesis, Paracha, 8*, Berlin, 1866. Trans. in *ZfdA XXI*, 414-416. Scherer: *Die Vier Töchter Gottes*. Certain German versions follow the *Midrash* form of the allegory. For a list of these see the articles already referred to by Heinzel (*ZfdA. XVII: 46-47*) and Scherer (*ZfdA XXI: 414-416*).

<sup>9</sup>Professor Barton informs me that in the Aramaic of the Talmud

another. Justice and peace fought together." Mercy said, "Create him; because he will practise mercy." Said Truth, "Create him not; for he will be full of lies." Justice spoke, "Create him; for he will be just." Peace opposed it because he would be contentious. What did God do? He took Truth and threw her to earth, as it says in Daniel 8: 12. But the angels cried, "Lord of the angels, why dost Thou despise Thy first bodyguard? Let Truth rise from the earth." Therefore it says in Ps. 84: 12, "Truth shall spring out of the earth."

To return to Hugo, we find that he, and those who subsequently treat the subject, with the exception of a few German writers, transfer the matter of the pleading between the sisters from the creation of man to his redemption. Hugo's version of the story<sup>10</sup> is, briefly, as follows:

Veritas dwelt in Heaven with God, but Misericordia on earth with man. At the appointed time, God descended with Veritas to judge man; but Misericordia, knowing His plan, determined to present herself first, and beg mercy. Here, Veritas, with obstinate look, interfered. Thus, "Misericordia et Veritas obviaverunt sibi." Misericordia argued, that since it is written, "Universae viae Domini misericordia et veritas sunt," she should precede Veritas in

and Midrash the root which in Hebrew means "to meet" has also the meaning "to fight," and the word which in Hebrew means "kiss" has also in Aramaic the meaning "arm one's self." He says, therefore, that it is clear that this Midrashic story arose after Hebrew had been supplanted by Aramaic, as it is only in the latter tongue that the verbs have this double meaning. The fact that Hugo makes the same application, therein differing from most versions, would seem to imply that he was influenced to interpret the verse in this way by a knowledge of the Midrash parable. This he might have gained through the *Yalqut Schimoni*, which contains almost literally the same story, as Professor Scherer notes. It is uncertain where the *Yalqut* was compiled, but some attribute it to an eleventh century Rabbi Simeon of southern Germany. (See Jewish Encyclopedia, XII, 586.)

<sup>10</sup>Hugo: *Annotationes in quosdam Psalmos David*, Migne. *Patrologia*, CLXXVII: 623-625. In Ps. 84: 11, 12. Hugo and the other early versions naturally quote from the Vulgate, where the numbering differs from that in the English Bible, Ps. 85: 10, 11.

authority, and that, therefore, she was the more grieved at not being called to council. This slight, Veritas justified on the ground that her counsel would have been contrary to what has been ordained, and, therefore, profitless. When Misericordia urged that if all who sinned were condemned, God would be wholly deprived of servants, Veritas replied that this would be better than that He should be served unworthily; and to the further plea of Misericordia that conversion would secure God's abundant grace, she answered only that grace must not subvert justice. God, desiring peace and unable to proceed to His judgment until the controversy should be settled, begged them to put the matter in His arbitration. When they consented, provided that the rights of each were preserved, He sent Veritas to earth and kept Misericordia in Heaven. Veritas, entering the heart of man, found it wholly evil, and cried to Heaven in accusation, but Misericordia at God's side would not desist from her cry for mercy. Meanwhile, Veritas, having stimulated man to repentance, ascended with his confessions, while Justitia was sent to man. Thus accord was made and Justitia, calling for Pax, embraced and kissed her, then rose to Heaven, never to descend till the Lord's coming.

### SECTION III. BERNARD.

From this slightly developed version, Bernard took little more than the germ,—the strife between the sisters over man's sin and redemption—and proceeded to work it out in an original manner. Whereas in Hugo peace is made through man's repentance and confession, in Bernard the solution is reached only by the substitution of Christ for the sinner, an application which was probably suggested from the fact that Ps. 84:11, 12, figured in the Christmas liturgy.<sup>11</sup> The story as Bernard told it is far better known.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup>See M. Sepet: *Les Origines Catholiques du Théâtre Moderne*. Paris, 1901, p. 276.

<sup>12</sup>St. Bernard: (*In Festo Annunciationis Beatae Virginis*, Ps. 84: 10, 11). Migne, *Patrologia*, CLXXXIII; 383-390 esp. 387-390.

Man originally was clothed with the four virtues: Misericordia to guard his steps, Veritas to teach him, Justitia to rule him, and Pax to cherish him; but like the man who fell among thieves on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, he was robbed of his protection, losing Justitia when he listened to the serpent, Misericordia when he burned with desire of the flesh, Veritas when he yielded, and at the same time Pax, since "there is no peace to the wicked." Thereupon a strife arose between the sisters, Veritas and Justitia wishing to afflict man, Misericordia and Pax to spare him. Misericordia and Pax came before God and touched His heart by their distress; but He, wishing to satisfy the other two as well, summoned them to a conference. At the appointed time all appeared, though Justitia and Veritas, obscured by their zeal, could not rise above the clouds. Against Misericordia's plea that the time for mercy had come, Veritas urged God's warning to Adam that he should die if he ate the forbidden fruit. Misericordia moaned that, unless grace were shown, she must die, but Veritas declared that she herself must die if the liar were pardoned. At this juncture an angel suggested that Solomon (here evidently a name for Christ) be sent for. At His coming, the controversy was renewed: Veritas, though admitting the purity of Misericordia's zeal, declared the granting of her request inadvisable, especially in view of the loss of authority which the Judge would suffer through yielding. Pax here intervened, protesting against so disgraceful an altercation between sisters. Then the Judge wrote with His finger in the sand, and Pax, being nearer, read: "Haec dicit: Perii, si Adam non moriatur; et haec dicit; Perii, nisi misericordiam sequatur. Fiat mors bona et habet utraque quod petit."

At these words of wisdom all were amazed, but could not conceive how death, cruel and terrible, could be good. The answer, "Mors peccatorum pessima, sed pretiosa fieri potest mors sanctorum. An non pretiosa fieri si fuerit janua vitae, porta gloriae?" only half satisfied them till God ex-

plained that if one, himself guiltless, should die out of love for man, Death could not hold him, for Love, being stronger than Death, would enter Death's home and bind him, and so free the dead. The saying seemed worthy of acceptation, and Veritas and Misericordia went forth to find such a one. But Veritas in all the earth could find none, even one day old, without sin, and Misericordia could find no angel in Heaven of charity equal to her need. They returned in sorrow from their fruitless search, only to be rebuked by Pax for their lack of understanding, since He alone who gave the counsel could bear the aid. The King, hearing, cried, "Pœnitet me fecisse hominem. Pœna me tenet, mihi incumbit sustinere pœnam, pœnitentiam agere pro homine quem creavi." He then sent Gabriel to the Virgin to make the annunciation, ordered Veritas and Misericordia to go before Christ, told Justitia to prepare His throne, and directed Pax to come with Him. When all was thus planned, amid a chorus of angels "Justitia et Pax osculatæ sunt."<sup>13</sup>

This sermon of Bernard's is of peculiar importance because of its extraordinary influence on mediæval literary history. It became immensely popular, and translations or redactions appeared in every country. Of these, two, by Grosseteste and Bonaventura<sup>14</sup> respectively, deserve special study, since they introduced modifications of Bernard's story which determined the development of the allegory in a large

<sup>13</sup>Since the acceptance of this dissertation, I have come upon another reminiscence of the allegory of the Four Daughters,—(it can hardly be called a version, since there is no controversy here)—which is so curious that it should not be omitted. In the sermon *De Adventu Domini* (*Migne CXCVIII: 1736-37*) by Peter Comestor (†1178) it is said that the four daughters of the King,—Misericordia, Justitia, Veritas, and Pax,—were present at man's creation, again at his fall, and once more at his redemption. These statements Comestor explains at some length and he ends by quoting Psalm 84: 11. Although there is no controversy here, the sermon is of much interest as implying a possible knowledge of both the *Midrash* and Hugo's or Bernard's versions of the allegory by its reference to the creation as well as the redemption of man.

<sup>14</sup>See notes on Grosseteste (Ch. II, n. 1) and Bonaventura (Ch. III, n. 2).



majority of later versions. These modifications are more patent in Grosseteste's version, as he transforms the parable into an allegorical romance. In Bonaventura, though the modifications are no less real, they are not so noticeable, since the greater part of the story is directly transcribed and the whole is attributed to Bernard. The most radical changes are in the introduction and conclusion, which make no pretense of following Bernard. In addition to these marked differences, a close comparison of the two works reveals a large number of minor variations in that part of his work which claims dependence upon Bernard. It is perhaps due to the seeming coincidence of the two works at first sight that Bonaventura's importance in the history of the development of the allegory has been so little recognized; for, as will be seen later, even those who borrow directly from him often cite Bernard as their source.

But before either Grosseteste or Bonaventura wrote the versions which were so greatly to modify the future development of the allegory, three others appeared, in Latin, English, and German, respectively. The latter, *Das Aneenge*, though dependent upon Bernard, is even more indebted to Hugo, but a discussion of this poem lies outside the limits of this monograph.

The English version just mentioned is found in the treatise, *Vices and Virtues*,<sup>15</sup> which its editor, Dr. Holt-hausen, dates about 1200. The allegory in question, which is imbedded in the chapter "Of Milce," shows indebtedness to Bernard in so far as concerned the general idea of the discussion between the virtues. The writer does not claim originality for his material but speaks of it as "igadered . . . of manizes halizes mannes zeswinkes." Nevertheless, his treatment of our allegory is on the whole original

<sup>15</sup>*Vices and Virtues, being a Soul's Confession of its Sins, with Reason's description of the Virtues; a Middle English Dialogue of about 1200 A. D. from the Stowe Ms. 240 in the British Museum.* Ed. Ferd. Holthausen. E. E. T. S. Orig. Ser LXXXIX, 1888, pp. 112-116.

and unlike any found elsewhere. Because of its accessibility and because it has not apparently influenced later versions, I shall content myself with a brief notice of its contents.

The writer is not very clear in his presentation. He begins by saying "God's Milce and Soð, that is, God, met together," adding "And I shall write as if Milce spoke with Soð." Here God's attributes are represented as speaking for Deity himself. This view further is implied in Soð's statement "I warned him," and is expressly affirmed in the reply of Milce, "Consider that just as thou saidst he should suffer death, so thou saidst also 'Let us make man in our own image' . . . Never let thy likeness perish, but let him come, through thy goodness, to the happiness for which he was created." At this point, however, confusion is introduced by making the Attributes speak as distinct from God. Soð answers, "Let us go before God and his Rihtwisnesse and His Judgment and before all His holy Virtues and complain there." God is appealed to by the Virtues and speaks as a separate person. The confusion is not yet ended; for Soð, who at first is referred to as "she," is later identified with God's Son, offering Himself to release mankind. Finally, to complete the confusion, we read that when this was done, Soð sprang out of the earth.

In the arguments employed there is greater clearness than in the personifications, and they have a fairly consecutive development. The thought most emphasized is that Adam was made in God's likeness and for happiness, and, therefore, should have hope of mercy. Soð at the beginning, and Rihtwisnesse when the Virtues meet before God, insist upon the fact that man's sin was wilful, not necessitated by force on the devil's part. Nor is this denied by Mercy, Rewæ or Sibsumnesse. No justification is attempted. The only plea is for mercy and the release of man from his pain and mourning. This plea Truth upholds, and God confirms it by appointing His Son as a sacrifice for Adam's guilt.

These are the usual theological arguments, and all are

so general as to defy assignment to any particular source. Although, as I have said, the writer was indebted to Bernard for the idea of a discussion between the Virtues concerning man's redemption, it does not follow that he had seen the sermon on the Annunciation. Indeed, I feel sure that he knew it merely by tradition; for the only feature common to the two is the general conception of a dispute begun between Mercy and Truth and carried before God, there to be settled by the Son's offer of Himself as man's redeemer.

The Latin version referred to above is the *Scheirer Rhythmus*,<sup>16</sup> a poem in fifty-eight quatrains, of which only the first twenty deal with our allegory. It has been ascribed to the Bavarian monk Konrad von Scheirern (1226-1259), though Hartmann,<sup>17</sup> judging from the many obvious corruptions in the manuscript, thinks that he was merely the copyist. In this version the number of the contestants is reduced from four to two—Justitia and Clementia, or Pietas,—and the plot of the allegory has almost disappeared. The only points of connection between the *Rhythmus* and sermon of Bernard are the use of Ps. 84: 11, and the application of this passage to the decision of God to redeem man. Indeed, Hartmann thinks it uncertain whether the author of this poem knew Bernard's sermon at all. He adds that the author shows certain creative power, linking to the strife of Justitia and Clementia that of Ratio and Fides without destroying the unity of the poem, since the second conflict in the minds of men serves as a reflection of the first in the thoughts of God.

It is a curious fact that from the time of the appearance of the revisions by Grosseteste and Bonaventura, Bernard seems rarely to have been consulted as immediate source, those who used the allegory later having colored their work according to either Grosseteste's or Bona-

<sup>16</sup>MS. Cod. Schirensis 4 clm. 17404 fol. 302.

<sup>17</sup>A. Hartmann: *Scheirer Rhythmus von der Erlösung*, ZfdA. XXIII: 173-189.

ventura's treatment. The only exceptions to this practice that I have discovered are in Theramo's *Belial*, Mai's *Comedie von der . . . Vereinigung . . . Gerechtigkeit und Barmherzigkeit*, Lydgate's *Life of our Lady*, the *Pomerium Sermonum* of Pelbartus, and a few minor poems to be mentioned at the end of the chapter. The second of these, the play by Mai, being in German, lies outside our present consideration; moreover, it draws only slightly upon its source. Lydgate's *Life of our Lady*,<sup>18</sup> on the other hand, written more than two hundred years after *Vices and Virtues*, is very definitely modelled upon the work of Bernard. †1200

It is introduced by generalizations on the supreme misery of man after the Fall, because of his supreme happiness before.

"For ioye passid can hertys more constrayne  
Here welthe aforne to by wepe and waile  
Than alle torment that doth hem assaile."

Seeing him thus plunged in misery, Mercy and Pees would have come to his relief, but Trouthe with a stern face "saide flatly that he gete no grace."

"Then furste of alle cruelly to threte  
Trouthe began al mosste in a rage  
Of cruel ire and of malencolye  
And seide shortly that man for his outrage  
Of verre rigt most nedys dye  
And thus began the contrauersye."

<sup>18</sup>Chapter XV. This poem is extant in several MSS. In my description I follow MS. Harl. 629. For the determination of the date of the *Life of our Lady*, see Dr. Schick's edition of Lydgate's *Temple of Glas* (E. E. T. S. Ext. Ser. LX (1891), p. cviii), and for a list of the manuscripts, the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* The poem is to be edited for the E. E. T. S. by Prof. Georg Fiedler. Since the presentation of this dissertation, *Studies in the Life and Writings of John Lydgate, the Monk of Bury*, a dissertation by Henry Noble MacCracken has been presented at Harvard University, Apr., 1907. Dr. MacCracken quotes and discusses Prof. Schick's date for the *Life of our Lady* and concludes: "It is probably safest to date the *Life of our Lady* within the reign of Henry V" (p. 52). In the appendix to the chapter he gives the date 1412-1422.

Trouthe says that at man's creation she had told him the peril of his offence, but he had given her "no manere audience." Then Rigt tells of her efforts with all diligence to rule man and that he took no heed. "Wherfore of me he gete noon helpe at nede." Man engaged in a quarrel with her, Rigt adds, when he gave credence to the snake; with Trouthe he quarreled when he put her out of his sight; and with Pees when he put Mercy from him, thus breaking the truce and declaring for war. Therefore, it would be a great wrong to restore him. But Mercy cries, "Nature has reserved to Pees, my sister, and to me ever to have pity on wretchedness. Man offended more by ignorance than of malice." Rigt remains obdurate. Then Pees speaks, "I think that on the way to Jericho he was despoiled by cruel foes because of lack of help, since he was left alone." This seems to be a thrust at Rigt who had just declared that since man would not obey her, she would not help him at need. Trouthe apparently feels this and seeks to justify Rigt's and her own desertion of man by saying, "That was because he was reckless, not to go the way I taught him." Mercy, however, continues man's defence in the line suggested by Pees, saying, "The mortal foe of Pees, the old serpent, root of all treason, lay in wait to deceive man, assuring him that if he ate of the forbidden tree, he would become like God, knowing good and evil; and because my sister Trouthe was absent and Rigt also, man was slyly betrayed. Therefore, I purpose utterly to relieve him if I can or may." "And I," said Pees, "will help faithfully."

With this the two go before the heavenly Consistory and beg a hearing for man. Pees begins, urging that since God has made Mercy sovereign over all His works, He should not disdain their united prayers. She then breaks forth in enthusiastic eulogy of Mercy, hailing her as empress of heaven, as above the seven stars, and quoting from the Scriptures her praises and the promises of mercy. No less

does she exalt her own position as the inseparable companion of God who is the Prince of Peace, and she gives numerous Biblical quotations testifying to her power.

The Judge gives benign audience, but declares that He cannot proceed to give sentence without granting equal hearing to the other two sisters, and He orders them to be summoned. Trouthe is the first to speak. She warns God that unless man die for his iniquity, both she and Rigt must lose the franchise of their liberty and jurisdiction; for it was God's own word that man must die if he ate the apple. It seems to her that Pees does wrong to defend man in opposition to Rigt and herself. It should rather be her duty to restrain discord. To Trouthe's words Rigt adds her assent, saying,

"Hit must followe thoux he were my brother  
That he mote dye by doome of quite.  
Or in his name mote be dede some other."

Mercy combats the sentence of man's death, insisting that the death of a sinner can give no pleasure to God and that guilty blood can be no sacrifice. As to finding "some other" to die in his name, that will be difficult; for he must be "of synne innocent and clene" and such a one would be hard to find throughout the world. None other will suffice, for "foule with filthe may [not] be purified," a fact illustrated in the Jewish ritual, where only a spotless lamb could be offered in sacrifice. She urges that they beg the Father to fashion a way by which she may be helped without displeasing Rigt and Trouthe.

God is inclined to condescend to her will. He announces that one pure and clean of life will die to pay the ransom of man's guilt, and will do this freely and un-compelled, purely for man's sake. He explains that this must be His own Son who will

“Wraspe himself in the mortal kynde,”

being born of the

“Maide debonaire and mylde, the humble  
 Dougtir of Juda and Sion.  
 And unto her shalle trouthe and mercy goon  
 By oone accorde sent afor my face  
 Liche my deuysse to chese me a place  
 And seie to her in alle manere thinge  
 Her tabernacle that she make faire  
 Azen the comynge of her mygty kynge  
 Which is my sonne and myne owne aire  
 That in her breste shale have his repaire  
 Where trouthe and mercy shalle togyther mete  
 By one assente and her rancour lete.  
 And ther shal pees kisse rixtwisnesse  
 And alle the sustirs accorde in oon place.

\* \* \* \* \*

And finally mercy shalle purchase  
 A charter of pardoun liche as this maide clene  
 And whiche for man be so goode a mene  
 That he shalle nowe ascape daungerlees  
 Amid the forest free from every trappe  
 While the maide that causeth alle this pees  
 Hathe the unicorne<sup>19</sup> slepyng in her lappe  
 That thourz mekenesse shal his horne so wrappe  
 Ther it was wonte to slee by violence  
 Thourz dethe it shall azen dethe be diffence  
 Azeins venym more holsome than triacle,  
 Every poyson asofte and asswage  
 Whan the lyon maketh his habitacle  
 Wyth in a maide but of tendir age.”

<sup>19</sup>This reference to the well known tradition from the *Bestiaries*, where Christ is represented as a unicorn which only Mary could tame, is of peculiar interest because, as far as I know, it is the only instance where it appears in connection with any version of the allegory of the strife between the Four Daughters of God. But the connection had already been established in French and German art. As early as the beginning of the twelfth century a sculpture on the *Johannis Kirche*, Gmund, shows Mary enthroned with the Child in her lap and near her

In the poem thus outlined, Lydgate's dependence upon Bernard is unmistakable. Especially noteworthy borrowings, because nowhere else adopted, are the statements that man had lost the protection and guidance of each of the four Virtues,<sup>20</sup> and the comparison of his wretched state to that of the traveller toward Jericho. Less striking coincidences are also to be seen; for example, the Father's answer to Mercy and Peace that their sisters must also be summoned to present their wishes before He pronounce judgment, and His direction that Trouthe and Mercy go before Christ and prepare His way.

Besides the general dependence upon Bernard, one observes in Lydgate's poem a number of touches which reveal the influence of later versions of our allegory. The speech of Pees before God's throne suggests Grosseteste in its insistence upon the exalted position and dignity of herself and Mercy, and the consequent necessity of granting their joint request, though in Grosseteste it is only her own position which she rates so highly. Again, in the passage where Rigt declares that by just doom man must die "thou he were my brother," one is reminded of *Piers Plowman*. But these are minor points; the important source is Bernard.

At the end of the century in which Lydgate wrote, one more example of a version based directly upon Bernard is to be found in the *Pomerium Sermonum*, a Latin mystical

the chase of the unicorn. The unicorn is pursued by a hunter with two dogs; but as yet the dogs are unnamed. In miniatures decorating religious works of the fourteenth century, however, Gabriel or God is represented as a hunter holding four hounds in leash below which are written their names,—Mercy, Truth, Justice and Peace. For instances of this application of the allegory see W. Mannhardt: "*Weihnachtsblüthen in Sitte und Sage*," Berlin, 1864, p. 161, ff., and F. Piper: "*Der Rathschluss der Menschenwerdung und Erlösung in Evangelisches Jahrbuch für 1859*," Berlin, 1859, pp. 17-42. E. Mâle (*Le Renouveau de l'Art par les Mystères à la fin du Moyen Age* in *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, Paris, 1904) adds a full account of the illustrations of the allegory in France.

<sup>20</sup>Grosseteste and others suggest the existence of guardians before man's sin, but do not develop the thought as here.



treatise, by the Hungarian Franciscan, Pelbartus of Temesvar.<sup>21</sup>

The author expressly credits Bernard with the invention of the allegory, and except that he expands freely, he follows Bernard fairly closely. Pelbartus' version of our allegory occurs in that portion of his work dealing with the Annunciation. His plan of treatment is stated as follows in the heading of this division of his treatise:

"Per modum historiae qualiter determinatum est per divinam sapientiam ut homo redimatur. Ubi primo ponitur allegatio misericordie, secundo oppositio justicie, tertio determinatio sapientie." According to the plan here outlined, he divides his material into three chapters, of which the first is wholly original, the second and third dependent upon Bernard for the general framework. These are amplified, however, by the introduction of new arguments, some of which are cited from Anselm.

In the first chapter Misericordia attempts to show why mercy is due to man. She will prove this, she says, in four ways, that is, by divine, canonical, philosophical, and civil law. To establish the first point, she quotes the Scriptures where the eternal mercies of God are asserted. According to canonical law, what has once been pleasing should never become displeasing; therefore, man, created for happiness, should attain this goal. Philosophical law treats of the natural properties of creatures; mercy is a natural property

<sup>21</sup>First printed at Hagenau in 1498 at the request of John Rynman of that city. The full title runs: *Pomerium Sermonum de beata virgine dei genitrice vel Stellarium Corone beate virginis pro singularum festivitatum eiusdem predicationibus coaptatum*. Brunet (*Manuel du Libraire: Supplement: Dictionnaire de Geographie*, p. 599), says that Maittaire cites a book by Pelbartus in 1475, a date which Brunet considers due to a mistaken reading for 1405. The work was often printed by Gran, eight editions appearing between 1498-1500 alone. The edition from which I have worked, belonging to Cornell University, is dated 1511. It ends as follows:

"Impressum ac emendatum impensis circumspecti viri archibibkopole Joannis Rynman de Oringaw in officina industrii Henrici Gran: cuius imperiali oppido Hagenaw: Finit feliciter anno virginei partus millesimoquingentesimo undecimo. In vigilia sanctorum Simonis et Jude apostolorum."

of God, and all noble natures spare even an enemy that is prostrate. Finally, it is a maxim of civil law that one should not derive profit from doing evil. Yet the serpent has enjoyed great gain from his fraud, in the power he has since held over captive man.

The second chapter begins by repeating the arguments which Bernard used in the opening dispute between Misericordia and Veritas, but then adds others in which Misericordia so skilfully makes the distinction between corporal and eternal death, that Veritas is convinced and led to desire the release of man in any way not prejudicial to herself and Justitia. Justitia, alarmed at her sister's yielding, vehemently dissents; even when Misericordia appeals to her regard for her own dignity and happiness, she only half relents but declares that she cannot at all consider the question of man's release until satisfaction be given her unto the last farthing. Otherwise, she herself would perish.

The last chapter follows Bernard with but slight alterations and additions, as, for example, the substitution of Charitas for Pax. In general tone, as well as in specific quotations, the parable is, on the whole, one of the most faithful redactions of the Bernard sermon.

In concluding this list of versions which seems to depend directly upon Bernard, I may mention several French poems which refer to the allegory of the debate. Since they do not show traces of the influence of later redactions of Bernard's work, I group them loosely here.

Earliest in point of time is a French version of the thirteenth century in MS. 24406 fr. (Anc. la Vall. 59) fol. 153, but this is merely the slightest possible summary of the allegory. A corrupt copy of this is found in MS. 389 No. 79 Bern.<sup>22</sup>

Other references to the allegory occur in Huon de

<sup>22</sup>See J. Brakelmann: *Die Altfr. Liederhandschrift* No. 389 der Stadtbibliothek zu Bern in Herrig's Archiv. XLI: 339-376, XLII: 249.

Meri's *Tournoiement de l'Antichrist*,<sup>23</sup> *Les Noels Bourguignons de Bernard de la Monnoye*,<sup>24</sup> *La Passion*,<sup>25</sup> an eighteenth century poem, and *La Naissance de Notre Seigneur Jesuchrist*<sup>26</sup> (1734).

In these poems the debate between the sisters is merely summarized in the briefest way. That they depended directly upon Bernard one cannot be certain, since their references to the allegory are too slight to be decisive on this point. In any case the matter is not important, as none of these poems added anything to the development of the allegory.

<sup>23</sup>In Coll. des Poetes Champenois anterieurs au XVI siècle; Reims, 1851, p. 1-105, esp. p. 58.

<sup>24</sup>Ed. F. Fertiolt, Paris, 1858.

<sup>25</sup>In MS. fr. 19149, Bib. Nat., Paris, fol. 88-146, esp. fol. 92.

<sup>26</sup>In MS. 4542 nouv. acq., Bibl. Nat., Paris, Fol. 48-97, esp. fol. 50-1.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE CHASTEAU D'AMOUR AND THE GROUP WHICH IT REPRESENTS.

#### SECTION I. THE *Chateau d'Amour*.

With the exceptions named in the last chapter, the later development of the allegory of the Four Daughters of God proceeds not in strict accordance with Bernard's sermon, but rather along the lines suggested by his followers. The first of these to introduce important modifications in the form of the allegory was the famous bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste<sup>1</sup> (1175-1253), a man of enormous influence on the intellectual life of his time. In his theological poem, the *Chateau d'Amour*,<sup>2</sup> the allegory from Bernard's sermon appears in a novel setting; for by shifting the scene from a heavenly to an earthly court, he has transformed it to a feudal romance. The story in this form won immediate popularity, as the numerous manuscripts extant both in French and English translations testify. It also gave rise

<sup>1</sup>Dr. J. Felton (*Robert Grosseteste, Bishop von Lincoln; Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen und Culturgeschichte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*, Freiburg, 1899, p. 87-8) doubts whether Grosseteste wrote the poem in the form in which it is preserved. He thinks it more probable that he supplied the dogma, and perhaps the framework, and that the scribe added his name either through an error or to add greater lustre to the work.

Dr. Felton's point does not seem to me to be proved. Dr. Francis Stevenson (*Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, A Contribution to the Religious, Political, and Intellectual History of the Thirteenth Century*, London, 1899, pp. 38, 39), although he takes account of Dr. Felton's doubt, does not hesitate to attribute the *Chateau d'Amour* to Grosseteste.

<sup>2</sup>For lists of manuscripts, editions, etc., see Hupe: *Robert Grosseteste's Chateau d'Amour* in *Anglia* XIV: 414-455, and Haase: *Die ae. Bearbeitungen von Grosseteste's Chateau d'Amour verglichen mit der Quelle* in *Anglia* XII: 311-374. I have used the version of the poem as printed in Michel's *Libri Psalmorum*, Oxonii, 1860, for the outline here given.

to a number of dependent versions which it is the purpose of this chapter to examine. I will speak first of the *Chasteau* itself, then of the French group most intimately connected with it, and finally of English and other versions more remotely derived.

In the *Chasteau* the story opens with a brief statement of the donnée. A king of great power and knowledge has a son of the same power through whom he achieves whatever he wishes done throughout his realm. He has also four daughters, Misericorde, Verite, Justice, and Peis, to each of whom is given a portion of his substance and without whom he cannot govern his kingdom nor judge his subjects justly. This king has further a servant who, having proved unfaithful, has been delivered to his enemies for torture and imprisonment. Misericorde, seeing the captive in his torment, is so filled with pity that, unable to contain herself, she goes before the King to plead for the servant's release. First reciting her own sweet qualities, she then begs the release of the prisoner since he has suffered so much, and that through the falsity of his enemies. Without mercy she cannot remain the daughter of the King of Mercy, who has placed her above all his works and thus given her the right ceaselessly to cry for grace. Verite is amazed that her sister should try by her sweetness to save the prisoner endlessly condemned by herself. Could Misericorde save all for whom she would cry, the King's authority would suffer. She adds the plea also advanced by Justice, that, as the daughter of the King and of his substance, she ought equally to be heard. Another argument urged by Justice is that the servant, when free, had all the sisters to help him but of his own accord left them, and therefore deserves the death decreed by Verite, whose judgments Justice will not oppose.

Her statement is of interest, as showing probable direct contact with Bernard's sermon, where the parable is introduced by the description of these four virtues as man's guardians before his sin. By way of digression, but again

in accordance with Bernard's treatment, Misericorde laments over the poor wretch, despoiled of all his heritage and given into vile servitude, desperate of remedy. Misericorde is debased and Peis exiled, while all mankind, with the exception of Noah and his family, are doomed to destruction through this

"très cruel jugement  
E tut est dreit e verité  
Mès sans peiz e sans pieté."

Now Peis approaches the throne and shows herself aggrieved, since though she is also the King's daughter, who ought equally to be heard, her sisters have dared to give judgment without herself and Misericorde, forgetful of the fact that their sole activity should be to preserve peace. Her word must be supreme, for the King is Prince of Peace, and peace is the end of all good, without which wisdom and riches avail nothing. Therefore, the judgment made without the assent of all four sisters must be void, and until all be accorded, she must flee. At this, the son appears, rehearses his power through his father's love for him, and declares himself so moved by Misericorde, that he will have pity on the servant, will take his vesture upon himself, sustain his judgment, and end discord. Thereupon, Justice and Peis kiss.

## SECTION II. FRENCH VERSIONS DEPENDENT UPON THE *Chasteau.*

Grosseteste's poem, as has already been stated, exerted a far-reaching influence upon the later developments of the allegory. The first version to show this influence is that by Guillaume le Clerc,<sup>3</sup> of Normandy, who flourished in the

<sup>3</sup>Ed. Michel: *Libri Psalmorum*, Appendix. Arundel 292.

For an account of the manuscripts and author see: Rob. Reinsch: *La Vie de Tobie de Guillaume, le Clerc de Normandie. Nach der*

first third of the thirteenth century. This is found as a separate poem in some manuscripts, the best known of which in MS. Arundel 292,<sup>4</sup> and it has also been inserted by Guillaume as an episode in his translation of a Latin *Tobias* in place of the first chapter of the Latin version. As the differences between these two forms are unappreciable, I shall speak of them as a single version under the name by which it is best known, the *Vie de Tobie*.

Though Guillaume's account departs from the *Chasteau* in the order of events,—the son is not introduced until he enters to settle the controversy between his sisters,—the narrative as introduced by Guillaume in his *Vie de Tobie*

*Pariser und Oxford hss.* (Herrig's Archiv: LXII: 375-96). See also: *Histoire Litteraire de la France*. Paris, 1835, XVIII: 830-7.

H. Seeger: *Ueber die Sprache des Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie und Ueber den Verfasser und die Quellen des Tobias*. Diss. Halle, 1881, pp. 25, 26.

A. Dinaux: *Trouvères . . . du Nord de la France et du Midi de la Belgique*. Bruxelles, 1863, IV: 343-69.

A. Schmidt: *Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie insbesondere seine Magdelenen legende*, Rom. Stud. IV: 493-542.

E. Martin: *Le Besant de Dieu von Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie*. Halle, 1869, pp. v and xlii.

de la Rue: *Essais sur les Bardes*. . . . Caen, 1834. II: 270-284, III: 5-11.

Petit de Julleville: *Les Mystères*, Paris, 1880, I: 259.

\*This manuscript was formerly known as MS. Norfolk 292. M. de la Rue referring to it under this name, outlined the allegory of the four daughters here to be found and attributed it to Stephen Langton. In an earlier chapter, however, he had already described the allegory, but in this case he named no manuscript. Here he said that it was invented by a "Guillaume Herman," whom he treats as a predecessor of Guillaume le Clerc. When, later, Guillaume le Clerc was recognized as the author of the version in MS. Arundel 292, scholars continued to speak of a version in MS. Norfolk 292, perhaps by Langton, as if there were two distinct manuscripts. Reinsch gives a history of the confusion to which this error led, and declares that MS. Norfolk and MS. Arundel are identical. He then proves that the versions in MS. Arundel 292 and the *Vie de Tobie* are practically the same, and, moreover, that both were written by Guillaume le Clerc. Nevertheless, Seeger (op. cit. pp. 25-6) questions Reinsch's statement that these two manuscripts are identical, and Gröber (*Grundriss* II. 1. 690-1) seems to feel the same doubt. A librarian of the British Museum, however, to whom I wrote on this question, confirms Reinsch's assertion by assuring me that the name of MS. Norfolk was changed when it came into Arundel's possession.

is clearly modelled upon the *Chasteau*, as the many resemblances to Grosseteste's poem show. In the first place, the pleadings of the sisters are similar in both cases, although Guillaume, instead of giving one long speech to each, breaks the dialogue up into a number of shorter, less important speeches; again, in each poem, Peis, having failed to gain her point, leaves the court, and the son comes to make concord by putting on the vesture of the prisoner. Finally the allegory in both the *Vie de Tobie* and the *Chasteau d'Amour* ends with an address to the reader, although these addresses differ somewhat. On the whole, Guillaume<sup>5</sup> has followed Grosseteste fairly closely.

Another poem which bears the impress of the *Chasteau d'Amour*, probably through the medium of the *Vie de Tobie*, is *Les Quatre Sereurs*.<sup>6</sup> From the fact that in one of the manuscripts the author refers to himself under the name of "richars" M. Paulin Paris<sup>7</sup> has suggested that it was written by the well known trouvère, Richard le Fournival<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup>One might ask whether the *Vie de Tobie* did not precede the *Chasteau*. Had Langton (†1228) been the author of this version, as de la Rue and some of the earlier scholars believed, to him rather than to Grosseteste would have to be assigned the priority. In Guillaume's case, on the contrary, so far as dates are concerned, the question of precedence cannot be determined, inasmuch as Guillaume and Grosseteste were contemporaries. Nevertheless, since no arguments have been advanced to prove that he was the first to tell the allegory as a romance, I have preferred to abide by the generally accepted tradition, giving to Grosseteste the credit.

