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Abstract

This dissertation examines the intersection of law and monastic literature in the *Speculum religiosorum* (c.1322), a guide to the monastic life, written by the English parish priest and doctor of canon law William of Pagula (c.1285-1332). William’s *Speculum* is unique among monastic treatises in that it incorporates a long compendium of monastic law. The introduction provides context for the *Speculum* through an overview of the history of monastic reform from the mid-eleventh century to the fourteenth. In chapter one, I examine the manuscripts of the *Speculum religiosorum*, its relationship to William’s other works, and its sources. The non-legal contents of the *Speculum* come mostly from the Bible, the Fathers, and Cistercian writers, but I show that William’s sources for this material were often more recent compilations, such as Thomas of Ireland’s *Manipulus florum*. In chapter two I argue that the *Speculum* belongs to a genre that I call “encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation,” but that the work also has an important relationship with sermons and preaching aids. Chapters three and four cover the legal contents of the *Speculum*. Chapter three is an overview of monastic law from Gratian’s *Decretum* to the *Clementines* (1311), with an emphasis on the English context. Chapter four surveys compendia of monastic law in fourteenth-century England. I argue that William’s legal
methodology is more sophisticated than that of similar works. In Chapter five, I demonstrate that wisdom is the governing theme for the *Speculum* as a whole. I argue that William encourages his audience to treat law as a form of wisdom, and to internalize it through meditative reading. I provide parallel examples from other monastic contexts. William’s conception of wisdom combines elements from Augustine and from monastic exegesis of biblical wisdom literature. I conclude by observing that the *Speculum* does not allow for a neat division between pastoral, legal, and monastic literature.
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# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCCM</td>
<td><em>Corpus christianorum, continuatio medievalis</em>. Turnhout: Brepols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td><em>Corpus christianorum, series latina</em>. Turnhout: Brepols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clem.</td>
<td>“Clementines” (= Clement V, with John XXII. <em>Clementis papae V constitutiones</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td><em>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum</em>. Vienna, Prague, Leipzig: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


RTAM  *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*


VI  “*Liber sextus*” (= Boniface VIII, *Sextus decretalium liber*).

X  “*Liber extra*” (= Gregory IX, *Decretales*).
Introduction

In the early 1320s, William of Pagula, doctor of law and parish priest of Winkfield, near Windsor Castle, wrote the *Speculum religiosorum*, a treatise for the cloistered religious.¹ The *Speculum religiosorum*, although relatively brief by the standard of William of Pagula’s other writings, is a substantial work of approximately 75,000 words. This likely makes it the longest work composed by a secular cleric for a monastic audience in the later Middle Ages. The contents of the *Speculum religiosorum* (hereafter *SR*) consist of a compilation of biblical and patristic quotations and excerpts from more recent devotional works. It also contains a collection of canons, one of the few examples of an attempt to make a collection of all of the available law for the religious. The purpose of this thesis is to provide a detailed study of the *SR*—its form, sources, and reception—in the context of the intersection of late medieval monastic literature, law and pastoral care.

¹ I will refer to the *Speculum* by folio number (all references to Gray’s Inn 11, unless otherwise stated) and by divisions of the text. The *Speculum*, as it appears in Gray’s Inn 11, is divided into two parts, each of which is divided into chapters. Chapters I.7 and I.9 are very long, and so I have further divided them into paragraphs. These paragraphs correspond with subdivisions in Gray’s Inn 11.

The nomenclature of monasticism in the later Middle Ages causes endless difficulty, since the distinctions between monks, regular canons, and friars shifted with the audience, author and context. Sometimes these differences are expressed in the minutest detail, and at others they are ignored. Since William of Pagula draws on many heterogenous sources, the vocabulary in the *Speculum religiosorum* is inconsistent. His words for the audience of the work are, in order of frequency: *monachus* (>200 uses), *religiosus* (>150), *claustralis* (22); *canonicus regularis* (18). The *Speculum* almost always uses *canonicus regularis* together with *monachus*—a given statement applies to both monks and canons. Different rules are applied to the two groups only twice, at I.9.27 (fol. 44r) and I.43 (98v). William explicitly excludes mendicants from his audience (I.7.1; 25v).


1.1 William of Pagula’s Life and Work

William of Pagula was born, probably in the mid-1280s, at Paull (‘Pagula’, in Latin), a Yorkshire fishing village on the north bank of the Humber, about ten kilometres east of Kingston-Upon-Hull. Nothing is known of his early life, but he clearly secured some form of patronage for his education, since he entered Oxford c. 1298, became a master of arts a decade later, and began to study law c. 1308. The first sure date in his biography is November, 1313, when he left the curia of William Greenfield, archbishop of York, where he had been a clerk. On 5 March, 1314, William, having been ordained a deacon at some point in the previous winter, became perpetual vicar of Winkfield, a parish near Windsor Castle. That summer, he became both a priest and a bachelor of law. He took immediate advantage of a leave of absence to continue his legal studies at Oxford, a practice that Boniface VIII had encouraged in his bull Cum ex eo (1302). In 1319 he incepted as a doctor of law, and from Michaelmas term, 1319 to Trinity term, 1321, he served his regency (that is, a mandatory period of lecturing and participation in the corporate life of the university). Thereafter he returned to his parish sometime in 1322.

---


Boyle used the form “Pagula,” and it continues to be the most common form in contemporary scholarship (e.g. Cary J. Nederman). Richard Sharpe, A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), no. 2141 uses “of Paull”, and the International Medieval Bibliography confuses the matter by splitting entries between “William of Pagula-theologian”, and “William of Paull- vicar of Winkfield.” I will use “Pagula” throughout, not only because it is the most widely-used form of the name, but also because it avoids confusion with another William of Paull (d.1349), a Carmelite theologian who wrote a lost work De ente rationis formaliter (see Sharpe, Handlist, no. 2142).

Between 1320 and 1322 he produced a remarkable quantity of literature. In these years he found time to write the *Summa summarum*, a practical compendium of canon law, to begin his most widely-read work, a pastoral manual called the *Oculus sacerdotis*, and to combine material from the *Summa*, the *Oculus*, and other sources into an enormous *Speculum praelatorum*. William of Pagula’s written output appears to have declined after 1322, perhaps because he became penitentiary for the deanery of Reading in March of that year, the first of various pastoral and administrative posts in the diocese of Winchester. At some point between 1322 and 1326 he excerpted a section on cloistered religious from the *Speculum praelatorum* to create the more manageable *Speculum religiosorum*. In 1330x31 he wrote his final work, the *Speculum regis Edwardi III*, a plea for the defence of his parishioners against the exactions of royal agents. He likely died in 1332, although the exact date of his death is not known.

It is reasonable to suppose that William engaged in this flurry of publication in part as an attempt to win ecclesiastical preferment. If this is the case, he enjoyed only moderate success, since his highest office, archdeacon, was often a stepping stone to higher office, such as dean. It may be that William did not advance further in his *cursus honororum* because his dedication to exercising his duties as a parish priest and archdeacon that caused him to avoid the non-residential benefices that formed a key part of ecclesiastical promotion.

It would be difficult to argue that William of Pagula’s significance lies in his originality or in the depth of his thought. He wrote no surviving academic commentary on law or theology. Nevertheless, one should not underestimate the importance of William of Pagula’s writings for the intellectual history of the later Middle Ages because they provide a popular synthesis; the opposite should rather be the case. Even for those who had considerable education, synthetic

---

4 For the dates of William’s writings, see Boyle, “The *Oculus sacerdotis,*” 105-08. All references to the *Summa summarum* in this thesis are to Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 293, unless otherwise noted. All references to the *Oculus sacerdotis* in this thesis are to Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Rare Book Library MS Codex 721, unless otherwise noted. The unique manuscript of the *Speculum praelatorum* is Oxford, Merton College, MS 217.


works provided an important means of accessing knowledge quickly. The extension of access to education in the later Middle Ages made synthesis and popularization particularly important, since there was a larger audience that could not handle the complexities of scholastic debates, but needed and expected to learn by reading. William served the needs of a middling group, which included most parish priests, many friars and monks, and the better-educated laity. To his skill as a popularizer, he added sound practical knowledge of pastoral care. The *Summa summarum*, which survives in eleven manuscripts, takes the entire body of canon law going back to Gratian, and condenses it into one relatively accessible volume. The *Oculus sacerdotis*, William’s most popular work (fifty-seven mss.), does the same for pastoral literature and Dominican theology, as does the *Speculum religiosorum* for monastic literature. This is no mean achievement, even if it fails to win renown among intellectual historians.

Among his voluminous writings, only the *Speculum Edwardii III* arguably makes a significant contribution to medieval thought, and Cary Nederman has produced several studies that draw on it. The derivative character of the rest of his output, combined with its enormous size, has meant that Leonard Boyle remains the only scholar to have wrestled with any work in the corpus as a whole. All who work on William of Pagula should be grateful for Boyle’s map of a vast territory, but he could not explore many topics at length, including the *Speculum religiosorum*, to which he devoted only a few paragraphs. More recent scholars have dipped into William’s oeuvre, especially the *Oculus sacerdotis*, to extract evidence for a variety of projects in social and religious history, but have not given much attention to any of the works as a whole.

---


The Speculum religiosorum (hereafter SR) opens with a prologue on wisdom, followed by six chapters on the core requirements of the religious life: obedience, poverty, and chastity (fols. 1r-25v). The work then shifts into three chapters of mostly legal material dealing with “abbots and priors,” “correction,” and “the constitutions that a monk ought to know” (fols. 25v-54r). Chapters ten through forty-two deal with a miscellany of monastic topics (fols. 54v-101r). The second part of the SR (fols. 101r-65r) concentrates on devotion and contemplation. After a brief introduction (fols. 101r-104r), William provides a series of meditations on the passion (II. 2-6; fols. 101r-23r). The next section (II. 7-19, fols. 123r-44v) employs another familiar devotional motif: how to order one’s behaviour to conform to love of oneself, of one’s neighbour, and of God. He then deals with the nature of the contemplative life (II.20-29, fols. 144v-58r), before turning to some final thoughts on reading, discipline, speech and deportment (II. 30-41, fols. 158r-65r).

1.2 The History of Monasticism, c.1050- c.1350

To understand this context, it will be helpful to provide a brief history of monasticism in the centuries before William of Pagula’s lifetime, with a particular emphasis on English conditions. The period from c.1050 to c.1150 is generally seen as one of the golden ages of monasticism. Giles Constable has famously called this period “The Reformation of the Twelfth Century,” comparing its significance to the religious transformation of the sixteenth century and pairing it

---

10 The legal chapters (I. 7, 9) are by far the longest in the SR I.5, with a combined length of around 12 000 words. SR I.5 De paupertate and I.23 De cogitacionibus are about 2700 words long, and I.2, 6, 43 come in at around 2000 words. The other chapters are between 300 and 1500 words.

11 The subjects being: death to the world; grumblers (murmurantes); abandoning (relinquere) the world; humility; the talkative; gluttons and drunkards; silence; solitude; patience; pride; lust; sloth; adoration; thoughts (cogitaciones); chant (cantus); tears (fletus); sighs (gemitus); flight (from sin); clothing (induere, interpreted allegorically); the yokes of religion; speech; five things that must be done willingly (libenter); raising one’s soul to God; gentleness (mansuetudo); prayer; making a pleasing odour (allegorical); deportment (ordo); peace; patience (again); beauty; “What the religious ought to suffer, do, seek, teach, trust (confidere) and desire;” spiritual holiness; clothing (veste, interpreted allegorically); “the religious state and its benefits.”
with Charles Homer Haskins’s more secular “Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.” The number of men and women in the religious life grew several-fold, and the religious life itself took on new forms. Some of these new forms of religious life involved loosely organized communities, often of both sexes, that grew up around holy men and women. It appears that in many areas the most successful religious groups, such as the Cluniacs and the Cistercians, grew as much by reforming existing monasteries, or incorporating heretical communities, as by founding new houses themselves. At the same time, some of these new religious orders, such as the Cistercians and Carthusians, began to hold general chapters meetings and visitations, which bound their houses closely together.


13 For the growth in the monastic population, see Constable, Reformation, 44-47, 88-89. He gives, among other examples: a doubling of the houses in the diocese of Toul (Lorraine), 1069-1107; forty-two new houses associated with Hirsau, 1080-1120; a six-fold increase in England, 1066-1154. The total monastic population seems to have grown ten-fold in some areas, including England, c.1050-c.1150. True population totals are almost impossible to arrive at with any accuracy, and even calculating the number of houses is complicated by dissolution, movement, and the adoption of new customs. Nonetheless, the total increase was clearly spectacular, even with an increase in the European population as a whole. For female monasticism, see also Bruce L. Venarde, Women’s Monasticism and Medieval Society: Nunneries in France and England, 890-1215 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 15, 57-82. The high point in the growth of female houses seems have come slightly later than that of male houses, 1125-1170.


16 In the Middle Ages, a religious ‘order’ (ordo) referred to a group of communities that shared a common way of life, or indeed it referred to that way of life itself. The meaning of the word could range, depending on context, from the general ordo monasticus, which included all monks, to centralized organizations. After Lateran IV established a system of visitation and chapters for all monks and canons, the term ordo referred more often to legal and administrative entities, although the wider usage continued. In contemporary monastic scholarship, under the influence of Gert Melville and his associates, the term “order” has been increasingly restricted to the later sense of a
The heart of this growth was in the Loire Valley, and in the border lands between France and the Empire—Burgundy, the Rhineland, Provence and Northern Italy, but the total number of foundations was spectacular even in a peripheral area like England. Important new houses include: the Benedictine monasteries of Battle (1070) and Reading (1121), and the attempted restoration of Jarrow (1070s), the houses of regular canons at Llanthony (c.1100), Merton (1117), Carlisle Cathedral (1122), and St Augustine’s, Bristol (1140), the Cistercian monasteries of Tintern (1131), Rievaulx (1132), and Fountains (1132), and St Bartholomew’s hospital in London (1123). The major Benedictine houses were transformed by an infusion of monks from the major Norman houses. England also produced its own, admittedly modest, order, the Gilbertines.