<sup>6</sup>For list of manuscripts see Gröber II, 1. 690. See also: Ferd. Wolff: *Ueber einige altfr. Doctrinen und Allegorien von der Minne nach hss. in der R. R. Hofbibl.* in "Denkschriften der K. Acad. der Wissenschaften," Wien, 1864, XIII: 135-192, esp. 159-160. Fr. Michel: *Rapport à M. le Ministre de l'Instruction publique sur les anciens Monuments de l'Histoire et de la Littérature de la France qui se trouvent dans les Bibliothèques de l'Angleterre*, Paris, 1835, pp. 13, 14.

<sup>7</sup>See Paulin Paris: *Les Manuscrits françois de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, Paris, 1840, III: 247-248. Zarifopol (*Kritischer Text der Lieder Richards de Fournival*, Halle, 1904, p. 6) quotes Paris' hypothesis, and strengthens it somewhat by showing that the "contesse de Ponthieu" who is named in M.S. fr. 12467 of the *Quatre Sereurs* might have known Richard de Fournival.

<sup>8</sup>This poem suggests a trouvère in the adoption of the word "tençon" throughout, instead of the usual "guerre" or "contec." Another



(1200-1260), a suggestion which appeals to me as reasonable.

The supposition that the *Quatre Sereurs* depends upon the *Vie de Tobie* is strengthened by a comparison of the two poems. Grosseteste, in introducing the four daughters, merely named them without adding anything further than that Misericorde is the oldest. Guillaume adds a word of description as he names each daughter. The author of *Les Quatre Sereurs*, in turn, expands these descriptions somewhat further, especially in the cases of Justice and Pais, who are represented as possessing great administrative and judicial powers. Again in accordance with Guillaume's version, the son is not mentioned until he enters to settle the controversy between his sisters, and emphasis is laid upon the trust and power given to the servant, here made seneschal of all the earth, with the promise of still greater power if he is obedient to the "mult legier comandement."

bit of evidence in favor of Richard de Fournival's authorship is supplied by the mention of "Gautier" in the following lines from MS. fr. 378 of *Quatre Sereurs*:

"Par un sien saintisme poëte,  
Le roy David, son sien prophete  
Nous manda dieus couviertement  
Che c'or veons apiertment  
Dont il a un ver on sautier,  
A tesmoing de *maistre gautier*  
Si nous dist que misericorde  
Et verite orent discorde  
Lune a lautre et puis sapaisierent  
Justice et pais sentrebaisierent

\* \* \* \* \*

Mais pour le tres gente contesse  
Cui *richars* enfist la promesse  
Li plot ceste ouvraigne a enprendre  
Pour faire li ces vers entendre."

The occurrence of "maistre gautier" in close connection with "richars" becomes significant, it seems to me, if one compares with it a similar coupling of the same names in two "jeus partis" between "Mestre Richart et Mestre Gautier" which Zarifopol prints, since these latter poems in his opinion (op. cit. pp. 8-10) were also written by Richard de Fournival.

From this point the *Quatre Sereurs* becomes less similar to the *Vie de Tobie*, as the following outline will indicate. A felon warrior, envious of the great honor he sees bestowed on the king's servant, sends a messenger who persuades the man to break the command. Then the unhappy wretch, unable to clear himself though ignobly trying to shift the blame, is delivered to four tormentors, whose cruel punishments here enumerated are daily renewed. The ensuing arguments advanced by the sisters are but rudimentary in character; each in turn presents her claim for consideration, declaring she will lose the right to her name and refusing to remain the King's daughter unless her wish be accorded to her. The King is in much trouble of mind because of this "tençon" which he knows not how to decide without wronging someone. But he has a sage and subtle son, who presents himself at court marveling how his father could permit such discord. When the father adjures him to appease the sisters' strife, he commands them to be friends, and, having dispatched a messenger to announce him, descends to the tormentors and finally forces them to accept him as hostage. The allegory thus outlined forms scarcely one-third of the whole poem. It is followed by an exhaustive commentary and explanation of the parable, which closes with the account of Christ's returning to Heaven and restoring the lost sheep to the Shepherd. The controversy as a whole is not so well conducted as in the *Chasteau* or the *Vie de Tobie*.

This seems to have been recognized, for not long after, at the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth, appeared a poem, MS. Metz 535,<sup>9</sup> which Gröber<sup>10</sup> calls a reworking of *Quatre Sereurs*. The poet, however, though evidently working from *Quatre Sereurs*, proba-

<sup>9</sup>P. Meyer: *Bulletin de la Société des anciens Textes*, 1885, No. XI: 41 ff.

MS. Metz. 535 No. 30 fol. 141-144.

<sup>10</sup>Gröber II: I: 864.

bly used also the *Chasteau d'Amour*. As in *Quatre Sereurs*, the author begins by asserting the obscurity of his subject, and thus justifying his use of a parable. In a few words he presents the situation, and then before describing the controversy, gives the explanation (of the allegorical characters) which comes only at the end of the story in *Quatre Sereurs*. The arguments advanced by the sisters, superior to those in *Quatre Sereurs*, somewhat approach in interest those in the *Chasteau*. Pais says nothing but, seeing the discord, flees the land. At this point the poet interrupts his narrative to expatiate on the difficulties of the situation, somewhat in the manner of Grosseteste. Then comes Sapience, the son, who announces that he will end the discord, but as in *Quatre Sereurs*, the means he will use is left to the reader's imagination. Finally it is to be noted that at this point the Metz poem, like the *Quatre Sereurs*, abandons the parable without returning to it. The rest of the poem—nearly one-half—is devoted to an account of the sufferings of Christ, concluding with an exhortation to repentance.

In the Arsenal Library, Paris, is a manuscript, No. 3460, of the thirteenth or possibly the early fourteenth century, which expressly calls itself *L'estrif des iiij Vertus . . . selonc St. Bernart*, but which bears slight resemblance to his sermon. It belongs rather to the *Chasteau* group, and is particularly close to the *Quatre Sereurs*. In both, the narrative element is much subordinated to the didactic, but whereas in *Quatre Sereurs* the didactic portion is confined to the direct exposition of the allegory, here it is unrelated. For example, the story of the sisters is prefaced by a long homily on hypocrisy which is totally irrelevant. The power and wisdom of the King and his son are more fully described than in the *Quatre Sereurs*, but less is said of the daughters. On the other hand, the words of the King to his servant are given as in *Quatre Sereurs*, and the disobedient servant is delivered, as there, to the four tormentors. From this point

the writer amplifies. With great relish and detail he lingers upon the descriptions of the several torments which these four inflict upon their victim, interspersing the account with denunciations of Adam for bringing such misery upon his descendants. In this preoccupation he quite forgets his story, or had not the inventive power to complete it; for, having told of various saints and martyrs, who, in spite of torment, were loyal unto death, he abruptly brings his poem to an end with a prayer for mercy:

“Seignor ne maies en despit  
 Por che se iai de sens petit  
 Q'ai contee cheste hystoire  
 Car ie lai trouve en escrit  
 Sains bernars le raconte et dit  
 & bien savons q'ele est voire  
 A moi non ; a lui debes croire,” etc.

One more version seems to show the direct influence of the *Quatre Sereurs*. This is in a fifteenth century manuscript found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. fr. 9588. The author of this manuscript, like the poet of MS. 3460 Arsenal just described, cites Bernard as source. Indeed, he claims that the poem is only twenty years later than Bernard's sermon.

“Le abbes fist ja un sarmon  
 Bien a XX an a chasteillon  
 Li sarmons fu simples et dois  
 Li rois de france iprint lacroys<sup>11</sup>  
 Que jay translate en rommans  
 Li abbes en est mi garens.”

<sup>11</sup>I have tried in vain to find any explanation of this reference, which seems to imply that Bernard preached this sermon at Châtillon as a part of his campaign to incite the second Crusade. But that was not until 1146 A. D., whereas this sermon was probably written about 1140 A. D. Nor do I find reference to Châtillon in the lists of places where Bernard preached the Crusade. Finally, the character of the sermon itself is not what one would naturally expect on such an occasion.

This testimony is not to be taken seriously, as the poem seems clearly to be a late form of the allegory.<sup>12</sup> In another respect MS. 9588 resembles the Arsenal manuscript, since it does not bring the narrative of the four daughters to its conclusion, although it carries it farther than the point reached in MS. 3460.

A powerful King of France, to whom even the Emperor of Rome paid homage, had a son wise beyond comparison who knew all his father's will. He had also four daughters who knew and guarded his laws. Pais, the oldest, beloved of her father, guarded all the land and his castle from tower to foundation. If an enemy appeared, she seized him and delivered him to Justice, the full justiciar against rich barons, of such authority that to her came suitors from all the neighboring principalities for settlement of their disputes.<sup>13</sup>

When the difficulty had been stated, Justice would retire to decide on the judgment with Verite, who could not be bribed. The King had a servant to whom he gave great terrestrial power, and him he made in his own image and clothed like himself. Only one command he gave him, promising him even greater power if obedient; death, if not. The servant in his folly transgressed the command, then sought to excuse himself by blaming "the woman whom thou gavest me," but in vain. The King delivered him to four servants for torment. When Misericorde perceived that the man had been disinherited and banished from the

<sup>12</sup>The version in this manuscript is probably an unfinished copy of an earlier poem; for not only are the facts in the introduction garbled, (see the preceding note); but there are a number of manifest corruptions in the text as if the story had been copied by a careless scribe. One point which might seem to imply a very early date for the composition of the poem, as claimed in the passage quoted, is the reference to Bernard as "abbes," not "saint." Bernard was not canonized until 1174, thirty-four years after his sermon on the annunciation. It is not safe, however, in view of the other misstatements in that passage, to place any weight upon this.

<sup>13</sup>Into the description of Pais and Justice is woven much material of local interest, which I omit as not pertinent to the allegory.

kingdom, with tears in her eyes and sighs in her heart, she came and fell at her father's feet, pleading for mercy. But Verite threatened the King, declaring that since other kings keep their word, he must keep his. And here, in the middle of a sentence, the manuscript abruptly ends.

From this outline it is clear that MS. 9588 is the fragment of an expanded treatment of *Quatre Sereurs*. It is interesting to note the gradual extension of the descriptions of the daughters of the King in this French group of poems. The analyses given in this chapter show that these expansions have followed the recognized law of development, culminating in the very full account in MS. 9588.

### SECTION III. VERSIONS OTHER THAN FRENCH DERIVING FROM THE *Chasteau*.

All the poems in the group just described are in French, but the influence of the *Chasteau* was not limited to France, but extended to other countries; English and German versions also show Grosseteste's impress,<sup>14</sup> though they do not usually refer to him as their source. Indeed, the only instance I know in any language where Grosseteste is quoted as authority for this allegory is the Middle English *Cursor Mundi*,<sup>15</sup> written about 1325 by an unknown author. In the

<sup>14</sup>In Germany there appeared in the middle of the thirteenth century a poem, *Sich hub vor Gottes Thron*, which in its opening verses follows this feudal type. See Bartsch, ed. *Die Erlösung* in "Bibl. der gesammten deutschen Nat.-Lit." Leipzig, 1858. XXXVII, p. 9.

<sup>15</sup>The *Cursor Mundi* in four Texts, ed. Dr. R. Morris, 1874-1878. E. E. T. S. Orig. Ser. No. LIX, p. 548 *et seq.*

Of the English translations of the *Chasteau*, the *Cursor Mundi* is nearer MS. Ash. 6r and the edition by Weymouth, which, being arranged from three different manuscripts, succeeds in following the French originals quite closely. The agreement of *Cursor Mundi* with the only French manuscript that I have been able to see, MS. fr. 904 (formerly MS. Colb. 7268) is so close as to persuade me that the author worked from a French original.

As to his working from MS. Ash. 6r, the English version which it most resembles, I am inclined to think the indebtedness reversed; for no point is in MS. Ash. 6r, which is not in *Cursor Mundi* also, whereas the latter contains many small points of contact with the French version that are lacking in this manuscript.

*Cursor Mundi* the allegory of the four daughters is introduced at the end of a survey of Old Testament history, obviously as an introduction to the story of the Redemption.

The allegory itself is prefaced by some one hundred and fifty lines recapitulating the account of man's creation and fall. The poet then announces that he will tell a "sample from St. Robert" and proceeds with the story in such close conformity to Grosseteste that it will not be necessary for me to outline the story here.

Grosseteste's version of the allegory also served as the direct source of the similar story in *Gesta Romanorum*,<sup>16</sup> and through the medium of the latter was communicated to the French morality plays. On account of its intimate relation to these plays, however, it seems best to defer consideration of the story in the *Gesta* until we come to speak of them in Chapter VII.

In the fifteenth century Grosseteste's influence still continues. It is clearly discernible in the *Court of Sapience* and less obviously in the *Castell of Perseverance*. Possibly it is to be detected also in *Piers Plowman*. As these poems show a blending of more than one form of the allegory, they must be left for discussion until later chapters.

<sup>16</sup>Ed. H. Oesterley, Berlin, 1872, pp. 350-4. This connection with Grosseteste is interesting as in accordance with the theory that the *Gesta* had their origin in England, though, to be sure, Grosseteste's *Chateau d'Amour* was originally written in French and was as well known in France as in England. Gröber, however, thinks the original was in Latin (I, I, 690).

### CHAPTER III.

## THE *MEDITATIONES VITAE CHRISTI* AND ITS INFLUENCE.

### SECTION I. RELATION OF THE *Meditationes* TO BERNARD.

We now come to consider the fourteenth century version of our allegory in the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*,<sup>1</sup> by Cardinal Bonaventura of Padua, and the influence which it exerted upon the subsequent versions. It is not strange that this treatise, bearing the name Bonaventura, was long ascribed to the more celebrated divine of the same name, the "seraphic doctor," who died in 1274. Nevertheless, authorities now agree in excluding the *Meditationes* from the list of St. Bonaventura's works, and the treatise is generally assigned to the Cardinal of Padua,<sup>2</sup> who was, it is interesting to note, a personal friend of Petrarch.

The allegory of the Four Daughters, in the *Meditationes*, is introduced in the first two chapters, which treat of the necessity for the Redemption, thus forming a preface

<sup>1</sup>*Sancti Bonaventura . . . Opera*. London, 1668, VI, 335-336. For lists of editions and translations of the *Meditationes* see Hain, Brunet and the British Museum Catalogue. Since this dissertation was presented I have come upon additional references to French translations cited by E. Roy (*Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XIVe au XVIIe siècle*, Dijon and Paris, 1903-4, pp. 249-250), who also adds a list of the imitations of the *Meditationes*, usually under the title, *La Passion de Jesus-Crist*.

<sup>2</sup>Molanus, in his *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1618), seems to have been the first to restore the *Meditationes* to Bonaventura of Padua. He is followed by Aubertus Miraeus (*Auctarium de Scriptoribus Eccl.*, No. CDXLII, in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, Hamburg, 1718, p 81). Cf. also the *British Museum Catalogue* sub "Bonaventura Baduarius." The editions of St. Bonaventura's works in 1756 (*Opera*, Venetiis, XII, 379) and in 1858 (*Opera*, ed. Peltier, Paris, XII, pp. xli-xlix) deny his authorship of the *Meditationes*. This rejection of his authorship is accepted also by Wechssler (*Die romanischen Marienklagen*, 1893, pp. 26-27) and by Roy (op. cit., p. 92).



to the body of the work. The author expressly acknowledges his dependence upon Bernard,<sup>8</sup> and his treatment of the allegory is on the whole very similar to that in the sermon on the Annunciation. It is, therefore, only by closely comparing the two works and noting variations of detail that one can decide whether later writers are following Bonaventura or are dealing directly with Bernard. It will not be necessary here to give a complete outline of the allegory as it appears in the *Meditationes*; it will suffice merely to note those points in which it varies from Bernard's sermon.

In the first place, an entirely new setting is employed, for Bernard's introduction is discarded, and the action opens with the prayers of the angelic choirs. The arguments which the angels advance are: that man, formed in the likeness of God, was created after the fall of Lucifer and his cohorts to fill the heavenly mansions thus left vacant; that if he, too, be eternally condemned, hell will be filled, not heaven, and that none can then restore the angelic ruin. Why, then, was man born, if only to be delivered to beasts? Their prayers ended, Misericordia appears and with her, Pax on the one hand, and Veritas, with Justitia as aid, on the other.

From this point the story runs essentially as in Bernard, though omitting a large number of minor details and inserting a few new ones. On the whole, therefore, it is more condensed, as Bonaventura led one to expect by his preliminary statements. The only insertion of importance in the *Meditationes* is the explanation why among the persons of the Trinity the Son was preferred by the four Virtues for the office of Redemption. It is said that the Father, being so terrible and powerful, Misericordia and Pax would fear him; and that the other two would suspect the Spirit,

<sup>8</sup>This acknowledgment is found at the beginning of Chapter II: "Et inter eas magna controversia facta est, prout narrat B. Bernardus pulchro et longo stylo. Sed ego succinte, ut potero, referam summam. Frequentes enim ipsius dicta melliflua intenda, adducero sed plerumque cum exceptione, propter prolixitatem vitandum."

as being too gracious; but that in the Son, the Middle Person of the Trinity, an acceptable Mediator was found.

## SECTION II. TRANSLATIONS OF THE *Meditationes Vitae Christi*.

The remarkable popularity of Bonaventura's *Meditationes* is attested by the fact that in both France<sup>4</sup> and England it was soon translated into the vernacular. From the number of manuscript copies of these translations which still survive it is clear that they must have circulated widely.

In England the *Meditationes* was translated in 1410 by Nicholas Love, under the title, *Speculum Vitae Christi: the boke that is clepid the Mirroure of the blissed lyffe of our lorde J'hu cryste*.<sup>5</sup> Of this version I have seen only the extracts which have been printed by Hone.<sup>6</sup> To judge from

<sup>4</sup>Roy (*op. cit.* 249 n. 2) cites a considerable number of manuscripts containing French translations of the *Meditationes*.

<sup>5</sup>*Codices MSS. Coll. Aenei Nasi* No. IX, "Iste liber translatus fuit de Latino in Anglicum per dominum Nicholaum Love, priorem monasterii de Mounte-grace ordinis Cartusiensis." The editor of the catalogue adds: "On the lower margin of the first page of the poem are the initials of the translator in gold letters, so that probably this volume was his own copy. At the end of the table of chapters is a rubricated note, beginning, 'Attende lector hujus libri, prout sequitur in Anglici scripti, quod ubicunque in margine ponitur litera N verba sunt translatoris sive compilatoris.'" In *Cod. MSS. Collegii Wadhamensis*, No. V, is mentioned another manuscript which contains Love's name. A note at the end adds that in 1410 an original copy of the work received the approval of Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury. A third copy is in Brasenose College Library MS. IX. In spite of this proof of Love's authorship, a tradition sprang up ascribing the translation of the *Speculum* to John Morton. I have not found a record of any manuscript making this claim, like those just mentioned signed with Love's name. But the editors of the *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts* says in the index that the *Speculum* was "translated, as it is supposed, by John Morton." The same assignment is made in the *Appendix to the Third Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, pp. 118 and 224, for two other manuscripts there described. Since the presentation of this dissertation the *Register of Osney Abbey* (E. E. T. S. orig. ser. CXXXIII. 1907), has appeared, and here, too, the editor attributes this translation to Morton, without citing any authority.

<sup>6</sup>Hone, *Ancient English Mysteries*, London, 1823, pp. 73 ff.

these extracts, it is a literal, though a somewhat condensed translation of the *Meditationes*. Hone was impressed with the similarity between the allegory of the Four Daughters (or, as he terms it, "the Council of the Trinity") in the *Speculum* and the opening scene in the salutation play of the Hegge cycle, and believed that the former supplied the source for this scene. This claim, however, can hardly be allowed when one compares the Salutation with other versions of the allegory, as I shall undertake to do in a later chapter (see Chap. VIII): Nevertheless, this English translation of the *Meditationes* maintained its popularity for at least a century, as is indicated by the fact that it was printed by Caxton, and again by Wynkyn de Worde and Pynson.

### SECTION III. VERSIONS DEPENDENT ON THE *Meditationes*.

The resemblances between the versions of the allegory in the *Meditationes* and in Bernard's sermon, and the fact, moreover, that Bonaventura acknowledged Bernard as his source, led some later writers to cite the latter as their source even when they were clearly depending upon the *Meditationes*. Nevertheless, the changes in the introduction and conclusion of the allegory in the *Meditationes* are so marked as to certify the indebtedness to that wherever these modifications have been introduced, as, for example, in the French mystères. Indeed, even where these characteristic modifications are omitted, it is often possible to establish the indebtedness on the *Meditationes* through the fact that the condensed treatment of that version is observed.

An interesting instance of the dependence upon the *Meditationes*, even though Bernard is expressly cited, is furnished by an expanded version<sup>7</sup> probably made not long

<sup>7</sup>The *Meditationes* seems to have given rise to a large number of *Vitae Christi*. Roy (op. cit. pp. 250-251) gives a list of those in French, one of which, from his description, seems to contain the allegory given by Bonaventura, *La Vie de nostre benoist sawver ihesu-crist*, dated 1380. Another of 1462, *La vie de N. S. J. Christ*, may also contain this allegory.

after the *Meditationes* itself. This is the *Vita Christi*<sup>3</sup> by Ludolphus (or Lupold) de Saxonia, prior of the Carthusian convent at Strassburg and a contemporary of Bonaventura. Although Ludolphus introduces the allegory by a citation of Bernard's sermon,—“prout narrat Bernardus longo sermone de annuntiatione,”—his work clearly follows the *Meditationes*. In the first place, the general remarks on the value of meditating on Christ's life which open the *Vita* are merely a free expansion of similar remarks in the poem of the *Meditationes*. Again, like Bonaventura, Ludolphus differs from Bernard by introducing the allegory itself with a reference to the centuries of suffering between the Fall and the Redemption and to the prayers of the compassionate angels for man's salvation (although he does not give the prayers themselves). Finally, it resembles the *Meditationes* rather than Bernard in its condensed account of the allegory itself. Bonaventura had already abridged Bernard's sermon. Ludolphus now condenses still more by the omission of phrases or whole sentences wherever possible.

The fact that Bonaventura and Ludolphus were contemporaries might suggest the doubt whether Ludolphus's version were not the source rather than the descendant of Bonaventura's, but a comparison of the two will dismiss that possibility. For Ludolphus, it will be seen, in his abridgment of the story, has omitted a number of phrases which are common to Bernard and Bonaventura. To suppose, therefore, that Ludolphus served as the intermediary between these two would leave unexplained the occurrence of these phrases in the text of the *Meditationes*. On the other hand, the fact that the *Vita Christi* does not contain the prayers of the angels for man's restoration and the theological passage explaining the peculiar fitness of the Son for the office of Redemption, which appear for the first time in

<sup>3</sup>*Vita Jesu Christi e IV evangeliiis et scriptoribus orthodoxis concinnata. Ed. novissima studio et opera A. C. Bolard, L. M. Rigollot, et J. Carnandet, Parisiis et Romae, 1865.*

Bonaventura's treatise, is not significant, for these details may easily have been cut out by Ludolphus in the course of his condensation of the story.

Ludolphus's *Vita Christi*, in turn, circulated widely in Germany, France, and England, both in the original Latin and in translations. Two French versions of this treatise are preserved in fifteenth century manuscripts.<sup>9</sup> The first of these, by Guillaume le Menand (Bibl. Nat., Paris, MS. fr. 20046) is a close translation of Ludolphus. The other version by an anonymous author (Bibl. Nat., Paris, MS. fr. 181) adheres less faithfully to its original. Indeed, Paulin Paris<sup>10</sup> decided that its author must have been translating some other *Vita Christi*. Nevertheless, after collating it with Ludolphus and also with the *Meditationes*, I am convinced that it is based in the main on Ludolphus, though the author has corrected his translation in some details by referring to the *Meditationes*. This, at least, appears to be true so far as his treatment of our allegory is concerned. The most striking instance of his reference to Bonaventura is the insertion from the latter of the explanation why the Son was best fitted to undertake the work of Redemption. This, it will be remembered, had been omitted by Ludolphus.

Besides these French versions, a paraphrase of Ludolphus's *Vita Christi* in English verse was made by Walter Kennedy (circa 1460-1507) under the title *The Passioun of Christ*.<sup>11</sup> In this poem the strife between the sisters is

<sup>9</sup>In addition to these two versions, E. Roy (op. cit., p. 249, note 3) cites anonymous French translations of Ludolphus in the Bibliothèque Nationale (MSS. fr. 177-9 and 407-8), as well as a translation by Jehan Hubert (cf. *Romania*, 1887, p. 169). He refers also to a paraphrase of Ludolphus's treatise by Jehan Mensel, preserved in Arsenal MS. No. 5205-6. Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 16,609, *The Lyfe of Cryste*, is an English translation of Menand's *Vita Christi*.

<sup>10</sup>P. Paris, *Les MSS. fr. de la Bibl. du Roi*, Paris, 1836-48, II, 82.

<sup>11</sup>*The Poems of Walter Kennedy*, Ed. with intro., various readings and notes by J. Schipper, Denkschriften der K. Akad. der Wissensch. Phil. hist. Klasse, Wien. 1902, Vol. LXXXIV, pp. 1-94. The dependence of Kennedy's *Passioun* on Ludolphus has been worked out in detail by

described in barest outline within the limit of three stanzas (vv. 29-49). Mercy and Piete, contending against Justice and Verite, assert that by their law "man suld be fre fra bane." To this Justice and Verite reply,

"That be thir law Adam and his ofspring  
Eternalie suld be banist his rigne,  
God infinit because he offend;  
After thair law his pane suld nevir end."

The Father gives command to His Son to restore peace between the sisters. This Christ does.

"Sayand, 'Ane deid sall make you baith content  
And bring Adam till peace with all his seid  
That we will worship baith in word and deid."

The influence exerted upon the development of the allegory by the *Meditationes* is by no means confined to France and England. It will suffice here to mention two examples from other countries; one the late fourteenth century poem, *Marien Genat*, by Bruder Hans, the other Feo Belcari's *Le Rappresentazione quando la N. Donna Vergine Maria fu annunziata dall Angelo Gabriello*, the only drama I have found of those borrowed from the *Meditationes* which does not introduce new arguments into the debate between the sisters. Bonaventura's influence will be further recognized when we come to examine the French mystères (see Chapter VI, Section 2) and again in the English dramatic versions of the allegory (see Chapter VIII, Section 1) and in the allegorical poem, the *Court of Sapience* (see Chapter IX, Section 2). In these versions, however, there has been a fusion of influences, the elements borrowed from the *Meditationes Vitae Christi* having been combined with others taken from Grosseteste and, in the case of the

F. Holthausen, *Kennedy-Studien*, Herrig's Archiv., Vols. CX (1903), 359-387, and CXII, 298-316. His comparison of the allegory of the Four Daughters is in CXII, 299-300.

*Court of Sapience*, with still others from Deguilleville. To undertake the examination of these versions at this point would involve our discussion in difficulties on account of the complexity of influence which they represent. Nevertheless, the full extent of the importance of the *Meditationes* in the development of the allegory cannot be appreciated until these versions also have been examined.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE "PROCESSUS BELIAL."

#### SECTION I. INTRODUCTION.

The versions of this allegory which appear in the French drama do not seem to depend primarily upon any single source. Although there are instances like *L'Amour Divin* (see Chap. VII), where the feudal setting of the *Chateau* is preserved, or like the Rouen *Incarnation* (see Chap. VI), which shows verbal borrowing from the *Meditationes*, these dramatic versions in general present a complex combination of different influences.<sup>1</sup> The scene of the action is restored to heaven as in Bonaventura, but the setting is as rich in color, as feudal in tone, as in Grosseteste. Again, the intercession of the angels which especially characterizes Bonaventura's version is here sometimes directly reproduced, sometimes represented in the laments of the fathers in hell.

But most striking is the tendency, foreshadowed in the *Chateau*, to make more prominent man's position and his guilt. This is the main topic of the controversy. It is a natural consequence of the adoption of the scene by the Passion plays to serve as transition from man's fall to his redemption, but it involves new elements. The new arguments concerning man's guilt are drawn largely from Thomas Aquinas. But they had already been used in works whose influence is otherwise felt on the drama in the introduction of two new elements,—the Devil motive and the intervention of a fifth sister, Sapience. The latter appears

<sup>1</sup>In this chapter I shall be obliged to diverge from my plan of discussing only the French and English descendants of the Latin versions in the body of my dissertation, since the Dutch forms here described seem to me to be necessary as helping to mould the French mystères of the succeeding centuries.



in the *Pèlerinage de Jesucrist*, by Guillaume de Deguillville; the former is first seen in conjunction with the allegory of the Four Daughters in the *Merlijn* by Jacob van Maerlant. As both these elements were prominent in the drama, it becomes necessary to examine them before taking up the consideration of the drama itself. The Devil motive or "Processus Belial," as the first to appear, demands first treatment.

In intimate connection with the conception of the eternal strife between the justice and mercy of God, which is older than the Christian religion, is that other idea, forming the basis also of all pagan religions, of the struggle between good and evil powers for the possession of man's soul. In the order of events, the natural result of man's putting himself in subjection to the evil power by yielding to sin is that justice should range itself with that power in condemning him. This fusion of the two conceptions is that which we have to study in this chapter on the "Processus Belial," and, in modified degree, in those to follow on the French drama. In the works which are the special subject of this chapter, the evil power is usually very definitely centralized in the devil and his procurator, and the contest is one excited by, and in opposition to, the harrowing of hell. Therefore, this phase of the allegory has been designated by Heinzel<sup>2</sup> the "Processus Belial."

Curiously enough, the versions illustrative of this phase of the allegory seem to derive from Hugo rather than from Bernard. This is certainly true in the case of the *Merlijn*, the first to be examined.

## SECTION II. THE *Merlijn*.

This "Processus Belial" as told by Maerlant<sup>3</sup> is as

<sup>2</sup>Heinzel: *ZfdA.*, XVII: 45.

<sup>3</sup>*Jacob van Maerlant's Merlijn*. Steinforter MS. ed. van Vloten, Leiden, 1880. The manuscript here edited was first discovered by Tross, a professor in Hamm, in the library of Prince Bentheim-

follows: The devils, seeing that by the harrowing of hell they have been outwitted and robbed of their prey, call a council and choose Masceroen, "scalek ende zwaer," to go before God as their procurator and there to recover control of mankind. He presents himself before the heavenly throne, stoutly crying, "Lord, where is Justice?" The Lord examines his letter of credential, a masterpiece of Satanic ingenuity, in which mankind, since given over to Satan for torment, is summoned to hear the procurator's demands. He appoints the next day, Good Friday, for the trial. Masceroen demurs against the appointment of a holy day, but is forced to yield. Returning to hell, he tells his companions how miserably he has fared, but Lucifer despite his protestations sends him back early the next day. In the heavenly court he chooses a high place and waits. When at midday no one has appeared against him, he goes before God and demands the judgment by default. To no purpose is this, however, for God silences him by saying the case is set for evening. As evening approaches, Masceroen again becomes impatient, and when even is fully come, cries loudly: "Lord,

Steinfort in 1838. He made known his discovery to the Leyden Society, but then the manuscript mysteriously disappeared and all trace of it was lost until, forty years later, van Vloten found and published it. Van Vloten does not seem to doubt Maerlant's authorship of the poem which from a reference to "Aelbrecht heer van Voorne" he assigns to about 1260, the manuscript itself, however, being dated 1326, as expressly stated in the epilogue. Willems (*Belgisch Museum voor de nederduitsche Tael-en-letterkunde en de Geschiedenes des Vaderlands*, Gent, 1838, II: 438-451), on the other hand, is sceptical of Maerlant's authorship on the ground that Maerlant in his *Spieghel Historiael*, having spoken scornfully of the story concerning Merlin as a "valsche sagem," would not be likely to write it. He does, however, grant that the manuscript is 1326 is a copy, more or less changed in dialect from Flemish to low Dutch, of a poem composed about 1270, as shown by its dedication to Albrecht.

Finally, Jan te Winkel (*Paul's Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, II. I., 458 and 465) declares Maerlant to be the author (about 1261) and Lodewijc van Velthem (in 1326) the continuator. The objection to the genuineness of the manuscript, which has been raised on the score that because of its prophecy of Jeanne d'Arc it could not be so early as claimed, is valueless, since this prophecy has been added in a later hand on the back of the first folio which had been left blank.

where is Justice who, men say, harbors in heaven?" But God postpones the trial till the next day and Masceroen again goes to hell in discomfiture and is again forced by Lucifer to return.

Meanwhile the Virgin Mary, feeling a mother's sorrow for mankind, offers herself as advocate, at which there is rejoicing among the angels. The hour comes. God takes His place in the consistory surrounded by countless hosts of angels, patriarchs, and prophets, and when Mary, attended by hosts of angels singing her praises, has entered and seated herself beside her Son, the parliament opens. She asserts her readiness to answer for man and challenges Masceroen to present his claim. He, unable to raise his eyes to the brightness of her glory, turns fretfully to God, saying, "In every case, there must be three: the judge, the complainant, and the defendant. You are the judge, I the complainant, but I see not the guilty one." Mary interposes with a second assertion of her intention to act as man's representative, but Masceroen continues, "It is contrary to all justice new or old, that a woman be advocate. Besides, she is your mother and bound by kinship." Mary indignantly replies: "The villain would falsely threaten to destroy my right. Although I am your mother, I am of mankind and so am summoned. Though I were an unbeliever or accursed, I have indeed a right to plead my own case. It is untrue that I have not an advocate's right; I plead for the suffering, for widows and orphans."

After much opposition, Mary is recognized as advocate. Then follows prolonged argument back and forth, Masceroen seeking to establish his right to man<sup>4</sup> and Mary insisting that it has been lost and is forfeited to Christ. At length she triumphantly asks if he has anything more to say. He replies with a sneer that he has not yet begun, whereupon God insists that he be more polite. Pulling a Bible from his pocket, Masceroen cites Genesis 2:17, and again the

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Hugo. Comm. on Ps. 15 in Migne CLXXVII: 596-597.

strife grows hot between the two until Masceroen so presses his right that Mary seeks refuge in tears and begs her Son to help her. Moved by her distress, He would dismiss Masceroen, but the latter suggests a compromise. "I will take my speech from the Scriptures, and confirm it by heathen law. When there is a strife between two parties, what does the judge do but make a division? Therefore give to me the evil, to your mother the good. Put mankind in the scale. Her part shall be bitterly small." Christ seems about to yield, but Mary cries that the weighing has already been done through the death of her Son. At this Masceroen shrieks fearfully that the debate has been degraded into a triviality which he can no longer endure, demands advocates, and chooses Justice and Truth. The angels, distressed at the thought of the turn he may thus give to the case, urge Mary to choose like advocates; she decides upon Mercy and Peace. While these are being summoned, a strife ensues between Mary and Masceroen as to who were guiltier, the immaterial angels who fell because of pride, or men of flesh and blood on whom a prohibition had been laid.

At last the four virtues come, and the debate is given over to them. Gerechteheit and Waerheit would condemn man unsparingly; but Ontfermeheit would have those who repent pardoned. She suggests, when Gerechteheit continues obdurate, the inconvenience to God if, sparing none, He be left without servants. "Better that, than to countenance evil," is the burden of Gerechteheit's reply. Ontfermeheit pleads God's grace above justice, and God, seeing that they will not come to agreement, intervenes, declaring His love for both and the possibility that each might be satisfied with partial fulfilment of her desire. He closes by saying that Gerechteheit will not be satisfied until she has entered the heart of man and troubled him all she can. This Ontfermeheit firmly resists, recalling God's promise of salvation to those who repented and were baptized. Upon God's declaration to abide by this, she continues, turning

now to Gerechteheit and Waerheit, that it would be unjust to suffer so noble a creation, formed after the likeness of his Maker, to be lost; for to this purpose had he been made, to learn to know and love God and to have free enjoyment of Him.<sup>5</sup> She closes by quoting a number of the prophecies of God's mercy.