Although the artistic and organizational achievements of this “twelfth-century” monasticism were widely respected in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, scholars often failed to recognize its intellectual and spiritual vitality. Even Catholic scholars, trained in neo-Thomism, generally relegated pre-scholastic writing to the realm of private edification. This began to


change with the publication of Étienne Gilson’s The Mystical Theology of St Bernard. An interest in pre-scholastic theology had already led Claude Mondésert, Jean Daniélou and Henri de Lubac to found the Sources chrétiennes series, and de Lubac’s Medieval Exegesis would later emphasize the continuity between the monastic and scholastic intellectual traditions. Gilson’s work had a direct influence on the prodigious scholarly labour of the Benedictine Jean Leclercq, perhaps the most prominent scholar of monasticism in the second half of the twentieth century (along with Adalbert de Vogüé). Leclercq’s L’amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu remains a classic one-volume introduction to the intellectual and cultural history of medieval monasticism, with an emphasis on the Cistercians.

This emphasis on the emergence of the Cistercians and other new orders led many scholars to posit a “crisis of coenobitism” beginning c.1050, in which traditional Benedictine monasticism no longer satisfied cultural and spiritual aspirations. In response, John van Engen drew attention to the continuing vitality of ‘old’ monasticism, and attempted to describe the worldview

---


of its participants.\textsuperscript{24} Van Engen’s work was part of a new wave of monastic research, beginning in the mid-1970s, by secular scholars, or at least scholars writing for a secular audience, who sought to understand the mentality of various religious actors, often drawing on contemporary anthropology and religious studies.\textsuperscript{25} This interest in monasticism has continued down to the present as part of a larger interest in religion in medieval studies, and in much of the academy.\textsuperscript{26}

In addition to the “reformation” of monasticism c.1050-1150, monks and regular canons played an important role in the “Gregorian Reformation” of the Church as a whole.\textsuperscript{27} J.-F. Lemarignier long ago suggested that the ecclesiastical structures that facilitated broader reforms originated in papal exemption of monastic houses from lay control.\textsuperscript{28} Monks and canons also provided much of the senior leadership of the reformist party; from Gregory VII (d. 1073) to Adrian IV (d.


\textsuperscript{27} Harold Berman, \textit{Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983) uses “Gregorian Reformation” instead of the more common “Gregorian Reform.” I accept Berman’s argument (p.19) that translating \textit{reformatio} as ‘reform’ for the twelfth century and ‘reformation’ for the sixteenth contains an implicit bias towards Roman Catholic ecclesiology. I do not, however, subscribe to Berman’s vast scheme of revolutionary history.

1159) every pope was a monk or regular canon except for Callistus II (1119-24). At the local level, lay lords often gave the patronage of their churches to monasteries, which then had responsibility for providing pastoral care, usually through a designated secular priest. Regular canons played a more direct role in pastoral work, especially in parts of Germany and southern France. Beyond these official roles, Martha Newman and Dominic Iogna-Prat have drawn attention to the importance of Cistercians and Cluniacs as intellectual leaders who used dramatic example, rhetorical persuasion, and personal bonds as a means of furthering the reform of Christian society.

By William of Pagula’s lifetime the status of the cloistered religious had declined considerably. Already in the second half of the twelfth century, cloistered monasticism played a less dominant role in the intellectual and administrative life of Latin Christendom. After the death of Adrian IV, very few popes would be cloistered religious, and a similar pattern is observable in the episcopate—in the See of Canterbury after Baldwin of Ford (d. 1190) for example. The quality of monastic writing also declined after the mid-twelfth century. Caesarius of Heisterbach,

29 The papacy of Callistus marks a clear division between a period of Benedictine dominance (1073-1119), and a long succession of regular canons (1124-59), interrupted only by the Cistercian Eugene III (1145-53). This change likely has some connection to the end of the Investiture Controversy.


31 Iogna-Prat, Order and Exclusion; Newman, Boundaries of Charity.
Matthew Paris and Bernard Ayglier, while important writers, were poor replacements for Bernard of Clairvaux, William of Malmesbury and Hildegard of Bingen. Martha Newman has suggested that after c.1150 the model for reforming authority in the Church moved from the charismatic leadership of monks and canons to representatives of the “moral-biblical movement” at Paris, who worked for reform through administrative norms based on correctly-applied law and moral theology.\textsuperscript{32} For the new leaders of the Church, cloistered monastics were a group that needed supervision and reform, as demonstrated by the growth in episcopal visitation of monasteries, and in papal legislation for the religious.

A model of transition from charisma to technocracy does not take into account the extent to which monastic culture was absorbed and appropriated by other groups in Christian society, including holy women, lay reform movements (Humiliati, Waldensians), saintly bishops (Edmund of Abingdon, Robert Grosseteste), and, most importantly, the mendicant orders. Elements of monastic devotion would eventually become a standard part of religious life even for the laity. The monasteries lost prestige and distinctiveness in part because others had adopted their methods and literature.\textsuperscript{33} The overwhelming amount of work in recent decades on these inheritors of monastic culture is difficult to summarize, even if one limits one’s scope to the late-twelfth and early-thirteenth centuries, but the greatest and most important innovations have come

\textsuperscript{32} The term “moral-biblical movement” refers to a tendency among Parisian scholars, c.1175-c.1225, to concentrate on the practical application of theology and law, and the moral exegesis of scripture, in contrast to the speculative theologians of the preceding and following periods. The phrase comes from Martin Grabmann, \textit{Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode nach den gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen}, vol. 2 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1911), 476. The two standard studies of Parisian intellectual culture in this period are: John W. Baldwin, \textit{Masters, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle}, 2 vols. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970); Beryl Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages}, rev. 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed. 1941), 196-263.


\textsuperscript{33} Even the Protestant Reformers found much to like in Bernard of Clairvaux. See Theo M.M.A.C. Bell, “Luther’s Reception of Bernard of Clairvaux,” \textit{Concordia Theological Quarterly} 59:4 (1995), 245-77; Anthony N.S. Lane, \textit{John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers}, chps. 3-4, “Calvin’s Use of Bernard of Clairvaux” and “Calvin’s Sources of Bernard of Clairvaux” (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1999), 87-150; Franz Posset, \textit{Pater Bernhardus: Martin Luther and Bernard of Clairvaux} (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2000)
in the study of the religious culture of women, whether nuns, *mulieres religiosae*, anchoresses or pious lay women.  

1.3 The Historiography of Late Medieval Monasticism

Compared to the unabated work on the “Reformation of the Twelfth Century,” or to the on-going interest in thirteenth-century friars, heretics, and women, male religious after c.1200 have received comparatively little attention. Some scholars have attempted to rehabilitate monks and canons in this period. Jessalyn Bird, Beverley Kienzle and Brian Noell have all demonstrated the important role of the Cistercians as preachers of reform in the early decades of the thirteenth century. Patrick McGuire has argued that the history of Cistercian literature should not be seen as a story of decline, but of change from contemplative theology to narrative genres (e.g. the *Exordium magnum*, and the works of Caesarius of Heisterbach). These scholars make a resonable point; scholastic sermons and narrative sources have less appeal for modern spiritual seekers and theologians, but this does not mean that they were not important in their own cultural moment. Nevertheless, even these defenders of male monasticism limit themselves to the

---


Cistercians active in the strip running from the Low Countries to the Mediterranean, and do not extend their studies past c.1230.

Another promising line of scholarly inquiry has looked at the attempts of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to control monastics through visitation and ad status sermons for monks and canons. These practices reflect the newly subordinate and economically vulnerable position of the cloistered religious. The starting place for episcopal visitation remains Christopher Cheney’s classic study. \(^{37}\) In England and Northern France, at least, conscientious bishops investigated the moral and economic health of each house every few years. \(^{38}\) These visitations could provoke considerable hostility on the part of the religious undergoing visitation, but Brian Golding has provided a needed corrective by showing that the visitations of the Gilbertines were normally characterized by sensitivity and co-operation. \(^{39}\) Preaching was a standard part of visitation, and Jessalyn Bird and James Ginther have recently provided fine studies of sermones ad religiosos by two important thirteenth-century reformers, Jacques de Vitry and Robert Grosseteste. \(^{40}\) Both churchmen saw the failings of monks, but also exalted their vocation as contemplatives fully withdrawn from affairs of the world. In the case of Jacques de Vitry, this was a change from his earlier position, which accorded an important reforming role to the cloistered religious. To a


large extent, the ecclesiatical hierarchy came to view the houses of monks and canons (as well as female religious) as important sites for reforming supervision, rather than as sources for reforming energy in the wider Church.

Another genre that reflected this dynamic was the confessional treatises for monks, although this was largely limited to northern Europe. Monks had taken the lead in developing the techniques of self-analysis that underlay private confession. In the decades around Lateran IV, however, secular clerics and friars began to write confessional formulae for monks in a scholastic style. There has not been much research on this development, with the exception of several editions by Joseph Goering (and his collaborators). Goering is primarily concerned with confessional treatises for monks as they relate to the history of English scholasticism and confession, rather than to monastic history. William of Pagula was keenly interested in confession and preaching, and the genres of the *sermo ad status* and *tractatus de confessione religiosorum* provide a background to his interest in the pastoral care of monks.

The authors of *sermones ad religiosos* and confessional treatises, whether they were friars or secular clergy, had, for the most part, been educated in the universities. In the early thirteenth century some monks sought out scholastic education, and a steady stream of converts from the schools ensured that many prominent monasteries had a few masters. In response to the increasing prestige of the universities, many houses and orders established official structures to support monk-students at these centres of learning, including most notably monastic colleges, and a system of minimum quotas for students from each house. The Cistercians became the first order to formalize this relationship by establishing a college at the University of Paris in 1245, and many large French Benedictine houses followed their lead. By the end of the century, some houses of black monks had colleges at Oxford as well (Durham Cathedral Priory and Canterbury

---

Cathedral Priory had their own colleges, while the other houses shared Gloucester College. The new formal structures of support for monastic participation in the universities amounted to an admission that monastic scholars and administrators could not do without an advanced scholastic education, but they ensured that monks could provide this scholastic training within the framework of their own communities, rather than relying on recruits from the universities. The success of this educational scheme was moderate; the monasteries gained a class of competent university graduates to serve as teachers and administrators, but Benedict XII (Jacques Fournier), Jean de Mirecourt and Uthred of Boldon are among the very few university monks who are remembered at all today.

At the opposite end of the intellectual spectrum from the treatises of the university monks are “treatises of practical spiritual advice” (to use Carolyn Walker Bynum’s phrase). This category

---


includes a variety of works, such as treatises for novices, letters of advice, and commentaries on the Rules of St Benedict and St Augustine, which aimed at instructing less-educated monks in the knowledge and practices necessary for the monastic vocation. Bynum’s study of these works is important for this present study because, although it focused on the twelfth century, it included works from the thirteenth century. Mirko Breitenstein has recently produced a large volume on treatises for novices that extends into the thirteenth century.  

Most research on thirteenth-century spiritual formation, however, has focused on the friars, nuns and the laity. The use and production of this material by male monastics after the early thirteenth century still requires detailed attention. In particular, there is a need for studies of the encyclopedic surveys of the religious life produced by both cloistered religious and friars.

Some of the most compelling recent scholarship on monasticism has investigated the related issues of canon law, customaries, and the nature of *ordo* as a concept. Most of the Benedictine monasteries and houses of regular canons were fiercely independent, following their own customs. After the Fourth Lateran Council, all cloistered religious were compelled to form centralized religious orders with provincial chapters that drew up binding statutes and performed regular visitation, along the lines of the Cistercian Order. Before that, even the great

---


47 The following collections of capitular statutes have some relevance to England:


hierarchical network of Cluniac houses was bound together more by a shared loyalty to the abbot of Cluny and shared customs than by corporate control. The papacy and local bishops increasingly promulgated legislation for the cloistered religious, a process that culminated in the reforming statutes of Benedict XII. Monks and canons in the early fourteenth century confronted a body of internal and external legislation aimed at producing conformity.

There has been a considerable amount of scholarship on these developments in recent years, covering the whole period from the mid-eleventh century into the early fourteenth. Sébastien Barret, Isabelle Cochelin, and Gert Melville have explored the relationship between rules, customaries, and statutes. The general outcome of this research has been to emphasize that

---


For English diocesan and provincial legislation, see: William Lyndwood, Provinciale (seu Constitutiones Angliae)...continens constitutiones provinciales... a Stephano Langtonto ad Henricum Chichielum... cum... annotationibus (Oxford, 1679); John Acton, Constitutiones legatinae... regionis anglicanae D. Othonis et D. Othoboni... cum... annotationibus, in Lyndwood, Provinciale, separate pagination following p. 356; F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney, eds., Councils and Synods, with Other Documents relating to the English Church, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).

customaries, especially the ones written before the late eleventh century, were not binding legislative documents, unlike later statutes, but edifying records of exemplary monastic conduct. Alain Boureau, on the other hand, has suggested that the remarkably detailed customaries produced at several houses in England in the thirteenth century are an attempt to preserve local custom by giving it the appearance of statutory law, to limit outside interference that sought to create uniform practice across different houses.  