Vrede now rises and proves that her sisters have already had their due. Christ, by assuming humanity and dying for man, has satisfied the demand of Gerechteheit for man's unending punishment. The execution of God's sentence of death upon those who ate the apple, which Waerheit claims, has already been accomplished, since before this sin man was immortal; and to Ontfermeheit God has shown his favor by humbly suffering the disgrace and torture of man. Therefore Vrede, too, now claims her right, namely, that David's prophecy be fulfilled, in that Ontfermeheit and Waerheit meet and Gerechteheit and she kiss. This is granted, whereupon Masceroen in rage and dismay flees to hell where is vowed endless enmity and activity against Christ.

The body of the *Merlijn* is, of course, merely a translation of the French *Merlin*. But the three chapters (IX, X and XI) which deal with this "Processus Belial" do not occur in the French narrative, but have been inserted by the Dutch translator. In order to show the setting in which they are placed, I quote the titles of these chapters together with those which precede and follow:

"Ch. VIII. Hier begint dat boeck van Merlijne, ende hoe die Duvele benyden, dat God die Helle tebrach, ende syne vrient daerut verlosede. Ch. IX. Hoe die Duvele

<sup>5</sup>Compare, St. Anselm. *Cur Deus Homo*. II. 1 and 4, Migne CLVIII (1853).

II. 1. "Rationalem naturam a Deo factam esse justam ut illo fruendo beata esset, dubitari non debet."

II. 4. "Ex his facile cognoscere quoniam aut hoc de humana natura perficiet Deus quod incepit, aut in vanum fecit tam sublimem naturam ad tantum bonum."

alle vergaderden, ende koren enen procureere. Ch. X. Hoe Onse Vrouwe wart een vorsprache van alle Kerstenheit tegen den viant. Ch. XI. Hoe Gerechteheit ende Waerheit degedingeden tegen Ontfermeheit ende Yrede. Ch. XII. Hoe die Duvele visierden, hoe zy enen man mochten maken. Ch. XIII. Hoe Merlijn gewonnen wart, ende daerna hoe hy geboren wart."

Inasmuch as the *Merlijn* is for the most part merely a translation, it is reasonable to presume that in his account of the "Processus Belial" Maerlant was also following an older source, though in this case no such source is known. Further reason for believing that Maerlant's narrative represents a lost version of the allegory will appear, however, on examining the structure of the story in the *Merlijn*.

This story is a combination of three separate elements which are readily distinguishable: (1) a trial scene in which the Virgin and Satan's representative contend for the possession of man, (2) the motive of the scales in which man's good and evil deeds are weighed, (3) the debate between the four sisters—of whom two condemn man, and two plead in his behalf. Each of these three elements is found separately in stories current long before the time of Maerlant.

The representation of a contest between Satan and God, or Christ, for the possession of man, is, of course, of early origin and is one which appears in a variety of forms. In the twelfth century, Hugo of St. Victor in his commentary on the fifteenth Psalm<sup>6</sup> gives an account of a dispute between Christ and Satan which contained certain noteworthy points of similarity to the trial scene in the *Merlijn*. According to

<sup>6</sup>Hugo: *Misc. Annotationes Elucidatoriae in quosdam Psalmos David*. Cap. XII. Migne CLXXVII, p. 596-7. Cf. also the *Altercatio Diaboli contra Christum* in Bodl. MS. 52 (12th cent.), mentioned by Schenkl (*Sitzungsberichte Wien. Akad.*, Vol. CXXIII, Abhandl. V, p. 14); *Altercatio inter deum et diabolum*. Phillips MS. 24377 (12th cent.), Schenkl (*Sitz. Wien Akad.*, Vol. CXXVII, Abhandl. IX, p. 71); *Ritter mit der Cuculla*. Mussafia (*Sitz. Wien. Akad.*, Vol. CXXXIX, Abhandl. VIII, p. 38 ff.); *Ueber die Quellen des Gautier de Coincy*. Mussafia (*Denkschrift, Wien. Akad.*, Vol. XLIV, Abhandl. I, p. 20).

Hugo, as in the *Merlijn*, the devil asserts his right to man as having been consigned to him after the Fall, and in both, this claim is refuted on the ground that the devil through his excessive cruelty toward man has forfeited his power over him. Also, in both Hugo and the *Merlijn*, the devil, when his claim is overruled, suggests a compromise, though in Hugo the scheme by which Satan proposes to make the division of souls between himself and Christ differs from that in the *Merlijn*.<sup>7</sup>

It was Christ, according to Hugo, who contended with the devil over man. But according to another form of the story, which also goes back to the twelfth century, it was the Virgin, as in the *Merlijn*. This is found in the legend—one of the many which at that time grew about the cult of the Virgin—of a pilgrim whose soul was seized at his death by the devil, but was afterwards released as the result of a trial held before Mary.<sup>8</sup> Important differences between the legend and the scene in the *Merlijn* are, to be sure, not far to seek. In the legend we have the story of an individual man; in the *Merlijn*, on the other hand, the subject of controversy is the human race. Again, Mary appears in the legend as the judge in the case, not as an advocate contend-

<sup>7</sup>F. Roediger: *Contrasti Antichi*. Intro. Firenze, 1887. Roediger speaks of this dispute in Hugo, as the earliest example of such a strife and perhaps the indirect source, through the similar thirteenth century *Piato del Dio col Nemico*, which he edits, of the later Italian version ascribed to Bartolus. He suggests that this dispute between Christ and Satan was transformed into one between Mary and Satan's representative in order to avoid offence against religious sentiment. But since it is wholly lacking in juristic elements, he doubts whether it can be regarded as the direct source of such versions as the one by Bartolus, even though the arguments employed are sometimes the same.

<sup>8</sup>Gordon Hall Gerould: *The North English Homily Collection: A study of the Manuscript relations and of the Sources of the Tales*, Oxford, 1902, pp. 31-36. The legend here treated was in its earlier forms variously attributed to Hugo of Cluny, Hugo of St. Victor, Anselm of Canterbury, and Lactantius. Cf. also the story by Gautier de Cluny in his *De Miraculis B. V. M.*, cap. 4 (Migne CLXXIII, col. 1384) of the Blessed Virgin delivering the soul of a monk who was being carried to hell by a crowd of demons. There is a trial scene here. This collection is dated 1141.

ing against Satan. Nevertheless, in this legend and in the commentary of Hugo we may recognize in an earlier and less developed form the trial scene which appears fully elaborated in the *Merlijn*.<sup>9</sup>

The notion of a contest between the evil and angelic powers for the possession of man's soul, in which the case is decided by comparison of his good and evil deeds is as old as the time of Bede, and doubtless far older. Bede tells this story of a knight who on dying was confronted by two records: the one a mighty volume containing his sins, the other a tiny book in which were enrolled his few good deeds.<sup>10</sup> Bede's story, however, is remote from the scales motive in the *Merlijn*; in the first place because scales are not employed to weigh the sins against the good deeds; second, because the result is different, since it is the fiends who win victory and bear off the soul.

A closer parallel to the *Merlijn* is found in the legend

<sup>9</sup>Possibly a dramatic treatment of the same theme in the twelfth century is to be inferred from a ceremony which preceded the canonization of Alexander III, in which an "Advocatus Diaboli" figured (cf. Stintzing: *Geschichte der populären Literatur des Kanonischen-römischen Rechts in Deutschland am Ende des XV und Anfang des XVI Jahrh.*, Leipzig, 1867, p. 260), though that ceremony may have been only a pageant or procession without dialogue. Contemporary with Maerlant, there was a dialogue in Italian, *Il Contrasto fra il Diavolo e Maria*, by Fra Bonvesin da Riva (circa 1250-1290?) (cf. d'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro Italiano*, Roma., 1891, I: 522-5), but this was not a trial scene, nor is the subject of the dispute the same as in *Merlijn*.

<sup>10</sup>Old English version of the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Ed. T. Miller, E. E. T. S. XCVI, 1891, pp. 436-442; *Beda's Ecclesiastica Historia*, Ed. Plummer, I, 311-313.

This story by Bede found its way into the "Example" literature. It is repeated, together with a similar tale quoted from Cæsarius, in the fifteenth century collection entitled *Jacob's Well (Jacob's Well—An English Treatise on the Cleansing of Man's Conscience*. Edited from the unique MS. about 1440 A. D. in Salisbury Cathedral by Dr. Arthur Brandeis. E. E. T. S. CXV. 1900, 225-226.)

Deguilleville also, in his *Pèlerinage de l'Ame*, later to be discussed (see Chap. V), seems to have made use of Bede's story, for he there combines the motive of the scales with the volumes containing the records of good and evil deeds. Bede was an author widely known on the Continent as well as in England, and Deguilleville may easily have been acquainted with his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.



of *Piers Toller*, which had its origin in the life of the sixth-century John of Alexandria. A pair of scales appear to Piers in a vision. In one scale the fiends heaped up his sins and the angel could find nothing to put in the other side except the little loaf which he had thrown at a beggar.<sup>11</sup>

The debate between the four sisters, of course, is borrowed from the allegory of the Four Daughters of God, with the history of which we are already familiar. As to the form of this debate in the *Merlijn*, it is noteworthy that the arguments there employed by the sisters are unmistakably derived from Hugo's Commentary on Ps. 84: 11 rather than from the sermon of Bernard. Passage after passage in the *Merlijn* has been literally incorporated from Hugo's treatise. In addition to the theological material derived from Hugo, the statement of the purpose of man's creation has been borrowed from Anselm, and the distinction between the sin of man and of Lucifer, from Thomas Aquinas.

Now that we have examined the three elements of the story which are combined in the *Merlijn*, we are again brought to the question: Did Maerlant himself make the combination of these separate elements, or did he find it already made in some version now lost? A very important piece of evidence in settling this point is found in a story related by Cæsarius of Heisterbach about a quarter of a century earlier than the *Merlijn*. The story in outline is as follows:<sup>12</sup>

A man burdened with sins is carried in a vision before the judgment throne of God where the devil demands the

<sup>11</sup>For the sources and earliest forms of this legend see Gerould, *The North English Homily Collection*, Oxford, 1902, pp. 56-7.

<sup>12</sup>*Die Fragmente der Libri VIII Miraculorum des Cæsarius von Heisterbach*. Hsg. von Dr. Aloys Meister, Prof. in Münster. (*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte*, 13th Sup. vol., Rome, 1901), Lib. III, No. 77. The story in question has the title: *Exemplum de quodam homine permulta mala opera a diabolo ducto ad iudicium dei, quem sancta Maria, Veritas, et Justitia a diabolo acceperunt*. The book was probably written between 1225 and 1238.

surrender of the poor wretch to him. He bases his demand on three points: that mankind had been given over to him, that as a descendant of Adam this man is under the sentence of death for eating the forbidden fruit, and that whatever good he may have done is over-balanced by his evil deeds. God, not wishing to condemn the man, gives him an opportunity to defend himself; then, when the man remains silent, He postpones the trial for eight days. As the poor fellow goes out in great fear and trembling, he meets a man who inquires the cause of his sadness. Upon hearing his story, the stranger promises to defend him against the first claim of the devil. He gives his name, when interrogated, as Veritas. Later, another stranger calling himself Justitia promises to answer the second claim.<sup>18</sup>

On the eighth day the trial is opened. The devil advances his first claim and Veritas answers that there is a double death; that of the body, and that of the soul. All are condemned to the first but not all to the flames of hell. The devil is somewhat daunted, but presents his second claim, to which Justitia objects that by his cruelty the fiend has forfeited his right to mankind. But to the devil's third claim no one is found to answer. Then God commands scales to be brought that the man's good and evil deeds may be weighed. Thereupon Veritas and Justitia lead their protégé before the Virgin, the mother of Misericordia, who is seated beside her, and implore her aid. The blessed Virgin places her hand on the scale in which the few good

<sup>18</sup>The devices of a vision, of a trial postponed by the judge that the accused may have time to defend himself, and of his lucky meeting with mysterious strangers who promise their aid at the appointed time are so common in folk-lore that I am tempted to apply in this case the general remark made by the editor of these "exempla," that Cæsarius may have learned many of his stories through oral tradition, and that these would very naturally often be transformed almost beyond recognition before reaching the isolated little cloister of Heisterbach in the lower Rhine district. It is an interesting fact that all the earliest German versions of the allegory come from this region, which is so closely connected with the Netherlands and Northern France that influences from these countries might easily penetrate thither.

deeds lie and, though the devil seeks to drag down the other, causes her scale to outweigh his, thus liberating the poor man. He, waking from his vision, reforms his life so effectually that God crowns him in heaven.

In this story by Cæsarius, it will be noted, all three of the elements distinguishable in the "Processus Belial" are found already combined. There is a trial scene before God's throne in which the devil appears on one side and Mary on the other, the interposition of the Virtues, the device of the weighing, and the final victory of man, besides the devil's appeals to Scripture and the postponement of the trial. Moreover, there is a striking coincidence with the *Merlijn* in the devil's claim that man had been given over to him and its refutation on the ground of cruelty.<sup>14</sup>

It is clear, then, that the elements which are fused in the *Merlijn* were not for the first time combined by Maerlant. But may it not be possible that in this story by Cæsarius we have the source used by Maerlant? Against this supposition is the fact that in a number of points where Maerlant follows the usual type Cæsarius has departed from it. For example, in Maerlant the debate between the four sisters conforms to the usual form of the allegory: two of the sisters oppose man's redemption and two plead for him. In Cæsarius, on the other hand, Pax is omitted altogether, and Veritas and Justitia are changed to the male sex. Moreover, all three are ranged on the side of man. Again, according to Cæsarius, it is God who introduces the scales for weighing man's good and evil deeds. In *Merlijn*, on the contrary, it is the devil who proposes to do this, while Mary refuses to allow it, saying that the weighing was finished at the death of Christ. This, as will appear later, is the usual form of the story.<sup>15</sup> Altogether, then, the

<sup>14</sup>This, it will be remembered, occurred also in Hugo's Commentary on Ps. 15.

<sup>15</sup>In Deguillaume's *Pèlerinage de l'Âme* (Cf. Chap. V), on the other hand, the plan of weighing is proposed by St. Benoist, who seems, like God in this story, to wish to help man thereby, and there

version by Cæsarius seems a perverted rather than an original form of the allegory. It can hardly have been itself the source used by the author of the *Merlijn*, but in the very fact that it contains in combination the several elements of the "Processus Belial" it affords evidence of the existence before Maerlant of a version of the allegory similar to that of the *Merlijn*.

Another piece of evidence tending to confirm the existence of such a lost source is the fact that two other versions—the *Questiones ventilate coram domino nostro Jesu Cristo inter Verginam Mariam . . . et dyabolum* by Bartolus<sup>16</sup> and *L'Advocacie de Notre Dame* by Jean de Justice<sup>17</sup>—give a scene which runs practically parallel to Maerlant's poem up to the point where Masceroen asks for advocates. Both these versions, it is true, are half a century later than the *Merlijn*, yet it is difficult to believe that a Netherlandish version was the source of these Italian and French works. Moreover, from the fact that both these end at an early point in the trial and lack the strife between the sisters, the natural inference would be that they were founded upon a version antedating Maerlant's and less developed than his.<sup>18</sup>

it is accepted by the devil, though his hopes are frustrated by Pitie's putting into the scales with man's good deeds a letter of grace obtained from Mary because of Christ's death.

<sup>16</sup>*Incipit tractatus questiones ventilate coram domino nostro Jesu Cristo inter verginam Mariam ex una parte et dyabolum ex altera parte.* This edition was printed in 1473, but gives the date of the original as 1311. (See Roediger, *Contrasti Antichi*, p. 23-5.)

<sup>17</sup>Jean de Justice: *L'Advocacie de Notre Dame*, ed. Alph. Chassant, Paris, 1855.

<sup>18</sup>Stintzing (op. cit. pp. 265-266) mentions a *Processus judicarius* . . . in his possession beg. "Accessit Mascaron ad dei omnipotentis praesenciam et ait," etc., and a *Libellus procuratoris* (see Hain, 2647) beginning in the same way, which he says are more extended than the *Processus* connected with Bartolus' name, since the four virtues are also present. They are also, he believes, earlier, for they refer to the procurator as "Mascaron," later replaced by "Satan," the more usual name. This name implies a Spanish origin for these versions, and I have found references to a Spanish version called *Mascaron*, but have not succeeded in finding any copy of these versions or any information as to their date or character.

The result of this examination of possible sources for the allegory in the *Merlijn* cannot be said to be decisive; nevertheless, when one remembers that Maerlant, for the rest of his poem, was merely a translator, one must doubt whether the credit for inventing the "Processus Belial" belongs to him. I cannot but feel, therefore, that an earlier version of similar character must have existed in either Latin, Spanish, or French, and that from this the allegory in *Merlijn* was derived. Lacking this hypothetical version, however, I must use the *Merlijn* as the basis for comparison in tracing the subsequent history of the "Processus Belial."

### SECTION III. THE *Mascheroen*, A REVISION OF THE *Merlijn*.

About one hundred years after Maerlant, another Netherlandish poem appeared which repeats the scene from the *Merlijn* almost exactly. This is the *Mascheroen*,<sup>19</sup> which may possibly have been written by Jan Boendale, a disciple of Maerlant. Only two changes occur. The council of devils with which the scene in *Merlijn* opens is preceded in the *Mascheroen* by another council in which the devils, dismayed that their efforts to tempt Christ were vain, learned through studying the Scriptures that the object of the incarnation is the redemption of man through the death of Christ,

<sup>19</sup>F. A. Snellaert, *Nederlandsche Gedichten uit de veertiende eeuw, van Jan Boendale, Hein van Aken, en Anderen*. Brussels, 1869, pp. lxiii-lxxviii and 493-549. It is found in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Marshall Coll. No. 32, of the late fourteenth century. The first three numbers, *Melibeus*, *Jans Teesteye* and *Van der Wraken*, are by Jan Boendale, who was a pupil of Maerlant's. That fact may account for the inclusion of the *Mascheroen* in the same manuscript, either as a revision by Boendale or as a free copy by some later scribe. Whether there was an earlier *Mascheroen* to give rise to the "wagon-spel" described in the 1615 prose story, *Marieken van Nymwegen* (see Snellaert's Intro.) or whether that "wagon-spel" was a direct dramatization from *Merlijn*, I cannot say. From that description it would seem to be a less developed form than any extant. In 1475, *Mascheroen* was played in Petegem (Crelzenach I: 477). This may be the play referred to in *Marieken van Nymwegen*.

and accordingly planned to prevent His death by sending a vision to Pilate's wife.

The other instance where the two poems materially differ is in the arguments employed by the four virtues. These instead of coming from Hugo, as in *Merlijn*, here seem to be inspired by Anselm. Gherechtiched complains that man has ever been disobedient and unprofitable and that, having lightly broken the command of God, great to eternity, he deserves eternal punishment. No man could atone for Adam; for all are servants to sin. Nay, were even one found sinless, he would still be in endless debt to his Creator, and would therefore have no extra merit by which he could atone for himself or another. Further, even if he could make satisfaction, this would not restore his innocence, so that he could not deserve bliss, and it would be wrong to admit to Paradise one so unclean. Adam wished rather to obey his wife than God. Since he fell from such honor,—the joys he had in Paradise,—to become like a beast, let him now remain in toil and torment. Next, Waerhede makes her usual speech about the penalty for eating the apple, and then the poem proceeds practically as in *Merlijn*, although with a few unimportant expansions. I have noted these slight changes, because, as will later appear, they recur, modified, in Greban, so that it seems likely that Greban worked from the *Mascheroen* rather than the *Merlijn*.

#### SECTION IV. THERAMO'S *Processus Belial*.

The *Processus Belial*, the work which gave the name to those versions which contain the Devil motive, is a fuller development of the *Merlijn* type, written by Jacopo da Theramo.<sup>20</sup> It is also of great importance in mediæval

<sup>20</sup>The full title reads: *Compendium breve Consolatio peccatorum nuncupatum; et apud nonnullos Belial vocitatum ad papam Urbanum sextum conscriptum*. It is found in numberless editions and translations, for which see Stintzing, pp. 271 et seq., and the articles on Theramo in Goedeke's *Grundriss* and the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*. Theramo wrote it in 1381, in order to show in an amusing style the method of conducting a trial.

literary history through its enormous popularity, and it is important for my purpose because of its direct influence upon certain Provençal plays. This *Processus Belial*, though modelled upon the same plot as *Merlijn*, departs freely from that version, amplifying prodigally.<sup>21</sup>

It begins with a council of demons similar to that in *Merlijn*, except that the part there played by Mascheroen is here given to Belial, and proceeds in like fashion, though much more detailed, up to the point where Belial presents his charges against Jesus. Belial accuses Jesus of robbing Satan of his rightful possession and of acting as an impostor in claiming to be God's Son. On the plea that Jesus had lived under Solomon's jurisdiction when on earth, the Lord sends Belial to present his suit to that king. Thereupon the tedious formalities incident to the conduct of a mediæval trial are repeated with much elaboration. In many points this trial resembles the one in the *Merlijn*, though the advocate here is not Mary, but Moses. Belial, finding the case going against him, obtains a postponement and hastens to hell for council. There he is advised to drop the prosecution of Jesus as a robber and to sue only for the return of the redeemed souls.

In the arguments which follow the renewal of the case on this changed basis, the only one which recalls the *Merlijn* is the decision that Satan, by too despotic use of his power, has lost whatever claim to man he may originally have had. The case is decided against Belial, who rages furiously at his defeat and who the next day after another consultation in hell presents a formal protest against the sentence and a demand for a new trial. This time God sends him before Joseph, the patriarch of Egypt, for a hearing. Here Belial's argument is that man, having eaten the apple, must suffer

<sup>21</sup>In *Deutsche Dichter aus dem XVI Jh.* (Goedeke und Tittmann. Leipzig, 1868, II. I., p. xxxii) it is suggested that Theramo worked from Bartolus. But much in *Merlijn* and the *Processus Belial* is not known to Bartolus. For example, the four sisters do not there appear at all, nor is there any second pleading.

the penalty; God being eternally just, man must eternally die; but Moses replies that God mingles with justice His mercy which is equally eternal. "If mercy and justice are mingled," taunts Belial, "why has mercy been so long silent?" "She has not been silent," Moses answers. "Through all the ages Misericordia and Pax through the prophets have proclaimed the deliverance of man as soon as Justitia and Veritas were satisfied. When the time came, Misericordia went before the throne of the father to plead for man." And Moses relates at length the story of the debate before the throne, and its issue in the Incarnation; but in this account, the author abandons the later tradition to give the pleading as it is in Bernard's sermon on the Annunciation. When Moses has finished, Belial grimly gnaws his lip, stupefied with dismay; and since he can answer nothing, this case, too, is decided against him. Again he goes to hell for advice, and again is forced to continue the struggle.

The third trial is like the second one in *Merlijn* in that the principals do not speak, but choose each two advocates who speak for them. Belial chooses King Octavius and Jeremiah; Moses, Aristotle and Isaiah. In the arguments which follow, the only thing which directly recalls the *Merlijn* is the suggestion of Octavius that a compromise be made and the world be divided between Christ and Satan. The suggestion gives opportunity for a voluminous account of the reign of Antichrist and the last judgment. This account is particularly detailed in its description of the reception to be accorded to the various classes of sinners and their efforts at self-justification.

At the Judgment, Justitia and Misericordia reopen their pleading before God, Justice taking stand first against the Jews for putting Christ to death, Misericordia quoting Christ's dying words of forgiveness. Other arguments advanced are the cruel penance already suffered in purgatory during thousands of years, the deep remorse and peni-



tence of some of the sufferers, the healing that flows from Christ's pierced side, the futility of Christ's death unless those in purgatory be redeemed, the superiority of Misericordia over Justitia, and the fact that the very essence of her nature is to forgive sins. Then Lucifer, who is waiting at one side to carry the condemned down to hell's pit with him, troubled at Misericordia's weighty arguments, goes to Mary and urges her to plead for his forgiveness. To this she sweetly accedes, but in this case her pleading is in vain. God asks her, however, to reconcile Misericordia and Justitia. Having heard both sides of their controversy, she persuades them to accept a compromise: Misericordia to agree to have only those who for a thousand years have expiated their sins, and Justitia to consent to have the rest. God says this may be accepted as the solution of the difficulty, but excepts those who have not repented, no matter how long they have suffered, and those guilty of the seven deadly sins. Misericordia now pleads for babes who have died before baptism, and God summons Life and Death to answer her accusation. With their defense, the account of the Last Judgment ends.

In the story thus sketched, the dependence of *Belshazzar* upon the *Merlijn* is evident, as is also the fact that Theramo has added much that is original. As to its influence, the picture of the Last Judgment here given, with its condemnation of the Jews, may have suggested the debate of the sisters concerning the punishment of the Jews in *Le Vengeance*, a play to be discussed in a later chapter, and the novel treatment which Theramo employed throughout had a direct influence upon a very interesting Provençal cycle now to be described.

This Provençal cycle<sup>22</sup> is of peculiar interest, inasmuch as it is the only example in French dramatic literature of a series of Old and New Testament plays like those of the

<sup>22</sup>*Mystères provençaux du XV siècle.* A. J. Jeanroy, et H. Teulié, Toulouse, 1893. (Ms. Bibl. Nat. 6252 nouv. acq. fr. 15th cent.)

great English cycles. The only two plays of interest in connection with this subject are *Lo Jutgamen de Jhesus de Nazaret* and *Lo Jutgamen General*, or, strictly speaking, only the second, though both, I believe, are clearly inspired by Theramo's *Processus Behal*.<sup>23</sup>

In the first, the number of the virtues is increased. Of the four traditional sisters, only one, Veritat, appears, and she in a rôle opposed to that which she usually plays, since here she pleads for man against Jesus. Instead of the other three appear Ignocensia, Fidelitat, and Humilitat, advocates of Jesus, and Caritat and Necessitat, who with Veritat are the advocates of Humana Natura. The occasion of the pleading is also different from the usual one, being the demand of Humana Natura for the immediate death of Jesus who has been in the world thirty-three years without fulfilling his promise to die for man. This demand is a logical outgrowth of the usual pleadings, which result in the determination of the Son to assume humanity and die. Considering these departures from the traditional form, one can accept this play only as a disfigured version of the allegory.

<sup>23</sup>It is probable that the editors of these plays have not compared them with Theramo's work, since they say in their introduction that although the author seems at times to have followed a model, this cannot be identified, and that we possess no such composition on the last judgment anterior to *Lo Jutgamen General*. The assumption is that the author had read widely in the drama and utilized in his composition a number of diverse sources, most of which are to-day lost.

The only other example of a last judgment known to the editors is the mystery represented at Modane in 1580, *Le Jugement de Dieu* (see Petit de Julleville, II, 460), but there are others, in Germany, also dependent on Theramo. Whether the *Contrast de natura humana am lo demoni infernal loqual contrast fouc determenat per Dieu la Païre* played at Rodez in 1440 could be like either of these plays, I cannot say. (See Petit de Julleville, II: 14-15.) The editors of this Provençal cycle think not.

In Romania XXIII: 527-8, M. Jeanroy expresses his conviction of the debt of this cycle to some lost French play, and says that the *Jutgamen de Jhesus* especially would be unintelligible without such a predecessor.

Since writing this chapter, I have discovered that Roy (*op. cit.* 323 ff. and 411 ff.) has anticipated me in advancing the theory of dependence upon Theramo. Cf. Rom. XXXV: 365-378.

*Lo Jutgamen de Jhesus* follows the *Belial* in the conduct of the trial,—the appointment of advocates for each side, the summoning of witnesses, and the appeal of the case to three successive tribunals. Here it is Jesus' side which loses the case each time and His mother who with violent lamentations at the cruel sentence of death, carries the case before *Ley de Nature*, *Ley de Escripture*, and *Ley de Gracia* in turn. But although there are important modifications, the groundwork here is the same as in *Processus Belial*.

In the *Jutgamen General* the likeness to the *Belial* is much closer, the Provençal play adding nothing to that account of the Last Judgment. The condemnation in turn of the bad angels, Jews, idolators, unworthy clergy, and lay officers and others, the pleading of Mercy and Justice, Mary's request for Lucifer's forgiveness, and the examination of Life and Death, all depend almost verbally upon the *Belial*.

#### SECTION V. SUMMARY.

To sum up the results of this chapter, the Devil motive not improbably had its beginning in a simple debate between the Virgin and Satan's advocate, a conception derived from Hugo's commentary on Ps. 15; but no composition of this type is known to be extant which can be proved to be earlier than Maerlant's *Merlijn*. Nevertheless, it is probable that an earlier source for this scene, more closely resembling it, did exist and that this was also the source for Bartolus, Jean de Justice, and other such versions. The only version which is demonstrably earlier than the *Merlijn* is that of Cæsarius. But this is too slight to have offered more than the barest outline and too widely different in many points to have served as a model for the scene in the *Merlijn*.

A century after the *Merlijn* appeared the *Mascheroen*, but this has no character of its own except in the substitution of different arguments in the debate between the Daugh-

ters of God. Otherwise it is only a revised copy of the *Merlijn*. Finally, the *Processus Belial* and the Provençal plays with their repeated trials and endless refinements of legal chicanery show the third and decadent stage. Having traced the development of the devil motive from a separate contest to its union with the *strife* between the virtues, it remains to show how in the French *mystères* the two contests are again separated,<sup>24</sup> and how the debate between the sisters has gained in richness by the absorption of elements suggested in the arguments bandied between Mary and the procurator.

\*To illustrate from Greban's *Mystère de la Passion*, the devil scenes there have the same plot as the earlier ones in *Mascheroen*. That the rest of the poem,—the contest between *Mascheroen* and Mary, was known to Greban and purposely rejected by him is implied in the *mystère* itself. The devils having called a council after the harrowing of hell, Cerberus says:

Cerberus:

“On nous fait tort, on nous fait tort,  
et de cestuy desrobement  
j'en appelle au grant jugement,  
car le faulx Jhesus n'y a droit.

Lucifer:

Ton appel riens ne nous vaudroit:  
Jhesus qui la chose a bastie,  
si seroit la juge et partie;”

## CHAPTER V.

### DEGUILLEVILLE AND HIS INFLUENCE UPON MERCADÉ AND GREBAN.

Guillaume de Deguilleville turned the struggle of good and evil for man's soul into a romance, a form that was doubtless suggested by the *Roman de la Rose*. The conception of such a struggle had been first presented in the *Psychomachie* of Prudentius and developed in such works as the *Voie de Paradis*, but it has nowhere been so fully elaborated as in Deguilleville. In his three poems, *Le Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine*, *Le Pèlerinage de l'Âme*, and *Le Pèlerinage de Jesucrist*,<sup>1</sup> there appears a three-fold development of his theme; in the first, the struggle for man's soul is represented as a conflict of the Virtues and Vices; in the second, as a trial carried on by the Devil before the Powers of Heaven; in the third, as a controversy between Mercy and Justice. It is true that the sisters appear also in the second poem, and that a hint of the devil conception is recognizable in the last, yet in general, the distinction of theme in the three poems is preserved. The *Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine*, the first poem in the trilogy, may be dismissed with a mere mention, as it does not contain any reference to the allegory of the Four Daughters. It is an allegorical account of the journey of man's soul through the life on earth towards the heavenly kingdom. In both the other poems, however, our allegory makes its appear-

<sup>1</sup>All three poems have been edited by J. J. Stürzinger for the Roxburghe Club, London, 1893-7, and are described in outline by Gröber II. I. 749 ff. An English translation of the first poem was made by Lydgate and is edited by Dr. Furnivall in E. E. T. S. Ext. Ser. LXXVII and LXXXII. This society promises also an edition of the *Pilgrimage of the Soule*, an English translation of Deguilleville's second poem. This second translation has also been ascribed to Lydgate, but wrongly. (See J. Schick: *Lydgate's Temple of Glas*, E. E. T. S. ext. ser. LX, 1891, pp. ci-ciii.)

ance, and it is with the discussion of these that we are here concerned.

### SECTION I. THE *Pèlerinage de l'Ame*.

The *Pèlerinage de l'Ame* continues the history of the Soul begun in the *Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine*. The subject in the second poem is the fate of the soul after death, and the contents may be outlined as follows:

The guardian angel attempts to carry the Soul to heaven, there to plead for grace before God's throne, but is stopped by Satan, who seeks to drag it down to his tortures. Thereupon an altercation between the two arises, which they decide to submit for arbitration to St. Michael, to whom until the Last Judgment such decisions belong. He summons to the trial St. Peter, St. Benoist, Reason, Justice and Truth, and some, who like the Soul have made pilgrimages on earth, St. George, St. Nicholas, and many others. Man's good angel opens the pleading by alleging that his charge had been committed to certain guardians on earth from whom Satan has no right to snatch him, but to this Satan replies that some of these guardians would witness against man and in favor of his own claim. The good angel tries to excite the sympathy of the judges, but Satan presents so strong a case against the Soul, telling of its sins after baptism and its repeated lapses from virtue, that an ominous silence succeeds his speech. Perceiving that no one will speak for him, the Soul confesses all his sins, then calls upon Christ and Mary for mercy. He also appeals to the angels and saints present to plead for him.

At this point Justice interferes, saying that she and Verite must bar from this court confession and pleading after death. The Soul replies that Satan should then be equally barred from the court, having once been dismissed from heaven; but Satan, unalarmed, answers by saying: "I need not say anything; for Justice, Verite, Reason and Syn-

daresis all speak for me." This gives Syndaresis, the worm of conscience, his opportunity and, unmoved by the Soul's attempt to silence him, he bitterly rehearses all the evil deeds of the Soul, which Satan eagerly writes down as they are cited. The poor Soul, able to deny nothing in this long accusation, again humbly pleads for mercy, seeking excuse in the fact that he had sinned not through despite of God, but oppressed by the weight of ignorance and of his frail nature. Sin, wrapped in goodly seeming, had deceived him. These excuses Justice rejects as worthless, for Grace Dieu had given the Soul a full letter of instructions and complete armor. Had he chosen to profit by these, he might have escaped. "Yes," Reason adds, "Justice is right in all she says of the helps he might have had against the world, but he left his five posterns, the five wits, open." Verite, too, heaps up the evidence against him by telling how futile and fleeting his penitence has always been. Satan, assured of his case, here demands the surrender to him of the Soul, but Pitie at last steps forward with words of warning against rash condemnations. "I must speak to deserve my name. No pilgrim ever kept to the right road and therefore none could ever be saved but for my Lady and the Sovereign Lord who made the journey on earth. This He did at my prayer and to bring about accord between Justice and me.<sup>2</sup> Since He did this to save man, you who hold His court should follow His will; guard the Soul from hell, not send him thither." Justice objects that Christ did not die to save sinners who would not leave their errors, and so to countenance sin, but only to redeem such as amended their lives while on earth.