Gert Melville has also studied the difficulty that canonists had in absorbing the stubbornly particular law of different orders and monasteries into the common law of the Church. Even Cécil Caby’s work on monastic students is concerned more with the adaptation of monastic norms in the university environment than it is with monastic scholarship. All of these studies suggest a complex struggle to understand the place of cloistered monasticism within the legal order of the post-Lateran IV church.

1.4 The Structure of the Thesis


Caby, “Non obstante quod monachi.”
described by Bynum. William, however, was not a monk, or even a friar, but a secular cleric and university master with an interest in pastoral care. In this regard, he resembles Robert Grosseteste. He was also a lawyer, with an obvious interest in canon law for monks and regular canons. William’s *Speculum religiosorum* is thus a suitable text for a study that maps the relationship between different kinds of normative literature for the cloistered religious in an effort to understand the monastic culture that developed under the pressure of declining social prestige and the reforming activity of the secular hierarchy.

The thesis will be divided into five chapters. The first chapter will investigate the textual history of the *SR*, its sources, and the circumstances surrounding its composition. This chapter will be further subdivided into five parts. The first will consist of a description of the manuscripts of the *SR*, followed by a consideration of the evidence for their ownership and circulation. The second and third address the relationship between the *SR*, William of Pagula’s *Speculum praelatorum* and the monastic treatise known as *Abbas vel prior*, which I will show to be an early version of the *SR*. The fourth investigates the circumstances of the composition of the *SR* and the evidence for William’s authorship, and the fifth lays out the ultimate and proximate sources of the *SR*.

The second chapter of the thesis deals with the genre of the *SR*, and the wider context of writing for the cloistered religious. This context can be divided into two categories. First, there are works by secular clerics written for the cloistered religious. Almost all of these works are *pastoralia* of some kind, either confessional treatises or sermons. Since William is best known as a pastoral writer, it is of some interest to see how his work relates to this tradition of monastic *pastoralia*. At the same time, the *SR* has more obvious similarities to thirteenth-century guides to the monastic life. There is some difficulty in defining these guides as a genre, and the chapter will consider previous attempts at definition before offering the category of “encyclopedic manuals of religious formation.” The chapter will conclude by demonstrating parallels between the *SR* and various guides to the religious life.

The third chapter will provide an overview of monastic law from Gratian’s *Decretum* to the *Clementines*. This survey will include both common law and English provincial law, but it will exclude internal monastic law (customary, statutes, etc.), for reasons that will be discussed in the chapter. Chapter four will use this general account of monastic law as a starting point for a more detailed consideration of William’s use of law in the *SR*. The chapter will also survey the
compilations of monastic law available in early fourteenth-century England, and show how William’s work relates to the other examples of the genre.

William declares in the prologue to the *SR* that it is a guide to true wisdom, and the fifth and final chapter of the thesis will explore what this means. It will investigate William’s use of the concept of wisdom in the context of law, theology and monastic writing in the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. It will also show that wisdom is the hermeneutic key to understanding the place of law within the work.

**A note on nomenclature**

The problem of nomenclature confronts any scholar of medieval history. There are three consistent approaches. The best approach would be to render all names in their Latin form, since this would remain closest to the sources, and would allow for consistency across different scholarly languages. Despite these advantages, it is too far out of step with contemporary scholarly norms to be viable. It would also introduce unnecessary obscurity by compelling all but the most erudite readers to look up Latin place names. A second approach is to render all proper names in an English form. This approach quickly runs into absurdity (John Boccace?), and is also out of step with contemporary scholarly norms. Finally, one could render all forms in the modern national language of the medieval person. This is even-handed, but leads to difficult political choices, or an endless profusion of variants, in areas of overlapping ethno-nationalist claims, including Iberia, the Celtic countries, and Central Europe. It also suggests an inappropriately strong sense of national identity in the medieval period. I have therefore decided to abandon any attempt at consistency, and to conform myself to common practice as best as possible in each case.
Chapter 1
The Composition and Reception of the Speculum religiosorum: Manuscripts and Sources

This chapter will investigate the circumstances of the composition of the SR, and its subsequent reception and circulation. It will begin with a description of the six extant manuscripts, which will provide evidence for the SR’s textual variants, readership and use. It will be shown that the text of the first half of the SR (London, Gray’s Inn MS 11, fols. 1r-101r) remains fairly stable in the different manuscript copies, but the text of the second half (Gray’s Inn 11, fols. 101r-165r) is often shortened considerably. The exception to this pattern is Cambridge, St John’s College MS 136, which excises significant portions of the text, producing what I will call SR—Version B. The SR continued to be copied in the fifteenth century, and its owners included not only cloistered religious, but also mendicants and perhaps parochial clergy.

Leonard Boyle has already demonstrated that the SR is closely related to two other works, William of Pagula’s Speculum praelatorum, and the anonymous treatise known as Abbas vel prior.¹ He argued that the Speculum praelatorum was the source for much of the material in the SR, and that Abbas vel prior was a later abbreviation of the work. The first argument is certainly correct, and I will investigate the role of the Speculum praelatorum as source for the SR in greater detail. On the second point, I contend that Abbas vel prior represents an earlier stage in the composition of the SR, rather than a later revision. Abbas vel prior survives only at Durham Cathedral, which suggests that William wrote this initial version of the SR for monks from that priory, probably while they were studying at Oxford.

Having investigated the textual history of the work, I turn to the analysis of the SR’s sources in the third part of the chapter. The sources vary greatly from one part of the SR to another; however, it is possible to draw a few general conclusions. William’s use of the Bible, the Fathers, the pagan classics, and the monastic authors of the twelfth century is largely conventional. The only notable features are an emphasis on sapiential writings and a heavy reliance on Bernard of Clairvaux. William’s proximate sources are largely influential works of

his own generation: James of Milan’s *Stimulus amoris*,\(^2\) John of Freiburg’s *Summa confessorum* and Thomas of Ireland’s *Manipulus florum*.

Taken together, the evidence examined in this chapter shows that the *SR* is an unapologetically composite work that went through several stages of development. Although the text remained relatively stable, later readers felt free to alter it in a variety of ways. Just as it brought together material from a variety of genres, it moved easily between different contexts of readership and use.

### 1.1 Manuscripts of the *Speculum religiosorum*

The *SR* survives in six manuscripts, which will be described below in roughly chronological order.

#### 1.1.1 G London, Gray’s Inn MS 11

*Speculum religiosorum* and James of Milan, *Stimulus amoris* (incomplete). Parchment. vii + 167 fols. 210 x 140 mm. Franciscan convent, Chester. s.xiv\(^{med}\) (with later additions). *\(^1\), \(^*\)\(^4\), \(^***\)\(^1\), a-m\(^1\)\(^2\), n\(^1\)\(^2\) (wants 12).

**Contents**

1. fols. i (ir blank), vii s.xiv\(^2\) Sermon [?] with notes, table of contents for *SR*
2. fols. ii-vi s.xiv-xv Alphabetical index to *SR*
3. fols. 1r-165r s.xiv\(^{med}\) *SR* (fol. 1r: “speculum religiosorum”; fol. 165r: “Summa quae vocatur speculum religiosorum”) *Inc. prol.* “Accipite uos religiosi hoc speculum et comedite...” *Inc.* “Religio vera est qua unus deus colitur secundum augustinum de vera religione...”\(^3\)
4. fols. 165r-167v James of Milan, *Stimulus amoris* (very incomplete)

---

\(^2\) Falk Eisermann has shown that there were several versions of the *Stimulus amoris*, which he has called: St.a. minor (s.xiii\(^{ex}\)); St.a. maior Ia (s.xiv\(^{ex}\)); St.a. maior I (s.xiv\(^{ex}\)); St.a. maior II (s.xiv\(^{med}\)). James of Milan only wrote the first version of the work. William of Pagula used St.a. maior I, and so references to James of Milan’s authorship in this thesis are only for the sake of convenience. See Eisermann, *«Stimulus amoris» Inhalt, lateinische Überlieferung, deutsche Übersetzungen, Rezeption* (Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), 4-5, 512, and, in more detail, 229-49.

\(^3\) All copies of the *SR* have the same incipit. I have provided the title of the work as it is recorded in the manuscript.
Physical description

The main text (fols. 1r-167v) is written throughout in a rounded textualis of the kind that M.B. Parkes associates with the universities of the mid-thirteenth to mid-fourteenth centuries.\(^4\) The text is in a single column of twenty-six lines. Initials of chapters are in red and blue, as are chapter titles and paragraphs marks for smaller divisions within the text. The text has been extensively corrected, often in what appears to be the main hand. There are three marginal hands: a rounded textualis, limited to adding “\textit{nota}”; a currens anglicana that supplies many short phrases that were omitted in the main text (by homeoteleuton, etc.), as well as a few brief marginal comments; a currens secretary that adds chapter numbers (in arabic numerals) and occasional titles in the margins.

The unnumbered leaves at the front of the manuscript contain three distinct elements. On fol. vii\(^\text{rv}\) one finds a full and accurate table of contents in a neat hybrid anglicana. On fol. iv and above the table of contents on vii\(^r\), a rapid secretary hand has written part of a sermon on John the Baptist. Another hand, a currens anglicana, has added what appear to be references to a florilegium or collection of distinctions. On fols. ii-vi yet another hand, which writes in a secretary that alternates between calligraphic quality and hasty execution, provides an extensive alphabetical index to the \textit{SR}. It appears that fols. i and vii were the original flyleaves, and that fols. ii-vi were interpolated later.

Distinctive Features

This manuscript contains what is likely the earliest text of the \textit{SR}, and the only complete copy. (\textit{J2}, discussed later, appears to have been complete at one time, but much of the text is now lost.) Unlike the other manuscripts, \textit{G} divides the text of the \textit{SR} into two parts (fols. 1r-101r; 101r-165r). I have used \textit{G} as my manuscript of reference throughout the thesis, and I have therefore retained its division between a \textit{pars prima} and a \textit{pars secunda}. This break corresponds to a significant change in the \textit{SR}, and it may be original, since it is more likely that such a division

would drop out in copying than that it would be inserted. $G$ divides the *pars prima* and *pars secunda* into forty-three and forty-one chapters, respectively.

The text of the *Stimulus amoris* breaks off in mid-sentence in the first chapter, without a proper explicit or colophon, and so the scribe undoubtedly intended to complete the work, but the remaining text was either never written, or has been lost.

**Origin and Provenance**

A note on fol. 1r reads, “From the community of the Friars Minor at Chester, by Brother Ralph Wyche.”

Nothing further is known about Wyche, except that he commissioned (and perhaps copied) at least one other manuscript for his house, now Gray’s Inn MS 2. The library of Gray’s Inn owns two other manuscripts from the Franciscans at Chester in addition to those given by Wyche. All three of the manuscripts, as well as MSS. 2-5, 7-9, 14-16, 18, 20, 22-23, contain annotations in the same sixteenth-century hand. Neil Ker dates this hand to before 1540, and the composition of one of the manuscripts provides a *terminus a quo* of 1509. It is probable that the annotator, whom Ker suggests had been a monk of St Werburg, Chester, collected these volumes from local religious houses following the Dissolution. Based on evidence for the ownership of MS. 9, Ker argues that Gray’s Inn received the volumes from Richard Bostock (d. 1630), a

---

5 De communitate fratrum minorum cestrie per fratem Radulphum Wyche.

6 I have consulted with Michael Robson, who has a large collection of unpublished prosopographical material about English Franciscans, but he has not been able to provide any further information. Wyche is not mentioned in J.H. E. Bennett, “The Grey Friars of Chester,” *Journal of the Chester and North Wales Archaeological & Historic Society* n.s. 24:1 (1921), 1-85.


7 MS 1 (s.xii, Cassian, *Institutes*) and MS 12 (s.xiv, *moralia* and *praedicabilia*). Both of these works were gifts of Br. Roger of Conwy to the convent. See Horwood, *Catalogue of Gray’s Inn*, 1, 10-11.

Cheshire landowner and bibliophile, or from his son John, who entered the Inn in 1632. The manuscripts were certainly in the library of Gray’s Inn by 1697.

1.1.2 J1 Cambridge, Jesus College MS 24 (Q.B.7)

Monastic miscellany. Parchment. 143 fols. 265 x 190 mm. Durham. s.xiv. a\(^4\) b\(^8\) c-d\(^{12}\) e\(^{14}\) f\(^{12}\) (11, 12 canc.), g\(^{12}\) (+2 leaves between 10&11) h\(^{12}\)-k\(^{12}\) l\(^{14}\) m\(^{16}\) n\(^4\) (4 canc.)

Contents:

1. 1r-3r Tables and notes
2. 3v-8v “Quidam tractatus de morte et eius circumstanciis.” Inc. “Quia ad mortem tendimus omnes…”
3. 9r-12v Sermon for the feast of St Benedict
4. 13r-50v SR (fol. 50v: “speculum religiosorum”) 
5-7. 51r-58r (58v-60v blank) Various religious diagrams
8. 61r-75r Walter Daniel, *Vita Aelredi abbatis Rievallensis*
9. 75v-110v Aelred of Rievaulx, *Sermones de oneribus Isaiæ* (incomplete)
10. 111r-24v John of Tynemouth, *Historia aurea* (extracts)
11. 125r-30v Calendar for Durham Cathedral Priory
12. 131r-36r Philip of Clairvaux, *Vita Elisabethae sanctimonialis in Erkenrode*

---

9 ibid., 50. John Bostock seems to be the most likely donor, since he might not have had much use for his father’s collection, and Gray’s Inn would have been a sensible place to donate it. For a similar account of a bibliophile’s son donating books to an institution of higher learning, see below, chp. 1, n.18.

10 Horwood, *Catalogue of Gray’s Inn*, iii.

11 I have not found any other copies of this work.

12 Six wings of the cherubim, tower of wisdom, trees of virtues and vices. Reference is made on 55r to a *Speculum theologiae* of Master John of Wells [Welensis], but it is not clear how this work relates to the diagrams.


13. 136v-43v ps.-Augustine, *De diligendo deo*\(^{17}\)

**Physical description**

The manuscript contains a variety of layouts. The material on fols. 3v-12v, and the *Vita Aelredi* share a layout, so the SR and the miscellaneous material on fols. 50r-60v were likely inserted between two gatherings that were originally contiguous. The text of the SR is in two columns, in a neat anglicana of the mid-to-late fourteenth century. Another anglicana hand has added extensive corrections. Initials of chapters are in red and blue.

**Distinctive Features**

The version of the SR in *J1* is relatively complete; it contains all of the *Pars prima* (except for I.33-35, 41-42), and a substantial section of the *Pars secunda* (II. 1-15). It does not separate the two parts of the work, as *G* does. The two chapters on obedience in *G* (cc.2-3) have been merged into one. The text of the SR in *J1* thus has fifty-two chapters, which are close in title and content to their equivalents in *G*. The major exception to this is a long section of text missing from the end of I.6 *De castitate* and the beginning of I.7 *De abbatibus et prioribus*. *J1* lacks from “...sancte. Augustinus de libro coniugali in coniugali vinculo pudicicia conservatur...” (*G* I.6 [fol. 22v]) to “...et ille maior dicitur qui est iustior. extra de tempore. ordinis. c. ad aures et in glossa ultima.” (*G* I.7.13 [fol. 27v]). This loss occurred in the exemplar, or earlier in the tradition, since *J1* treats “Abbas debeat esse presbiter...” (*G* I.7.14 [fol. 27v]) as the start of chapter seven, complete with a rubricated initial and a title in the margin.

**Origin and Provenance**

All the contents were bound together by the fifteenth century, as indicated by a table of contents on fol. 2v. The calendar points to Durham Cathedral Priory, and it is likely that this miscellany


\(^{17}\) PL 40.847-74.
was assembled there, although most of the texts are Cistercian. The manuscript came to Jesus College as part of a bequest by the Rev. Thomas Man, M.D. (c.1650-1690), the son of a Yorkshire parson, who became a successful doctor and a fellow of the college. In his own lifetime he presented the college library with a large collection of northern English monastic manuscripts, largely from Durham, but also from other houses, including Fountains. 18

1.1.3  

R London, British Library MS Royal 8.C.ii

William of Pagula, SR and Oculus sacerdotis. Parchment. i + 183 + i fols. 215mm x 150mm. England. s. xiv. i^1 a-b^{16} c-d^{10} (collation after fol. 52 not omitted)

Contents

1. fols. 1ra-52va (52vb blank) SR (fol. 1ra “tractatus que dicitur speculum religiosorum”)  
2. fols. 53ra-183vb William of Pagula, Oculus sacerdotis

Physical description

The medieval foliation starts again at the beginning of the Oculus, which suggests that the two parts of this manuscript were originally independent. The following description applies only to the SR. Gatherings a-b (fols. 1ra-32vb) are written in a neat, round textualis hand of the mid-fourteenth century. Gatherings c-d (fols. 32ra-52vb) were written by two scribes who give their names, Sallow and Howson, in the colophon of the SR. Sallow, who writes in an elegant anglicana with some calligraphic elements, copied 33ra-44rb, and 49va-52va. Howson, writing a spidery anglicana, supplied 44va-48vb.

---

18 It seems unlikely that Dr Man had the opportunity to amass such a collection himself, since he left Yorkshire for Cambridge while still an adolescent, and he showed little interest in antiquarian matters. It is probable that his father, Thomas Man, Sr., gathered the collection. The combination of anarchy and historical nostalgia during the Civil War meant that many monastic manuscripts appeared on the market at this time, particularly from collections, such as that of Durham, that had survived the Dissolution relatively unscathed. It seems that Thomas Man Jr., finding his father’s collection cumbersome, entrusted it to the safekeeping of his college, where it still forms the bulk of the western manuscript collection.

I am grateful to Dr Stephen Heath, Keeper of the Old Library at Jesus College, for sharing his unpublished research on the Man collection with me. His unsolicited interest in the work of a young and inexperienced researcher, and his good humour, added greatly to my visit to his library.
The flyleaves contain tables of contents for the *SR* (verso of the front flyleaf) and the *Oculus* (recto of the back flyleaf). Both tables are in a sloppy fifteenth-century anglicana, and this scribe was presumably the owner who bound the two works together. As discussed below, the flyleaves are draft copies of ecclesiastical documents (or perhaps notes on them).

**Distinctive Features**

The text of *R* contains most of the *pars prima* of the *SR*, but like *J1*, it lacks I.33-35, 41-42 (it does have I.6-7 in their entirety). It has only the first chapter of the *pars secunda*, which it divides in two. It also combines the chapters on obedience and disobedience (I.2-4) into one chapter, resulting in thirty-eight chapters. *J1* has a slightly longer version of the chapter on the benefits of religion (*G* I.43). The explicit of I.43 in *G* is “petrus ravennensis [i.e. Peter Chrysologus] in sermone. Qui magistro sancto adheret require in titulo relinquere mundum.”

The note at the end directs the reader back to chapter twelve *De relinquere mundum*, where the same quotation “Qui magistro sancto adheret...” appears in full. *R* has followed this cross reference, and appended the text of *De relinquere mundum* from that quotation onwards to the end of the *pars prima*.

**Origin and Provenance**

Nothing can be said with certainty about the origin of this text of the *SR*. The only clue to the ownership of the manuscript comes from the flyleaves. The recto of the front flyleaf contains a copy of a letter from R. rector of N. to another rector, stating that he (R.) has published the bans between Robert, of his parish, and M., of the other parish. The back flyleaf contains a *probatio pennae* that mentions the humble submission of “Richard Dotyn.” These notes are in an elegant, if rapidly executed, secretary. They seem to belong to a parish priest, or perhaps the clerk of an ecclesiastical official.

---

19 *SR* I.43 (101r).
1.1.4  

**E London, British Library, MS Egerton 746**

Religious and mathematical miscellany. Parchment (fols. i-iii paper). iii + 97 + i fols. 225 x 150 mm. England. s.xiv. *1, *2, a-c12, d8 (wants 1), e8, f2, g12, h10, i8 (†1), k8, *1

Content

- fols. i-2v Modern notes
- fols. 3ra-43rb *Liber de Sapientia et Scienta. Inc. proloc.* “De viciis et virtutibus auctoritates...” *Inc.* “Uani sunt homines in quibus non est scientia dei. sap. xiii. sapiencia huius mundi stulticia est...”
- fols. 43v “Grace be for derer.” Macaronic (ME and Latin) prayer. *Inc.* “benedicite: dominus: <O> lorde god owre heyuynly father blesse thow this and these thy gyftes...”
- fol. 44r Diagram: tree of virtues
- fol. 44v Table linking the articles of faith to the minor prophets and apostles
- fol. 45r Table linking the eight beatitudes, the eight “remunerations” (i.e. rewards for each blessing) and the nine orders of angels
- fol. 45v table linking canonical hours, events in Christ’s life, and fives senses (with *consensus* and *libertas arbitrij*)
- fols. 46ra-47va Exposition of *Pater noster*
- fols. 47va-48ra Exposition of *Credo*
- fols. 48ra-50vb various short prayers

---

20 This is a work on the virtues and vices in 72 chapters, also known as the *Summa de viciis et virtutibus* or the *Speculum beatorum*. Sharpe, *Handlist*, 2023, 2279, and J.-P. Rothschild, et al., *Bibliographie annuelle du Moyen Age tardif* 20 (2010), no. 1521 both describe it as an abbreviation of William Peraldus’ *Summa de viciis et virtutibus*. Newhauser and Bejczy have made a more thorough examination of its contents, and state that, while it borrows from Peraldus, it contains much independent material (*Supplement to Broomfield*, no. 1478, 6323). Sharpe provides a list of five manuscripts, all in British libraries, but neither he nor Newhauser and Bejczy list Egerton 746.

21 E.g. *In circle* (Amos) Qui edificat in celo ascencionem suam (ascencio) ascendit ad celum sedet ad dextram dei patris omnipotentis (Iacobus minor)

22 E.g. (Beati misericodes) Quoniam ipsi (Misericordiam consequentur) In benedicacione [stic] (dominacionum)

23 E.g. (Nona) Nona vir ploret et compungatur et oret (Christus emittens spiritum) Conueniens tactus tibi sit christi necis actus (Tactus)
10. fols. 51r-53rb (switches fr. 1 to 2 cols. 53r, 53v blank) Alexander of Villedieu, “Carmen de algorismo.”

11. fols. 54ra-97vb (98 blank) SR (fol. 54ra: “speculum religiosorum”)

Physical description

The text of the SR covers four gatherings, g-k, but the format of the text in gatherings g-h is quite distinct from that in i-k. The text is in two columns throughout with fifty lines to a column in g-h, but forty-two in i-k. Gatherings g-h are written in an elegant textualis with anglicana elements. There were historiated initials on fols. 54r and 55r, although these have now been excised, and the coloured initials in red are large and ornate. Gatherings i-k are in a poorly executed currens anglicana, the framing is notably sloppy, and the coloured initials (in blue) are small and plain. It appears that the producers of the manuscript ran out of either time or money, and had to change from obvious care and expenditure to harried functionality.

Quires a-d (the Liber de sapientia et scientia) and g-h have similar coloured initials, and it would appear that they were produced in the same workshop, although the main text hands differ.

The volume has modern flyleaves, and a note on back flyleaf states that re-binding occurred in 1985.

Distinctive Features

The text of the SR in E contains a complete version of the Pars prima, but it lacks any material from the pars secunda. E contains the longer ending of the pars prima found in R. The division of the chapters differs slightly from those in G. The two chapters de obediencia (G I.2-3) have been combined into one, as is the case in many manuscripts. E is unique in dividing the second legal chapter (G I.9) in two: De constitucionibus quas religiosi tenentur scire and De abbate vel priore suspenso a collacione beneficiorum. The second chapter begins in the middle of G I.9.63, an extract from the long canon Ne in agro (Clem. 3.10.1). The new chapter begins at “Quod si


25 Compare the following letter forms: A 27vb, 39rb, 64vb; P 6rb, 60rb; D 34ra, O 56ra.
fecerint et dampnum inferant...’” (E fol.75ra; G fol.49r). The scribe seems to have been hesitant about where to make the division, since the start of this chapter lacks a rubricated initial; indeed, it should probably have started a few lines above, at the point where the discussion concerns the suspension of abbots.

**Origin and Provenance**

There is no evidence of the manuscript’s origin, but the high quality of quires a-d and g-h suggests that it was intended for a wealthy institution, presumably a monastery.

On fol. 2v there is a note from “F.M.” stating that he first learned to read medieval hands from this manuscript, with was leant to him by J.J. Conybeare at Batheaston in January, 1824. The British Library’s on-line Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts identifies “F.M” as the palaeographer and editor Sir Frederic Madden, whose work includes the first editions of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and the Wycliffe Bible. John Josias Conybeare (1779-1824) was first Professor of Anglo-Saxon (1808-12) and then Professor of Poetry (1812-21) at Oxford. Conybeare left the manuscript to his brother, William D. Conybeare (1787-1857), a noted geologist, whose inscription of ownership appears on fol. 1v. Fol. 1r states that the British Museum purchased the volume at Southgate’s in 1839. Nothing is known about how the manuscript came to J.J. Conybeare.

1.1.5  **J2 Cambridge, Jesus College MS 41**

Monastic normative texts. Parchment. 176 fols. 200 x 145mm. Durham. s.xiii-xv (SR s.xv). a-b\(^{12}\) c\(^8\) d\(^{12}\) e\(^6\) f-g\(^8\) h-k\(^{12}\) l\(^8\) m-n\(^{10}\) o\(^6\) (wants 3-4, 6) p\(^{10}\) q-r\(^8\) s\(^8\) (wants 7-8) t\(^{2}\) u\(^4\) v\(^6\)

**Contents**

1. fols. 1r-44r SR (s.xv, incomplete) (fol. 44r: “summa que vocatur speculum religiosorum”); on 44r prayer for John de Halloughton; 44v poem on Mary Magadelen. *Inc.*


2. fols. 45r-46r Table (s.xiv) for a volume containing 24 sermons and a *Summa de viciis* of 131 chapters.  

I have not been able to identify either of these works.

28

29

I have not found any other copies of this work.

30


31

I have not found any other copies of this work.

32


33

David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae...* (London, 1737), II.588
16. fols. 168r Bull of Innocent IV granting abbot of Durham certain powers to dispense from
   \textit{Rule of St Benedict}\textsuperscript{34}

17. fols. 168v-69r (s.xv-xvi) \textit{Informacio ad computandum algorismum}

18. fols. 169v-70v (s.xv) Ordinances of annual chapter at Durham in 1417, under Prior John
   Wessyngton

19. fols. 171r-76v (s. xiii) Documents on investigation of Magister Rostandus, nuncio of
   Alexander IV, into the finances of the archdeaconry of Durham, 1256

\textbf{Physical description}

The manuscript is a composite work with a variety of hands and layouts. The \textit{SR} is written in
single columns of thirty-seven lines. The hand is a neat fifteenth-century anglicana. Initials of
chapters are in red. Chapter titles are given in the margin and at the head of the page. The work is
incomplete, beginning at chapter twenty-seven, which corresponds to \textit{G} I.32 \textit{De leuare}.