Further argument between them follows, which St. Benoist thinks to end by his proposal that the deeds of the Soul be placed in the balance of Justice. All agree, and the friends of the Soul place in the right scale all that they can

<sup>2</sup>This apparent reference to an earlier controversy between the sisters seems to be an acknowledgment of indebtedness to older versions of the allegory for the conception of the strife. Cf. also *Castell of Perseverance*, vv. 3134-52.

allege in his favor; the enemies weight the left with their claims against the Soul until this is much the heavier. Triumphant, Satan calls for the immediate surrender of the Soul to him, but Pitie begs delay until she can go to Mary and Christ. During her absence, St. Benoist adds to the two scales the scripts of man's good and evil deeds, but without altering the balance. Pitie now returns with a letter of grace which at Mary's request Christ had given her. By this letter all who in deep penitence will cleanse themselves in a purgatory which is to be established for them, shall be saved; but no grace shall be shown those who persist in wickedness. The opponents of the Soul complain against Pitie for thus setting aside both their claims and the evidence of the scales, whereupon a long council is held to decide how to end the matter. Finally it is suggested that the letter which Pitie has brought be added to the right side of the scales. This is done and it is seen that the letter outweighs anything else. All yield, the Soul is instructed how to cleanse himself in purgatory in order that Justice may be satisfied, Justice and Pitie meet at last in accord, and Satan descends to hell in a rage crying out that he had found "not reason, but treason."

In looking back over the plot just outlined, one gains few clear indications of the sources used by the author. Deguilleville seems to have known more than one version of the allegory, and to have borrowed from each impartially such points as he chose, transforming them to suit his purpose. Certain points similar to earlier versions, however, suggest indebtedness.

From Bernard or Grosseteste may have come the reference to the guardians granted to man, and from Grosseteste the argument which Justice advances that indiscriminate mercy would lead to the countenancing of sin. In both Cæsarius and the *Merlijn* Satan demands that the Soul be surrendered to him, and in the *Merlijn*, as here, his right to speak in the heavenly court is challenged. As between these



two earlier versions, the fact that Satan's demand is made immediately after man's death and for an individual, rather than for all humanity, though this latter, too, is at times implied in Deguilleville, places this poem somewhat nearer Cæsarius than the *Mertijn*. In agreement with Cæsarius also, we find the acceptance of the proposition to try the balance, the fact that this proposal is apparently made with the view of aiding man, and the alteration of the result of the weighing by an appeal to Mary. The parallel of the two scripts in which were written man's good and evil deeds with the similar books in Bede's story may be fortuitous only; yet Bede was popular on the Continent as well as in England, and there is nothing impossible in supposing that he was known to Deguilleville. Possibly more significant is the fact that in one manuscript of *Le Pèlerinage de l'Âme* at a later point of the poem is an insertion of about five hundred lines, which, though expanded, is taken directly from the account of the debate in the *Vie de Tobie*. Many other points in the narrative suggest the *Roman de la Rose*, *Voie de Paradis*, etc., but as they have no connection with my subject, I mention them only to point my assertion that Deguilleville drew from a multitude of sources.

## SECTION II. THE *Pèlerinage de Jesucrist*.

The *Pèlerinage de l'Âme* seems not to have influenced succeeding versions of our allegory, probably because this poem presents it in so perverted a form. Deguilleville's third poem, however, *Le Pèlerinage de Jesucrist*, which we come now to consider, has a peculiar interest, on account of its direct and important influence upon the French mystères. Nor was its influence confined to France, for, as we shall see later, it was the source used by the author of the English *Court of Sapience* (see Chap. IX). Its chief importance, however, lies in the effect which it exerted through Mercadé and Greban upon the French dramatic forms of the allegory.

Deguilleville exerted this influence through an important modification which he introduced into the allegory by bringing in the character of Sapience<sup>8</sup> and assigning to her instead of to Christ the rôle of arbitrator between the Four Daughters. As will be seen from the following outline of the version, Sapience plays an important part in the allegory.

In *Le Pèlerinage de Jesucrist*, the allegory is introduced by man's good angel, who tells his companions of the fall of his charge, through the cunning of Orguel, son of Lucifer. They urge him to repeat this before God and with their aid, to plead for Adam. While the angels are singing in nine circles before the Lord, the three dames, Justice, Misericorde and Veritas, enter into discussion. Veritas favors a long punishment as the penalty for man's disobedience; Justice, eternal punishment; and Misericorde hopes for pardon. Having argued for some time in the usual fashion, Veritas suggests that they go for council to Sapience. Justice protests the uselessness of doing so, but is overruled, and they go. Sapience tells them that the only possible escape would be that the King himself become man and pay the debt of sin, but that this is not fitting, for no one is worthy of it.

Hearing this, Misericorde goes to the Holy Spirit and pleads with him, whose advocate she is, to procure Adam's salvation in the way indicated by Sapience, and reminds him that she had been given her name, Misericorde, as a symbol of the rainbow covenant, a "cord of mercy" to men. Turning to Justice, she reproaches her for her rigor, greater than that of God, who repented making man because He foresaw that He must suffer for his sin. Justice protests the reasonableness of her claim and denies that the Father, for whom she is advocate, has made any promise to man, whatever the Spirit may have done. This seems to Misericorde an idle distinction, since the three Persons of the Trinity

<sup>8</sup>MS. Metz 535 (see Chap. 11) used the name "Sapience" in speak of Christ.

cannot be divided. Man's sin, disobedience, must be purged by obedience, which belongs to the Spirit. "No," says Justice, "to the Son, since the Father gave the command." Veritas here speaks again: "Yes, and I am His advocate, but I cannot discuss the matter without commission." She offers, however, to go and present the proposition to Him.

When she returns, she tells how after much piteous debate in the Trinity, He was asked to make the pilgrimage for man, and might not have yielded had not His mother, "Charite," been there, whose love for Misericorde is well known. The Father had shown that no angel,<sup>4</sup> but only a man could atone; the Son, that all men were attainted and helpless to save, through the sin of the first; and the Spirit, that help could come only from one of the Trinity, since they alone were innocent. Thereupon the Father had turned to the Son, as the one best fitted to undertake the office, but He laid no command upon Him, for it was necessary that the act be voluntary.

At this point, a new character is introduced in Charite the mother of Jesus. She besought her Son to please the Father. Of her many arguments, the chief were, that man's sin had been caused by guile and was, therefore, less damnable and that it was unjust that Adam's descendants should be involved in his punishment, while Lucifer had no successor to suffer for his misdeeds. Her words prevailed, and the Son, though expressing grief for the pain he must suffer, and misgiving lest many a man would not appreciate His sacrifice, turned to the Father and asked for instructions how He should enter upon this pilgrimage. Gabriel is sent to make ready a hostelry worthy to receive a King, and the annunciation to Mary follows.

Again, towards the close of the poem, Christ after His resurrection and ascension bids an angel summon the three dames, Justice the doughty, Veritas the well-praised, and Misericorde the sweet. When they are come, the Father

<sup>4</sup>Cf. extract from Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, below, note 12.

asks them if they are satisfied with the payment which His Son, in the habit of a pilgrim, had made for man with the blood of His heart. For reply they cast themselves at His feet, with the assurance that they are more than satisfied. God then bids them kiss in token that their discord is ended and, to cement the peace, ordains that a feast of joy begin. Angels in numberless hosts assemble and chant sweet praises, led by Justice and Misericorde; the first declaring her rigor abated, the second rejoicing that she may now approach nearer the Father and make supplication for all who henceforth shall sin, unless the sin be against her "especial dear Master, the Holy Spirit." To add to the general joy, Jesus brings in John the Baptist and Mary is crowned.

In its general structure the scene in the *Pèlerinage de Jesucrist*, like that in the *Pèlerinage de l'Ame*, seems to be largely original. Deguilleville must have known several versions of the allegory. The elements taken from them he has fitted together into a mosaic according to his own pattern. Some of these elements, however, can be recognized. An indebtedness to Bonaventura is suggested by the likeness of the opening scenes in each,—the formal pleading of the angels in man's behalf. The sisters' submission of their quarrel to Sapience for a decision, while suggested perhaps by a similar application to Christ in Bonaventura, is nevertheless nearer to Bernard, since in the latter's sermon the Son is spoken of as King Solomon, the type of wisdom. Deguilleville, however, is the first to make Sapience another sister. Reminiscent of the *Mascheroen* is the discussion of the relative sin of Lucifer and man, here touched upon and the appearance of Christ's mother as advocate for man. With these exceptions, Deguilleville's treatment of the allegory is an independent one.

This scene in the *Pèlerinage de Jesucrist* is of special importance, as furnishing the model for the "Proces de Paradis" in the Passion-plays of Mercadé and Greban. Since these are so much alike, it will perhaps be the simplest

course to outline both and then to compare them with De-guilleville and with each other.<sup>5</sup>

### SECTION III. THE ALLEGORY IN MERCADÉ'S PLAY.

At the opening of Mercadé's play<sup>6</sup> is given a description of the *mise-en-scène*. "Let there be the Trinity, that

<sup>5</sup>Before Mercadé, however, before even Deguilleville, the allegory had appeared in the drama, though in the most rudimentary form, namely, in the so-called *Maestricht plays* (ZfdA. II: 302-350), which was probably composed about 1330. At it is in German, I omit discussion of it here, and do this more readily since it does not seem to have influenced Mercadé or Greban. Traces of French influence in this play suggests its derivation from some French *mystère* not now extant.

<sup>6</sup>*Le Mystere de la Passion. Texte du MS. 697 de la Bibl. d'Arras*, ed. Jules-Marie Richard Arras, 1893. Cf. Petit de Julleville, II: 415-18. For convenience sake I speak of this play as Mercadé's, since it is generally accredited to him by French literary historians; but M. Richard, in editing it, is more cautious, and, though he gives all the arguments in favor of Mercadé's authorship, does not commit himself. Mercadé certainly wrote the *Vengeance de Jesucrist*, as attested not only by his signature in the epilogue to that play, but also by the statement that he did so made by a contemporary, Martin Le Franc, in his *Champion des Dames*. The *Passion* and the *Vengeance* are in the same manuscript, the copyist passing directly from one to the other, without giving, at the end of the first, the usual appeal to the audience for indulgence and to God for mercy, or any list of players. These defects are supplied at the end of the *Vengeance*, so that it seems not improbable that the copyist intentionally omitted them after the first play, in order to bind the two together. Yet the preacher at the end of the first does not announce the second; and the second has some characters not in the first, some allusions to evils in society, also not mentioned in the first, and some affectations of erudition and preciosity. Both, however, have the same *Picardesque* forms here and there, and they offer no contradictions in their ideas or personages. Common to both are the absence of lyrical passages, the use of prose, rare in the *mystères*, the abuse of long tirade, and the coldness of action.

Admitting that both were written by the same author, the *Passion* was composed before the *Vengeance*, which seems to belong to the unhappy years of Charles VI, from its references to the lamentable state in France. Since there are no allusions to invasion, but only to intestine anarchy, these would point to the time before Mercadé's going to Corbie, in 1414. The mention "1390 circiter" added to the first leaf of the manuscript, in a sixteenth century hand, while it is erroneous as a date of the copy, might apply as the approximate date of the composition of the earliest play, the *Passion*.

These are the arguments as Richard presents them. He adds that Mercadé had attended the schools of Paris, where he gained the title

is to say, God the Father, in Paradise seated on His throne, and about Him a great multitude of angels and archangels making melody and others on their knees before God, with Misericorde, who holds an olive branch in her hand. At the right is Justice holding a sword, and kneeling with Misericorde are Verite, Sapience and Charite."

Misericorde cries out in longing for the day of comfort for those who for five thousand years have been left to perish. Though desiring to help, she sees no way of escape for them, unless it be through Dame Charite, whose place is nearest God's. To Him she exclaims, "Can it please Thee that all perish? Why dost Thou so multiply the race if all must be left to torment, or why must the last man born on earth partake of the misdeeds of the first?"

Justice, moved to anger, replies: "Sister, say no more of this. There ought to be no memory of man so long as God endures, so great was his sin; for eternal sin, only eternal punishment is just."

Verite does not think it follows that the punishment should be infinite and considers Justice too rigorous. "Not so," rejoins Justice, "Lucifer is under eternal punishment; so should man be, whose sin, like Lucifer's, was in seeking to exalt himself, forgetting the great honor and beautiful place of abode with which he was blessed."

This attitude Misericorde thinks inhuman; for she refuses to consider the sins equal inasmuch as Lucifer sinned of his own accord, man through the conspiracy of the serpent. As to Justice's statement about man's former honor, she asserts that Lucifer's had been greater, a fact clear from his very name, Light-bearer, the fairest of angels. Moreover, man instantly repented of his sin; not so the malicious Lucifer. Therefore, it is right that the devil suffer eternally.

"bachelier en theologie et docteur en decret," which necessitated long years of study, so that he must have been in Paris in the first years of the fifteenth century, when the "Confrères de la Passion" had just obtained royal recognition, and their activity may have stimulated Mercadé to compose his plays.

but man has already been punished severely, when Justice drove him from the garden.

"Truly, my sweet sister, you speak well," says Verite, and she seeks to convince Justice that man has suffered enough, but in vain; for the latter only answers that it is not customary for courts to revoke their sentences. Verite succeeds, however, in obtaining permission to seek a means of breaking man's bonds, if this be not opposed to Justice's rights. The solution she suggests as the only one possible is that the King himself humbly assume humanity and die to redeem the sinner. All the angels could not suffice, since only a man can atone for man's sin. Justice objects that pain cannot touch God, yet to pain man was condemned. She adds her conviction that God would never consent to it. "I do not say that he would," Verite admits. "It does not pertain to me to know His glorious will, but this is the only possible means of escape." At Misericorde's entreaty, Verite goes to Sapience, tells her the position of affairs and persuades her to go before the King and beg Him to grant His aid. This Sapience does, presenting the matter as the plea of the beloved Misericorde, at first not suggesting the means, but only pleading that sorrowing humanity be released from limbo and brought to dwell with God. When God objects that this release can come only from one who is sinless, and that it is hopeless to wait for such an one, she speaks more plainly, showing Verite's plan, and urging her belief that God must have expected to suffer for man, else He had not said, "*Me poenitet fecisse hominem.*" God's only answer is to express His regret that man must remain in his prison.

Then Charite, intervening, kneels and pleads the extenuating circumstances in the case of man's sin. Since he had been created out of dust, he might easily be expected to fall. Lucifer, on the other hand, formed of celestial substance, had sinned in pure malignity. Gabriel adds much the same pleas and reminds God of the mansions which must

be left vacant if man be not restored. Then, when God says the sin was too like Lucifer's for a distinction in justice to be made, Michael and Raphael join their prayers that the deserted palaces be refilled, lest God's work seem imperfect and man's creation superfluous. Still God remains firm. Now Uriel supplicates Him, if He does not wish personally to effect man's redemption, to command one of His creatures to do it, that all may be again perfect as when He said, "Let there be light."

The cherubim, on behalf of all the angels, plead for man in his pitiful plight, beg that Paradise no longer be left desolate, and urge that the discord of heaven be harmonized.

Finally, Charite again entreats, "Only by Thee who created him can man escape. Hear the prayers of all the angelic orders and hierarchies."

God is moved. Turning to Charite He says: "Thy request accords with that of Misericorde, thy daughter. I do not wish to act contrary to your request and the prayers of the blessed angels, and therefore I yield my consent. To bring man from exile, Our Son shall become incarnate in the form of man. A virgin pure and gracious shall lodge Him as behooves the Son of a King. After that, death shall follow. Alas, I owe little love to the apple man bit, for by that deed am I summoned to bear the burden of the redemption of mortal man."

Having described the suffering which Christ must endure, God summons Gabriel and gives him the secret message of annunciation to Mary. Then Sapience, returning to the sisters, tells how, through the entreaties of Charite, the decision to redeem man had been made.

At the end of the play, after His resurrection, Christ ascends to the Father's throne and announces His pilgrimage completed, the voyage fully accomplished. He shows the marks of His cruel pains on earth, tells all that He has done, and orders that the virtues be summoned to answer whether they are fully satisfied. Gabriel is sent for them, and they,



declaring their joy in obedience, present themselves before the Trinity. The Father recalls to them their discord, and their requests through Sapience, and then tells what the Son has suffered for man and ends by asking each if she is now content. Misericorde first, afterwards the other two reply by hymns of praise, and at the Father's command, meet and kiss in token of restored concord. The play ends with Gabriel's command to all the angelic hosts to praise the Trinity in joyous melodies.

#### SECTION IV. THE ALLEGORY IN GREBAN'S PLAY.

Possibly half a century after Mercadé's came Greban's *Mystère de la Passion*.<sup>7</sup> Greban's treatment of the allegory is the most fully developed of any. His "Proces de Paradis" appears on three separate days, twice at considerable length. These must now be severally examined. The purpose and scope of the *Mystère de la Passion* is indicated in a note prefixed to the MS. of 1473, stating that the play was written at the request of certain notables of Paris, to show the difference between the sin of Lucifer and that of Adam, and why the latter's could be atoned for. In his prologue the author gives a "creation abrégée." After describing the creation of angels and men and their Fall, the long laments of Adam and Eve, and their banishment from Paradise to the exultant joy of the powers in hell who have wrought the second Fall, he proceeds with an account of the resulting sin of Cain, the expedition of Seth to Paradise, the death of Adam and Eve, and the torments prepared for them in hell by Satan.

<sup>7</sup>*Le Mystère de la Passion d'Arnout Greban*, ed. Gaston Paris et Gaston Raynaud, Paris, 1878.

For lists of manuscripts and editions of the *Passion*, see the introduction in this edition, or Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, Paris, 1880, II: 394-411.

The earliest manuscript is dated 1473, but among the papers of the Benedictine Dom Grenier of Abbeville, is the copy of a receipt for money paid for a representation there in 1452 of Greban's *Passion*, so that the *mystère* must have been composed earlier than this.

Thus far the prologue carries us. The first day then begins with the laments of Adam and Eve in Hell, the attempts of the prophets to comfort them by their predictions of the coming deliverance when the time shall be fulfilled, and the vehement prayers of all that this day of release come soon.<sup>8</sup> At this point, *Misericorde* declares that she cannot longer restrain herself from pleading for humanity. It seems most pitiful to her that man, in the pursuit, as he supposed, of greater happiness and power, should have fallen to such a depth of woe and impotence, and that, after being endowed with such high excellence and nobility, he should now be so degraded. Moved by his bitter mourning, she would break his cords of bondage. God signifies His desire to please her, and she continues, confident of being heard, since the Father and she must be one and have a common will. She reminds the Father that He had created the world through gracious desire to share His happiness and good,<sup>9</sup> not from any need, and that this had been planned through two orders of beings, the one of angelic substance, to praise Him in heaven, the other lower, but lords over the earth. Yet both had sinned. The sins being diverse,—one due to pride grasping at power, the other to ignorance striving for knowledge,—the punishments were also diverse; for that of the fallen angel is eternal, but to man is extended the hope of an end to his pain. Therefore she may rightfully plead for man though she will not intercede for the Devil.

Justice now interposes with the demand for a formal hearing, announcing her purpose of mortal war against man's whole lineage, to defeat *Misericorde's* plea. A sharp dispute ensues, in which charges of undue leniency are made on one side and of cruel rigor on the other. Finally Justice urges that the balance be held between them,

<sup>8</sup>This introduction may have been suggested by the prayers of the angelic orders which open Bonaventura's narrative, or it may be written in obedience to the convention of the procession of the prophets, with which so many of the mystères are introduced.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. note on Anselm in Chap. IV n. 5.

and man be rewarded according to his deserts. God intervenes with the demand that recriminations cease and each present her arguments.

In the formal hearing of their claims thus opened Justice speaks first. She states that Misericorde demands three impossible things in wishing to bring man from hell to repair his fall, and to punish the like sins of Lucifer and man by different penalties. Being challenged by Misericorde to prove the sins alike, she proceeds to sum up the case against man. His sin is especially damnable, considering the nobility with which he was endowed and the affluence of power and bliss granted him in Paradise, where no earthly pleasure was denied him but one small fruit to which, like a gourmand, he at once extended his hand. His was therefore a triple offence: disobedience, gluttony, and pride. The Devil, on the other hand, was guilty of pride alone. Thus man fell from liberty to servitude, from nobility to baseness. That he was tempted is no excuse. Consequently, the sins being equal, the punishments must also be equal, or, if one is to be succored, so must the other. To talk of satisfaction is useless; for when one owes and cannot pay, he must remain as hostage, and to release him through courtesy would be folly.

Verite thinks the arguments of Justice are sound, but that Misericorde may possibly find a way of escape. Resuming her plea, Misericorde urges first the wrong of defeating God's high purpose when he formed man in his own image; next, man's weakness and ignorance among mortal enemies, where he was as a stranger making a pilgrimage through a land he knew not; and further the cruel and long penance he had already suffered.

Justice interrupts with the remark that the plea of man's nobility defeats itself, since the higher and more puissant a man's estate, the heavier should be the punishment of his sin. This Misericorde is willing to grant, but not its application to the present case, because here, she alleges, the sin was caused through the guile of another. When Justice protests

that man had free will, she admits that only in part; for he had been created weak and sensuous under the domination of the flesh, which sways him like the branch which the wind inclines. To accept that as excuse, Justice thinks, would be to admit that he could sin with impunity and always claim forgiveness on the plea of weakness. Misericorde pleads man's true repentance, but she is told that no infinitude of penance could avail. She then asks whether another might not make satisfaction and suggests that man has a puissant helper. She denies again that man and Lucifer sinned alike.

"I'll prove it!" cries Justice. "Both were noble and intelligent, both sinned through perverted free will and pride. If Lucifer had clear vision, no less had man, having received before his transgression a warning from the mouth of God himself."

Misericorde, however, opposes her in six points:<sup>10</sup> first,

<sup>10</sup>Compare St. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentum in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*. Lib. III. Dist. I. Quaest. I. Art II.:

Ad secundum dicendum, quod peccatum hominis fuit remediabile, non autem peccatum Angeli, cujus ratio multipliciter assignatur. Primo ex virtute naturali utriusque; quia quantum ad cognitivam Angelus cognoscit in luce plena per intellectum deiformem, ut possit totum considerare sine inquisitione quod ad electionem alicujus rei pertinet, ut sic per ignorantiam non excusetur, sicut homo qui cognoscit quae agenda sunt deliberando per rationem, quae est quasi quaedam umbra intellectus . . . quantum ad affectivam vero, quia voluntas Angeli invertibilis est post electionem cum sit infra voluntatem divinam, quae est invertibilis ante et post, et supra voluntatem humanam, quae est vertibilis ante et post. . . . Secunda ratio assignatur ex natura utriusque: quia Angelorum natura non propagatur ex uno, ex quo vitium contrahat, sicut humana: et ideo nec per unum eam reparari congruit: . . . Tertia ex peccato utriusque: et quantum ad genus peccati; quia homo superbivit ex appetitu scientiae, cujus natura creata capax est; Angelus vero ex appetitu potentiae, quam natura creata non ita perfecte potest recipere sicut scientiam; . . . et etiam quantum ad circumstantiam peccati: quia homo peccans et de venia cogitavit, et in aliquo deceptus est. . . . Quarta ex iustitia divina: quia omnes illi ad quos corruptio peccati primi hominis venire debebat, nondum erant in actu, sed in virtute tantum; et ideo non decebat ut priusquam essent, ultimam damnationem reciperent, sicut omnes Angeli actu existentes proprio arbitrio peccaverunt. Quinta ex misericordia divina: quia tota natura humana lapsa erat in uno parente, non autem tota natura angelica; et ideo magis indecens erat ut natura humana tota

the difference in knowledge, for man acted under a misapprehension; Lucifer sinned in full light and in firmness of purpose never to return to God, but man sought to return. Second, there are no generations of angels, but man's descendants partake of his punishment. Third, the difference in the sins themselves; though man disobeyed through vain-glory, his aim was knowledge, but Lucifer sinned in pure malice, and later he seduced man. Fourth, the angels were all created, and each who sinned did so of his own incentive; but in the case of Adam, all yet unborn would be condemned by Justice to torment, because of the father's sin. Fifth, only those angels who sinned are condemned, the others remain in glory; so it is not just to condemn all men. Sixth, man sinned when just beginning on earth his pilgrimage toward the kingdom of heaven where his course should end, and on this account should be given power through penitence to continue his course; but the angel Lucifer sinned when already in a perfect mansion. Therefore, the sins are unlike and man deserves redemption; the angels eternal condemnation.

These arguments are greeted with hearty approval by all, and the Father turns to the three sisters to ask if they are satisfied. Justice rather sulkily replies that it is useless to say more, since Misericorde has gained the sympathy of her hearers, but still insists that some one must be found to answer for man's offence against her, since he is unable to give satisfaction himself. Verite confesses herself persuaded by Misericorde's arguments to favor man's redemption. Then Pais, glad at the prospect of harmony, adduces two more reasons why man should be pardoned: first, she points out the pity of it if a world should have been created in vain, if the glorious mansions in heaven must remain uninhabited by the men for whom they were destined. Sec-

*relinqueretur sub damnatione quam natura angelica, quae non tota corruerat. Sexta vero et praecipua est ex parte status utriusque; quia homo non peccavit in termino viae suae sicut Angelus, cui ad propriam electionem status viae finitus est.*

only, she reminds God that many men and women of high and noble lives would have to be eternally condemned, if no remedy could be found.

It being granted that man should be saved, provided the rights of all the sisters be preserved, the question of the means arises, and at Misericorde's request Verite lays the matter before the lady Sapience. Sapience declares the problem a difficult one, agreeing with Justice that man is unable to do anything for himself, though he endeavor for a thousand years. She then proceeds at some length to compare man's case to a civil suit and dwells upon the impotence of the prisoner's penitence to change the sentence of the judge. This gives Verite a suggestion, and following out the similitude, she shows that though the sentence could not be remitted, the powerful prince whose servant was condemned might pay the price for him. "Would an angel do?" asks Pais, hopefully. "No," says Justice, and Sapience shows why not, since angels are finite, the sin infinite. Pais then asks whether God could not make a man or angel of such perfection that he could make reparation. "This might be possible to the all-powerful God," Sapience grants, and yet, the one so made would be insufficient, since all his powers would be owing to his creator, none left for another's service, and since the reparation can only be made through a creator, a sovereign power."<sup>11</sup> Hearing this, Pais replies, affirming her certainty that the redemption will be made, and asking Sapience to declare whether it shall come through the Trinity as Unity, or by some member.

The conclusions reached thus far are now summed up

<sup>11</sup>Compare St. Anselm *Cur Deus Homo* 1:5. (Migne *Patrol.* CLVIII, 1853):

"Haec ipsa liberatio si per aliam quam per Dei personam (sive per angelum. sive per hominem) esse facta quolibet modo diceretur, mens humana hoc multo tolerabilius acciperet. Potuit enim Deus hominem aliquem facere sine peccato. . . . An non intelligis quia quaecunque alia persona hominem a morte aeterna redimeret, ejus servus idea homo recte judicaretur? Quod si esset, nullatenus restauratus esset in illam dignitatem quam habiturus erat, si non peccasset."

by Sapience: that the punishment must follow the sin; that man is incapable of atoning, yet must be redeemed; that another must be found to make his atonement; that God alone can do this, and that since God in His divinity cannot suffer, He must assume humanity. But since three should not do what one can do, only one is here needed, and it is expedient that this be the Son, the image of the Father, the Word, and the Middle Person of the Trinity. The Son denotes obedience, humility and patience; as the Son is full of charity, so is the Father of authority. It is fitter that the Son on earth pray to the Father to honor Him than that this be reversed; and better that He who in heaven is the Son of the Father by divine generation, be on earth the Son of a pure virgin,—and thus enable man as an adopted son to participate in heaven's bliss. The true image of God in becoming man will assume the lower image of God, for man was created in God's image. As the Word, He is the fulfilment of prophecies, and as the Middle Person, He can best reconcile the creature and the creator.<sup>12</sup>

All praise this solution and return to the Father, to whom they report the sentence passed. He breaks out into cries of grief that His beloved Son should be so tortured.

<sup>12</sup>Compare St. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentum in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*. Lib. III, Dist. I, Quaest. I, Art. II. *De Incarnatione Verbi*:

"Utrum magis fuerit conveniens Filium incarnari vel Patrem vel Spiritum sanctum. . . . In propriis autem ipsius possunt considerari quatuor, scilicet quod Filius est, quod verbum est, quod imago, quod media in Trinitate persona. Secundum autem quod imago, convenientiam habet cum eo qui reparandus erat, scilicet cum homine, qui ad imaginem Dei factus est. . . . Secundum autem quod Filius est, . . . convenit sibi ad Patrem, et deprecatio, et satisfactio, et alia hujusmodi, quae in Patre auctoritatem demonstrant. Sed secundum quod in Filio intelligitur determinatus modus originis, convenit sibi nasci, ut qui in Divinitate est Dei Filius, in humanitate sit Virginis Filius, ut non sunt plures filii in Trinitate. Convenit etiam sibi; inquantum Filius naturalis est, ut per eum cujus est naturalis hereditas, alii in filios adoptentur, et coheredes fiant. Sed inquantum Verbum est, convenientiam habet ad officium praedicationis et doctrinae. . . . Inquantum vero est media in Trinitate persona, congruit ad ultimum effectum, qui est reconciliatio hominis ad Deum; decet enim ut qui est medius, etiam sit mediator."

and asks Justice to accept some other price; but she remains inexorable. The Father then yields, and in a noble apostrophe to man, tells him how loved and honored he is thus to be redeemed by the Son of heaven in lowly human vesture; and how, when all is done, the evil pardoned and repaired, only one return is asked,—man's love. The scene ends with the commission to Gabriel to make the Annunciation, and with the angels' chants of praise.

On the second day of the *Mystère*, Greban introduces a much shorter "*Proces de Paradis*," which occurs at the time of Christ's agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. The Father, distressed at this suffering, pleads earnestly with Justice to remit some part of her sentence, since the Son has already suffered so bitterly during all His earthly life, and has never known joy, but only persecution and cruelty. But Justice is inexorable; "I ask no more than you promised."

Then *Misericorde* also pleads, that the anguish of the Garden in itself is more than enough to redeem man. This Justice grants, but for the example of love which Christ's death will furnish to man, insists that He go on and be nailed to the cross. The Father asks no more, but sends Michel to strengthen Christ in the Garden, and Gabriel to Mary, his mistress, who will sorely need his consolation.<sup>13</sup>

Again on the fourth day of the *Mystère* after the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the heavenly court is re-assembled. This is done at the suggestion of the Father, who thinks Justice should be asked whether she is satisfied. At first the Son demurs, saying that He has fully satisfied all the demands upon which Justice insisted and that He feels no further obligation to her; but He yields at once to His Father's wish, and Michel is sent to summon the five dames.

When they reassemble, the Father recounts at length the dispute between *Misericorde* and Justice, the conclusions

<sup>13</sup>Cf. *Bona Pacienza in Jutgamen de Jhesus*.



reached, and the solution proposed by Sapience, and asks whether He has related it all correctly. Sapience assents briefly; Misericorde and Justice at length, each feeling it incumbent upon her to recapitulate the arguments of her "most reasonable" demand. The Father then tells Justice, if she feels that she has further claims to make, to declare them at once. She admits that Adam's great fault has been fully repaired. The answer seems grudging, and Jesus cries, "Justice, if you require more reparation, declare it, though you cannot have anything more perfect than what I have suffered." He proceeds to show how perfect was His reparation. Adam had delight in the Garden of Paradise, He was cruelly seized in the Garden of Olivet; Adam found the tree delightful and stretched forth his hands to it, the tree on which He stretched out His hands was grievous; Adam abused his power in vainglory, He humbled His and answered no word to His accusers; gluttony tempted Adam to eat of the forbidden fruit, this eating cost Him dear when on the tree He was given bitter vinegar and hyssop; Adam chose in haste and disobeyed, He in constancy chose and firmly obeyed the Father even to death. He describes in detail the cruel sufferings He bore and closes with the reproach, "Justice, what wish you more?"

Completely softened at last, Justice falls in adoration, while the other four call upon man to acknowledge the infinite love and favor which has been shown him when God invested His high divinity with human frailty. Endless love and unending praises are returns all too slight. Sapience now turns to the Father, asking that the discord be formally concluded by the fulfilment of the prophecy of David, who clearly foresaw the strife which would arise between the sisters, when he wrote Ps. 84: 11. At this, the four, with gracious speeches of love and amity, meet and kiss, and the Father calls upon the angels to make the heavens resound with harmony of sweet sounds.

## SECTION V. COMPARISON OF DEGUILLEVILLE, MERCADÉ AND GREBAN.

Comparing the three plots just outlined, certain broad similarities are at once manifest. In all three—though least prominently in Deguilleville—the “Proces” serves as a framework for the whole, supplying in the first instance where it occurs in each the motive for Christ’s Incarnation, and in the last, closing His career by the scene of reconciliation and praise. This point is of great importance and would alone be sufficient to establish the indebtedness of the two dramas to Deguilleville. Moreover, though the first scenes in these three versions show considerable variety, the last take place in all under precisely the same conditions and are conducted in the same manner.

Secondly, in all three versions *Verite* leaves her traditional attitude of hostility to man, and shows a distinctly conciliatory spirit and willingness to act as intermediary, a survival perhaps of the part played by *Veritas* in *Cæsarius’* tale. If this is less true in Greban’s *Passion*, even there her position is an advance upon the older conception.

Thirdly, in all, recourse is had to *Sapience*, who decrees that only by the death of Christ Himself can peace be restored.

Finally, certain arguments drawn from St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Anselm are common to the three; from Aquinas, the comparison of the sins of Adam and Lucifer, from Anselm, the statement of the inability of an angel to atone for man. But of these, some have already been employed in *Mascheroen*, with which Deguilleville in the *Pèlerinage de l’Ame* shows a few possible points of contact. Besides these general likenesses, there are a number of phrasal similarities, though none of them are striking.

The only case in which there is an agreement between Deguilleville and Greban from which Mercadé is excluded is the use of the argument in each that Lucifer, having no

successor to suffer for his sin, may more justly be eternally condemned than his victim, man. But Greban may have drawn this argument directly from Aquinas. There are, however, several points common to Deguilleville and Mercadé, not employed by Greban. The most noteworthy of these is the action taken by the sisters in sending an intermediary, Verite or Sapience, before the King to plead for them while they await the answer, and the important part played by Charite<sup>14</sup> in securing the decision to redeem man. Her position as mother of Misericorde, Verite's disclaimer of authority to discuss Christ's purposes without express permission, the cry, "Alas, that bad apple, because of which I am summoned to bear the burden of man's redemption," the designation of Mary as fit hostelry for the Son of a King, and the emphasis laid upon Christ's earthly career as a pilgrimage, are other points common to these two versions.

If Mercadé is nearer Deguilleville on one side, on the other he is in closer contact with Greban. Both open the dispute by Misericorde's cry of longing for man's release, and in both Verite applauds her sister's eloquence and logic and Justice seeks to prevent the sinner's pardon by the reminder that earthly courts do not revoke their sentences. Many arguments common to the two result from the insistence on one side of the likeness of man's sin to Lucifer's together with the consequent demand for like punishments for both, and on the other side the repeated denial of these claims. In both it is argued that by the very weakness of man's substance it was to be expected that he would fall; Lucifer sinned in pure malignity, but man was beguiled. He, unlike Lucifer, has since repented and has already been sufficiently punished. Other arguments used in each are in reference to the desolate mansions in heaven and the futility of the creation of the earth unless man be redeemed. These arguments, it is true, are employed by different persons in the two dramas and they do not follow in the same order.

<sup>14</sup>Compare *Court of Sapience* for Charite's part there.

## SECTION VI. CONCLUSIONS.

From all these comparisons it seems clear that Mercadé knew Deguilleville, and not unlikely that Greban may have worked from Mercadé,<sup>15</sup> gaining from him those points

"I claim this dependence of Greban upon Mercadé with some hesitation, since it is not endorsed by Richard, and only doubtfully suggested by Gröber. The indebtedness to Anselm, *Mascheroen*, and Deguilleville, has not, I believe, hitherto, been recognized. The editors of Greban's *Passion* (see Intro., p. 20), in giving to Greban the credit of writing without much dependence on earlier works, make no mention of the Arras *Mystère*, but only of the collection of primitive *mystères* published by M. Jubinal. It is possible, therefore, that they did not know of Mercadé's work, or at least that they had not compared it with Greban's. Mercadé, like Greban, was a student at the Paris University and a "bachelier en theologie," but probably half a century earlier, since he accepted his charge at Corbie in 1414. I see nothing against the supposition that Greban while at the university learned of Mercadé's work, especially as his master there, Thomas de Courcelles, was a native of Picardy who might naturally boast to his pupil of his fellow countryman, Mercadé.

The earliest manuscript of Greban's *mystère* which we possess, that of 1473, is prefaced by a note in which this sentence occurs: "Et devez savoir que maistre Arnoul Gresban, notable bachelier en theologie, lequel composa le present livre a la requeste d'aucuns de Paris, fit ceste creacion abrégée seulement pour monstrier la difference du peché du deable et de l'omme et pour quoy le peché de l'homme ha esté réparé et non pas celluy du deable." From this I would argue that Greban virtually admits the existence of earlier *mystères* and justifies himself in adding another on the ground that his is written *solely* to show the difference in the sins of Adam and Lucifer,—a point but lightly touched upon by Mercadé.

The discussion of this difference may have been suggested to him by the *Mascheroen* from which he seems to have derived the incidents elaborated in the devil scenes. But he was too thorough a theologian not to quote the original theological source, Thomas Aquinas, for this and other points which he borrowed. In his prologue he writes:

"S'arguerons que si, que non,  
comme Saint Thomas l'a traictié  
Soubtillement en son traictié  
sur le tiers livre de sentences."

In his dissertation *Ueber die romanischen Marienklagen* (Halle, 1893) Eduard Wechsler has declared that Greban's direct and constant source was the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*. But the statement is extreme. What points they have in common in this allegory of the Four Daughters are those which characterize the tradition generally. See *Romania* XXIII: 490.

Since the presentation of this dissertation I have read Roy's *Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XIV<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in which he proves conclusively (pp. 203 et seq.) by a comparison of the two

which the three works have in common. It is not necessary to suppose direct contact between Deguillaume and Greban; for the only point that they have in common which is lacking in Mercadé's *Mystère* is used by Aquinas, whom Greban cites as a source.

Greban, indeed, introduced many arguments not known to the other two, greatly extended the scale of the controversy, and inserted a third "Proces" at the time of Christ's agony in Gethsemane. But the two striking additions to the allegory,—the introduction of Sapience and the use of the "Procès" as a frame to the story of Christ's passion, both Mercadé and Greban owed to Deguillaume. As the inventor of these new elements and also of the rôle played by Charite,<sup>16</sup> Deguillaume's importance is manifest. Nevertheless, overshadowed by Greban's greater fame, both Deguillaume<sup>17</sup> and Mercadé disappear, and the later French *mystères* are modelled chiefly upon Greban.<sup>18</sup>

*mystères* scene by scene that Greban had read the Arras *Passion*. It is a matter of gratification to me to find my hypothesis confirmed, since I had not dared to put it forward with assurance without knowing more of the French *mystères* as a whole.

<sup>16</sup>I have already suggested that the *Mascheroen* may have furnished the conception of Christ's mother as advocate, although Deguillaume's treatment is different.

<sup>17</sup>In England, however, Deguillaume's influence reappears in the *Court of Sapience* and possibly in the *Castell of Perseverance*, for which see Chapters VIII and IX.

<sup>18</sup>One cannot fail to note the striking similarities between the "Proces" in Greban's play and the trial scene in *The Merchant of Venice*. In both the conflict is between the claims of justice and those of mercy. In both the question is submitted for decision to one famed for wisdom. Sapience, like Portia, for a time appears to side with Justice (Shylock), upholding the validity of the claim against the accused and the necessity of satisfying it. Verite and Pais, as friends of the accused, suggest means whereby man may escape (either by the imposition of long penance or by the vicarious suffering of an angel) even as Antonio's friend, Bassanio, offers to pay double the amount of gold due Shylock, and finally to suffer in his stead. Sapience (Portia) asks Justice (Shylock) if she will accept these offers; and when Justice refuses, she shows that the offers made in behalf of mankind do not satisfy the conditions of the sentence resting upon him.

Compare, too, the praise showered upon her wisdom as she declares the weighty terms of this sentence. Pais cries, 'Oh sovereign Sapience,

Dame of great authority, treasure of pure deity, nobly have you answered," and Verite says later, "Oh noble and divine judgment, blessed be what thou hast pronounced." But now Sapience, who had seemed to side wholly with Justice, shows her sympathy for Misericorde by declaring that though the sentence must be fulfilled, man may escape through the substitution of God's Son. As she explains her meaning, Verite praises her, saying, "You deliberate highly, no other could make so divine a proposition," and Misericorde adds "Sacred, blessed study by which such high science is reached." It is almost inevitable that in reading this, one should be reminded of Shylock's exclamations, "O, wise young judge, how I do honor thee," etc.

In the present state of our knowledge as to the sources used by Shakspeare for *The Merchant of Venice*, it is, of course, impossible to put forward any theory to explain these similarities. They are, however, in my opinion, too striking to be dismissed as mere coincidences. It will be noticed that *Il Pecorone*, the analogue that approaches nearest to the plot of *The Merchant*, does not afford so close a parallel to Shakspeare in this trial scene.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE FRENCH MYSTÈRES SUCCEEDING GREBAN'S.

That Greban's *Passion* attained immediate popularity is attested not only by the number of manuscripts still extant, and by the fact that almost no contemporary reference to drama omits his name and praise, but also by the influence his work exerted upon later dramas until it was superseded by Michel's *Passion*.

#### SECTION I. MYSTÈRES MODELLED UPON GREBAN ALONE.

Probably first in order of time after Greban's *Passion* is the enormous *Viel Testament*<sup>1</sup> compiled about 1480. Greban had employed the "Proces de Paradis" not only at the beginning and end of his mystère, therein imitating Deguilleville and Mercadé, but also in the Gethsemane scene on the third day of the play. This use of the "Proces" as a background served as a model for the *Viel Testament*, where repeated colloquies between the sisters are introduced. They are used to emphasize almost every incident in the first part of the mystère, but occur less frequently later. Not only the repetition of these controversies, but also some of the arguments employed suggest Greban.

The first occurrence of the "Proces" is just after

<sup>1</sup>*Le Mistere du Viel Testament, Publié avec introduction, notes et glossaire par le baron, James de Rothschild.* Paris 1878-91. 6 vols.

The mystère as here edited by Rothschild is taken from a number of manuscripts, since no single one is complete (see Petit de Julleville, II: 352-377). He suggests that it may be a compilation from a number of earlier plays not by the same author, a supposition which explains certain gaps and conspicuous inconsistencies and the great lack of proportion in the whole. The compiler has probably transcribed what he found and added as a sort of bond of unity the "Proces de Paradis."

Adam's sin. There Justice demands his eternal condemnation. Misericorde opposes, and the discussion of the relative sin of man and Lucifer ensues. Justice declares them equally guilty, but is told that Lucifer in wishing to surpass God sinned beyond Adam, who would only be wise as He. She insists that man's sin is the worse because impelled by the lower motive, gluttony. Misericorde pleads that the fault is that of the woman and the serpent, and that man is very penitent. But penitence, Justice holds, is unavailing; the fact of the sin remains. God intervenes; the sisters plead with Him; and He, though wishing to hear Misericorde, upholds Justice and pronounces sentence as in the Biblical narrative. At the moment of expulsion from Paradise, however, Misericorde prevails upon God to have the cherubim promise to man some future grace. Even this Justice opposes. Later, when God tells of the oil of mercy and Justice objects to it, Misericorde declares that it would be unjust to punish the whole race for the sin of one, but Justice insists that the sin of one member infects the whole body.

The next three scenes in which the "Proces" occurs offer no points of resemblance to Greban, but the following four on the subject of the flood slightly suggest his treatment.

God repents that He made man; Justice in horror at the increasing and incredible sins of men, demands instant and terrible vengeance; and Misericorde prays for an opportunity for repentance before the flood's destruction, making constant excuse for man on the ground of his frailty. Somewhat later, God, pleased by Abram's virtue, decides that the time has come to lighten man's punishment. He will restore him by an infant born of a sacred virgin. Justice demurs that it will be difficult to find such an one, but when God reminds her of His Son she is pleased. Not so Misericorde, who grieves at the thought of the sacrifice. When God would have the prophets foretell the death of Christ,



she protests that this is "not death but torment," and pleads for some other means of purifying man than the crucifixion. Justice, however, will accept no other. From the time of God's decision to sacrifice His Son for man, most of the scenes dealing with the "Proces" are prefigurations<sup>2</sup> of Christ's life and death; such are, Abram's sacrifice, Joseph's cruel treatment at the hands of his brothers and his being sold for thirty pieces of silver, the slaughter of the Hebrew children from which Moses escaped, and Moses' deliverance of his people from captivity. Finally, suggestive of a passage in the closing scene of Greban's *mystère* is Misericorde's exclamation over the sovereign charity which induces Christ to assume the habit of humanity and her exultation in the felicity which will follow for man.

The whole work lacks unity. The author seems to have taken scenes from several authors and fitted them loosely together by the "Proces de Paradis" for which he was indebted to Greban.<sup>3</sup>

Another example of Greban's influence is seen in a play found in the Paris National Library in a unique copy of an

<sup>2</sup>These prefigurations, with others, are also mentioned in *Belial* and the *Jutgamen de Jhesus*, but in those cases without the addition of a "Proces."

<sup>3</sup>The fact that Greban calls his account of the creation "abrégée" and the many points of similarity to Greban's play, have led the editors of that play to suggest that Greban might also be one of the authors of the *Viel Testament* and that both works were founded upon an earlier play on the creation which he had written. This earlier play, they think, may also have been the source of a Troyes *Passion* where the fuller account of the creation is preserved. This Troyes *mystère* holds a position intermediate between the *Viel Testament* and Greban's *Passion*, since it follows the former for half of the first part, the latter for the second and third. Since I have not seen this work, I cannot be sure that it contains the "Proces" (see the edition of Greban by Paris and Raynaud, p. 25, and Vallet de Viriville: "Notice d'un *Mystère par personnages représenté à Troyes*," in *Bibl. de l'École des Charles*, III: 446-74).

It does not seem to me probable that Greban composed so many long *mystères*, nor that, had he done so, a man so celebrated as he should have been accredited with only one of them, *Le Mystère de la Passion*, and the later work which he compiled with his brother, the *Actes des Apôtres*.

old book without date or name of author which reads, *Le Procès qui a fait Misericorde contre Justice, pour la redemption humaine, Lequel nous demonstre le vray mistere de l'annunciation nostre seigneur ihesucrist.*<sup>4</sup> The play opens with a curious scene, not elsewhere found in the mystères, between la Terre, Lun and Lautre.<sup>5</sup>

La Terre in a long soliloquy more pagan than Christian in tone and with many references to the classical poets, boasts of her activities and honors. She is interrupted by Lun and Lautre, who complain of their nakedness and demand an explanation. While La Terre is telling them of Adam's sin and mankind's loss of innocence the scene changes, disclosing Adam and the patriarchs in hell,—the scene with which Greban's *Passion* opens. From this point to the end, with a few slight omissions the scene is literally taken from Greban, but, by the displacement of one folio, the scribe has introduced some confusion, giving to Jerémiah a part of Misericorde's first long speech and to Misericorde the words thus wrested from Jeremias. This error further augments the confusion by the introduction of David and Adam into the sisters' dispute.

## SECTION II. MYSTÈRES SHOWING INFLUENCE OF GREBAN AND BONAVENTURA.

The plays thus far described have been modelled solely upon Greban for the scenes of the controversy between the sisters. I come next to a group of three plays—the *Concep-*

<sup>4</sup>See Petit de Julleville, II: 425.

The *Bibliophile Belgique*, VI: 68-70, Brussels, 1871, mentions a singular poem (written as a school exercise) by Pierre Bello, a priest at Dinant, printed at Namur, 1634, which, from the opening stanzas there printed, seems to be a revision of the French "Procès" now under discussion. Although the Namuraise poem was reprinted at Brussels in 1874, I have been unable to find any copy of it, but its title is almost identical with that of our mystere,—*Procès et Appointment de la Justice et Misericorde divine au parquet de Dieu sur la redemption du genre humaine.* (See Rothschild, Intro. to *Viel Testament.*)

<sup>5</sup>But see the English *Charter of the Abbey*, where a somewhat similar scene occurs.

tion, the Valenciennes *Passion* and the Rouen *Incarnation*—in which there is a combination of features borrowed from Greban and Bonaventura.

The first of this group, the *Conception*,<sup>6</sup> said to have been played at Paris as early as 1507, is full of long and diffuse speeches, which throughout are carefully balanced in length. The first scene reads like an amplification of the corresponding scene in the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*.<sup>7</sup> No new arguments are added to those employed by Bonaventura. The only change from Bonaventura's version is the introduction of a Devil scene at the point when Misericorde and Justice set out to find a sinless man who will consent to die as man's substitute. Time for their search having been allowed by this interpolated devil scene, the action continues as in Bonaventura's version to the end of the scene. The scenes which follow deal with the relations of Joachim and Anna, the laments of the fathers in limbo, and the Annunciation to Zacharias.

At this point a second "Proces" is introduced. Misericorde comes again before the Father begging for favor, only to be opposed again by Justice, who declares that it is merest justice that he who has done wrong should be punished, shut out from heaven, and enclosed in hell for his great outrage. To this Misericorde replies in the words used by Pais in Greban where the Father turns to her for her opinion, and she suggests that it would be a misfortune

<sup>6</sup>The full title reads: *Le Mistère de la Conception, Nativité, Mariage et Annonciation de la Benoïste Vierge Marie, Avec la Nativité de Jesuchrist et son enfance*. The earliest edition appeared in 1511. It has been successively edited by Trepperel, de Marnef, Lotrian and Pierre Sergent. For an account of editions Cf. Brunet, *Manuel*, II, 1967-71. Cf. also Petit de Julleville, II, 427, and Parfaict, *Histoire du Théâtre Français*, Paris, 1745, I. pp. 76-84.

<sup>7</sup>Hartmann (ZfdA, XXIII, 186) endeavors to prove that this scene in the *Conception* rests directly upon Bernard's Sermon, and cites a number of parallel passages from the two, but, as it happens, these passages are also to be found in Bonaventura, whereas other points in this scene of the *Conception* which find a parallel in Bonaventura are not in his predecessor's sermon.

if the beauteous heavens were closed to man and many virtuous men and women were left to suffer without hope. From this point to the end of the scene the *Conception* agrees exactly with Greban.

The other play, showing dependence upon both Greban and Bonaventura,<sup>8</sup> is *Le Passion et Resurrection de nostre sauveur et redempteur Jhesucrist, ainsi qu'elle fut juée en Valenciennes, et en le an 1547, par grace de maistre Nicaise Chamart, seigneur de Asembergue, alors prevost de la ville.*<sup>9</sup> The opening scene is taken directly from the introduction in the *Conception*. Then after the history of Joachim and Anna, which is interrupted by a glimpse of the grieving fathers in limbo and of the plotting devils, the "Proces" is resumed. God declares his purpose of granting to Anna a daughter, Mary, the glorious flower of virginity, who shall become the mother of the Redeemer. Justice admits God's power but questions whether it is just that the Redeemer should suffer baseness and affliction, as He must if he is born through man. Misericorde would have this avoided, but Justice insists that all the lineage of Adam must suffer misery, and Misericorde yields, hoping that when the time of suffering comes she will have found a remedy. An angel is sent with the glad news to Anna and Joachim, and the first day closes with their meeting at the Golden Gate.

On the second day, after the account of Mary's birth and presentation, the fathers are again seen mourning in

<sup>8</sup>Petit, de Julleville, II: 422-24.

<sup>9</sup>Contained in MS. 12536 fr. (Anc. sup. fr. 5155) in the Bibl. Nat., Paris, an enormous series of plays arranged for twenty-five days from the plays of Greban, Michel and others.

Another Valenciennes *Passion*, sometimes quoted as containing this scene, is in the MS. Valenciennes 449 (anc. 421) which is described in the catalogue of that Library belonging to the series of French catalogues published by the government as a *mystère* for twenty days. *Copie abrégée du mystère, de Jean Morel le quel est un remaniement de celui d'Arnoul Greban.* I have been unable to see this manuscript, but the librarian at Valenciennes writes me that it does not contain the scene in question. (Rothschild, MS. 560; Mangeart, 421.) Cf. Petit de Julleville, II: 418-421.

limbo, and Oraison<sup>10</sup> is sent from them to Misericorde to beg her to go before God in their behalf. Misericorde promises to do her best for them and Oraison, and presents herself before the Father's throne. The pleading which follows is identical with that in the *Conception*, except that the name of Pais is changed to Charite.

In this outline I have assumed that the author of the Valenciennes *Passion* derived the material of his "Proces" at second-hand through the *Conception* instead of going back directly to Greban, the source upon which the *Conception* depended. This assumption seems to be established by a significant coincidence. In the second "Proces" of the *Conception* the speech which marks the junction with Greban is given to Misericorde instead of to Pais as in Greban's *Passion*. Now in the Valenciennes *Passion* also these lines are given to Misericorde. This, taken with the fact that the Valenciennes play at no point follows Greban rather than the *Conception*, makes it altogether probable that the latter was the medium through which the scene was derived.

In following the *Conception*, however, the author of the Valenciennes *Passion* has rearranged the scene somewhat. Instead of leaving it a single long scene as in his source, he has broken it into two. The first, ending at the point where the sisters learn from Sapience the solution of their difficulty, is followed by the epilogue which closes the second day's play. The third day is opened by the return of the sisters to God with a report of Sapience's solution. After the reluctant yielding of the Father to His Son's death,

<sup>10</sup>This new character, Oraison, the personification of the prayers and laments of the fathers given in other French dramas, is of interest in connection with a play which lies outside the limits of the monograph. This is *De eerste Blijscap van Maria* (ed Willems, Gent. 1845), given in Brussels in 1444 by a company of Antwerp players. There Bitter Ellinde, by her woes brought on by man's sins, moves the pity of Innig Gebet, who with her auger bores her way into heaven and persuades Ontfermicheit to plead for man's deliverance. A somewhat similar scene is that which opens the pleading in Fletcher's *Christ's Victories* (see Chapter IX), the characters there being Repentance and Faith.

the reconciliation of the sisters in accordance with David's prophecy is effected at once, instead of waiting as in Greban until after Christ's ascension. Oraison is then sent to bear the joyful news to the captives in hell, and the scene closes with the joy of the fathers and the rage of devils. The whole agrees, therefore, with the *Conception* except for the addition of the two short scenes concerning the annunciation to Anna and the mission of Oraison.

In these two plays, the *Conception* and the *Valenciennes Passion*, the indebtedness to Greban and Bonaventura is clearly seen, and the parts due to each are easily distinguished, but the Rouen *Incarnation*,<sup>11</sup> presented in 1474, offers a more difficult problem. Here is seen a fusion of different elements not easy to separate. The debt to Bonaventura and Aquinas is acknowledged by the author himself, evidently an ecclesiastic, who justifies the argument he employs by quoting his sources in the margins of his folios. But an outline of the plot will suggest that he knew also Greban's *mystère*.

The play is arranged for two days only, the first of

*"Mystère de l'Incarnation et Nativité de Notre Sauveur et Rédempteur Jesus-Christ, Représenté à Rouen à 1474. Pub. d'après un imprimé du XVe siècle par Pierre le Verdier, Rouen, 1886. In the introduction of this edition, M. le Verdier says that apparently no manuscript of this mystère exists and that it has only one edition of which but three copies are extant. Of this a print was made by the Société des Bibliophiles Normands, and it is this print which le Verdier edits.*

By a careful system of elimination, he arrives at a period between 1454 and 1474 as the time when the *mystère* must have been written, and he inclines toward the later date. Parfaict says that this work is dependent upon the *Conception*, but this le Verdier denies, declaring it to be formed on a wholly different plan. Nor does he find any passage which one could prove borrowed from the other *mystères*, nor any similarity not forced by the subject. The fact that the speakers in the "Proces" accumulate so many texts he regards as a proof of the originality of the work. The author is a learned ecclesiastic who quotes widely from the Bible, the Christian Fathers, the *Legenda Aurea* and the pagan philosophers, always citing his source in the margins. He also adds notes which are of interest, since they refer to previous *mystères* in Rouen now lost. The authorities quoted for the scene in question are Bonaventura and St. Thomas. Cf. Petit de Julleville, II: 430-37.

which contains the "Proces."<sup>12</sup> This opens with the prophecies of Christ's advent and the story of the altar in honor of the coming King built by Octavian when he hears the sybil's prophecies. Then follows the lament of the fathers in limbo and their prayers for redemption. After an account of the sacrifice in the new temple of Apollo, "est Paradis ouvert, fait en maniere de trone et rayons d'or tout en tour. Au milieu duquel est Dieu, en une chaire patee; et au costé dextre de lui Paix et sous elle, Misericorde. Au senestre Justice, et sous elle, Verite; et tout en tour d'elles neuf ordres d'anges les uns sur les autres." The pleading is opened by the four archangels, followed by the nine orders, with arguments taken from Bonaventura's opening chorus of angels. The marginal note quotes this passage from Bonaventura, and then a second note gives the rest of the quotation, the pleading between the four sisters.

The angels' pleas ended, Misericorde presents reasons why God is bound to listen to her, if he would fulfil the Scriptures. Moses in Exodus declares, "Deus misericors, clemens, multe miserationis," and Isaiah adds the golden words, "Miserationum Domini recordabor." Jeremiah gave a fruitful lesson, "Non irascar in perpetuum." Daniel also wrote, "Custodiens pactum et misericordiam," and later the good Abacuc says "Misericordie recordaberis," while David spoke of God's mercy here and there a thousand times, "Miseracors et miserator." So she could find in Scripture a hundred other instances, but these should suffice. Moreover, the angels cry for pardon for man, and peace between God and man. Following this long speech is a sort of antiphonal hymn of entreaty by Misericorde and Paix in which the refrain is "Alas, Lord, drive me not away from this lovely company of angels."

God replying to Misericorde, says that Verite and Justice deserve equally to be heard. Thereupon Verite ex-

<sup>12</sup>See Petit de Julleville. II: 430. I: 392-3. for analysis.

presses her disapproval of Misericorde's plea for one who had sinned against God in breaking a command so light and easy to keep, and who, not satisfied with the beautiful and pleasing place appointed for him, had dared in his presumption to aspire to be like God. She grants Misericorde's good will, but thinks it mistaken. "To yield to Misericorde," she says, "will be my overthrow." Misericorde answers, "I in turn must be destroyed if man be finally hurled to hell, as Verite demands with cruel rigor." Verite quotes God's sentence of death to man when eating the apple. If he escape, God's word becomes untrue, and she will be ruined.

Now Misericorde urges that the sentence can be kept and yet man be saved; for that sentence implied only corporal death whereby the corruptible body should be separated from the soul. Thus Verite in demanding eternal death<sup>13</sup> would defeat the end for which God created man. The sentence was comminative only, not definitive, as can be illustrated by Jonah's prophecy of destruction to the Ninevites, which was remitted for those who were penitent. Many men have been virtuous and so deserve escape from the condemnation; such, for example, was Abraham, who was willing to sacrifice his son at God's command. Justice replied that Abraham was sufficiently rewarded in the great wealth with which he was blessed; but Misericorde, taking her argument from the axiom that the end should be better than anything leading up to it, shows how worthless is earthly bliss if the end be misery.

God now calls upon Justice to speak, and she proceeds to demolish Misericorde's carefully constructed argument in behalf of mercy. "Misericorde says much of mercy, but I hear nothing of justice, though it is written, 'Justitia plena est dextra tua.' She was foolish to quote 'Misericors Deus,' for after that is written 'ac verax,' and 'qui reddis iniquitatem patrum in filiis et nepotibus.' Next, I remember the words she took from Isaiah, but just before is, 'Ego qui

<sup>13</sup>Cf. note on Anselm, Chap. IV, n. 5.



loquar justiciam.' And there is no distance between His word and deed who made the world by His word. Then she quoted from Jeremiah, 'Non irascar,' but omitted 'Loquar iudicia mea cum eis!' She quoted Daniel, but not the words before her phrase, 'Deus magne terribilis!' Afterwards she took Abacuc's 'Misericordie recordaberis' without adding 'cum iratus fueris.' And when she spoke of David's word 'misericors,' I remember she left out 'et justus.' In short, my sister, in all His works you and I are together."

Misericorde is pained by this attempt to twist her words, but still maintains that man may have pardon, not by merit, as Justice scornfully interjects, but by divine mercy. Justice would combat this by showing that man's sin was like Lucifer's, but this point Misericorde refutes by pronouncing the six distinctions between their sins.<sup>14</sup> Worsted here, Justice persists: "I have still an argument. To satisfy Justice some one must die; for remission without satisfaction is impossible." Misericorde assents. "But he has nothing with which to give satisfaction;" continues Justice, "for his offence is infinite." Here Paix intervenes and three times beseeches them to drop a controversy, so unfitting to sisters. From this point to the end of the scene the text follows Bonaventura; the Father writes the sentence concerning "bona mors," Paix reads, and Misericorde and Justice go out in search of a sinless man.

In the next scene the devils, alarmed, take council and send Astaroth to earth, and Verite, seeking an innocent man comes to Rome in time to witness the sacrifice to the idols there. Discouraged, she wends her way to Jerusalem as a last resort, the place in all the world most sacred, but her quest is vain. In the temple she hears the high priest complaining that his profits from the oblations are no larger, and admitting that, to obtain the dignity of his office, he bribed Herod with one-third of his goods. In despair of success, and with sorrow for the grief among the angels

<sup>14</sup>See Chap. V, n. 11.

if Misericorde has not prospered better than she, Verite returns to Paradise.

Meanwhile Misericorde calls upon the angels for help, reminding them of the joy that will be theirs if their ruin may be restored and heaven's seats refilled. Her words bring perturbation. Gabriel urges Michel as prince to assume the undertaking. Raphael and Uriel recognize their incapability of so high a charge. Then Michel, impelled by the others, humbly answers, that, while they all desire Adam's redemption more than they can say, there is not one of them who feels he has sufficient power, virtue, and love to make satisfaction for Adam's sin. Here occurs another antiphonal passage, Misericorde asking ever, "Who will it be?" and the others answering in turn, "Alas, I know not one of great enough dignity and sovereignty." Misericorde turns away sorrowing at the grief there will be in heaven if Justice has not been more successful.

The sisters meet; and again the antiphonal effect is repeated. Three times they greet each other in this way, "I am come my sister." "Alas, what cheer?" "And you?" "But you?" "Have you found none?" When finally they report how ill they have fared, all are in bitter grief, but Paix reproaches them for lack of understanding. At length the Father says that He will send His Son to earth, and tells the pains He must there suffer. Hymns of praise from the sisters and the angels follow this announcement. Paix declares that thus God, like a perfect workman, makes all perfect. As no house is perfect till the last is joined to the first, so Christ, the first created, by joining himself to man, the last, completes the divine work. To this Misericorde adds that it is a part of God's goodness that nothing should lack the good of which it is capable, wherefore it is fit that man now receive the blessing. Justice says, "And as it befits divine wisdom that satisfaction be made for every offence, so it behooves God to do what man could not." Finally Verite approves that divine wisdom which assumes

that fallen nature should be restored to its pristine honor, which is only made possible by union with God. She suggests then the propriety of their fulfilling David's prophecy that they should meet together and kiss. They gladly accord, and the whole ends with chants of praise.

From this account it is seen that the general plan of the "Proces" in the Rouen *Incarnation* is taken in its entirety from Bonaventura. But it is expanded by copious quotations from the Scriptures and from Aquinas, the latter, as I believe, adopted because of their previous use by Greban. Most of the passages showing agreement with Greban, it is true, are those drawn from Aquinas, yet the fact of the similar application of these passages in Greban's *mystère* and in this one seems to me significant.

My analysis of the plot yields the following results. After the opening scene, which is original, comes one suggesting Greban in the laments of the fathers in limbo. It is followed by another original scene. The borrowing from Bonaventura begins at this point with the angels' prayers and continues to Verite's assertion of the inviolability of God's sentence. The text is expanded, however, by a number of original passages:—Misericorde's accumulation of texts to prove God's mercy, a counter accumulation by Justice, and Misericorde's discussion of the meaning of the sentence of death. The references to the purpose of man's creation and the escape of virtuous men from eternal punishment suggest Greban, as does Verite's denunciation of man's lack of gratitude for the beautiful place in which God placed him and her assertion of the likeness of man's and Lucifer's sins. This assertion is disproved by the six distinctions which Greban quotes from Aquinas. Nor does the likeness to Greban end until Justice refuses to yield before satisfaction has been given her and insists that no satisfaction is possible for an offence which is infinite. With the intervention of Paix a return to Bonaventura's version is effected. The only other insertion of importance is the scene intro-

duced to allow an interval for the search of Misericorde and Justice for a substitute for man. The antiphonal responses of the sisters are rather expansions of hints given by Bonaventura than insertions of new matter.

### SECTION III. *La Vengeance Nostre Seigneur.*

The dramas thus far discussed in this chapter have been classified in two groups, those influenced by Greban alone, and those showing the influence of both Greban and Bonaventura. *La Vengeance Nostre Seigneur*, an anonymous<sup>15</sup> play which remains to be mentioned, is independent of either. It is further separated from the other plays by the fact that the debate is here given a unique application. Since it had no influence on other versions, however, *Le Ven-*

<sup>15</sup>*La Vengeance Nostre Seigneur par personnages.* Antoine Verard, 1491. Bibl. Nat. Paris. See Gröber II. I. p. 1229 and de Julleville II: 45-60 f. For full description see L. Paris: *Toiles peintes et Tapisseries de la Ville de Reims ou la misc en scène du Théâtre des Confrères de la Passion*, Paris, 1843. Richard, however, in the introduction to his edition of the *Passion de MS. 697 Arras*, already described as Mercadé's *Passion*, says that he does not print the *Vengeance* of that same manuscript, because it is practically the same as the *Vengeance* printed by Verard in 1491. The *Vengeance* in MS. Arras 697 is a signed work of Mercadé. If it be true, that the two plays on the *Vengeance* are essentially the same, one may assume that Mercadé is the author of this *Vengeance* printed by Verard. If so, a remark made by Justice in this print is of value as tending to confirm Mercadé's authorship of the *Passion* in MS. Arras 697. Unfortunately, I have not been able to see the Arras manuscript in order to discover whether the same remark is there. It occurs where Justice is demanding vengeance against the Jews. She says she will make for her first allegation Adam's transgression, which condemned all his posterity to death and captivity. The condemnation, however, had been revoked through pity of humanity and to end the discord between God and man. This had been accomplished at a past "Appointment" when at the supplication of Paix and Misericorde it was determined that Jesus should redeem humanity. Therefore Justice says she does not base her present demand for the execution of the Jews on this first transgression. This is plainly a reference to an earlier play in which the debate occurs in connection with Christ's Passion, and as such is the case in the *Passion* of MS. 697 Arras, and as this is followed by a *Vengeance* it seems not unreasonable to assume that the present reference is to that *Passion* and that this linking of it to the *Vengeance* implies a common author, Mercadé, for the *Vengeance* and *Passion*.

*geance*, though curiously interesting, can have but scant notice here. In the prologue Josephus and Egissipus are cited as authorities for the facts. The subject of God's vengeance upon the Jews was a very popular one, and it is frequently developed in both religious chronicle and drama, but in no other of the cases which I have examined does the debate between the sisters enter.<sup>16</sup>

The debate, which is very long, is opened by Justice's demand for the utter destruction of the Jews, the occasion of her outbreak being the gross corruption of the high priests and their indifference to the sacrilegious dancing and rioting of the Jerusalem girls and youth before the temple. Misericorde opposes, and God commands each to state her arguments at length, appointing Verite and Paix as judges. They do so, and Justice wins. Having gained her demand that the Jews be destroyed, Justice proceeds to describe the manner of their punishment in three terrible sentences. These Misericorde seeks, but unsuccessfully, to annul as too terrible and inhuman. God asks Verite and Paix for their opinions as to the merits of the case. The former, of course, sides with Justice, the latter with Misericorde; Paix adds the pleas of human frailty and of strong and subtle enemies which are so common in the *mystères*. The debate is transferred to these two, Verite forcing Paix to concessions, point by point, until the condemnation of the Jews is complete. God then pronounces sentence, granting to Justice all her claims and to Misericorde hope for those who repent and are converted. To induce their penitence, He will cause many signs and wonders, a promise which much comforts Misericorde, who hopes that all may be thus terrified into turning from their sins. With this the scene ends, a scene which may have been suggested in its mere germ by the judgment scene already described in the *Processus Belial*. Its development is, however, wholly original.

<sup>16</sup>See instances in Petit de Julleville or Gröber.

## SECTION IV. SUMMARY.

To sum up what has been brought out by this account of the growth of the allegory in the French drama, four names have been repeatedly cited as centers of influence: Bonaventura for the angels' pleading and explanation of the Son's peculiar fitness to redeem man; Grosseteste for the feudal elements; Maerlant<sup>17</sup> for the introduction of the Devil motive which seems to enter the *mystère* through the *Mascheroen*; and Deguilleville for the transformation which produced Sapience and Charite. Of these Bonaventura and Grosseteste are directly dependent upon Bernard. Maerlant upon Hugo. Deguilleville combines from all earlier sources.

From Deguilleville descended, either directly or, more probably, through the medium of Mercadé, Greban, the chief center for the dramatic development. Here we find devil scenes, which though detached from the controversy between the four sisters, yet preserve many of the elements which mark these scenes in the *Mascheroen*; a prayer for redemption preceding the "Proces de Paradis," though here voiced not by the angels as in Bonaventura, but by the prophets and patriarchs in hell; and the appeal to Sapience borrowed from Deguilleville. The justification of the Son's death was probably also suggested to Greban by Bonaventura, although in the arguments employed he has recourse rather to Thomas Aquinas. From St. Thomas also comes the discussion of the relative sin of man and Lucifer, which was also employed by the *Mascheroen* and Deguilleville, though at less length.

Closely connected with Greban's Passion are the *Viel*

<sup>17</sup>The *Mascheroen*, of course, is only a revision of Maerlant's *Merlijn*, but it is closer to the French devil scenes. This acknowledgment of indebtedness to Maerlant is provisional only and subject to the limitations established in the fourth chapter; namely, that Maerlant be credited with the full development of the devil motive in connection with the debate between the sisters only until some earlier version be discovered. One can hardly doubt that such an one either in Latin, Spanish, or French once existed.

*Testament*, the *Troyes Passion*, and the *Proces qui a fait Misericorde contre Justice*. Equally close is the *Conception* for its main scene, but this *mystère* adds another taken directly from Bonaventura. Dependent upon the *Conception* is the still further expanded *Valenciennes Passion*, which keeps both the scenes from Bonaventura and Greban that its predecessor has, and adds two short original ones. But now Greban's influence almost disappears.

Preponderantly dependent upon Bonaventura is the Rouen *Incarnation*, which, although it is primarily based upon Bonaventura, adds original scenes and employs freely arguments from Greban.