There is a table of contents on fol. 44r, which begins from the start of the \textit{SR}. Its enummeration
of chapters does not match those in the main text; for example, it counts \textit{De leuare} as c.30, rather
than c.27 (or c.32, as in \textit{G}). Because of a slightly different division of chapters, the table’s count
catches up with, and then passes \textit{G}, to arrive at forty-five chapters in the \textit{pars prima}. The table’s
numbering skips from 44 to 50, probably due to the easy confusion between 44 and 49 in
medieval Arabic numerals. The table only provides two chapters of the \textit{pars secunda}, while the
text of \textit{J2} is more extensive, so the table is likely incomplete. It may also have been copied from
a different manuscript of the \textit{SR}, which would explain its disagreement with the main text.

\textbf{Distinctive Features}

Since much of the manuscript has been lost, and the relationship between the main text and the
table on fol. 44r is not clear, it is impossible to establish the original contents. No other
manuscript shares the enummeration of chapters in \textit{J2}, so one cannot know why it is five
chapters behind \textit{G}, but the conflation of the three chapters \textit{de obediencia} and \textit{de inobediencia} is
likely part of the solution. Scribal error may also have resulted in incorrect numbering. This copy

\textsuperscript{34} Ed: James Raine, ed. Appendix to \textit{Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres}, lxxxii.
could have been missing the legal contents, as in S below, but this seems improbable, since the compilers of the manuscript had a keen interest in law.

The remaining text includes the entirety of the pars secunda, as in G, but J2 counts the chapters continuously, rather than dividing the work into two halves. This manuscript adds an additional sentence to the explicit, as found in G: “vt igitur lector huius summe materias diversas facilliter poterit inuenire <illeg.> rubrica per quas leuite inueniet materias quas requirit.”

*De statu et beneficiis religiosorum* has the longer ending, as in R.

**Origin and Provenance**

This belongs to a series of compilations of normative texts made at Durham c.1360-c.1446. Several works recur in these compilations, including: *Abbas vel prior*, Bernard of Clarivaux’s *De praecipito et dispensatione*, statutes of the provincial chapters of the Benedictines, 1343-1426, the Constitutions of Benedict XII, with the letter of Bernard of Genebreda on their implementation, and various bulls, collections of canons, etc. Many of these manuscripts also show an interest in the preservation of material from the thirteenth century.

It seems that the earliest of these compilations, Durham, Dean and Chapter Library MS B.IV.26 was made in the mid-fourteenth century at the behest of the librarian, Roger of Alwerton. Between 1425-1445, Prior John Wessyngton (d. +1446, librarian, -1416; prior, 1416-46) had the existing compilations revised and updated, and commissioned new manuscripts. Much of this work was done by John Fishburne (d. 1434), librarian, 1416-30, and William Dalton (d. +1455), librarian, 1431-37, both of whom had close ties to Wessyngton. The compilations, in their final form, are the work of a particular group of monks, dedicated both to the library and to ecclesiastical discipline.

---


36 Cambridge, Jesus College MS 61 (see pp. 60-62) may date to the same period. See Pantin, *Documents*, II. viii-xix, xv-xvi, xvii-xix. Pantin claims that Uthred of Boldon may have been ultimately responsible for these compilations.

37 On Wessyngton, see Dobson, *Durham Cathedral Priory*, 81-113.
Among the Durham compilations, J2 stands out, because it does not actually contain _De praecetto et dispensatione, Abbas vel prior_, or the Constitutions of Benedict XII, although it does have tables for each of these works, suggesting that the compilers intended to include them. One can speculate that the SR served as a replacement for the missing _Abbas vel prior_.

Thomas Man gave the manuscript to Jesus College (see _J1_).

### 1.1.6

**S Cambridge, St John’s College 136 (E.33)**

*Praedicabilia.* Paper. 188 fols. 215 x 150 mm. England (mendicant?). s.xv. **a**¹² (wants 12) **b**¹⁴ **c**¹⁰ **d**¹² **e**⁸ **f**⁵ **g**¹² **h**¹⁰ (wants 1-3) **i**¹⁴ **k**⁵ **l-m**¹² **n**¹⁰ (+1) **o**¹² **p**¹² **q-r**¹² **s**⁶

**Contents**

1. fols. 1r-11v John Gobi the Younger (d.1350), _Historia de spiritu Guidonis_ (c.1323).³⁸
2. fols. 12r-59r _Vitae patrum_.³⁹
3. fols. 60r-98v _Speculum laicorum_.⁴⁰
4. fols. 99r-162v Michael de Hungaria, _Sermones XIII_.⁴¹
5. 163r-84v _Speculum religiosorum— Version B_ (fol. 163r: “quidam tractatus de speculo religiosorum”)

---


³⁹ Lives of over a dozen early monks, nuns and hermits. For a partial list of saints, see M.R. James, _Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913), 173.


⁴¹ The identity of Michael de Hungaria remains elusive, but he was a mendicant of some kind, and it has recently been argued from internal evidence that he spent most of his career in England. See Gedeon Borsa, _Michael de Hungaria: A Mediaeval Author in Britain: His Person and a Bibliography of the Printed Editions of his Work between 1480—1621_ (Budapest: Borda Antikvárium, 1998). Those who can read Hungarian may prefer to consult Borsa, “Ki lehetett Michael de Hungaria?” _Magyar Könyvszemle_ 116 (2000), 374-378. I am grateful to Gergely Galai for bringing this book to my attention, and for translating some of Borsa’s Hungarian research for me. For editions of these sermons, see Bert Roest and Maarten van de Heijden, “Michael de Hungaria (d. 1480, Budapest),” in _Franciscan Authors, 13th—18th Century: A Catalogue in Progress_, online, [http://users.bart.nl/~roestb/franciscan](http://users.bart.nl/~roestb/franciscan).
6. 184v-88v Notes on eucharist, confession and preaching

Physical description

The manuscript is copied in several hands, but they all write in untidy (“hideous,” says M.R. James) fifteenth-century hybrid secretary. The divisions between the sermons of Michael de Hungaria, the SR and the notes on pastoral care do not correspond to divisions between the gatherings, so the material from fol. 99r onwards was copied together, or at least the SR was deliberately added to the sermons. All of the works in the manuscript have a similar layout of one column in a frame of 110-120 x 160-170 mm. The rubrication of initials is in a consistent style throughout the manuscript. The SR has 34-37 lines per column.

The chapter divisions within the SR are marked by rubriacted initials and rubricated chapter numbers in roman numerals (“cc I”, etc.) in the margin. The text also provides a running rubricated title, “Speculum religiosorum,” at the top of the page.

Distinctive Features

The text of the SR is only one quarter of its length in G. The work has been divided into sixteen chapters, which correspond to the chapters in G in the following manner:

Prologue (G prologue); 1 (G I.1), No title; 2 (2), Obedientia; 3 (3), Obedientia; 4 (part of 4, rearranged), No title; 5 (part of 4, rearranged), De inobedientia; 6 (5), De paupertate; 7 (6), De castitate; 8 (13), De humilitate; 9 (14), De loquacitate; 10 (15), Contra gulosos; 11 (16), De silencio; 12 (17), Religiosus debet esse in solitudine; 13 (18, with interpolations from 34), De patiencia; 14 (19), Contra superbiam; 15 (20), De superbia [recte luxuria]; 16 (21), De accidia.

This abridgment not only shortens the SR, it also alters its nature radically by removing all of the canon law and all of the pars secunda. The version of the SR in S is a short guide to the basic elements of the monastic life, covering the substantialia, deportment, and a few of the most prominent monastic sins. The explicit in S is unique to this manuscript:

42 James, Descriptive Catalogue of... St John's College, Cambridge, 172.
“...venite ad iudicium. Iam aliquis boni operis facit sine intermissione. Repente veniente die extremo peniteat te ab opere bono cessasso dum tibi licuit operari, et cetera. Explicit tractatus quidam de speculo religiosorum.”

This means that it omits William of Pagula’s advice at the end of the GI.21 to “look in the summa that is called the Oculus sacerdotum for the other mortal sins, and the remedies against them.”

Based on the evidence of Abbas vel prior, which will be discussed below, this shorter version certainly represents a later abridgment, rather than an early form of the text. It seems likely that St John’s 136 was intended to be a preaching handbook for a mendicant friar. The SR, in its truncated form, could serve as a sourcebook for preaching to a religious audience, whether mendicant, female, or male cloistered.

Origin and Provenance

The origin of the manuscript is unknown, but the contents of the volume suggest an English mendicant house.

The first known owner of this manuscript was William Crashaw, DD (1572-1625/6), a well-known Puritan preacher, controversialist and poet. Crashaw was a noted bibliophile, who owned over 200 manuscripts. Henry Wriothesley, 3rd Earl of Southampton (1573-1624), an important literary patron, bought most of Crashaw’s books, and donated them to St John’s College, where they form the bulk of the manuscript collection. St was was not part of this donation, since, according to an note on a flyleaf, Thomas Wriothesley (1607-1667), Henry’s heir, owned the volume in 1635, and later donated it to St John’s.

1.1.7 Lost Copies of the Speculum religiosorum

The Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues provides only one entry that may refer to the SR. This comes from a valuation of books that the Cistercian abbey of St Mary Graces in London put up as surety on a loan. Since the title Speculum religiosorum could refer to other works, one

---

43 “De ceteris peccatis mortalibus et de remediis contra illa quere in summa que vocatur oculus sacerdotum.” SR I.21 (G fol. 69r).

cannot be sure that the list refers to William of Pagula’s work, but it is the most likely candidate.\textsuperscript{45}

1.1.8 Manuscripts: General Conclusions

The first half of the text of the \textit{SR} (\textit{G}, fols.1-101r) remained quite stable. \textit{J1} and \textit{R} lack I.33-35, 41-42, but this loss does not significantly affect the structure and content of the work. The division of the work into chapters is also remarkably secure. The main difference lies in the three chapters (in \textit{G}) on obedience. This stability is particularly notable in the legal chapters (cc. 7,9); it appears that care was taken to avoid the accidental omissions that might easily occur in a long, poorly organized compendium (with the exception of \textit{J1}).

Such stability is lacking when one turns to the second half of the work (\textit{G}, fols. 101r-65r). Only two manuscripts contain the entirety of the \textit{pars secunda}, while three others (\textit{S} must be treated separately) vary between including a substantial amount of the material on contemplation (\textit{J1}) and lacking it completely (\textit{E}). Unlike the occasional missing chapter in the \textit{pars prima}, these differences alter the character of the work as a whole. Most copies of the text have a rough structure of ascent from the \textit{substantialia} of religion, through law and other normative material, up to contemplation, with (in \textit{G} and \textit{J2}) a final return to deportment, but the role of contemplation shifts dramatically depending on how much of the \textit{pars secunda} is included. The losses to the \textit{pars secunda} may have been due to copying from damaged manuscripts. Nevertheless, the \textit{SR} is a large, heterogeneous and loosely organized work, and its readers might have felt an understandable freedom to tidy it up.

A desire to make a more manageable and coherent work certainly lies behind \textit{S}. \textit{S} demonstrates the difficulty of cataloguing works by title and incipit, since its “Version B” is arguably no closer to the “canonical” text of the \textit{SR} than the treatise \textit{Abbas vel prior}, which will be discussed below. The \textit{SR-Version B} is, in essence, a work of \textit{praedicabilia} for a monastic audience, and its manuscript context suggests that it was used in this way. Nevertheless, it could have also served as a devotional work for monastic reading. Boyle has argued that contemporary readers found

\textsuperscript{45} “Alius liber vocatus Speculum religiosorum” It follows immediately after a “Liber vocatus Stimulus amoris.” David N. Bell, ed., \textit{The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians}, CBMLC 3 (1992), Z12.4-5 (p.33).
the compendium of monastic law to be the most valuable section of the *SR*, but *S* suggests that this was not always the case.\(^\text{46}\)

In contrast to the relative stability of the text, the context of the copies of the *SR* varies considerably. Only the two Durham manuscripts (*J1*, *J2*) clearly belong within the cultural milieu of cloistered monasticism, although *E* may also have belonged to a monastery. Mendicants owned at least one manuscript of the full version (*G*), even though the work itself explicitly excludes mendicants from consideration.\(^\text{47}\) Some friars may nevertheless have thought that it contained enough material of general applicability to be worth owning. *S*, and perhaps *R*, appear to have served as a resource for preaching to the religious. This easy movement between different contexts is typical of religious works in the late Middle Ages.

The *SR* does not appear to have attained enormous popularity, but it continued to find a readership for over a century after its composition. There was no vernacular translation of the *SR*. The extensive use of canon law likely signalled that William intended the *SR* to remain in Latinate circles. The *SR* was never printed, which is not surprising, since the work only circulated in England, whose printing industry developed slowly, and concentrated on vernacular works.\(^\text{48}\)

1.2 The *Speculum religiosorum* and the *Speculum praelatorum*

Leonard Boyle’s initial research into William of Pagula’s work revealed that there was a close relationship between the *SR* and the much longer *Speculum praelatorum*.\(^\text{49}\) The latter work, completed in 1322, was William’s *magnum opus*. It is a large compendium (almost 500 folios long) of almost everything that a pastor, preacher or administrator might need to know. The *Speculum praelatorum* survives in only one manuscript, Oxford, Merton College MS 217, which

---

\(^{46}\) “If [the *SR*] had some success, this was due to the fact that it set out in an ordered fashion in its central or legal chapters all the monastic legislation of the Church and of legatine and provincial synods.” Boyle, “*Summa summarum*,” 437.