All of the plays thus far mentioned represent the "Proces" as a controversy which results in the incarnation of Christ. But the Provençal *mystères* which are merely dramatizations of the *Behal*, and the *Vengeance*, which may have been suggested from the same source, deal with other questions,—the sentence pronounced upon Christ, His judgment of the whole world at the last day, and the destruction of the Jews. These last plays mark the decadence of the allegory in France; it still survived, however, in a few morality plays which will next be examined.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE FRENCH MORALITIES AND GROSSE-TESTE'S INFLUENCE UPON THEM.

When one turns to the dramatic treatment of the allegory of the Four Daughters of God in the French moralities, it is the influence of Grosseteste rather than that of Bonaventura or Greban that is discovered. But this influence is introduced so indirectly that it is not at first perceived. It has already been pointed out that the versions which followed Grosseteste are usually narrative rather than dramatic in form; now it will be shown that Grosseteste exerted an indirect influence upon the drama also through the medium of a tale in the *Gesta Romanorum*<sup>1</sup> based upon the *Chateau d'Amour*.

This story in the *Gesta* was mentioned in the chapter dealing with Grosseteste as one of the versions dependent upon the *Chateau*, but an analysis of its plot was postponed until this point.

<sup>1</sup>*Gesta Romanorum*, ed. H. Oesterley, Berlin, 1872, p. 350-4. See also ed. by S. Herrtage (E. E. T. S. ext. ser. XXXIII, 1879), pp. 132-35. In a note on page 470, Herrtage adds a notice of two versions of the allegory of the Four Daughters which I have not been able to see; an English poem by W. Forrest in MS. Harl. 1703 fol. 82<sup>b</sup>, and a Latin *Disputacio inter Misericordiam, Veritatem, Justitiam, et Pacem de restitutione hominis perditii* in MS. Reg. 6 E III, fol. 16<sup>b</sup>. The latter is identically the same version as in the Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 34763 fol. 63. Finally, I have learned (through Dr. Brown) of two manuscripts which seem to contain this allegory from the *Gesta Romanorum* detached from the others of that collection. The first is M.S. Douce CLXIX, fol. 3, *De quatuor sororibus, scilicet, misericordia, justitia, veritate, et pace*. The title of Balliol Coll. MS. CCXXVIII (sec. XV), No. 22 (fol. 278<sup>b</sup>) reads: "*De quodam rege qui habuit quatuor filias; sc. Misericordia, Verite, Pax, et Justice*. As I have learned of these notices since this dissertation was presented, I have not been able to discover whether they are the same as the tale in *Gesta Romanorum*.



SECTION I. THE ALLEGORY IN THE *Gesta Romanorum*.

That the variant in the *Gesta Romanorum* is derived directly from Grosseteste, there can be little doubt. In it one finds the same feudal setting, the King with four daughters, the son exceeding all others in wisdom and every lovely quality, and the faithless servant. But the last element is wholly transformed, there being here two offenders, as will be seen in the following outline from which I omit the introduction, since it is like that in all the versions of the Grosseteste type.

The King sought a suitable wife for his son and chose the beautiful daughter of the King of Jerusalem; but she after a time was seduced by a trusted servant of the King's son, into whose charge had been given the young wife. When her sin was discovered, she was divorced, deprived of all her honors, and sent away by her sorrowing husband. Soon she fell into such poverty that she had to beg her bread from door to door. When her husband, upon hearing of this, was so moved to pity that he sent a messenger to bring her back, she, though wishing to return, dared not come, even though the messenger assured her that his master was above the law, so that he could safely defy it in receiving her again. Still fearful, she begged that he himself would come and give her a kiss of forgiveness.

The King, who had been informed of his son's action, convened a council of all his officials, at which it was determined to send a wise man to bring home the penitent wife, but no one could be found in the kingdom willing to undertake the mission. Her husband, hearing of her bitter grief when this was reported to her, went to his father and offered personally to go to free her from her woe and bring her back with him. The father was pleased at this and answered: "Go in thy strength and bring her." But the elder sister, Justitia, was angered when she heard this, and, coming to her father, she declared that the sentence of divorce and banishment had been just, and that if the recreant were

restored, she herself would no longer be the King's daughter. Veritas spoke to the same effect. Misericordia, on the contrary, threatened not to remain the King's daughter unless mercy were shown the sister who had already suffered so grievously. At the sight of the discord between her sisters, Pax fled the land. Veritas and Justitia, drawing their swords, presented them to the King with the demand that the guilty woman be killed. Misericordia, however, snatched the swords away, crying that her sisters had ruled long enough, and that the time had come for her to be heard, a claim which so impressed Justitia, that at her wish their brother was called in to arbitrate their dispute.

He, expressing his distress at his sisters' discord and the flight of Pax, declared his willingness to suffer for his wife. Turning to Misericordia, he asked: "If my wife, after her restoration, sins again, will you again plead for her?" Her answer, "Not unless she is penitent," seemed to satisfy him, for he commanded them to cement the restored peace with a kiss. Then he went forth from his kingdom, made war for his wife, and brought her back with all honor. "Et sic ambo vitam in pace finiverunt."

The author at the conclusion of his story adds an exhaustive commentary in explanation of each point in it. Of these additions, one is of importance because of its application in the play *L'Amour Divin*. The Son of God, runs the commentary, declared his willingness to assume incarnation for man, and asked Justitia if that would not suffice. "No," answered Justitia. Then said the Son, "I will suffer hunger, and thirst, temptation and sorrow, will mingle my blood with my sweat," but again Justitia said "No." Next He told her that He would be flagellated, derided, and deserted; then that He would be bound to the cross; finally that He would die, and, rising from the dead, ascend to heaven, there to prepare a place for His bride. Justitia, obdurate till the last, then broke forth into praise at this exhibition of love.

From the foregoing analysis the dependence of this story in the *Gesta Romanorum* upon the *Chasteau* is evident. Not only does it contain the same feudal setting of the King, his incomparable son and four daughters and his faithless servant, but in many minor points it recalls Grosseteste's poem. The sisters accuse each other of unsisterly spirit in the zeal of each to uphold her own authority at the expense of the others, and they threaten the father that they will cease to remain his daughters unless their requests be accorded. Pax, distressed by the controversy, flees the land; and the King's son goes forth to make war upon the enemy, and thus ends the discord and restores Pax.

In the unavailing effort to find some one who will accept the mission of bringing home the unhappy wife, there is a reminiscence of the fruitless quest of Misericorde and Verite in Bernard's version. But in the transference of interest from the disobedient servant of the *Chasteau* to the faithless wife of the *Gesta*, the latter is original. The new turn here introduced may, however, have been suggested by the sixteenth chapter of Ezekiel, where is described God's endless love for Jerusalem, her monstrous adultery, and the grievous judgment pronounced upon her, with the hint of mercy at the end.

## SECTION II. *L'Amour Divin.*

This tale from the *Gesta* became the direct source of *L'Amour Divin*,<sup>2</sup> a play by Jean Gaulohe, which, according to a note<sup>3</sup> appended to the manuscript, was licensed to be printed at Troyes, July 26, 1601. The play is lacking in originality, and is little more than a dramatization of the story just outlined. The names of the persons involved are

<sup>2</sup>*L'Amour Divin—Tragicomedie Contenant un bref discours des Saintes et Sacres mystères de la Redemption de l'humaine nature. Par Jean Gaulohe, à Troyes chez Claude Briden. Copied in Collection Soleinne XI, No. 3, MS. fr. 9306, Bibl. Nat. Paris.*

<sup>3</sup>Fol. 161.

self-explanatory except for L'Astree, Chemis, and Eleone, who are the representatives of Justice, Peace, and Mercy respectively.

In the first scene, the King extols his own power after the traditional fashion, and recites the praise of his various daughters. To Physique, whom he especially loves, he will give a place in a beautiful garden where she may live in joy; and as a guardian to protect her from attacks of enemies he will send her Lucerin, a sage and subtle servant. We then see Physique rejoicing in the beauty of her new possessions, until Lucerin enters with feigned words of condolence that she should be so imprisoned by her cruel father and deprived of the one fruit which could give her wisdom and immortality. Together they set out to find this fruit.

The second act opens with the King's denunciation of Lucerin, who is exiled to the desert of the world, there to suffer untold pain till he shall long in vain for death. Then the scene changes, and Physique is heard lamenting her sin and praying for pity. She dares not plead with her father or her elder sister, and even through her dearest sister Eleone can hope for only partial pardon, happy if she may live at home as the lowest servant.<sup>4</sup> Now she must labor for her bread.

Meanwhile Eleone in deep grief because of the exile of Physique, her other half, with whom she had divided every thought until Lucerin had estranged her, goes to her brother Amour, who is so wise and powerful that he will know how to devise help. She tells him that Physique has confessed and deplored her sin and so wins his support. A messenger is sent to tell Physique that her brother and sister are going to plead for her return. She is incredulous at first, and fearful of the strong influence of Astree and Verite against her, but is persuaded to a more hopeful view.

The fourth act contains the long suit of Amour for his sister. He begins, "Father, when I think of Physique's

<sup>4</sup>Cf. the Prodigal Son.

extreme suffering I cannot contain myself. Some way must be found to restore her; therefore, I beg you to revoke your sentence. Since no other will bear her punishment, let me release her." While the King is expressing his willingness to have her back and his pride in his son's nobility, Astree begins a sharp dispute with her brother, a dispute in which Verite and Eleone also join. On the one side is alleged the King's desire to forgive, the concessions due to ties of kinship, Physique's repentance; on the other, Physique's vileness and impotence to recover from her offence, and the necessity of upholding justice. Finally Eleone says, "You speak in vain; she will soon return, you'll see," to which Astree answers, "I'll prevent it with my shining sword." "No," replied Eleone, "You will lose that; for you have reigned too long." Astree as a last resort declares that Physique cannot return without paying the ransom, but this Amour promises to pay.

Then ensues a laconic dialogue between the two, of which the chief points may be thus summarized. Astree warns him that he may be slain. Amour: "I am ready to take her mantle." Astree: "Then your case is assured." Amour: "I will suffer a thousand affronts for her." Astree: "That will win her." Amour: "I will suffer cold." Astree: "Father, for that I am appeased." Amour: "And famine." Astree: "At that moment you will retrieve her ruin." Amour: "I will be bound to a column." Astree: "Thus you guarantee her person from evil." Amour: "I will be nailed hand and foot to the cross." Astree: "Humanity will therefore be freed from death." Amour: "Blood will flow to earth." Astree: "Twill appease a bloody war." Amour: "I will yield my soul to my father." Astree: "My heart glows with a flame of love." Amour: "My side will be pierced." Astree: "To purge the world." Amour: "I will descend to inferno." Astree: "But win a royal crown. Clearly Physique may be restored, since your love is so perfect."

The fifth act depicts the return of Amour, who has suffered all the torments which he promised to undergo, and who, restored to his throne, would have his sisters formally united in peace under the law of Chemis, the sister who represents Pax in older versions.

The ensuing dialogue has no bearing upon our allegory. Its burden is the plaint of Verite that in the new reign of peace, her power in France is lost. She is comforted in part by the promise that Lucerin shall be rigorously punished.

From this summary it will be seen that, except in the fact that Physique is the sister of the King's son instead of the wife, *L'Amour Divin* is identical in plot with the *Gesta Romanorum*. The only changes are the direct presentation of the traitorous conduct of Lucerin, which in the *Gesta* is merely mentioned, the different attitude taken from the outset by Astree when Amour describes the torments he is willing to endure for Physique, and the local touches in the last act where Astree must yield her sway in France to Chemis. The scene of reconciliation, while implied in the Latin story, is not there fully developed. Its introduction in *L'Amour Divin* suggests the probability that Gaulohe knew Deguilleville's, Greban's, or some other version where the scene occurs.

### SECTION III. THE *Moralité de Nature*.

In connection with the two plots just compared, it is interesting to examine an earlier morality which may have been known to the author of *L'Amour Divin*. In this, the *Moralité de Nature et Loy de Rigueur*,<sup>5</sup> the central figure is Nature, or Humana Natura, to whom, of course, Physique in the later play corresponds. The play opens with the lament of Nature over her sad condition because of her sin,

<sup>5</sup>*Nature et Loy de Rigueur, Moralité a VI Personnages*, ed. by Leroux de Lincy et Francisque Michel. (*Recueil de Farces, Moralités et Sermons Joyeux*, Paris, 1837, No. III.) Also in Ms. 24341 fr. Bib. Nat., Paris, 16th century, and in Emile Picot: *Théâtre Mystique de Pierre du Val et des Libertins spirituels de Rouen*, 1882.

to whom Loy de Rigueur brings no comfort, as she emphasizes the heinousness of her sin and its hopelessness of help. The scene then changes and shows Divin Pouvoir proclaiming his power. Amour, full of compassion, asks permission to relieve the believing and penitent sinner. This his father, Divin Pouvoir, gladly grants and he sends a messenger, Loy de Grace, to comfort Nature with this hope. Nature can hardly believe such good news, but after Loy de Grace has said that God himself will effect the release, she rejoices greatly. Loy de Rigueur seeing her joy, comes forward and asks anxiously what is purposed. When the messenger answers that the corrupt body is to be changed to one of perfect purity, she denies that it can have any end but death, because of Adam's sin. A sharp dispute ensues between the two, who represent Justice and Mercy, the former insisting that all are polluted by the first offence, the latter declaring that Loy de Rigueur wastes time and words in defying what God has chosen to accomplish through His own Son. At this Loy de Rigueur is forced to yield through her admiration of such devotion, but she mourns that henceforth her own power is lost, since peace will return. The Annunciation to Mary follows.

Although this morality is much simpler and shortened in plot, its likeness to the *Gesta* and *L'Amour Divin* is obvious. In all are the scenes of the remorseful sinner comforted by a messenger from Amour promising relief, the father's rehearsal of his own power, Amour's spontaneous offer, the controversy it gives rise to, and the final glad yielding of Justice. Not in the *Gesta*, but common to the other two are the declaration that Justice only wastes time by her resistance to Mercy and the regret of Justice at finding her power gone.

#### SECTION IV. *Le Laz d'Amour Divin.*

Another earlier play suggests the tale from the *Gesta*, though but slightly, the thoroughly mystical poem *Le Laz*

*d'Amour Divin*,<sup>6</sup> which according to a study made of the Rouen theatre by E. Gosselin was there played about 1500.<sup>7</sup> It is divided into two parts, only the first of which has any reference to the subject of this monograph.

In this, Charite, substituted here for Mercy, pleads with Jesus to come to the solace of L'ame who has long yielded her heart to Him and is longingly waiting for His coming. She tells Him there is no excuse for longer delay and bids Him observe the lesson of Spring and turn His thoughts to love.<sup>8</sup> Jesus in reply to Charite declares His readiness to go to His spouse. Accordingly He sends Charite to tell her that He is coming to dwell with her and change her mourning to joy, but He warns her that she must first make herself lovely by much weeping and penitence. He will come in a garment dyed with His own blood, and to prove His love will suffer shame and reproach and anguish for her.

Charite hastens to L'ame with the message, but finds her apathetic at first, her heart cold with fear and misery, and incredulous of such joy; but when she kisses her on the mouth, saying, "Receive the blood of Jesus and renew your joy," L'ame is thrilled to great love. Charite then tells her how to prepare herself for the espousal. She must bathe herself in the tears of penitence, put on a robe of azure covered with little flowers of innocence and edged with sable to prevent vainglory, wear a girdle of pearls to denote chastity, lace her arms in memory of Christ's passion, and cover her head in humility. By the sea, she will find a pure marguerite to give her espoused in token of her innocent

<sup>6</sup>*Le Laz d'Amour divin a viij personnages cest assavoir Charite, Jesucrist, Lame, Justice, Verite, Bonne Inspiracion, Les Filles de syon, Les pecheurs . . . nouvellement imprime a rouen pour Thomas Laisne demeurant au dit lieu.*

<sup>7</sup>E. Gosselin, *Recherches sur les Origines et l'Histoire du Theatre à Rouen avant Corneille*, Rouen, 1868.

<sup>8</sup>This passage is developed at length in the manner of the Song of Solomon 2:8-13. Indeed, the whole play in its general tone, somewhat suggests this Song, though I do not know of other specific points of contact.



soul, a sapphire of great beauty as a sign that she will be loyal to death, a ruby to show her constant meditation on His passion, and an emerald as symbol of her glowing love.

Having finished her instructions, Charite returns to Jesus to report. Justitia, upon hearing of this, is alarmed at Charite's assumption of authority, which so threatens her power, and is roused to defiance. It seems preposterous to her to consider for a moment Jesus' union with a soul so full of weakness and so prone to sin, nor is she convinced by Charite's assurance that this one is purged to loveliness. She next objects: "There is no dwelling on earth but is too poor and rude to lodge Jesus. What worthiness has L'ame to become the Lord's beloved?" "Piety and humility and the desire to acquire grace and merit," replies Charite. Nevertheless, Justice still thinks it infamous for the sovereign Lord to stoop to one so low. Now Verite, too, declares her opposition, since there is no one in all the world who is not in continual warfare against God. Charite calls this unfair; for it applies to her seditious enemies, not to her friends. Still Verite will not yield her point, but repeats that all are evil and that to leave one's vice for a little while avails nothing in God's count. Charite, feeling that the discussion has gone far enough, declares that the strife must end; for Jesus has expressed His willingness to espouse L'ame. She then says to Jesus, "I pray you, take and keep this soul that loves you." Jesus replies with a vow to receive her and accomplish all her will, and L'ame is heard crying, "Love, come to me, who gives her heart to you. I wait in my chamber, amassing flowers of virtue." With the union of Jesus and L'ame the first part ends.

I said this play was slightly suggestive of the story in the *Gesta Romanorum*, but the resemblance consists only in the general conception of Christ's determination to come to the solace of the soul to which he is espoused and of the opposition to this purpose excited in Justice and Verite. The longing of the soul for the coming of her spouse, His

readiness to go on hearing of this and His dispatch of a messenger to announce His coming, her trembling doubt and later joy and the horror of Justice at the thought of the degradation for Jesus in union with the soul are points of contact. But there the likeness ends. There is no hint of any definite special sin on the part of L'ame, such as causes the exile in the Latin story, but only the burden common to all humanity. Indeed, L'ame is represented as rather better than most mortals and as having long before yielded her whole heart to Jesus. She waits for Him as for a lover rather than as for one who comes to release her from physical suffering and exile, as in the *Gesta Romanorum* and the earlier versions generally. This is the tone of which I spoke before, borrowed from the Song of Solomon, which it also suggests in its luxuriance of symbolism. The idea of the marriage of Christ and the soul is found in patristic literature as early as the fifth century in the writings of Cæsarius of Arles.

#### SECTION V. SUMMARY.

The study of these three plays and the Latin story upon which they are based, has shown that the play latest in time, *L'Amour Divin*, is the only one which follows the *Gesta Romanorum* absolutely, while the *Moralite de Nature* and the *Laz d'Amour* exhibit only a general likeness of theme with occasional points of closer contact.

Although the allegory in the *Gesta Romanorum* is clearly derived from the *Chasteau d'Amour*, there is no obvious connection between this poem by Grosseteste and the plays to which the *Gesta* in turn gave rise. A certain similarity of tone, however, is perceptible. As the *Chasteau* introduced into the allegory a worldly element,—the picture of a feudal court, and more personal interests in the actors,—so the *Gesta Romanorum* version and the plays founded upon it carry the tendency further, reducing the importance

of the controversy between the sisters to center the interest upon the hapless soul whom Love comes to solace. But with this growth of the human interest, the allegory of the Four Daughters reaches its end so far as the French drama is concerned.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE ALLEGORY IN THE ENGLISH DRAMA.

As we have seen, the allegory of the Four Daughters furnished a frequent theme for the French *mystères*<sup>1</sup> and moralities. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, to see how small a part it plays in the English drama. Curiously enough, in the great English cycles it is introduced only once, where it appears as the first part of the play on the *Salutation and Conception* in the so-called Coventry, or Hegge, cycle. Among the moralities, however, it fares slightly better, as their fondness for allegorical subjects would lead one to expect. To judge from the announcement in the prologue, our allegory would seem possibly to have been in the oldest English morality known, *The Pride of Life*.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, only a portion of the text remains, so one can only speculate in regard to its existence. The allegory is also found in what is on the whole the greatest of the English moralities, *The Castell of Perseverance*, and, in a somewhat changed rôle, in the fourteenth century political morality, *Respublica*.

The problems presented by the form of the allegory in the *Salutation* and the *Castell of Perseverance* are so intimately connected that we may best consider these plays together. Although the origins of both the *Salutation* and the *Castell of Perseverance* have received some study by scholars, so far as the versions of the allegory of the Four Daughters are concerned the sources have not been thoroughly investigated. In the case of the *Castell of Perseverance* no definite source has been established: in that of

<sup>1</sup>Likewise for the German passion plays, though these lie outside the bounds of the present monograph.

<sup>2</sup>See A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England*, Quellen und Forschungen, LXXX: 8.

the *Salutation*, so far as I am aware, the only immediate source that has been suggested is the "Council of the Trinity" in the English *Speculum Vitae Christi*, pointed out by Hone.<sup>3</sup> With these English dramatic versions I wish to compare a version of the allegory found in the fourteenth century prose treatise, *The Charter of the Abbey of the Holy Ghost*,<sup>4</sup> which offers some special resemblances.

Inasmuch as the resemblances between the *Charter* and the *Salutation*<sup>5</sup> are particularly close, it may be well to begin by placing these two in parallel columns, and to postpone for the present the consideration of the *Castell of Perseverance*.

#### SECTION I. THE ALLEGORY IN THE *Salutation* PLAY COMPARED WITH THAT IN THE *Charter of the Abbey*.

The *Charter* gives an account of a place called Conscience where God founded His Abbey under the charge of twenty-nine ghostly ladies, the Virtues. A foul tyrant, Satan, having succeeded in gaining entrance to the abbey, drives away its inmates. This was when Eve listened to the serpent. Adam and Eve, in shame of their nakedness, seek the abbess, but cannot find her. They go to Wit, who tells them that the abbey has been destroyed through the eating of the apple.<sup>6</sup> At this point the parallel begins.

<sup>3</sup>See Chap. III, Section II.

<sup>4</sup>C. Horstmann: *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, London, 1896, *The Charter of the Abbey of the Holy Ghost*, No. 10, Vol. I, 337 ff., esp. 349-352, MS. Laud. 210, University Coll., Oxf. 97 (in Suffolk dialect). In MS. Vernon (ca. 1380 A. D.) the *Charter of the Abbey* forms a part of the *Abbey of the Holy Ghost*, while in other manuscripts the two allegories are found near together. From this juxtaposition the theory has been advanced that the former as well as the latter was written by Richard Rolle of Hampole. However that may be as to the latter, the dialect of the *Charter* is not Hampole's.

<sup>5</sup>Ed. Halliwell: *Ludus Coventriae* in Pub. Shakespeare Society, London, 1841. See also Pollard's *English Miracle Plays*, Oxford, 1904, pp. 44-46 and 191.

<sup>6</sup>This incident is interesting in comparison with a similar scene in the French *Proces qui a fait Misericorde*, etc., a scene which has hitherto been considered unique, see Chap. VI.

*The Charter of the Abbey of the Holy Ghost.*

After vain search for the abess Adam and Eve die, and go to hell, and not they only but all who follow them, "þe whyche kemen aftur þat be foure þousande sex hundred & foure ger," till God had pity on them and came down into the world for "þre and þritty ger." After Adam's death came many prophets and wise men, who sought the abbey and abess in vain, among others four good men and true, David and Solomon, Isaiah and Jeremiah, "& I pray you listenþ what þey seyden."'

\* \* \* \* \*

Isaiah "seyde þus  
*"Vtinam dirumperes celos & descenderes,* wolde god, he seyð, þou woldest bresten heuene & come adoon,"

\* \* \* \* \*

Then Jeremiah "made a reuful mone & seyde þus: '*Ve michi misero, quoniam addidit dominus dolorem dolori meo; laboravi in gemitu meo,* wo me wrecche, he seib, þat god haþ eked more sorowe to my sorowe. \* \* \* *Quis dabit capiti meo aquam & oculis meis fontem lacrimarum, & (die ac nocte) interfeccionem filie populi mei,* a, he seib, who schal geuen me water to myn heued, & who schal geuen a welle of terris to myn eyen, & I schal wepen for þe maydens þat ben þus goof away, boþe day & niȝt."

\* \* \* \* \*

*magna velud (mare est contritio tua;*

\* \* \* \* \*

'The greater part of this treatise, the search for the abess and her attendants, I omit as irrelevant to the discussion in hand. I also omit such parts of the *Salutation* as are mere amplification of what has been said.

*The Salutation and Conception.*

The *Salutation* opens with a statement by Contemplacia of man's desperate case. "Ffowre thowsand sex undryd foure gere I telle, Man... hath loyn geres in the peynes of helle," Though granting that he deserves to lie there forever, she prays for pity.

"Have mende of the prayour seyð by Ysaie,"

\* \* \* \* \*

Wolde God thou woldyst breke  
 thin hefne myghtye,  
 And com down here into erthe;  
 And levyn geres thre and thret-  
 tye,

\* \* \* \* \*

A! woo to us wrecchis that  
 wrecchis be,  
 ffor God hath addyd ssorowe to  
 sorwe;

\* \* \* \* \*

A! quod Jeremye, who xal gyff  
 wellys to myn eynes,  
 That I may wepe bothe day and  
 nyght?

\* \* \* \* \*

Me binkeþ þi sorowe is as grete  
as a see. \* \* \* "*Cecidit  
corona capitis nostri, ve nobis quia  
peccauimus, I ne can nougt ellis  
seyne, he seiþ, but, þe fairest  
flour of al oure garlond is fallen  
away; alas, alas & weloway, þat  
euere we dede svnne.*"

When God had heard these  
prophets, he had great pity and  
bethought himself how to deliver  
man's soul out of its sorry prison  
and reestablish the abbey.

[He called a council of the  
Trinity, for which, see below.]

And þanne were almighty goddis  
dougtrun þere, þat is to seye  
Mercy & Treube, Rigthfulnesse &  
Pees, þe whiche harden seyen þat  
mannus soule schulde be delyu-  
ered out of helle-pyne, & þei  
comen alle to-gedir aforn god al-  
mighty. & þanne seyde Trube  
þus: "*Ecce enim veritatem dil-  
existi, A, lord, scho seyde, þou  
hast git eueremore loued wele me  
þat am þi dougtr, and þanne,  
seyde Trube, I pray þe for-sake  
nougt me.*"

þou seydest þat whattyme þat  
man ete of þat appul, þat he  
schulde dieye & goft to helle;  
berfore gif þou delyuerest man  
þanne out of þat prisoun, þou  
destroyest me, & þat were no skil,  
*Quia veritas domini manet in  
eternum*, for whi goddys treube  
schulde dwellen euere-more wib-  
outen ende.

As grett as the se, Lord, was  
Adamys contryssyon ryght,  
ffrom oure hed is fialle the crowne,  
Man is comeryd in synne, I crye  
to thi syght,

Gracyous Lord! Gracyous Lord!  
Gracyous Lord, come downe!

Contemplacio's entreaty for  
pity is seconded by the Virtutes,  
whose office it is to present to  
God the supplication of the  
prophets and patriarchs. They  
beseech him to show mercy and,  
by letting man dwell with the  
angels, to restore Lucifer's place  
in heaven. Since man has re-  
pentend he deserves pity as the  
obstinate Lucifer does not.

Moved by the wretchedness of  
man and by the ceaseless prayers  
of the contrite souls, the prophets  
and angels, God declares that the  
time of reconciliation is come.

But this decision moves  
Trewthe to opposition.

*Veritas.* "Lord, I am thi dow-  
tere, Trewthe,  
Thou wilt see I be not lore,  
Thyn unkynde creatures to save  
were rewthe,  
The offens of man hath grevyd  
the sore.

Whan Adam had synnyd, thou  
seydest yore,  
That he kulde deye and go to  
helle,  
And now to blysse hym to restore  
Twey contraryes mow not toge-  
dyr dwelle.

Thy trewthe, Lord, xal leste  
withowtyn ende,  
I may in no wyse ffro the go,  
That wrecche that was to the so  
unkinde,  
He may not have to meche wo.  
He dyspysyd the and plesyd thi  
ffo,

þerfore, leue lord, scho seyde, lat man be stille in helle, & forsake nougt me." & þanne seyde Mercy: "*O, pater misericordiarum & deus totius consolacionis, qui consolaris nos in omni tribulacione nostra.* A, þou fader of mercy, scho seyde, & god of al confort, þou þat confortes alle þing in anger & in woo, haue mercy of mannus soule þat lib bounden in prisoun þat is helle, & brynge h[im] in to blisse.

*Quoniam dixisti, in eternum seruabo illi misericordiam,* for why, scho seyde, þou seydest þat þou schuldes kepe to hym þi mercy wiþ-outen ende. & þerfore, gif þou be trewe, þou schalt haue mercy of mannus soule."

& þanne seyde rigtfulnesse: "Nay, nay, scho seib, it may not ben so: *Quia iustus dominus & iusticias dilexit,* for why, lord, scho seib, þou art rigtful & þou louest rigtfulnesse; & þerfore þou ne mayst not rigtfulliche sauene mannus soule, it is rigt & skil þat it haue as it hap disserued. *Dominum qui se genuit dereliquit, & oblitus est dei creatoris sui,* he forsok god þat hap forþe-Ibrougt hym, & he, lord, for-ȝat þe þat maydest hym of nougt; & þerfore it is skil & resoun þat he þat

Thou art his creatour and he is thi creature,  
Thou hast lovyd trewthe, it is seyde evyr mo,  
Therefore in peynes lete hym endure.

*Misericordia.* O ffadyr of mercye and God of comferte,  
That counselle us in eche trybulacion,  
Lete ȝour dowtere Mercy to ȝour resorte,  
On man that is myschevyd haue compassyon.  
Hym grevyth fful gretly his transgressyon,  
Alle hefne and erthe crye ffor mercy.  
Me semyth ther xuld be non excepcion,  
Ther prayers ben offeryd so specyally.

Trewthe sseyth she hath evyr be than,  
I graunt it wel she hath be so,  
And thou seyst endlesly that mercy thou hast kept ffor man,  
Than mercyabyl lorde, kepe us bothe to,  
Thu seyst *veritas mea et misericordia mea cum ipso,*  
Suffyr not thi sowlys than in sorwe to slepe,  
That helle hownde that hatyth the byddyth hym ho,  
Thi love man no lengere lete hym kepe.

*Iusticia.* Mercy me mervelyth what ȝow movyth,  
ge know well I am ȝour syster Ryghtwysnes,  
God is ryghtful and ryghtffulnes lovyth.  
Man offendyd hym that is endles, Therefore his endles punchement may nevyr sees;  
Also he forsok his makere that made hym of clay,  
And the devyl to his mayster he ches,  
Xulde he be savyd? nay! nay! nay!



hath forsaken þe lord of al pitee & mercy, þat he neuere haue of þe neiber pitee no mercy.

& þerfore, leue lord, scho seiþ, lat mannus soule be stille as it is, for þat is skil & resoun; & ellis me þenkiþ þou hast forsaken me, & þat schuldest þou not dofi: *Quia iusticia eius manet in seculum seculi*, for why, holy wryt seiþ þat þi rigtfulnesse schal lasten in to þe worldis ende." & þanne seyde Mercy to rigtfulnesse: "A, leue suster, let ben & seye not so, it were neiber rigt ne skil þat god schulde kepen þe & forsaken me: *Quia misericordia eius super omnia opera eius*, for why only goddis mercy is abouen al his werkes, *Et misericordia eius ab eterno & usque in eternum*, & goddis mercy was wiþ-ouen begynnyng & schal ben wiþ-ouen endyng. & þerfore, gif god forsok me, he schulde forsake boþe my sister Trube & þe, & þat were neiber rigt ne trube. & þerfore, leue lord, scho seiþ, to sauen vs alle þre, haue þou on mannus soule boþe mercy & pitee." & þanne seide Pees to here þre sistren: "*Pax domini exsuperat omnem sensum* &c., Goddis pees ouergoþ eueriche maner wiit. þoug it be so, sche seiyt, þat Trube seiþ a grete skile why mannus soule schulde not be saued, & Rigtfulnesse seiþ also, neuerbeles me þenkeþ þat Mercy seiþ alþerbest, þat man schulde be saued, for why ellys, scho seiþ, schulde god forsaken ȝow al þre, boþe Mercy, & Rigtfulnesse [& Trewþe] & þat were grete reupe. & not only, sche seyde, he schulde þus forsaken ȝow þre, but he schulde also forsaken me: for why as longe as man soule is in helle, þer schal ben discord bytwene ȝow þre; Rigtfulnesse & Trube schol willen to haue hym so

As wyse as is God he wolde a þe This was the abhomyabyll presumption,

It is seyde, ȝe know wel this of me, That the ryghtwysnes of God hath no diffynicion.

Therfore late this be oure conclusyon,

He that sore synnydly styлле in sorwe,

He may nevyr make a seyth be be resone,

Whoo myght thanne thens hym borwe.

*Misericordia.* Syster Ryghtwysnes, ȝe are to vengeabyll, Endles synne God endles may restore,

Above alle hese werkys, God is mercyabyll,

Thow he forsook God be synne, be feyth he forsook hym never the more.

And thow he presumyd nevyr so sore,

ȝe must consyder the frelnes of mankende,

Lerne and ȝe lyst, this is Goddis lore,

The mercy of God is withowtyn ende.

*Pax.* To spare ȝour speches, systeres, it syt,

It is not onest in vertuys to ben dyscencion,

The pes of God ovyrcomyth alle wytt,

Thou Trewthe and Ryght sey grett reson.

ȝett Mercy seyth best to my pleson,

ffor yf mannys sowle xulde abyde in helle,

Betwen God and man evyr xulde be dyvysyon,

And than myght not I Pes dwelle.

bere stille, & Mercy schal willen to haue hym oute; so þat pees schal ben amongys ȝou forsaken. bere schulde also, gif man were stille in helle, ben a discord by-twene god & man, by-twene man & man, by-twene man & hymself: so þat I, þat am pees, schulde a ben forsaken ouer-al, & þat were no resoun. & þerfore doþ after my conseil, seide Pees & acord by-twixen ȝou þre, bytwyne hymself & man, by-twyne man & aungel, & by-twene man & man, & ordeyne sich a weye þat he migt kepen vs stille alle foure, boþe Mercy & Truþe, Ryghtfulnesse & Peese, & h[er]e bougte þat scho seyde best, & prayden alle to be fadur of heuene þat he schulde so doñ.

And he seyde: "*Ego cogito cogitationes pacis & non afflictionis* &c., I þenke, he seyde, bougtis of pees & not of wickednesse. I schal, he seiþ, kepe ȝou stille alle foure, & I schal sauē mannis soule & brynge hym to blisse. I schal also, he seiþ fynden vp þe abbessē of þe holy gost & maken ageyn here couent & here place, betere þan euere it was."

Therefore me semyth best ȝe thus acorde,  
Than hefne and erthe ȝe xul qweme,  
Putt bothe ȝour sentens in oure Lorde,  
And in his hyȝ wysdam lete hym deme.  
This is most fytynge me xulde seme,  
And lete se how we flowre may alle abyde,  
That mannis sowle it xulde perysche it wore sweme,  
Or that ony of us fro othere xulde dyvyde.

*Veritas.* In trowthe hereto I consente,  
I wole prey oure lorde it may be so.  
*Justicia.* I Ryghtwysnesse am wele contente,  
ffor in hym is very equity.  
*Misericordia.* And I Mercy fro this counsel wole not fle,  
Tyl wysdam hath seyde I xal ses.  
*Pax.* Here is God now, here is unyté,  
Hefne and erthe is plesyd with pes.

*ffilius.* I thynke the thoughtys of Pes and nowth of wykkydnes,  
This I deme to ses ȝour contraversy,

If Adam had not deyde, peryschyd had Ryghtwysnes,  
And also Trewthe had be lost therby.

Trewth and Ryght wolde chas-  
 tyse ffoly,  
 gif another deth come not, Mercy  
 xulde perysche,  
 Than Pes were exyled ffynaly,  
 o tweyn must be gow fowre to  
 cherysche,  
 ut he that xal deye ge must  
 knawe,  
 That in hym may ben non ini-  
 quyté,  
 hat helle may holde hym be no  
 lawe,  
 But that he may pas at hese  
 lyberté.  
 Qwere swyche on his prevyde and  
 se,  
 And hese deth for mannys dethe  
 xal be redempcion,  
 Alle hefne and erthe seke now ge,  
 Plesyth it gow this conclusyon.

*Veritas.* I, Trowthe, have sowte  
 the erthe withowt and with-  
 inne,  
 And in sothe ther kan non be  
 fownde,  
 That is of o day byrth withowte  
 synne,  
 Nor to that dethe wole be bownde.

*Misericordia.* I, Mercy, have  
 ronne the hevynly regyon  
 rownde,  
 And ther is non of that charyté,  
 That ffor man wole suffre a deddly  
 wounds,  
 I cannott wete how this xal be.

*Justicia.* Sure I can fynde non  
 sufficyent,  
 ffor servauntys unprofytable we  
 be eche one,  
 Hes love nedyth to be ful ardent,  
 That for man to helle wolde gon.

*Pax.* That God may do is non  
 but on,  
 Therefore this is be hys avyse,  
 He that gaff this counselle lete  
 hym geve the comforte alen,  
 ffor the conclusyon in hym of alle  
 these lyse.

*ffilius.* It peyneth me that man  
 I mad,

[He<sup>s</sup> ordeyned a counseil of be holy trinite in be blisse of heuene, of be fadur & of be sone & of be holy gost, & seyde: "ge weten wel, he seyde, we maden mannus soule to oure lickenesse, [Man's loss of the abbey] \* \* \* \* he haþ ben in þat prisoun longe I-now, haue we pitee on hym, he is as hit were on of vs, maked to oure lickenesse." & alle be holy trinite graunted þat it schulde so be. But, he seyde, who þat schulde doñ swyche a dede, hym be-houed for to be swyche on þat were be-holden for to doñ hit, & also þat he mihte doñ it; but, þer was no þing þat mihte delyuere hym but gif it were god; & þerfore who so schulde do þat dede he most be boþe god & man: & so miht it noon be but gif it were oon of be þre persones in be holy trinite; almyt goddis sone schulde come doun in to his world, & ben I-born of a mayden & becomen man.]

& when his dougtren harden þis, þei were glad & myrie: and as-wiþe *Misericordia & veritas obuiauerunt sibi, iusticia &c.*, "Mercy & Truþe metten hem to-gedere, Rigthfulnesse & Pees weren kyste & maad at on."

The rest of the treatise is an account of how Christ refounded the abbey.

That is to seyn peyne I must suffere sore,  
A counsel of the Trinite must be had,

Whiche of us xal man restore.  
*Pater.* In gour wysdam, son,  
man was mad thore,  
And in wysdam was his temp-  
tacion,  
Therfor, sone, sapyens ge must  
ordeyn herefore,  
And so how of man may be sal-  
uation.

*Filius.* ffadyr, he that xal do  
this must be bothe God and  
man,  
Lete me se how I may were that  
wede,  
And sythe in my wysdam he  
began,  
I am redy to do this dede.

*Spiritus Sanctus.* I the Holy  
Ghost of gow tweyn do pro-  
cede,  
This charge I wole take on me,  
I love to gour lover xal gow lede,  
This is the assent of oure unyté.

*Misericordia.* Now is the love-  
day mad of us fowre fynialy,  
Now may we leue in pes as we wer  
wonte:  
*Misericordia et Veritas obuia-  
erunt sibi,  
Iusticia et Pax osculatae sunt.*

Then Gabriel is sent with three  
several messages from the Father,  
Son, and Spirit to make the An-  
nunciation to Mary.

"I have transferred this council of the Trinity, from the place where it occurs in the *Charter*, as noted above in my outline, to this point, in order to bring out more clearly the parallel with the *Salutation*.

On comparison of these versions with the earlier forms of the allegory it may easily be determined, I think, that both ultimately belong to the family of the *Meditationes*. In the first place, the dependence on Bonaventura rather than directly on Bernard is indicated by the fact that in both the *Charter* and the *Salutation* the introduction of the four daughters is preceded as in Bonaventura by laments of prophets over man's unfortunate state (the *Salutation* further agrees with Bonaventura by adding the laments of the angels). Again, both these English versions introduce the discussion which originated with Bonaventura as to which person of the Trinity should undertake the work of redemption. This latter detail also serves to show that the English versions were not following Ludolphus, for it will be remembered that in his *Vita Christi* this discussion was omitted. On these grounds I conclude that the *Charter* and the *Salutation* must be derived ultimately from the *Meditationes*.

Now, if we refer to the speeches of the sisters, we shall see that, up to the point where Peace persuades them to carry the dispute to the throne of God, there are very special resemblances between these versions. In both, these speeches are more expanded than in Bonaventura and introduce some theological argumentation. Many of the new points are the same in both. From these likenesses in points not found in the *Meditationes*, it may be inferred that the authors of the *Charter* and the *Salutation* did not base their accounts independently upon Bonaventura's treatise. This would invalidate the hypothesis mentioned at the beginning of this chapter which Hone suggests of the dependence of the *Salutation* upon the *Speculum*. Obviously, therefore, either the *Salutation* must derive directly from the *Charter*, or both the *Charter* and the *Salutation* must be using a common source which is itself in turn derived from Bonaventura.

Against the first supposition it may be noted that in the *Charter* the allegory of the Four Daughters has been thrust

into another allegory, and in this process it has been somewhat disarranged. Whereas in the *Salutation* the events follow in the normal order, in the *Charter* the discussion as to which person of the Trinity should redeem man has been transferred to near the beginning of the allegory, thus giving rise to the debate between the sisters rather than concluding it as usual. Notice again that in the *Charter* the four daughters are introduced with some abruptness. Finally, it should be observed that the allegory, as it appears in the *Charter*, does not introduce the annunciation of Gabriel, though this was the case in Bonaventura, and is also true in the *Salutation*. In spite, therefore, of the resemblances between these two versions at many points, it is difficult to believe that the *Salutation* was derived from the *Charter*.

## SECTION II. OUTLINE OF THE ALLEGORY IN THE *Castell of Perseverance*.

Before proceeding further in the attempt to define the relationship between these English versions, it will be necessary to take account of the form of the allegory in the *Castell of Perseverance*,<sup>9</sup> which seems to stand in some close relation to the versions which have just been compared. In this well known morality the allegory of the Four Daughters appears in the closing scene. At the Death of Humanum Genus, Bonus and Malus Angelus engage in controversy for possession of his soul. At this point, according to the stage direction, the four daughters of God enter. I outline briefly the scene which follows:

Mercy, having heard the despairing cry of Man's soul, as it is borne off to hell by Malus Angelus, appeals to Rytwysnes to show compassion, since by Christ's death remission of sin had been granted. Rytwysnes answers,

<sup>9</sup>Furnivall and Pollard: *The Macro Plays*, E. E. T. S. ext. ser. XCI, 1904. This play Pollard dates about 1425. See also A. W. Pollard, *English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes*, 4th ed., Oxford, 1904, pp. xlv-xlvi and 64-76.

however, that, although Christ's mercy covers all man's misdeeds, it can be granted only to those who forsake their sins. As man has brewed let him drink; the devil shall pay him his meed. A man may not sin all his life and at death crave mercy by the rood. That would result in strife and great abuse. This judgment is confirmed by Trewþe, who declares that she is ever present at man's death, holding the scales to weigh his good and evil deeds. Always just and true, she allows nothing to hurt any soul but its own misdeeds. This soul by its avarice has doomed itself to the pit of hell. Pes now protests against dooming man to hell. "For his love that died on tree, let us save Mankynde from all peril. If ye twain put him to distress, it would make great heaviness to us, Mercy and Pes. Let us go to God and pray him to deem this case."

Accordingly they proceed to the throne of God. After salutations have been exchanged, Trewþe begins: "Lord, as thou art crowned King of Kings, let me, thy daughter dear, never fail, *Quia veritatem dilexisti*. For if Mankynde be judged by right and not by mercy, how should he be saved, since he died in deadly sin? Unless he be damned, I am shamed. Too late, in dying he cried for mercy. Let him drink as he brewed! If late repentance should save a man, whether he wrought wickedness or good, then everyone would be bold to trespass in the hope of forgiveness. He has sinned against the Holy Ghost; that sin thou wilt never release, *Quia veritas manet in eternum*. On earth man had wealth, pleasure, and good counsel, yet he forsook God. Wherefore let him burn in hell, or I shall have no place in thy judgment." Then Mercy speaks: "O great father, God of consolation in tribulation, merciful God in Trinity, I too, am thy daughter, as thou knowest. Let me not be lost in thy judgment of man. Grant that Mankynde may find me. Had Adam never sinned I should have had no place on earth, nor would'st thou have been born and crucified. Though he has done more evil than good, if he dies in con-

trition the least drop of thy blood can save him. Therefore grant him salvation, *Quia dixisti 'misericordiam amabo.'*" "Righteous King," interrupts Rytwysnes, "thou hast loved me ever, night and day, as well as my sister. *Justicias Dominus justicia dilexit.* To acquit man from pain would be to go against thine own word. Often he has forsaken thee and betaken himself to the devil, so let him lie in hell's lake, damned forever. When he was born he was brought to church, washed with baptism, and he promised to serve thee alone; but when he came to man's estate, he forgot thy behests and thy benefits, and that thou had'st bought him with thy precious blood. He forsook thee and his Good Angel's governance, put away the virtues for the seven sins, and lost his five wits. Then Death tripped him in his dance. Too late he confessed, too little is his contrition. To receive his soul is to wrong Trewþe and me."

Once more Mercy pleads with Rytwysnes: "Dear sister, have mercy! Let us help save Mankynde. If he is damned, my estate must be less. I, God's youngest daughter, am above all his former works. I and my sister Pes will ever pray to obtain Mankynde's pardon. For God's mercy is without beginning or end." Trewþe repeats her assertion that Mankynde does not deserve mercy, for while he lived he would never help the poor at their need. Finally Pes asks God to grant her boon that she may not be compelled to flee, but may evermore dwell with Him. "Since man was created at Lucifer's fall to restore the tenth order in heaven, he ought to be saved, though Trewþe and Rytwysnes would leave him in woe. Now we all stand at discord, but my counsel is that we come together in accord and kiss one another. (Here Ps. 84:11 is introduced in the margin instead of at the end as is usual.) If Trewþe and Rytwysnes have their will, Mercy and Pes must sorrow: hence let there be love between us, let us turn from vengeance and become man's friends, and pray devoutly to God that mankind may find grace at doomsday." God is pleased at this issue



of the strife, since He thinks the thoughts of peace and not of affliction. Now that the sisters are united, He will yield to their prayers and not condemn man to torture, as he deserves, but bring him to bliss endlessly to dwell in heaven. To secure perfect happiness, He will mingle henceforth with His might all peace, some truth, some justice and most mercy. Having thus spoken, He sends the daughters to release Mankynde from the Fiend, and bring him to heaven's bliss. With the reception of the soul in heaven the morality ends.

### SECTION III. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE VERSIONS IN THE *Charter*, THE *Salutation*, AND THE *Castell*.

If the version of the allegory in the *Castell* be compared carefully with those from the *Charter* and the *Salutation*, it will be seen that from the time that the sisters carry their dispute to the throne of God there are certain special resemblances between the three. In all three cases the controversy is opened by Truth (in most other versions by Mercy) and in all, the succeeding speeches follow in the same order, with the exception of a short argument introduced by Truth in the *Castell* just before Peace makes her appeal for reconciliation among them. Moreover, the speeches themselves are like in their distinction from the Bonaventura controversy through their theological argumentation. In addition to their general likeness in character, these speeches are even more closely connected in many passages by similarity of phrasing, at times agreeing almost verbally. The *Castell* and the *Charter* are particularly close in this respect, especially in their retention of Latin quotations, though they add the English translations. To be sure, the speeches, which in the *Charter* and the *Salutation* were comparatively short, are greatly expanded in the *Castell* by both repetition and the insertion of new arguments. Yet it is difficult to

see how the resemblances which have been pointed out could have been fortuitous. We are thus driven to the supposition that these three versions of the allegory derive from a common source.

If now we place side by side the contents of the three versions, it will be seen that they fit together in rather a curious fashion:

<i>Castell.</i>	<i>Charter.</i>	<i>Salutation.</i>
	Laments of Isalah and Jeremiah.	Laments of Isalah and Jeremiah (presented by Contemplatio).
		Laments of angels (presented by Virtutes).
Preliminary debate.		
Debate before God's throne. Reconciliation at the request of Peace.	Debate before God's throne. Reconciliation at the request of Peace.	Debate before God's throne.
		Search by Mercy and Truth for someone to redeem man.
	Promise of God to re-found the abbey by incarnation.	Promise of God to redeem man by incarnation.
		Gabriel sent to make annunciation.
Release of Humanum Genus from Malus Angelus. Description of last judgment.		

It will be perceived now that the *Charter* is the middle version. With the exception of the controversy before God's throne, the *Castell* never runs parallel with the *Salutation*, though both the *Castell* and the *Salutation* present other parallels with the *Charter*. Moreover, the *Castell*, in both the introduction and the conclusion diverges radically from the other two. This divergence is easily explained by the fact that the *Castell*, being a morality play, does not use the

allegory to introduce the incarnation. Accordingly, it was impossible for its author to preface the allegory by the prayers of prophets and angels. Again, inasmuch as he is dealing with a period after the death of Christ, he cannot close the allegory with the annunciation. The preliminary debate between the sisters which appears in the *Castell* only may easily represent an expansion of the bare statement which Bonaventura makes that there was a great controversy between Mercy and Peace against Justice and Truth, before he begins to quote from Bernard. It is interesting to note that the same expansion into a preliminary debate is found in the French *mystères*, thereby suggesting that it may have stood in the original source.

By this process of comparison we may arrive at some notion of the general outline of the common original, and it will be seen that in the order of the allegory it did not differ materially from *Meditationes*, though amplifications must have been made in the speeches of the four daughters. It is not impossible that this hypothetical source may have been dramatic. The somewhat forced introduction of the four daughters in the *Charter*, “& þanne were almighty goddis dougtren þere þat is to seye, Mercy & Treuþe, Rigtfulnesse & Pees,” reads somewhat like a stage direction. It is generally admitted that the traces of French influence in the *Maestricht* play (see Chap. V, n. 4) imply its derivation from a French *mystère* now extant. It would be interesting to conceive of such a *mystère* as the same as the hypothetical source constructed from the three English versions just studied. As many of the *mystères* now extant contain all the scenes which a combination of these three versions would furnish,—i. e., the laments of prophets and angels, the preliminary debate, the debate before God’s throne, the annunciation and incarnation, and finally, after the passion of Christ, a last judgment,—it might be implied that these were all in that hypothetical source. I do not by any means put this forward as a theory to be accepted, but merely by way of suggestion.

SECTION IV. THE ALLEGORY IN *Respublica*.

The allegories in the *Castell* and the *Salutation* are the only English dramatic versions in which the traditional form of the controversy between the Four Daughters is found. In the sixteenth century, however, an interesting variant of the earlier theme appear in *Respublica*,<sup>10</sup> a political morality written to express the sentiments of the Catholic party at the time of Mary's accession. In this play the sisters no longer engage in controversy, but act in perfect harmony. Yet their speeches contain distinct reminiscences of those in the conventional versions. Moreover, the quotations from the Psalms are also introduced. This morality, therefore, may be regarded as a true, though decadent, version of our allegory, and as such may find place in the present discussion.

Avarice, as chief Vice, with his assistants Adulation, Insolence, and Oppression, plot how best to rob *Respublica*. They assume the names of Policy, Honesty, Authority and Reformation in order to cloak their evil, and thus disguised lull the weak and rather wearisome *Respublica* into false security and dependence upon their governance. People, a brusque and clownish fellow representative of the oppressed peasantry, is less easily deceived, but he, too, somewhat doubtfully yields to their sway. All goes well for their plot. They increase in wealth and power while the country sinks into greater and greater wretchedness. Then come the four daughters of God, who open *Respublica*'s eyes to the fraud practised upon her and who with the aid of Nemesis (Queen Mary) free the country from its oppressors.

The part of the sisters begins in the fifth act where *Misericordia* enters with a hymn of praise, which, in its

<sup>10</sup>*Respublica. A. D. 1553. A Play on the Social Condition of England at the Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. Leonard A. Magnus (from Mr. Gurney's Unique Macro MS. 115), E. E. T. S. ext. ser. XCIV, 1905; A. Brandl: *Quellen des Weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakspeare*, Strassburg, 1898, Quellen und Forschungen, No. LXXX: lviii-lx, 281-358.

account of God's greatness and mercy, suggests the scene with which so many of the religious dramas open, where similar declarations of His power are made by God himself. This is interrupted by the approach of Respublica, bewailing her utter misery in words which inevitably remind one of the laments of the fathers in hell in the French *mystères* or of Mercy's opening prayer for them in other versions.

"O Lorde, haste thowe for ever closed up thine eare?  
Wilt thowe never more the desolate prair hear

\* \* \* \* \*

I graunte that myn offences have so muche deserved  
But for whom, save sinners, ys thye mercie reserved?"

Mercy comes forward and rejoices Respublica by promising aid, then goes in search of Truth. As they return, Mercy is saying, "I daresae Respublica thinketh the tyme long," to which Truth replies, "Who can blame her?"

"but as meate and drinke and other bodylye foode  
is never found to bee, so pleasaunte nor so goode  
As whan fretting hongre and thirste hathe pincht afore;  
So after decaye and aduersytee overcome  
welth and prosperitee shalbe double welcome."

At Mercy's request, Truth then declares the state of the case and how it may be remedied by the dismissal of the false-seeming ministers. Mercy adds, "Peace and Justice will descend to keep you quiet and defend you." Peace and Justice at this moment enter and kiss in token, as the former says, of their joining to make perfect bliss. To this Justice adds: "And let us never be sundered any more." The four sisters assure Respublica that they will restore and establish her honor. Justice will dwell with her to redress what is amiss; Mercy, to temper rigor where there is hope of reform. In the last two scenes, a sort of trial is held in which the Virtues uncloak the masquerading ministers of Respublica and force them to confess. The dialogue in this scene is

vigorous and pointed, Avarice, with no little wit, seeking to defend himself and hold his accusers up to ridicule. He mocks them for leaving heaven, whence Justice and Mercy say they have come.

“Dwell ye in heaven and so madde to come hither?”

and again,

“Why, what folke are ye that cannot heaven endure?”

Therefore Truth declares herself sprung from earth, and as Avarice is incredulous, confirms it by the “Booke,” “*veritas de terra orta est.*” Avarice complains of her, though larding his speech with flattery, that she is friend to few. Earlier in the play he had characterized her to his companions,

“as unhappie a longtongued girle as can be  
She bringeth all to light, some she bringeth to shame  
She careth not a grote what Manne hath thinke or blame.”

The characterization suggests the earlier poems of the Grosseteste group or the *Court of Sapience*. The whole deceit being laid bare, Nemesis would pronounce sentence, but here Mercy, true to her name, becomes pitiful, and pleads for the very offenders she has helped to unmask.

“Ladie Nemesis, now have yee Occassion  
And Matier to shewe youre commiseracion  
It is much more glorie and standith with more skylle  
Lost shepe to recover, then the scabye to spill.”

Justice is alarmed and insists that the punishment should be strictly executed.

“Severitee must putt men in feare to transgresse.”

Mercy still pleads "If there were no offenders, wherefore might Mercy serve?" and Avarice cries delightedly,

"Stike harde to it, goode swete Ladie Compassion."

Nemesis ends the impending quarrel by declaring that each of the sisters shall have some part of her desires. "Neither all nor none shall taste of severity, but such as Truth shall show deserving it." After the apportionment of these punishments, the play ends with an invocation to God and Queen Mary.

As this summary shows, the plot varies too greatly from the accepted theme to make it possible to discover a definite source. Indeed, it is probable that the introduction of the four daughters into the play was suggested to the author through his general knowledge of the tradition rather than by any particular version. If the author of *Respublica* was Nicholas Udall, as Dr. Magnus, its editor, believes, there would be nothing improbable in the supposition that he was acquainted with the allegory in various forms.

#### SECTION V. CONCLUSION.

The influence of the allegory of the Four Daughters upon extant English moralities is confined, so far as I can discover, to the *Castell of Perseverance* and *Respublica*. Gayley<sup>11</sup> states that the Four Daughters appear in the morality *Mankynd*. I suppose he is referring to vv. 816-839, but the allusion is obscure. A short dialogue between Love and Justification at the end of the morality play, *The Life of Repentance of Marie Magdalene*,<sup>12</sup> written by Louis Wager in 1566, has sometimes been quoted as another example of our theme. But it does not seem to

<sup>11</sup>*Represent. Eng. Comedies*, New York, 1903, p. lxxvii.

<sup>12</sup>*The Life and Repentaunce of Marie Magdalene*, by Lewis Wager, Reproduced from the original edition of 1566-7, F. I. Carpenter, Chicago, 1904.

belong to this subject at all. There is practically no debate. Love and Justification merely explain to the Magdalene the meaning of Christ's words of forgiveness, making her understand that she had been forgiven solely through the favor of Christ, since she absolutely lacked any merit or power in herself to pay the debt of her sin. Considering that only two of the sisters are here introduced, and that the statements put into their mouths are the veriest commonplaces of Christian doctrine, there seems no reason for recognizing in this dialogue any dependence upon our allegory.

As the result of our examination of the allegory in its connection with the English drama, it must be said that neither in the morality nor the miracle plays of England did the Four Daughters enjoy any such popularity as they found in the mediæval drama of France. It is quite possible, however, that this allegory would have reached its crowning expression in the English drama, had John Milton carried out his original plans. At all events, it is interesting to know that the dramatic possibilities of this theme appealed to him. For this information we are indebted to Dr. Johnson. "It appears," he writes in his *Life of Milton*,<sup>13</sup> "by some sketches of poetical projects left in manuscripts and to be seen in a library at Cambridge (Trinity College, Cambridge) that he had digested his thoughts on this subject into one of those wild dramas which were anciently called mysteries; and Philips had seen (Philips, 12mo, 1694, p. 35) what he terms part of a tragedy beginning with the first ten lines of Satan's address to the Sun. These mysteries consist of allegorical persons; such as Justice, Mercy, Faith." Dr. Johnson informs us further that Milton drafted two plans for this "Tragedy or Mystery." In the first plan, as he quotes it, the sisters appear only once, and then in a way foreign to the usual tradition. The reference to the sisters

<sup>13</sup>Samuel Johnson, *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, New York, 1861, I, 138-40.



—or at least to three of them—reads: “Justice, Mercy and Wisdom debating what should become of man if he fall.” This is surprising enough, for it suggests the form of the tradition in the *Midrash*.

The second plan approaches more the traditional form. After sketching the fall of Lucifer and of man, it continues, “Man next, and Eve having by this time been seduced by the serpent, appears confusedly covered with leaves. Conscience, in a shape, accuses him; Justice cites him to the place whither Jehovah called for him, . . . Adam then and Eve return; . . . Justice appears, reasons with him, convinces him. . . . He is humbled, relents, despairs; at last appears Mercy, comforts him, promises the Messiah; then calls in Faith, Hope, and Charity; instructs him; he repents, gives God the glory, submits to his penalty. The chorus briefly concludes.” In certain ways this sketch suggests Deguilloville or the *Castell of Perseverance*; in others, the *Moralite de Nature*. The probability is that Milton knew a number of versions of the allegory.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup>That Goethe also contemplated the use of some features of this allegory in his *Faust* is implied by a note in *Paralipomena* to the Fifth Act of *Faust*. Here he tells us that he had thought of making Mephistopheles conduct a “Proces” in Heaven to defend his right to Faust’s soul. (See F. Paulsen, *Schopenhauer, Hamlet, Mephistopheles*, Berlin, 1900, p. 201, note, also Strehlke, *Paralipomena zu Goethe’s Faust*, p. 133, and the Loeper-Hempel ed. of Goethe’s works, XIII, p. 252.)

## CHAPTER IX.

### MISCELLANEOUS ENGLISH VERSIONS.

#### SECTION I. *Piers Plowman.*

The English versions which remain to be mentioned are less amenable to classification than those hitherto studied, so I must mass them here somewhat miscellaneously. The first of these in point of time is *Piers Plowman*,<sup>1</sup> in which the passage where the allegory of the debate appears is peculiar in that it is made the prelude to the Harrowing of Hell.

The writer in his vision sees a maid come walking out of the west. She is called Mercy, and is "benign and buxom of spech." At the same moment her sister, a comely creature called Truth, comes softly walking out of the east. As they meet, Truth asks the meaning of the din and the darkness, the light and the flame before hell. Mercy answers, "It betokeneth mirth." She says that Christ's death at midday has caused the eclipse and the light. This is to blind Lucifer while man is drawn from darkness. "For patriarchs and prophets have preached of this often, that a Man shall save man through a maiden's help, and what was lost by a tree, a tree shall win back." Truth, disdainfully incredulous of this "tale of waltrot," bids her sister hold her tongue; for who is once in hell never comes out. Mildly Mercy answers, "I hope they shall be saved; for as venom destroys venom, so shall this death, I dare wager my life,

<sup>1</sup>*Piers Plowman*, see Skeat's edition of the three texts with notes, glossary and introduction in E. E. T. S., Nos. XXVIII, XXXVIII, LIV, LXVII, LXXXI; Skeat's Clarendon Press two-volume edition, 1887, and *Observations sur la Vision de Piers Plowman* by Jusserand, 1879 and 1903. The debate between the sister occurs in Passus XVIII of text B, Passus XXI of text C.

destroy all that death destroyed first through the Devil's enticing."

An interruption occurs here, for Truth sees Righteousness, who "knows more than we both," come running out of the "nip of the north," and from the south Pees comes playing, richly clothed in the gay garments of patience. After these have met and greeted one another, Pees answers the question as to whither she is wending her way. "I go to welcome those whom for many a day I might not see because of the shadows of sin,—Adam and Eve and the others in hell. Moses and many more shall have mercy, and I shall dance thereto. Do thou so also, sister; for Jesus jousted well, joy begins to dawn. Love that is my darling, sent me letters that Mercy and I should save mankind, and that God hath granted us to be man's security forever after. Lo, here is the patent 'In pace in idipsum.' " "What sayest thou!" cries Righteousness indignantly, "dost thou believe that light can unlock mighty hell and save man's soul! Sister, never think it! At the beginning God himself gave the doom that Adam and Eve and all who followed should die and dwell in pain ever after if they ate of the tree. Adam ate of the fruit, and forsook both the love of our Lord and his lore, and followed what the fiend taught. I accord with Truth that their pain be perpetual and no prayer help them. Let them chew as they chose, and chide we not, sisters, for it is bootless bale, the bite that they ate!" Peace, however, is not disheartened by this outbreak, but continues: "And I shall prove their pain may have end, and woe unto weal may turn at last. Had they known no woe, they could not know weal; for no wight knows what weal is who never has suffered, nor what is hunger who has not lacked. If there were no night, no man could perceive day; nor could a rich man lying in ease, know woe without death. So God became Man of a maid to save mankind, suffered Himself to be sold and to feel the sorrow of dying. God, of His goodness, set the first man, Adam, in solace and sovereign mirth; then

suffered him to sin and feel sorrow; then He took man's nature to show what He suffered in three places,—heaven, earth and hell,—what all woe is, what all joy. Thus shall it fare with this folk. Their folly and sin shall teach them what languor is and bliss without end. None know what is well, til wel-a-way teaches them."

At this point Book approaches and tells how all the elements proclaimed Christ's power. While he is yet speaking, Truth exclaims: "I hear and see a spirit speak to hell and bid open the gates!" A dramatic account of the harrowing follows in the manner of the early English *Harrowing of Hell*. This ended, Pees "pipede of poetes a note," on the theme, "After sharpest showres . . . most sheen is the sonne."

"'Trewes,' quoth Treuth, 'thou tellest soth, by Jesus!  
Cluppe we in covenant, and ech of ous cusse other!  
\* \* \* \* \*

Tyl the day dawede these damseles daunsede  
That men rang to thy resurreccioun and with that ich  
awakede."

The question of the sources of this scene in the *Vision of Piers Plowman* is a vexed one. A number of sources have been suggested by Skeat, ten Brink and Jusserand, which I will quote in order. Professor Skeat,<sup>2</sup> in editing the poem, says that the sources for the Passus in which the debate scene appears are the Bible, Grosseteste, and the Gospel of Nicodemus. He adds, "Besides these, the author constantly shows that he had in mind some actual representation of the circumstances; so that the reader must throughout consult the Coventry mysteries." Ten Brink,<sup>3</sup> also, says that the author without doubt knew Grosseteste's *Chasteau d'Amour*. But I have found it impossible to discover pronounced likeness to Grosseteste or indeed to any other

<sup>2</sup>Skeat, Pt. IV, p. 395.

<sup>3</sup>Ten Brink II: 443-4.

version of the altercation of the sisters. The occasion is wholly different; the sisters meet just after Christ's crucifixion and dispute concerning His proposed release of His followers from hell. In this respect it faintly suggests the opposition of Satan to the harrowing of hell which is the occasion of the "Processus Belial" described in the fourth chapter, but there is no similarity in treatment. While not denying that the author may have known Grosseteste's poem, I think he might equally well have worked from Bernard or Bonaventura.

Another suggestion, made by Jusserand,<sup>4</sup> is that *Piers Plowman* was influenced by Deguillaume. He cites a number of instances which seem to show contact between the two poems, but none of them have any connection with the scene of the debate. To me the work seems to stand apart, an example of the originality and power of its author, who could so transform the material beneath his hand as to prevent recognition of the particular source of which he had availed himself. In my perplexity as to the whole matter, I have merely presented the scene, leaving it to some one else to decide what affiliations with other versions may exist.

If the question of the sources of the debate scene in *Piers Plowman* is difficult to determine, that of its influence upon later versions of the allegory is scarcely easier. But a few possibilities present themselves. I will first consider certain points of apparent contact between this *Vision of Piers Plowman* and the *Castell of Perseverance*.

Ten Brink<sup>5</sup> has called attention to the similarity of the situation in the attacks on the Castle of Perseverance and on Holy Church, though he fails to notice that in the two accounts the outcome is not the same. It has been further suggested that the author of the morality may have taken

<sup>4</sup>J. J. Jusserand: *L'Épopée Mystique de William Langland*, Paris, 1893, pp. 209-214.

<sup>5</sup>Ten Brink: *Geschichte der Englischen Literatur*, I: 456, and II: 443-4.

a hint from the Castle Caro in *Piers Plowman*. Dr. Furnivall<sup>6</sup> quotes this hypothesis from Professor Churton Collins, but dismisses the connection as too slight to be considered. To the resemblances pointed out by these scholars, one or two others may be added. In the refrain so often employed by Justitia, "Let him drink as he brewed," it is possible to detect a reminiscence of the lines in *Piers Plowman*:

"For-thie let hem chewe as thei chose, and chide we nat,  
susteres,  
For hit is a botles bale, the byte that thei eten."

Again, one may find a possible suggestion for Misericordia's declaration that without sin there would have been no place for her, in the long speech of which the theme is: "For haddle thei wist of no wo, wele hadde thei nat knowe." Except for these slight hints, which, in my opinion, are not sufficient to warrant us in affirming dependence, it is difficult to see a connection between the morality and *Piers Plowman*.

As in the *Castell of Perseverance*, so in a few other later English versions of the allegory, it is possible to fancy a slight dependence upon *Piers Plowman*.

A reminiscence of the encounter of the sisters at Christ's grave as described in *Piers Plowman* may possibly be discerned in the first lines of Lydgate's *Poem on the Prospect of Peace* in MS. Harl. 2255, which seems to have been composed about 1443.<sup>7</sup>

"Mercy and Trowth met on a hih mounteyn.  
Bright as the sonne with his beemys cleer.  
Pees and Justitia walkyng on the pleyn,  
And with foure sustreyn most goodly of ther cheer,  
List not departe nor severe in no maneer—"

<sup>6</sup>The *Macro Plays*, p. xxxix.

<sup>7</sup>Wright: *Political Poems and Songs relating to English History* London, 1891, II: 209.

The rest of the poem is merely political, though expressed in terms of religion. Another possible borrowing by Lydgate is the reference to death destroying death, as venom conquers venom in his *Life of our Lady*.

The defence of Mercy in the *Court of Sapience*, as losing her might without sin, just as physic is bootless without sickness, or drink without thirst, may have been inspired by the justification of woe in *Piers Plowman* for its efficacy in making weal appreciated.

## SECTION II. *The Court of Sapience.*

Another version of the allegory is to be found in the *Court of Sapience*, a poem of the early years of the fifteenth century, which was long, though I believe mistakenly, ascribed to Lydgate.\* As in *Piers Plowman*, the popular device of the vision is employed as the setting for the poem. Like Langland's vision again, this poem, though it offers convincing proof of its author's originality, is a skilful composite of elements borrowed from many sources. This is

\*Professor Schick, in his edition for the E. E. T. S. of the *Temple of Glas*, pp. cx, cxi, and cxvii discusses the *Court of Sapience*. There he expresses his conviction that it is the work of Lydgate, but he has since changed his view, persuaded by a study of its diction, versification, and general tone. MacCracken (*op. cit.* p. 216) mentions the *Court of Sapience* among the doubtful poems for which he does not want to express an opinion. A discussion of the whole matter is about to appear in a dissertation prepared by one of Prof. Schick's students, Joseph Jaeger, which will be valuable as an aid to the determination of the question. An edition is promised to the E. E. T. S. by Dr. Borsdorf.

Meanwhile, judging only from a comparison of this allegory, as it appears here and in the *Life of Our Lady*, certainly Lydgate's work, I cannot think it possible that the two were written by the same man. They have absolutely nothing in common in tone or manner. Moreover, it would be strange for the writer to treat the same subject twice, drawing his material, at one time from Bernard, at the other from Bonaventura, as in that case we should be compelled to suppose. As to its date, Dr. Schick thinks it may have been written about 1403, certainly before 1420.

For manuscripts and prints, see the *Dictionary of National Biography*. This study is based upon Wynkyn de Worde's print, his copy of which Mr. Jaeger kindly placed at my disposal.

true, not only of the scenes which introduce the Four Daughters, but also of those parts of the poem which lie outside the limits of this study. Before proceeding to discuss the sources from which our allegory is borrowed it will be necessary to have an outline of the version in the *Court of Sapience* before us.

This poem presents the dreamer looking for Dame Sapience, whom, after a long search in a dark wilderness, he encounters, attended by her followers, Intelligence and Science. While he rests from his long travel, she offers to tell him of her labors and the mediation which she has just effected. With this her story begins, as in Grosseteste, with the account of the King, his four daughters, Son, and disobedient servant who must suffer imprisonment, faying, killing, and devouring from the four tormentors to whom he is delivered.