\(^{47}\) I.7.1 (*G* fol. 25v). This passage, which comes from the introduction to the legal compendium, does not appear in *S*, which was also owned by mendicants.

\(^{48}\) For a brief overview of early printing, see Universal Short Title Catalogue, “The World of the Early Printed Book,” online, http://www.ustc.ac.uk/?page_id=866.

\(^{49}\) See above, chp. 1, n.1.
gives it the full title *Speculum praelatorum et religiosorum et sacerdotum parochialium*. This is an early fifteenth-century manuscript, copied from an exemplar owned by Thomas Holme, a fellow of Queen’s College, Oxford between 1401 and 1419. Boyle pointed out that William appears to have left the work unfinished, and this unfinished state, together with the *Speculum praelatorum*’s great size, may account for its lack of popularity.  

The *Speculum* has three parts. Part one, *De fide et ecclesie sacramentis* (fols.1ra-81ra), and part two, *De ministris ecclesie et officiis eorumdem* (fols. 81rb-179vb), both combine canon law and pastoral theology, most of it taken directly from the *Summa summarum* and the *Oculus sacerdotis*. To this material from his earlier works, William added most of the *Stimulus amoris*, which became I.I.ii *De contemplatione*. The third part, *De predicacionibus verbi divini et auctoritatibus sanctorum patrum* (fols. 180ra-484rb), includes themata for sermons (fols. 180ra-248ra), arranged by both *temporale* and *sanctorale*, and a florilegium, arranged alphabetically by head word, together with several indices (fols.284rb-484rb).

The legal compendium of the SR reproduces *Speculum praelatorum* II.4 almost word for word, as the following quotations demonstrate:

*Speculum praelatorum, Oxford, Merton College MS 217, fol. 90vab*

,... *ne autem ignorancia canonum regularum ac constitucionum predictarum ab earum obseruantia* ... *ne autem ignorancia canonum regularum*

*Speculum religiosorum, c. 7 ‘De abbatibus et prioribus,’ G, fol. 26r*

,... *ac constitucionum predictarum ab earum obseruantia quemquam religiosum possit*

---

There is, of course, no certain relationship between the number of surviving manuscripts and the popularity of a work during the Middle Ages. Nevertheless, I would argue that works of a similar character, produced in the same time and place, should survive at roughly the same rate. Since the *Oculus sacerdotis* and the *Speculum praelatorum* were both encyclopedic pastoral handbooks, written by the same author, there does not seem to be any reason why one work should have survived significantly better than the other.

One can also note that the only extant manuscript of the *Speculum praelatorum* was based on an exemplar from Oxford, the place where it was written, which may suggest that it only circulated within the local academic community.
religosum possit auertere omnes canones et regule ac constituciones tangentes non mendicantes
omnes canones et regule ac hic faciliter exponuntur [MS exponitur] et mendicantes hic faciliter exponuntur et
constituciones tangentes non ubi et de quibus locis assumuntur in hac summa breuiter inseruntur
ubi et de quibus locis assumuntur in hoc summa breuiter inseruntur

The relationship between the rest of the SR and the Speculum praelatorum is more complex. At the end of the legal compendium in Speculum praelatorum II.4, William adds the following note:

Religiosus verus debet esse mortuus mundi [sic] etc. ut nota infra in .iiijª. parte super verbo. Religioso §vlt. Religiosus vel alius murmursans de cibo uel potu deficit in principio belli spiritualis etc. ut notatur infra super verbo. murmurs §homo // religiosi sapienter faciunt qui mundum relinquant etc. ut nota infra in .iiijª. parte super verbo. mundus §relinquendus est mundus. Item reliquisus debet esse mitis et humilis ut nota infra in .iiijª. parte super verbo. Humilitas Item reliquisus non debet esse verbosus. ut nota infra in .iiijª. parte super verbo. loquacitas. // Religiosus nondum esse gulosus neque ebriosus ut nota infra in .iiijª. parte super verbo. ebrietas. // Religiosus debet esse in sollicitudine ut nota infra in .iiijª. parte super verbo. paciencia §paciencia. Religiosus debet esse obediens prelate suo et ad faciliter obediendum multa valere possent ut nota infra in .iiijª. parte super verbo. obediencia.

William directs the interested reader to headwords in the florilegium in part three of the Speculum praelatorum that contain material on various topics relevant to monasticism. The passages from the third part of the Speculum praelatorum are found in SR I.10-18, 2 (in that order). The entries in the florilegium for paupertas, castitas, and cogitaciones also provide


52 Speculum praelatorum, II.4 (fol. 96v).

53 For a more detailed discussion of these references, and there order, see the section on Abbas vel prior below.
material for their corresponding chapters in the SR (I.5-6, 23). William used the *florilegium* in the *Speculum praelatorum* as a major source of material for the *Speculum religiosorum*.

William’s use of the *florilegium* in the *Speculum praelatorum* explains one of the more perplexing aspects of the SR. In the chapter *De abbatibus et prioribus* (SR I.7), the long chain of canons breaks off abruptly at I.7.49 (32r), after which the chapter continues to the end with patristic quotations, such as one finds in the non-legal chapters. Chapter 8 *De correctione* similarly does not include canon law. The legal compendium then resumes at the beginning of I.9 *de constitutionibus quas religiosi scire debent*. No such break in the legal compendium occurs in *Speculum praelatorum* II.4. In the SR, William decided to split the legal compendium into two chapters, one for superiors, and one for the religious in general. He then appended the entry for “*prelatus*” to the end of the first chapter (SR I.7.49-53, 32r-33v). William provided cross-references between head words in the florilegium, and at the end of the entry for *prelatus* the reader is directed to several other words, the first two being *ambitio* and *correctio*. The entry on *ambitio*, which provides SR I.7.54-55 (33v-34r), ends with a cross-reference to *gloria*, which supplies I.7.56-59 (34r). William then included the entry for *correctio* as an independent chapter (SR I.8, 34v-37r).

At some point William stopped relying on his own cross-references between different “monastic” entries in the *florilegium* in the *Speculum praelatorum*, since several chapters in the SR do not take any material from the longer work. This is even true of some chapters in the SR that share a title with entries in the *Speculum praelatorum*. The *Speculum praelatorum* provided a crucial starting point for the composition of the SR, but the SR is much more than an excerpt from William’s *magnum opus*. To fully appreciate the relationship between the *Speculum praelatorum* and the SR, it is necessary to understand their relationship to a third work, *Abbas vel prior*.

### 1.3 The *Speculum religiosorum* and *Abbas vel prior*

The work known, from its incipit, as *Abbas vel prior* is a short treatise containing two parts, the first of which consists of a compilation of monastic law, and the second material on various

---

54 *accidita, luxuria, mansuetudo, oracio, ordo, superbia.*
topics pertaining to monasticism. John Bale saw a copy at Reading Abbey that was ascribed to the Durham scholar Uthred of Boldon, with the title *Pro monachis veris*.\(^{55}\) This attribution was provisionally accepted by W.A. Pantin.\(^{56}\) Boyle demonstrated that all of the material in *Abbas vel prior* can be found in the *SR*. He thought that *Abbas vel prior* was a later abbreviation of the *SR* (which would not discount Uthred’s authorship of the former), but never described the relationship between them in any detail.\(^{57}\)

A closer examination of the correspondence between the two works suggests a different conclusion about their relationship from that reached by Boyle, one which removes the possibility of Uthred’s authorship. The following table provides the chapter divisions that occur in some manuscripts of *Abbas vel prior*, together with the corresponding parts of the *SR*.\(^{58}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Abbas vel prior</em></th>
<th><em>SR</em> I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{\text{st}}). Extracta de decreto et 5 libris decretalium.</td>
<td>7.1-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{\text{nd}}). Extracta de constitutionibus octoboni et aliorum.</td>
<td>7.38-48, 9.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{\text{rd}}). decretales illae que legi habentibus in annuo cum regula iuxta octobonom</td>
<td>9.1b-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(^{\text{th}}). Excerpta de decreto... monachis seu subditis pertinencia</td>
<td>9.16-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(^{\text{th}}). De constitutionibus octoboni et oxoniensisibus</td>
<td>9.51-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(^{\text{th}}). de constitutionibus clementinis</td>
<td>9.62-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(^{\text{th}}). De ingredientibus religionem Seu de vna in alium transeuntibus</td>
<td>9.79-83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


56 Pantin, “Two Treaties by Uthred of Boldon,” 365.


58 See the descriptions of *J3* and *D3*, below.
8m. De uita solitaria et sociali 9.84-85
9m. Contra mundanos monachos 10
10m. Contra monachos murmurantes. 11
11m. De fuga mundi. 12a
12m. De oracione et contemplacione 12b
13m. Qualis est uita claustralis. 12c
14m. De humilitate. 13
15m. Ne religiosus sit uerbosus. 14
16m. Ne sit gulosus. 15
17m. Vt sit in silencio. 16
18m. Vt sit in solitudine. 17
20m. vt sit obediens. 2b

This list of contents corresponds exactly to the compilation of monastic law in the *Speculum praehlatorum* II.4, together with the entries from the florilegium that are listed at the end of that chapter. *Abbas vel prior* agrees with the *Speculum praehlatorum* against the equivalent section in the *SR* in two ways. Firstly, it does not have the non-legal interpolations found in *SR* I.7-8. More importantly, the chapter on obedience comes at the end of the work, as it does in the list in the *Speculum praehlatorum*, rather than before the legal material, as it does in the *SR*.

From this evidence, one can conclude that *Abbas vel prior* represents an earlier stage in the composition of the *SR*, not a later redaction. It is quite possible that a later editor would remove the interpolation in the legal collection, but it is highly unlikely that he would have moved the

---

chapter on obedience back to the position in which it appears in the *Speculum praelatorum*. It is more plausible that when William of Pagula first created an independent treatise for monks, he only fleshed out the cross-references that he had already included in the *Speculum praelatorum*. William circulated this early form of the work, which carried on an independent life as *Abbas vel prior*.  

*Abbas vel prior* has the advantage of being more compact than the full *SR*, but it gives the reader no indication of how to use the treatise, and or how to understand the relationship between the legal and non-legal material. William addressed these problems in two ways in the *SR*. He added a prologue explaining that the purpose of the treatise was to offer wisdom to the religious. Wisdom then provides an overarching thematic unity to the diverse contents that follow. He also created an introductory section on the monastic life (*religio*) in general (I.1), and its essential elements (he uses the word “*necessaria*”)—obedience, poverty, chastity. William, like many of his fellow canonists, clearly thought that *copiosus* was among the most complimentary of adjectives for a work, and so, having provided the reader with a basic conceptual framework, he proceeded to triple the length of his first version.

The chronological priority of *Abbas vel prior* requires the rejection of Bale’s (or, more accurately, a Reading scribe’s) attribution of the work to Uthred of Boldon. It is not difficult to understand how such a misattribution might have come about. Uthred may well have had a leading role in drawing up the first of the series of legal compilations at Durham in which *Abbas vel prior* appears. He, or his editorial team, may have been responsible for the elaborate table and index that appear in some manuscripts of the work. If this were the case, it would not be surprising for a scribe at Reading to have mistaken the “publisher” of the text, who was a well-known theologian and writer on monastic discipline, for the author.

60 William did sometimes revise his work several years after its initial completion. He finished the first two parts of the *Oculus sacerdotis* between 1320 and 1323, and then added the *Pupilla oculi* some time between 1326 and 1328.

61 On this theme, see Chp. 5.

62 See the description of ms. *J2* above, pp.40-44, esp. n.36.

63 On the table, see the description of ms. *J3* below. Cf. the attribution of a table on Bernard of Clairvaux’s *De praecepto et dispensatione* to Uthred in *J2*.
This reassessment of the relationship between the SR and Abbas vel prior changes how one understands the reception of the two works. If Abbas vel prior were a later abbreviation of the SR, it would suggest that, although the SR was moderately successful in its full form, many readers were interested primarily in canon law, and were happy to jettison most of the work. Since, however, Abbas vel prior is an intermediate stage in the composition of the SR, it is apparent that William thought that his audience wanted more than a legal compilation with a few chapters tacked onto the end. The full Speculum religiosorum enjoyed a broader readership than Abbas vel prior, as the following description of the manuscripts will demonstrate.

1.3.1 D1 Durham, Dean and Chapter Library MS B.IV.41

Monastic normative texts and hagiography. Parchment. 290 fols. 265mm x 170mm (heavily cut). Durham. s.xiii-xv. a-b12 c10 d6 e10 f8 g12 (2 leaves cancelled) h10 i8 (lacks 7) k12 l8 m-n12 o10 p12 (+12) q-s12 t2 u10 w6 x-bb12 cc6 (lacks 1)

Contents

1. fols. 1r-24v s.xiv Tables for the Rule of St Benedict and Bernard of Clairvaux, De praecepto et dispensatione

2. fols. 25r-30r s.xv Statutes of the provincial chapter of the Benedictines, 1363

---

64 This was Boyle’s interpretation. See above, chp.1, n.46.

65 On William’s desire to move beyond a compendium of law alone, cf. Boyle, “Oculus sacerdotis,” 103: “...his desire and ability to better [parish priests’] legal education did not blind him to a deeper want, a knowledge of theology without which the executive side of the pastoral care may become mechanical and lifeless: with Decretal and provincial canon [sic] he gave them Aquinas and the Stimulus amoris.”