Mercy, looking down into the prison, and seeing her beloved servant in misery there, is heartbroken. Weeping, she unlaces her sunny hair, rends her clothes, and falls at her father's feet, crying, "Oh merciful King of Kings and Father of Pity, have mercy on thy servant, or death will wound my heart. Remember that I am sovereign over all thy works, thy child and gem, and grant my boon. See how I kneel dishevelled; tears rain from my eyes, my lips and cheeks are pale, my throat strained with sighs. Turn my distress to cheer by granting me the prisoner, since he is penitent."

Truth asks what is meant by these prayers, and the father having related the case, she violently contends against any change in the original sentence. Nor is she moved when Mercy says, "You are sovereign on earth only, I in heaven." Again Mercy seeks to justify her demand by declaring that the purpose of her creation had been that she should restore heavenly bliss. If she were to die, the heavenly realm would be vain and empty, its court destroyed.

Truth, unmoved, goes to summon her sister Right-



wisnesse, who cannot be swayed by high or low to spare in judgment. She enters, fearful to behold, but of goodly seeming and beaming with light, and ranges herself with Truth. Her argument is the ingratitude and crass stupidity of man, whom fear of punishment or love for the bounty shown him should have incited to keep the command. On earth he had enjoyed a place full of every delight, and sovereignty over all. Nothing that could be desired for heart's ease or life's sustenance, had been denied him. That he had been traitorous in the face of all this bounty should deprive him of hope of mercy.

Here Peace enters, who is more perfect and full of grace than Phoebus himself. Greatly distressed by the strife between her sisters, she exclaims that the Kingdom will be desolate, Mercy doomed to death and herself to exile, unless this be appeased. "To sustain the realm," she says, "we four must be of one opinion and suffer no debate to threaten its tranquillity. My father styles himself the Prince of Peace, and the chief commendation of the realm is that it is one of peace. With strife I will not dwell, but if I be driven away, the realm is ruined forever. Yield the trespasser to Mercy, whose office it is to redress wrong. Without trespass, she would lose her might, like physic without sickness, salve without sore, or drink without thirst. Truth, on the contrary, can reign as princess without falsehood, Right have sovereignty without injury, or I without war; but Mercy has no power, except there be trespass. I counsel, therefore, that we obey Mercy and end the dissension; for as clerks say, little things grow with peace and great things wither away with discord." Truth and Rightwisness, however, refuse their assent, and going before the father, more urgently renew their demands for punishment.

From this point, the setting supplied by Grosseteste's version disappears, though arguments from that are still used, and the action is boldly transferred to heaven. The transition is effected by allowing Sapience to interrupt her

story to explain to the dreamer that the King is God Almighty, his daughters the virtues annexed to His Godhead, and the servant Adam.

She then renews the tale at the point where Mercy, seeing her sisters' obduracy, falls in a swoon, and Peace in ecstasy of pity cries, "Alas, I am forever exiled. Oh God, have mercy on my sister lying in a swoon, on whom Truth untrue has pronounced sentence of death. I cannot remain, but must wander forever through 'holt and heath.' Farewell, desolate household; farewell Mercy, over whom vengeance doth prevail. Cherubim gyve thine armor; Cherubim, banish thy glory; thrones, away with melody. Though judgment should not be executed without me, Truth has accused man and Rightwisenesse has condemned him. Woe to debate that never can have Peace. Woe that Rightwisenesse has no equity and Truth no charity, that the judge may not save the guilty. Farewell, Saturn, Jove, Mars and Phœbus, Venus, Mercury and shining lady of the night. I was your guide, but now must go away. Oh cruel Mars, thy tempestuous fury thou mayst now show, and Jupiter rain darts of fire. Now let hot strive with cold for victory, moist with dry; for Peace is gone. Farewell, broad country, Father, realm." Peace vanishes.

The sovereign joy of heaven, 'brother to Mercy, seeing this woeful case, sends hastily for Sapience and says, "Oh Sapience, help with counsel in this need; for Peace is gone and Mercy lies in swoon. Alas, the heavenly realm is desolate unless Mercy reign and Peace return."

Sapience replies, "Oh Master, hard is the case and high must be the help that can accord the sisters now opposed, two against two; for whoever would unite them must perform the will of all."

To this the Son answers, "But who can best please them all and give to each her will? We are three Persons in one Godhead; one of us will make this accord, but which?"

Sapience gives decision for the Son and establishes it in three ways. The first refers to the fear which awe of the Father would inspire in Mercy and Peace, and the unwillingness with which Truth and Rightwisness would accept the Holy Ghost, since He was Mercy's friend. Her second point concerns man's sin, directed not against the Father's might, nor the goodness of the Holy Ghost, but against the Son's wisdom. To Him, therefore, falls the answer to the challenge.<sup>9</sup> Third, whoever would take man's guilt and die for him, must be the son of man. In the Trinity there is but one Son.

Sapience further defines the Son's position with statements which, though different from those in the later French Passion play by Greban, yet suggest them. In speaking of the Trinity, she says one may call the Son full of wisdom; the Father, of might; the Spirit, of goodness. A father is a term of age, impotence and debility; a son, of youth, courage and stability.

Yielding to the case so clearly presented by Sapience, the Son determines to die that man may live. To this decision He is also persuaded by the angels, who, deeply compassionate of man's fate, come with all the heavenly college to plead for him.

They present their petitions in three divisions, or hierarchies, and the arguments they use are again those of Bonaventura, but expanded freely. The plea of each hierarchy ends with the refrain,

"For now is time of Mercy and Peace  
And time is come that vengeance cease."

<sup>9</sup>Compare Anselm: *Cur Deus Homo*, II: 9, Migne CLVIII (1853).

"Est et aliud cur magis conveniat incarnari Filio, quam aliis personis: quia convenientius sonat Filium supplicare Patri quam alliam personam alii" (cf. Greban).

"Item: Homo, pro quo erat oraturus; diabolus, quem expugnaturus; ambo falsam similitudinem Dei per propriam voluntatem praesumpserant. Unde quasi specialius adversus personam Filii peccaverunt, qui vera Patris similitudo creditur. Illi itaque, cui specialius ut injura, convenientius attribuitur culpae vindicta, aut indulgentia."

The Son sees that His Father is moved by these pleas, and wishing to strike while the iron is hot, kneels and begs to be allowed to settle the cause. The Father replies, "Sweet, sweetest Son, I am entirely glad of Thy behest. But it repents me that I made man; for Thou must bear his penance." Then the Son goes to Mercy, raises and kisses her, and embracing her says, "Sweet Mercy, Princess of Bliss, why arrayed in salt tears? I am that wight that shall end your sorrows and bring again Dame Peace. Behold, I am your champion; for your sake I will suffer passion, to restore man and make immortal what was mortal. Full manfully will I bear pain and think on you as my own lady, when I fight in arms and win the victory. To Truth and Right I'll give their desire at full and annul all guilt."

Joyously Mercy replies, "Oh sweet, most sweet brother, all my knight, and very cause of my heart's rest, where shall I gather might to reward you? I know not how best to thank you, but, oh, Prince worthiest, command me as your own and as you lyst."

Thus all was well and each kissed the other.

At Christ's Ascension, He brings Mary with Him to heaven, that she may ever plead for man, and presents to her Mercy to receive as her child. To Mercy He says, "Fair Sister, I have brought to you with double honor, man for whom you prayed. With my blood have I bought him, that Truth and Right may have no cause to complain. Even if he resort again to sin, unmindful of my Sacrifice, yet can you obtain your desire; for my mother will come and ask a boon, pleading for him by my great sufferings and her own cruel sorrows." He gives in full the long speech which Mary will make in such a case, but as it has no parallel in other versions of the allegory, I omit it.

The Son then turns to each of His other sisters, to ask if they are fully satisfied, and with their protestations of praise and love, the first book of the *Court of Sapience* ends. The second has no bearing on this subject.

The indebtedness to Grosseteste and to Bonaventura is clear enough; from the one the angels' pleas and the reasons why the Son is the most fitting Person of the Trinity to accomplish man's salvation; from the other the feudal setting, the threats of death and exile which Mercy and Peace advance, and Peace's assertion of her own and Mercy's importance and the wrong of forming a judgment without their concurrence. No less obvious is the debt to Deguillville. The appeal to Sapience for council, her selection of the Son as the one to die, and the second meeting with the sisters after the Ascension, are all borrowed from Deguillville's third poem, *de Jesucrist*, a summary of which I have already given. (See above, Chapter V, Section II.)

In combining these various sources, and preserving withal his own individuality and charm, the author has shown no little literary skill. The style throughout is fresh and vivid, the action varied and the descriptions sensuous and vital. The author's predilection for classical allusion is often apparent, and especially in the farewell lament of Peace. The spirit of chivalry, present throughout this poem, is most marked in the passages between Mercy and her Brother, where He, electing Himself as her champion, promises to fight for her as His lady. The poem, on the whole, is one of the most charming of the versions of the allegory.

### SECTION III. VERSIONS OF THE ALLEGORY IN EXAMPLE BOOKS.

Before leaving the fifteenth century I may note also the occurrence of a story in the English example book, curiously entitled *Jacob's Well*,<sup>10</sup> in which the Four Daughters are introduced, though the fact that there is no debate or strife between the sisters makes the connection of this story with our theme somewhat doubtful. Nevertheless I mention it

<sup>10</sup>*Jacob's Well*, E. E. T. S., No. CXV, orig. ser., Chap. XLI, pp. 255-6.

here as implying at least a general familiarity with the allegory of the Four Daughters. The story in *Jacob's Well* is quoted from "Alexander episcopus mindenensis."<sup>11</sup> A wicked scholar dreamt that he was roaming about on a field during a thunderstorm. He went to the House of Righteousness, to the House of Truth, and to the House of Peace, but none would receive him. Yet Peace advised him to find her sister Mercy, and Mercy saved him from the tempest that he might henceforth serve her. The character which Peace gives to Mercy is that common to all the versions hitherto discussed, "She is evermore redy to helpyn alle wretchys at cryen to here for helpe."

#### SECTION IV. GILES FLETCHER'S *Christ's Victory*.

For the next instance of our allegory in English literature we are carried down to the time of Shakespeare. It is found in a poem written in 1610 by Giles Fletcher, the full title of which reads, *Christ's Victory and Triumph in Heaven and Earth over and after Death*.<sup>12</sup>

The general theme of the poem is the Redemption. The scene is laid as usual before God's throne, where Mercy is heard to "lift up the music of her voice to bar eternal fate;" which Justice no sooner hears than opposes. A long description of Justice, her qualities and her retinue, follows, and then comes her speech against showing mercy to man, whom she arraigns in a long indictment of which I quote only a part.

"His body dust; where grew such cause of pride?  
His soul thy image; what could he envy?  
Himself most happy if he so would bide:  
Now grown most wretched, who can remedy?  
He slew himself, himself the enemy."

<sup>11</sup>Perhaps Alex. (Petit) de Balscot, Bishop of Meath (Mindensis), who died in 1397. See Gams *Series Episcoporum*.

This story is found also in the *Alphabet of Tales*, E. E. T. S., orig. ser., CXXVII, Part II, p. 338.

<sup>12</sup>First published in 1610 in an edition of poems of Giles Fletcher by his brother Phineas. Included in *A Complete Edition of the Poets of Great Britain*, Edinburgh, 1793, IV, 496-519.

His sin, without excuse, should be punished without mercy.

“I crave no more, and thou can give no less,  
Than death to dead men, justice to unjust.”

Her accusations ended, heaven's hierarchies burn with zeal against man, but then, like sunshine after storm, Mercy again displays herself. A description of her beauty and attributes follow, after which Fletcher, leaving the heavenly scene for a moment to turn to earth, shows Repentance bowed in misery because of man's fate.

“Crouching upon the ground, in sackcloth trussed;  
Early and late she prayed, and fast she must,  
And all her hair hung full of ashes and of dust.”

Sitting thus in utter wretchedness, weeping and beating her breast, she would have been wholly prostrate had not the “fair damsel” Faith upheld her. Mercy from heaven beholding these in their dark valley, sends one of the graces to comfort them, and herself hastens to annul the effect of Justice's arraignment.

She begins her prayer fervently, “Father, if thou hast no joy but to reward desert, reward at last the devil's deceit and let him die.” One thing for which Justice had inveighed against man, was his idolatry. This Mercy deplores, but thus excuses:

“The reason was, thou wast above their reason.  
They would have any gods rather than none.”

She then pleads man's weakness,—“He was but dust” and God's power to restore his handiwork. She asks, “If all must pay the debt of death, who will incense thy temple, or crown the sacrifice at the altar? If only they who are worthy might see thee, none could ever do so. But what man hath done, man shall undo, since God to him is grown so near a kin.” With growing enthusiasm she describes

Christ's birth and mission and the blessedness which that should bring to man. As she ceases

"the mighty thunder dropt away  
 From God's unwary arm \* \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \* \* and all to Mercy bow'd  
 Their broken weapons at her feet they gladly strow'd."

The poem is at once much fuller and freer than Kennedy's.<sup>18</sup> No attempt is made to follow a model, and the arguments are too vague and general to permit recognition of a definite source. Two points, however, recall former versions: the first, the minuteness of the descriptions of the personal appearance and qualities of Mercy and Justice, recalling similar stress in the *Court of Sapience*; the other, the account of Repentance and Faith, who under the name of Bitter Ellinde and Innig Gebet had already figured in the Dutch play, *De eerste Blijscap van Maria*. That Fletcher should have known the *Court of Sapience* is not too much to assume, since that seems from the number of manuscripts known, to have been a popular poem in its day. Yet the mere fact that both gave detailed pictures of Mercy and Justice need not imply borrowing, and the fact in itself is of no importance. But the employment of the pity excited by the grief and wretched state of Repentance as an incentive to Mercy's pleading is more unusual. In fact, I know it only in the *Eerste Blijscap*; and though I hesitate to say that Fletcher knew this play, yet the similarity of motives would seem to suggest it. It is true that in the Valenciennes *Passion* described in the sixth chapter, Oraison corresponds in a way to Faith here, but that mystère lacks the picturesque figure of Repentance who is described by Fletcher in the same way as is Innig Gebet in the *Blijscap*. On the whole, however, *Christ's Victory* is an independent treatment of a well known tradition.

<sup>18</sup>See above, p. 46.



SECTION V. DRUMMOND'S *Shadow of the Judgment*.

I bring to a close this list of miscellaneous English versions with the mention of William Drummond's unfinished poem, *The Shadow of the Judgment*.<sup>14</sup> Drummond's poem appears to be closely related to the scene just outlined from *Christ's Victory*. Indeed, one is inclined to regard it as a distorted imitation of this portion of Fletcher's poem. Charity, Justice and Truth come fleeing from wicked earth to heaven to tell of the outrages perpetrated against them on earth, and to plead for vengeance. Preparations for the last judgment begin, but the poem breaks abruptly off. It suggests the contemporary poem of Fletcher's in its characterization, but is lacking in any dispute, Charity being here one of man's accusers.

## SECTION VI. SUMMARY.

With the conclusion of this list of miscellaneous versions our survey of the history of the allegory in English literature is completed. Looking back now over the array of English versions presented in this and previous chapters, we shall hardly fail to recognize the important place which the story of the Four Daughters holds in the literary history of England. At the very beginning of the thirteenth century it made its first appearance in English in *Vices and Virtues*. By the middle of that century it had been developed in England into the feudal allegory, *Chateau d'Amour*, by the English Bishop, Grosseteste. In the early years of the fourteenth century Grosseteste's story was retold in English in the *Cursor Mundi* and was also incorporated into the *Gesta Romanorum*, a collection which, though in Latin, was probably compiled in England. A little later in the same century

<sup>14</sup>William Drummond: *The Shadow of the Judgment*—in (Complete Edition of the Poets of Great Britain) Anderson's Poets, v. IV: 669, Edinburgh, 1793.

*Poetical Works*, ed. Turnbull, London, 1856, pp. 182-196.

versions of the allegory are found in the *Charter of the Abbey of the Holy Ghost* and in *Piers Plowman*. With the beginning of the fifteenth century English versions multiplied. Moreover, the allegory at that time began to affect the miracle and morality plays. Even after the change of religion in England this story of the Four Daughters still lingered, and narrowly missed being made the basis of a dramatic poem by England's great Puritan poet. From first to last the popularity of this allegory<sup>15</sup> continued for four centuries. It is doubtful if any other allegory can parallel this record in the literature of England.

<sup>15</sup>Besides the evidences of popularity afforded by literature one may refer to the tapestries at Hampton Court depicting the scene, which are mentioned by Professor Pollard (*Macro Plays*, E. E. T. S., ex. ser. XCI, introduction).

## GENERAL CONCLUSION.

The materials here gathered for an historical study of the Four Daughters of God have been drawn chiefly from the literatures of France and England. By including also Italian, Spanish and German versions of the allegory these materials would be swelled to far larger proportions. Indeed, the complete history of this allegory, which took its origin not later than the tenth century in the Midrash, cannot even now be written, for it is not yet extinct, but survives in Germany in folk-plays of the present day.

In the course of its remarkably long career the allegory has assumed a wide variety of literary forms. In prose it is found in commentaries on scripture, in homilies and example books as well as in the various Lives of Christ. In verse it occurs in both didactic and narrative poems, sometimes as an episode, again as the main theme of the poem. Its most important influence upon literature, however, was that which it exerted in the field of the drama, where it was introduced into both miracle and morality plays.

Another noteworthy feature in the history of the allegory is the variety of settings in which the strife between the sisters is framed. These settings range in time from the Creation to the Last Judgment. In the Midrash and the few German works mentioned by Heinzel and Scherer the scene of the strife was laid at the creation of man. In a number of dramatic versions—the *Viel Testament* and several German plays—the scene immediately follows the fall of man. In the majority of the versions, however, the strife of the Sisters is connected with the Incarnation. Nevertheless, even in these there is not perfect agreement. While in most cases the debate directly precedes the birth of Christ, in the Provençal *Jutgamen de Jhesucrist* and in the middle debate scene of Greban's *Passion*, the pleading

of the Sisters is introduced at the close of His ministry and its object is to prevent, if possible, the necessity of His death. In others the action is postponed still later. Thus *Piers Plowman* represents the scene as occurring just after the death of Christ, and the *Merlijn* group make it follow the Harrowing of Hell. Other versions detach the scene wholly from the incarnation and ministry of Christ and transfer it to the Judgment. Sometimes the centre of interest is the question of the fate of an individual man at his death, as in the vision literature represented by Cæsius, or the same question in reference to Mankind as a type, which is the theme in Deguillville. The *Vengeance* scene, as its name implies, deals with the judgment upon the Jews for their crucifixion of Christ, while the last part of the *Belial*, some German plays founded upon this, and the second Provençal play are concerned with the general judgment of man at the last day. The relationships brought out in the course of this investigation can perhaps be best illustrated by the chart which I add. As a generic grouping of the versions, it, of course, is incomplete, since it is confined to the versions which have been considered in the preceding pages.

In conclusion, I pray the indulgence of the reader in the words of the author of one of the earliest versions, in MS. Arsenal 3460:

“Seignor, ne maies en despit  
 Por che se iai de sens petit  
 Q'ai contee cheste hystoire  
 Car ie lai trouve en escrit.”

and assert with Greban my openness to correction:

“S'erreur disons ou expliquons  
 des maintenant la revoquons,  
 soubmettans nos fais et nos signes  
 a vos corrections benignes  
 ou a ceulx qui parceu l'aront  
 ou qui mieulx faire le scaront.”

*Passion de Greban. Prologue Final et Total,*  
 II, 34551-34564.



A LIST OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES USED IN PREPARATION  
OF THIS DISSERTATION.

- An Alphabet of Tales*. E. E. T. S. orig. ser. CXXVII, Pt. II.  
ANCONA, *Origini del Teatro Italiano*, Roma, 1891.  
ANSELM, *Cur Deus Homo* (Migne, *Patrologia*, CLVIII).  
AQUINAS (THOMAS), *Libri Sententiarum* (Sancti Thomae Aquinatis  
. . . . Opera Omnia . . . . Tomus VII, Parma, 1857).  
BARTOLUS, *Incipit tractatus questiones ventilate coram domino Jesu  
Cristo . . . . inter Verginam . . . . et dyabolum*.  
BELCARI (FEO), *Sacra Rappresentazione*, Firenze, 1833.  
BERNARD, *Sermones* (Migne, *Patrologia*, CLXXXIII).  
BONAVENTURA, *Meditationes Vitae Christi* (Opera, Tomus VI), London,  
1668.  
BRAKELMANN (J.), *Die Alifr. Liederhandschrift*, Nro. 389, Bern (Her-  
rigs Archiv. XLI: 339 ff.).  
BRANDEIS (A.), *Jacob's Well* (E. E. T. S., orig. ser. CXV, 1900).  
BRANDL (A.), *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shake-  
speare* (*Quellen und Forschungen*, No. LXXX, Strassburg, 1898):  
BRUNET (J. C.), *Manuel du Libraire*, Paris, 1860-65.  
CARNAHAN (D. H.), *The Prologue in the Old French and Provençal  
Mystery*. Yale diss., 1905.  
CARPENTER (F. I.), *The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene*, by  
Lewis Wager, Chicago, 1902 and 1904.  
CAESARIUS VON HEISTERBACH, *Die Fragmente der Libri. VIII Miracu-  
lorum* (Römische Quartalschrift für christl. Altertumskunde, Roma,  
1901).  
CHAMBERS (E. K.), *The Medieval Stage*, Oxford, 1903.  
CHASSANT (A.), *L'Advocacie Notre-Dame . . . par Jean de Jus-  
tice*, Paris, 1855.  
CLARK (A.), *The Register of Oseney Abbey*, E. E. T. S., orig ser.,  
CXXXIII, 1907.  
COLLIER (J. L.), *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, London, 1831.  
COMESTOR (PETER), *Sermo de Adventu Domini* (Migne CXCVIII).  
Conception . . . . *Le Mystere de la Conception . . . . de la  
benoiste vierge Marie . . . . Imprime . . . . a Paris par  
Alain Lotrian*, 1541.  
*Court of Sapience*, printed by Wynkyn de Worde.  
CREIZENACH, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, Halle, 1893 and 1903.  
CRUEL (R.), *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*, Detmold,  
1879.  
DINAUX (A.), *Trouvères . . . . du Nord de la France et du Midi  
de la Belgique*, Brussels, 1863.  
DRUMMOND (W.), *Poetical Works*, ed. W. B. Turnbull, London, 1856.  
FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, Hamburg, 1718.  
FELTON (J.), *Robert Grosseteste, Bishop von Lincoln, Ein Beitrag zur  
Kirchen-Kulturgeschichte*, Freiburg, 1887.  
FLETCHER (G.), *A Complete Edition of the Poets of Great Britain*,  
Edinburgh, 1793. IV: 496-519.

- FURNIVALL (F. J.), *Lydgate's Deguilleville's Pilgrimage of Man* (E. E. T. S., ex. ser., LXXVII, LXXXIII), 1899, 1901.
- FURNIVALL AND POLLARD, *The Macro Plays* (E. E. T. S., ex. ser., XCI, 1904).
- GASTÉ (M.), *Les Drames liturgiques de la Cathedral de Rouen* (Revue Catholique de Normandie, 1893).
- GAULOHÉ (J.), *L'Amour Divin* (Collection Soleinne, Bibl. Nat., Paris).
- GAYLEY, *Representative English Comedies*, New York, 1903.
- GEROULD (G. H.), *The North English Homily Collection*, Oxford, 1902.
- GOEDEKE AND TITTMANN, *Deutsche Dichter aus dem XVI Jahrhundert*. Leipzig, 1868.
- GOEDEKE, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, Dresden, 1859-81.
- GOSSELIN (E.), *Recherches sur les Origines et l'Histoire du Théâtre à Rouen avant Corneille*, Rouen, 1868.
- GRÖBER, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1902.
- GRÖBER (G.), *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1902.
- HAASE, *Die ae. Bearbeitungen von Grosseteste's Chateau d'Amour verglichen mit der Quelle* (Anglia, XII: 311-74, 1889).
- HALLIWELL (J. O.), *Ludus Coventriae* (Pub. Shakes. Soc.), London, 1841.
- HARTMANN (A.), *Scheirer Rhythmus von der Erlösung* (ZfdA, XXIII: 176-184).
- HAZLITT (W.), *Works*, XI, New York, 1904.
- HEINZEL (R.), *Vier Geistliche Gedichte* (ZfdA, XVII: 1-56).
- HEERTAGE (S.), ed. *Gesta Romandum*. E. E. T. S. ex. ser. XXXIII, 1879.
- Histoire Littéraire de la France, Ouvrage commencé par les religieux, Benedictins de . . . St. Maur, et continué par l'Académie*, Paris, 1865-93.
- HOLTHAUSEN, *Vices and Virtues*, E. E. T. S., orig. ser. LXXXIX (1888); *Kennedy Studien* (Archiv. für das Studium der neueren Sprache und Litteratur, CX, CXII, 1903, 1904).
- HONE (W.), *Ancient Mysteries Described*, London, 1823.
- HORSTMANN (C.), *Altenglischen Legenden*, Heilbronn, 1881; *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, London, 1896.
- HUGO OF ST. VICTOR, *Canonici Regularis Laterensis Opera*, ed. Garzonius, Moguntiae, 1614; *Annotationes in Quosdam Psalmos* (Migne, *Patrologia*, CLXXVII).
- HÜFFER, *Vorstudien zu einer Darstellung des Lebens und Wirkens des heiligen Bernard zu Clairvaux*, Münster, 1886.
- HUPE, *Robert Grosseteste's Chateau d'Amour* (Anglia, XIV: 415-55), 1892.
- JACOB (P. L.), *Bibliothèque Dramatique de M. de Soleinne*, Paris, 1843.
- JANAUSCHEK (P. L.), *Xenia Bernardina IV*. Vindobonae, 1891.
- JEANROY (A.), and TEULIÉ (H.), *Mystères Provençaux du XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, Toulouse, 1893.
- JOHNSON (S.), *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, v. XII, New York, 1861.
- JULLEVILLE. PETIT DE, *Les Mystères*, Paris, 1880; *Le Théâtre en France*, Paris, 1889.
- JUSSERAND (J. J.), *L'Épopée Mystique de William Langland*. Paris, 1893; *Observations sur la Vision de Piers Plowman*. Paris, 1903.

- KUGLER, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Berlin, 1891.  
*Le Laz d'Amour divin* . . . nouvelle imprime a rouen pour Thomas Laisnec, 1500.
- LEROY (E.), *Études sur les Mystères*, Paris, 1837.
- LIEBNER (A.), *Hugo von St. Victor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit*, Leipzig, 1832.
- LINCY (LEROUX DE) ET. FR. MICHEL, *Nature et Loy de Rigueur (Recueil de Farces, Moralités et Sermons joyeux*, Paris, 1837).
- LUDOLPHUS DE SAXONIA, *Vita Jesu Christi* . . . ed. Bolard Rigollot, et Carnandet, Parisiis et Romae, 1865.
- MAGNUS (L.), *Respublica* (E. E. T. S., ex. ser., XCIV, 1905).
- MACCRACKEN (H. N.), *Studies in the Life and Writings of John Lydgate, Monk of Bury*, Harvard diss., 1907.
- MÂLE (E.), *Le Renouveau de l'Art par les Mystères* (Gazette des Beaux Artes), Paris, 1904.
- MANNHARDT (W.), *Weihnachtsblüthen in Sitte und Sage*, Berlin, 1864.
- MARTIN (E.), *Le Besant de Dieu von Guillaume* . . . de Normandie, Halle, 1869.
- MERI (HUON DE), *Tournoiement de l'Antichrist (Coll. des Poetes anterieurs au XVIe siècle*, Reims, 1851).
- MEYER (P.), *Bulletin de la Société des Anciens Textes*, No. XI, 1885.
- MICHEL (FR.), *Libri Psalmorum*, Oxonii, 1860; *Rapport à M. Le Ministre de l'Instruction*, Paris, 1835.
- MILLER (T.), *Old English version of the Ecclesiastical History of England* (E. E. T. S., orig. ser. XCVI, 1891).
- MINZLOFF (R.), *Bruder Hansens Marien Lieder*, Hanover, 1863.
- MONE (F. T.), *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, Freiburg, 1853-55.
- MONNOYE (BERNARD DE LA), *Les Noels Bourguignons*, ed. Fertiault, Paris, 1858.
- MORRIS (R.), *Cursor Mundi* (E. E. T. S.), orig. ser., LIX, 1875.
- NAETEBUS (G.), *Die Nichtlyrische Strophenform des Altfr.*, Leipzig, 1891.
- NEANDER (A.), *Der heilige Bernard und sein Zeitalter*, Hamburg und Gotha, 1848.
- OESTERLEY, *Gesta Romanorum*, Berlin, 1872.
- PARFACIT, *Histoire du Théâtre française*, Paris, 1735.
- PARIS (G.), *La Littérature française au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1890.
- PARIS (G.), ET RAYNAUD (G.), *Mystère de la Passion d'Arnoul Greban*, Paris, 1878.
- PARIS (L.), *Toiles peintes et Tapisseries de la Ville de Reims*, Paris, 1843.
- PARIS (P.), *Les MSS. fr. de la Bibl. du Roi*, Paris, 1836-48.
- PELBARTUS, *Pomerium Sermonum*, Hagenau, 1511.
- PICOT (E.), *Théâtre Mystique de Pierre du Val et des Libertins de Rouen*, 1882.
- PIPER, *Das Menschenwerdung Christi*, (Evang. Kalendar, 1859).
- POLLARD (A. W.), *English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes*, Oxford, 1904.
- Proces qui a fait Misericorde contre Justice* . . . Paris Bibl. Nat.
- RAAB (K.), *Ueber vier allegorische Motive* (Program zu Leopen, 1885).
- REINSCH (R.), *Mittheilungen aus einer fr. hs. des Lambeth Palace*, (Herrigs Archiv., LXIII, 52-3, 1880); *La Vie de Tobie de Guillaume de Clerc de Normandie* (Herrigs, LXII, 375-96, 1879).



- RICHARD (J. M.), *Le Mystère de la Passion, Texte de Ms. 697 de la Bibl. d'Arras*, Arras, 1893.
- ROEDIGER, *Contrasti Antichi*, Firenze, 1887.
- ROQUEFORT-FLAMERICOURT, *De l'Etat de la Poésie Française dans les XIIIe et XIIIe siècles*, Paris, 1815.
- ROTHSCHILD (J. DE), *Mistère du Viel Testament*, Paris, 1878-91.
- ROY (E.), *Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XIVe au XVIe siècle*, Dijon et Paris, 1903-4.
- RUE, DE LA, *Essais historiques sur les Bardes, les Jongleurs et les Trouvères*, Caen., 1834.
- SAYLE, *Early English Printed Books in the University Library, Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1900.
- SCHERER (W.), *Die Vier Töchter Gottes* (ZfdA, XXI: 414-416).
- SCHICK (J.), *Lydgate's Temple of Glas* (E. E. T. S., ex. ser., LX, 1891).
- SCHIPPER (J.), *The Poems of Walter Kennedy* (Wiener Denkschriften, LXXXIV, 1902).
- SCHMID (H.), *Mysticismus des Mittelalters*, Jena, 1824.
- SCHMIDT (A.), *Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie . . . Boehmer-Rom. Studien, IV: 493-542, 1880*.
- SCHROEDER (E.), *Marienlyrik* (ZfdA, XXV, 127 ff.).
- SEEGER (H.), *Ueber die Sprache des Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie und ueber den Verfasser und die Quellen des Tobias*, Halle, 1881.
- SEPET (M.), *Les Origines Catholiques du Théâtre Moderne*, Paris, 1901; *Le Drame chrétien au moyen Age*, Paris, 1878; *Le Drame religieux du moyen Age*, Paris, 1903.
- SKEAT (W. W.), *The Vision of William concerning Piers Plowman, by William Langland* (E. E. T. S., orig. ser. XXXVIII, LIV, LXVII, LXXXI), 1869, 1873, 1877, 1884; *Piers Ploughman*, Clarendon Press, 1886.
- SNELLAERT (F. A.), *Nederlandsche Gedichte uit de veertiende eeuw*, Brussels, 1869.
- STENGEL (E.), *Codicem Manuscriptum Digby 80 in Bodl. Bibl. asseruatum descripsit, excerptis, illustravit*. Halis, 1871.
- STEVENSON (F.), *Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln*, London, 1899.
- STINTZING, *Geschichte der populären Literatur des Kanonischen-römischen Rechts in Deutschland*, Leipzig, 1867.
- STRAETEN (E. VAN DER), *Le Théâtre Villageois en Flandre*, Bruxelles, 1874.
- STÜRZINGER, *Le Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine*, London, 1893; *Le Pèlerinage de l'âme*, London, 1895; *Le Pèlerinage de Jhesus Christ*, London, 1897.
- TEUBER (P. P.), *Ueber die vom Dichter des Anegenge benützten Quellen*. PBB., Halle, 1899.
- THERAMO (JACOPUS), *Compendium breue consolatio peccatorum nuncupatum*.
- THOMAS (A.), *Mystère rouergue* (Annales du Midi, II, 385 ff.).
- VACANDARD (E.), *St. Bernard et la seconde Croisade* (Revue Hist., pp. 398-457, 1885).
- VAN VLOTEN, *Jacob van Maerlant's Merlijn*, Leiden, 1880.
- La Vengeance nostro Seigneur . . . imprimé par A. Verard*, Paris, 1491.
- VERDIER (P. LE), *Mystère de l'Incarnation et Nativité de nostre Sauueur*, Rouen, 1886.

- VIRIVILLE (VALLET DE), *Notice d'un Mystère par personnages—à Troyes* (Bibl. de l'École des Chartes, v. 1843-4).
- WARTON (T.), *History of English Poetry*, ed. Hazlitt, London, 1871.
- WECHSSLER (E.), *Die romanischen Marienklagen*, Halle, 1893.
- WERNHER, *Deflorationes—Patrum sanctorum* (Migne, *Patrologia*, CLVII).
- WILLEMS (J. T.), *Belgisch Museum voor de nederduitsche Tael-en-Letterkunde*, Ghent, 1838; *De Eerste Blijscap van Maria*, Ghent, 1845.
- WILMOTTE, *Les Passions Allemandes du Rhin dans leur Rapport avec l'ancien Théâtre française*, Bruxelles, 1898.
- WOLFF (F.), *Studien zur Geschichte der spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur*, Berlin, 1859; *Ueber einige alt. fr. Doctrinen und Allegorien von der Minne* (Denkschriften der K. Acad. der Wissenschaften, XIII, Wien, 1864).
- WRIGHT (T.), *Biographia Britannica Literaria*, London, 1846; ed. *Piers Plowman*, 1887; *Political Poems and Songs*, London, 1891.
- WÜNSCHE, *Midrasch Bereschit Rabba*, tr. Leipzig, 1881.
- ZACHER (J.), *Mittelniederländisches Osterspiel*, ZfdA. II: 302-350.
- ZARIFOPOL, *Kritischer Text der Lieder Richards de Fournival*, Halle, 1904.

## VITA.

I, Hope Traver, was born in Bennington, Vermont. I graduated from Vassar College in 1896, and after teaching for five years, began my graduate study in English and History at Bryn Mawr College, continuing my teaching at the same time for the first two years. In 1903 I was made resident Fellow in English at Bryn Mawr, and in 1904 Mary E. Garrett Fellow. During 1904-1906 I studied in the University at Munich under Prof. J. Schick and in Paris, returning in the spring of 1906 to complete my work at Bryn Mawr. I have carried on my graduate work under the following professors: Profs. Andrews, Brown, Gerould, Gwinn, Schick, Sieper, and Tinker, to all of whom I wish to express my heartiest thanks.