66 Although I have examined all of these manuscripts personally, I have often followed Pantin, Documents, II.viii-xvii for the identification of some works. The detailed descriptions of the contents and appearance of Abbas vel prior and other legal collections are entirely my own, unless otherwise stated.

67 Gathering d fragmentary (only fols. 35-37, 39, 42, 54 present), fols. 32, 39, 42, 54 blank, no fols. 165, 169, due to numbering error, fol. 99 missing.

3. fol. 30v-32v s.xv “Decreta concernentia statum monachorum,” “Decretales monachorum ordinem concernentes,” Provincial constitutions of Otto of Monferrato (London, 1237), pertaining to monks 69

4. fols. 33r-34v s.xv Tractatus de prima institutione nigrorum monachorum. Inc. Quidam minus intelligentes... 70

5. fols.35r-37v s.xv Statutes of the provincial chapters of the Benedictines,1340, 1343

6. fols. 55r-64v s.xiii John of Salisbury and Alan of Tewkesbury, Vita S. Thomae Cantuarensis 71

7. fols. 65r-82v s.xiii-xiv in Rule of St Benedict

8. fols. 83r-100v s.xiv med Abbas vel prior

9. fols. 101r-10r s.xiv Bernard of Clairvaux, De praecepto et dispensatione

10. fol. 110v s.xiv Account of the provincial chapter of 1343

11. fols. 111r-12v s.xiv Constitutions of the council of London of the legate Ottobuono, 1268

12. fols. 113r-22v 1416x34 “Decretales monachos concernentes” 72

13. fols.123r-30v s.xv Admonition to those entering religion, Inc. “Quia de tenore cuiusdam...” 73

14. fols. 130r-32v s.xv Statutes of the provincial chapters of the Benedictines,1338

15. fols. 133r-69v s.xiv Clementines

16. fols.170r-84v s.xiv Synodal statutes of Durham, c.1241-1319 74

17. fols. 185r-209v s.xiv Constitutions of Benedict XII 75

---

69 For this collection, see below, section 4.2.


71 Sharpe, Handlist, no. 77. For an edition of the prologue and explanatio, see J.C. Robertson, Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, vol.2, RS 67 (1875-85), 2.299-301, 323-52.

72 For this collection, see below, section 4.2.

73 I have not identified any other copies of this text.

74 Edited in part in C&S, I.421-34, II.817-19.
18. fol. 210rv s.xv Letter of Bernard of Genebreda and bull of Clement VI, 1343, on Constitutions of Benedict XII

19. fols. 211r-19v s.xv Statutes of the provincial chapter of the Benedictines, 1343

20. fols. 219v-22v s.xv Decretals “De statu monachorum”

21. fols. 222v-25v s.xiv in Statutes of Durham College, Oxford

22. fols. 226r-90v s.xv Hugh of Fouilloy, *De claustro animae*

**Physical description**

The text of *Abbas vel prior* is in two columns, with forty-five lines per column throughout. The writing frame measures 197 x 127 mm, with a column width of 60 mm.

The main text hand of *Abbas vel prior* is a mid-grade textualis. An early anglicana hand has added notes in margins of 83r-87v, but the trimming of the manuscript has rendered these illegible. The text hand has added subject headings and references to citations in the margin beginning on 87v. The topical divisions provided by the main text hand in the margins do not match the division of chapters provided by the table that accompanies some manuscripts of *Abbas vel prior* (see below). There are occasional rubricated initials, although these are not present for all of the divisions indicated in the margin. Rubricated paragraph marks appear consistently, and legal citations are underlined in red or black.

**Distinctive Features**

The Anglicana glossing hand in *Abbas vel prior* appears to date to no later than the middle of the fourteenth century, making this likely the earliest of the extant copies.

---

75 Benedict XII, *Summa magistri*, in *Bull. rom. pont.*, IV.347-87

76 David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*... (London, 1737), II.588


78 Hugh of Fouilloy, *De claustro animae*, PL 176. 1017-1109. See below, section 2.1.1.
The text hand has appended the canon *Carnem cuiquam* (*De cons.*, D.5 c.32) on abstaining from meat to the end of the text. On 97r the text hand provides notes on the reasons to listen to the Word of God, and a discussion of aids and impediments to confession (e.g. imaging angels and demons bringing one’s sins before God, presumption of divine mercy, etc.). The layout of the page clearly distinguishes these notes from *Abbas vel prior*. On 97v a mid-fourteenth-century anglicana hand (not the glossing hand) has added a note on fasting from *Summa summarum* 3.56. On 98r a later anglicana hand has hastily scrawled a discussion of the need for consultation and consent in monastic governance, with reference to the *Liber extra*.

*D1* contains three other monastic legal collections, all of which date to the fifteenth century. The first collection, fols. 30r-32v, consists of short lists of canons, taken from the *Liber extra*, the *Liber sextus*, the *Clementines*, and the legatine statutes of Otto. These lists provide only legal citations, rather than full texts. The other two collections are in the hand of John Fishburne, the librarian of Durham. The largest of the three collections, fols. 113r-20v, provides the full texts of canons ranging from D.54 c.22 (*Abbati vel monacho*) to Clem. 3.10.1 (*Ne in agro*). The shorter collection of canons on fols. 219v-22v appears to be an addendum to the main list. The collection ‘*Abbati vel monacho*’ also appears in *D3*.

**Origin and Provenance**

This is one of the Durham compilations of normative material, discussed above in the description of *J2*. A note on fol. 55v declares that Robert Masham “gathered [the book] out of diverse places and had it written.” Masham (d.1418) entered Durham in 1383, became sacrist in 1404, and later oversaw several cells. Masham could only have collected the material down to the early fifteenth century (nos. 1, 6-11, 16-18, 21). John Fyshborne and William Dalton added most of the rest of the material.

*D1* has remained in the cathedral library to the present.

---

79 For this canon, see below, chp. 3, n.28. On the importance of abstaining from meat in monastic legislation, see below, pp.137, 145-46, 150, 163, 166, 172.

80 See above, p.43.

81 “*collegit diversis locis et fecit scribi.*”
1.3.2  **D2 Durham, Dean and Chapter Library MS B.IV.45**

Monastic normative texts. Parchment. 232 pp. 220 x 150 mm. Durham. s.xiv\textsuperscript{med}-xvi\textsuperscript{in}. a\textsuperscript{2} b-d\textsuperscript{12} e\textsuperscript{4} f\textsuperscript{12} (wantsd 12) g\textsuperscript{10} (wants 10) h-i\textsuperscript{10} (i wants 10) j\textsuperscript{12} k\textsuperscript{8} (wants 6-7) l\textsuperscript{12} m\textsuperscript{4}\textsuperscript{82}

**Contents**

1. pp. 1-4 s.xv Statutes of the provincial chapter of the Benedictines, 1420
2. p. 4 s. xv\textsuperscript{ex}-s.xvi\textsuperscript{in} List of the bishops of Lindisfarne and Durham to 1476
3. pp. 5-84 s.xiv\textsuperscript{ex} Constitutions of Benedict XII
4. pp. 85-94 s.xv Bull of Benedict XII, 1336, promulgating his Constitutions
5. pp. 95-101 s.xv Letter of Bernard of Genebreda and bull of Clement VI, 1343, on Constitutions of Benedict XII
6. pp. 102-06 s.xv Two decretals pertaining to provincial chapters, X 3.35.7 (*In singulis*) and X 3.35.8 (*Ea quae*)\textsuperscript{83}
7. pp. 107-24 s.xiv\textsuperscript{med} Statutes of the provincial chapters of the Benedictines, 1343
8. pp. 125-62 s.xiv\textsuperscript{med} *Abbas vel prior*
9. pp. 166-224 s.xv Statutes of the provincial chapters of the Benedictines, 1423, 1426

**Physical description**

*Abbas vel prior* is written in a single column of thirty-eight lines, in a crabbed mid-fourteenth century anglicana. A mixed secretary-anglicana hand has added extensive marginal notation, mostly short indications of topics or other marks to help the reader navigate the text. The text initially marks chapters in a rubricated display script within the body of the text. This rubrication divides the text into much smaller units than the chapter divisions in the table of contents found in *J3* and *D3* (see pp.61-62). After chapter five, *Quod habens minores ordines potest eligi in*

---

\textsuperscript{82} The manuscript is paginated in a modern hand, but pp. 5-32 have been numbered fols. 1-17 in a medieval hand.

\textsuperscript{83} The canons were read out at the beginning of provincial or general chapters. See Pantin, *Black Monks*, nos.28, 147, 152, 171-172 (I.89, 266; II.20, 135, 158).
abbatem (= G I.7.14), these chapter divisions cease. Internal divisions resume at De gulosis et ebriosis (= G I.15), which is marked by a large rubricated initial, but no title. This rubrication continues to the end of the text, and provides divisions that correspond to those of J3/D3. The marginal hand provides titles that correspond to chapters 12-20 in J3/D3.

Distinctive Features

D2, like D1, appends De cons., D.5 c.32, “Carnem cuiquam” to the text.

D2 is the most rigorously legal of the Durham compilations. Neither the Rule of St Benedict nor De praecepto et dispensatione appear, and the compilers of the manuscript show no interest in preserving texts of the thirteenth century. The statutes of the Benedictine chapters are also the most up-to-date. In this regard, D2 stands at the opposite pole from J2, which is the least narrowly legal of the Durham compilations.

Origin and Provenance

This manuscript is one of the Durham compilations, and it has remained in the cathedral library down to the present.

1.3.3 J3 Cambridge, Jesus MS 61 (Q.G.13)

Monastic normative texts. Parchment. 105 fols. 200 x 135 mm. Durham. s.xiv-xv. *8 a14 (wants 14) b12 c8 d6 e-f12 g6 h12 i8 k12 (wants 9, 10, 12).

Contents

1. fols.1-8 s.xv Durham account-rolls
2. fol. 9 s.xiv Table to the Rule of St Benedict
3. fols. 11r-37r s.xiv The Rule of St Benedict
4. fols. 37v-41r s.xv Legatine Constitutions of Ottobuono
5. fol. 41v Table to previous item
6. fols. 42r-47v s.xv Uthred of Boldon [?], Visitation articles of c.1366

7. fols. 48r-75v s.xiv Abbas vel prior

8. fols. 76r-87v s.xiv Statutes of the provincial chapter of the Benedictines, 1343

9. fols. 88r-95v s.xiv Statutes of the provincial chapter of the Benedictines, 1363

10. fols. 96r-103r s. xiv Lawrence of Somercotes, *Summa de formis electionum episcoporum faciendam*

11. fol. 103v s. xiv Explanation of Arabic numerals

12. fols. 104r-05v s. xiv *Quaestio*: “Utrum liceat prelato absque consensu sui conventus obseruanciarum dispensaciones siue mutaciones facere?”

**Physical description**

*Abbas vel prior* is in a single column format of thirty-one lines per column. The main hand is a mid-grade textualis. The text is followed (on fols. 69v-75v) by a table of contents and index (see below) in a calligraphic hybrid anglicana. A hand which may be a more hastily executed version of the hand of the table of contents has added chapter divisions in the following form: *Ca.*<sup>m</sup> *I*<sup>m</sup> in the margin, and *I*<sup>m</sup> in upper, outer corner of the page. This division of chapters corresponds to that in the table of contents. The layout of the main text does not reflect this division; it merely provides paragraph marks in red for each canon, without any further effort at organization.

**Distinctive Features**

---

84 See Pantin, *Documents*, vol. 2, no. 158.

J3, like D1 and D2, appends De cons., D.5 c.32 to the end of the text, but unlike those manuscripts, it seamlessly incorporates this canon into the text without any division.

On 69v there is a table of contents, with a brief preamble: “This little book is called ‘Abbas vel prior’ from its opening words. Although it is very small, nevertheless it is divided into twenty chapters and a prologue in such a way that the following table corresponds to the division, so that one can more easily find what one is looking for in it.” The table then lists twenty chapters, which I have given above in the table on pages 60-61 (it is not clear as to what the “prologue” corresponds). This division of the text provides a perceptive guide to the contents of the legal compendium. After the table comes an index, which consists of 145 alphabetical entries, from Abbas to Zona, which refer to the main text by chapter and paragraph (e.g. 14a, 8d). The index contains internal cross-references for redundant entries (e.g. “Taciturnitas. supra. silencium”). This sophisticated system of division and indexing makes the legal compendium considerably easier to use.

Origin and Provenance

This manuscript is one of the Durham compilations that have already been mentioned a few times, and it belonged to the Man collection (see discussion of J1).

1.3.4 D3 Durham, Dean and Chapter Library MS B.IV.26

Monastic normative texts. Parchment. 202 fols. 233 x 148mm. Durham. s.xiii-xv. a^4 b^{12} (wants 12) 1-2^8 3^{12} 4-6^8 c^4 d^2 7-11^{10} 12-14^8 e^2 15^{14} 16-18^8 22-23^8 f-i^8 k^6.

Contents

1. fols. 1r-11v s.xiii^ex Constitutions of the Priors of Durham, 1153-1260

86 “Libellus abbas vel prior sic a suo principio nominatus. si sit permodicus atamen [sic], ut subscripte tabule correpondeat, et quid in eo quis quieserit facilius inueniat, in 20 capitula et prologum est distinctus.” Cambridge, Jesus College MS 61, fol. 69v. cf. Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B.IV.26, fol. 149r.

2. fols. 12r-39v s.xiv Table to the Rule of St Benedict
3. fols. 40r-63v s.xiv Rule of St Benedict
4. fols. 64r-67v s.xiii Gregory IX, Statutes for Benedictines, 1235 and other legal matter
5. fols. 68r-69v s.xv Bull of Innocent IV dispensing from above statutes, with a bull of Eugene IV
6. fols. 70r-104v s.xiv Constitutions of Benedict XII, with the letter of Bernard of Genebrea and a bull of Clement VI (1343)
7. fols. 105r-16r s.xiv Statutes of provincial chapter of Benedictines, 1343
8. fols. 116v-124r s.xiv Statutes of provincial chapter of Benedictines, 1363
9. fols. 124v-27r s.xiv Bull of Benedict XII (1336) promulgating his statutes
10. fols. 127v-42v s.xiv Decretales monachorum ordinem concernentes
11. fols. 143r-44v s.xv Legatine Constitutions of Otto (1237)
12. fols. 145r-48r s.xiv Legatine Constitutions of Ottobuono (1268)
13. fols. 148v-82v s.xiv Abbas vel prior (with notes)
14. fols. 183r-98v s.xiv Bernard of Clairvaux, De praecepto et dispensatione
15. fols. 199r-202v s.xiv Table to preceding

Physical Description

The scribe of Abbas vel prior has attempted to produce a formal, calligraphic anglicana, but with limited consistency or success. He has tried to keep an upright ductus, but he often begins to write rapidly, at which point he slants strongly. Two anglicana hands have added brief marginalia throughout. The text is presented in a single column of thirty-three lines.

D3 has a similar layout to J3, with the same chapter divisions.

The text of Abbas vel prior begins on fol.148v, in the same hand as the legatine statutes of Otto (no. 11), and proceeds as far as “...obseruancia quemquam religiosum...” On fol.149r the table of contents and index (see J3), interrupt the text, and run to 154r. This front matter is in a second

---

88 See below, section 3.3.
89 For this collection, see below, section 4.2.
hand, a low-grade anglicana. This index hand reproduces the text of fol.148v on fol.154v, and then the main hand continues the text on 155r.

Distinctive Features

From the foregoing account of the text’s unusual opening, one can draw some conclusions about its history. Apparently this copy of *Abbas vel prior* was missing its opening when it was bound with the immediately preceding material in the fifteenth century, and the hand of no. 11, probably a compiler, added the opening of the text on 148v. At some point, a decision was made to add the index, which could not be put before the opening of *Abbas vel prior*, since it shared a folio with the end of another work. The new compiler inserted the index, and then recopied the opening of the text, so that one could read *Abbas vel prior* continuously.

*D3*, like *J3*, fully incorporates the canon *Carnem cuiquam* (*De cons. D.5 c.32*) into the final chapter of the text. The text hand also, like *D1*, appends an excerpt from *Summa summarum* III.56 on fasting. An elegant hybrid secretary hand then adds a note on the length of the probation of novices, attempting to reconcile, or at least sort out, the prescriptions in different canons.

Origin and Provenance

This manuscript is another of the Durham compilations, and it has remained in the cathedral library down to the present.

1.3.5  *D4* Durham, Dean and Chapter Library MS B.IV.49

Monastic normative and legal texts. Parchment. 101 fols. 190 x 125-130 mm. Durham. s.xiv²-xv. a-b¹² c⁶ d¹² e¹² (wants 12). Foliation starts at 49r. The manuscript is the middle third of a compilation, the other part are lost.

Contents

1.  fol. 49r s.xv End of table to the *Rule of St Benedict*
2.  fols. 49r-66v s.xv Table to Bernard of Clairvaux, *De praeepto et dispensatione*
3.  fols. 66v-72r (72v blank) s.xv Table to *Abbas vel prior*
4. fols. 73r-78v s.xiv Dossier of Durham’s rights and privileges
5. fols. 79r-100v s.xiv\textsuperscript{ex} Abbas vel prior
6. fol. 100v s.xiv\textsuperscript{ex}-s.xv Notes on the division of Gratian’s \textit{Decretum}
7. fol. 101rv s.xiv\textsuperscript{ex} Beginning of Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{De praeccepto et dispensatione}

Physical Description

\textit{Abbas vel prior} is in a late fourteenth-century hand. Capitals at paragraph divisions are filled in red, and the text opens with a three-line initial in red, with a red border of clove leaves on fol. 79r. Even this minor decoration is unusual in a copy of \textit{Abbas vel prior}. The table is in a fifteenth-century hand with capitals marked with red and yellow. Both works are in a single column of thirty-seven lines.

Distinctive Features

In this manuscript the table to \textit{Abbas vel prior} has become an independent entity. It appears that tables in the Durham compilations sometimes became separated from the text to which they refer, as in the first entry in \textit{D1}. This tendency reaches an extreme points in the compilation of tables without texts in the Edinburg manuscript discussed below.

Origin and Provenance

The manuscript was certainly one of the Durham compilations. The Dean and Chapter Library purchased it from a private owner at Christie’s in 1988. Its provenance before that is unknown.\textsuperscript{90}

1.3.6 Lost Copies of \textit{Abbas vel Prior}

John Bale saw a lost copy of the work at Reading Abbey.\textsuperscript{91} Edinburgh, University Library 106, fols. 146r-148v contains the table discussed in the account of \textit{J3} above, without an

\textsuperscript{90} Since the manuscript only arrived in Durham’s collection recently, Pantin does not discuss it, nor does Rud. It does appear in Sharpe, \textit{Handlist}, no. 1876. I am grateful to Gabriel Sewell of the Dean and Chapter Library for granting me access to the entry for this manuscript in the forthcoming catalogue.

\textsuperscript{91} Bale, \textit{Index}, 464.
accompanying main text. Edinburg UL 106 is a compilation of tables to various, mostly patrisitic, works. Its origin is unknown, but it dates to c.1400.

1.3.7 Manuscripts of *Abbas vel prior*: General Conclusions

The text of *Abbas vel prior* is quite stable, although both the main scribes and subsequent annotators often added canons and other short normative texts to the end of the work. The most notable example of this practice is the addition of the canon *De cons.*, D.5 c.32, which appears at the end of all extant manuscripts. It is unclear why this canon appears here, since it also appears in the body of the legal compilation. It is possible that both the canon and the excerpt from the *Summa summarum* 3.56 are William’s own notes for a chapter on fasting that he did not include in the *SR*, for whatever reason.

All of the surviving manuscripts come from Durham cathedral, and since the earliest manuscript (*D1*) was copied no later than c.1350, *Abbas vel prior* arrived at Durham within three decades of its composition. The work was often included in the first normative compilations, made between 1360-1380. John Wessyngton’s circle in the fifteenth century did not make any new copies, but it was responsible for compiling, or at least copying, several other legal collections. There is no evidence to suggest that the text circulated outside of Durham.

1.4 Date and Circumstances of the Composition of the *Speculum religiosorum*

Before addressing the circumstances of the composition of the *SR*, one must evaluate the evidence for William of Pagula’s authorship. Boston of Bury, writing in the early fifteenth century, assigns the work to William, but that is the only explicit evidence of William’s authorship. Boyle admitted that it was possible that the *SR* was the work of a later editor working from a manuscript of the *Speculum praelatorum*. Nevertheless, he maintained that William’s authorship was more likely, since it had one explicit attribution in its favour. An editor would have needed an exhaustive knowledge of the *Speculum praelatorum*, and we know that William

---

preferred to work by adapting material that he had already composed to suit new contexts. The simplest explanation of the available evidence is that William of Pagula is the author of the SR, although one must admit that there is no clear claim of authorship within the text, or in any of the surviving manuscripts.

I have already outlined a theory of the stages of the composition of the SR above, but it is still necessary to address the date of the work, and the possible circumstances that led William of Pagula, a secular cleric, to take the unusual step of writing for a monastic audience. As will be shown below in chapter four, William began gathering the legal compendium before John XXII promulgated the Clementines in 1317. The compendium was probably finished before the publication of William of Monte Laudano’s gloss on the Clementines in 1319, since William uses this gloss in other works. Abbas vel prior depends on a complete, or nearly complete, text of the Speculum praelatorum, which Leonard Boyle has dated to 1319x23. William finished the SR after Abbas vel prior, but before 1326, when William began to use Johannes Andreae’s commentary on the Clementines. Thus, William gathered the material that would become the SR between c.1317-1322, during the end of his doctorate and his regency at Oxford, but he may not have published the full SR until he returned to his parish in 1322.

Abbas vel prior has a close connection to Durham Cathedral Priory. Since William came from Yorkshire, it is possible that he had some connection to the monks of Durham before he moved south in 1313. In any case, he would have had an opportunity to make or renew a connection with them at Oxford, since Durham established a college there in 1286.93 The intellectual elite of the community had an ongoing interest in compilations of monastic law. It is possible that one of the monks of Durham gained access to a copy of the “Speculum prelatorum et religiosorum et sacerdotum parochialium,” and asked for a version without the prelates or the parish priests. William fulfilled this initial request quickly by excerpting the legal compendium, and fleshing out his cross-references. Whether or not the monks of Durham were the intended audience of Abbas vel prior, it is the only community from which copies of the work survive, and it appears

to have been a relatively important work in the intellectual life there during the century between 1350 and 1450.

Although it is not unreasonable to suppose that monks associated with Durham Cathedral formed the original audience for *Abbas vel prior*, there is little or no evidence about circumstances that led William to expand *Abbas vel prior* into a full-fledged guide to the religious life. When other secular clerics or mendicants wrote for the cloistered religious, they often wrote for a specific community or an individual recipient. Thus Robert Grosseteste wrote *Perambulavit Iudas* for an unnamed monastic superior who was known to him personally, and the monks of Cluny commissioned William Peraldus to write his treatise *Expositio professionis monachorum*. No such evidence for a specific recipient of the *SR* exists, although Durham did own two of the six extant copies. The context for writing the expanded *SR* may have been Oxford, but even that cannot be known with certainty. The limits of the available evidence do not allow one to say much about William’s reason for composing the *SR*.

### 1.5 Sources of the *Speculum religiosorum*

Different parts of the *SR* have different sources. Most of the *pars prima* (*G* fols.1r-101r) consists of long chains of quotations from authoritative sources, including the Bible, the Fathers, and some twelfth-century authors. William is careful to identify these sources, providing standard citations to the Bible and canon law, and at least the name of the author in other cases. As we have already seen, much of this material came from the preaching florilegium in the *Speculum praelatorum*. The second half of the work (*G* fols.101r-65r) consists of continuous prose, and does not identify its sources. Nonetheless, little of the material in the *pars secunda* is original; rather, it comes from a few works of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. The basic distinction in William’s treatment of his sources is thus between explicit citation of the *sententiae* of authorities, and silent borrowing on a larger scale.

The following section will discuss first those parts of the *SR* that consist of long chains of quotations. I will assess William’s use of different authorities, whether biblical, patristic, classical, or more recent, and then I will demonstrate that his source for much, though by no

---

94 See above, Chp. 1.2 (pp. 51-54).
means all, of this material was Thomas of Ireland’s Manipulus florum. Then I will turn to
William’s silent borrowings from three major sources, James of Milan’s Stimulus amoris, Hugh
of St Victor’s De institutione novitiorum, and Arnulf of Bohéries’ Speculum monachorum. This
chapter will not examine the legal material I.7-9, which will be discussed in chapter four.

1.5.1 Named Sources

The Bible is, it goes almost without saying, William’s most frequent source, and his use of it
generally accords with what one might expect from a medieval author writing in a devotional
and moral mode. He draws on the Psalms far more often than any other single book (106 times).
In the New Testament, he draws frequently on the gospels, particularly Matthew, but almost
ignores Mark. Among the Epistles, the Corinthian correspondence takes pride of place. In the
Old Testament he draws mostly from a few important books, above all Genesis and Isaiah, and
he largely ignores the historical books. More notably, he uses wisdom literature extensively:
Ecclesiasticus (61 citations), Proverbs (54), Job (20), and Wisdom (12).

Classical authors appear infrequently in the SR, which quotes only Seneca (15 times), Aristotle
(4), Valerius Maximus (1), Cicero (1) and the Timaeus (1). Almost half of these classical
references appear in chapter four, on poverty, a topic for which Seneca provided a particularly
rich store of aphorisms. Seneca, Valerius Maximus and Aristotle were well-established as
sources for moral philosophy in the later Middle Ages. Cicero was a popular author in
rhetorical instruction, and frequently appeared in florilegia. William also cites Plato’s well-
known Timaeus once, in chapter six, on chastity. This location is appropriate, since late medieval
moralists often saw Plato as a paragon of virginity.

---

95 For instance, this trio appears in a fourteenth-century Compendium moralis philosophiae as the representatives of pagan wisdom, with Augustine, Ambrose and Aquinas as the Christian representatives. Cited in Beryl Smalley, English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1960), 88, n.2.

96 For example, the Manipulus florum cites Cicero 107 times. See Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979), 435.

Among the Fathers, Gregory the Great (61) and Augustine (47) appear most often, followed by Jerome (20), Isidore (11) and Ambrose (10), with other authors contributing a few sententiae. Among the works of Gregory, the *Moralia in Job* is particularly prominent, as in most monastic works, but the *SR* also contains quotations from the homilies on Ezekiel and on the Gospels, the *Dialogues*, the *Regula pastoralis*, and even the *Registers*. For Jerome, William draws mostly on the letters of monastic advice (*Ep. 14* to Heliodorus, *Ep. 125* to Rusticus and *Ep. 52* to Nepotian), but he also uses *Adversus Jovinianum* and the commentary on Galatians. He does not give particular attention to Augustine’s *De sancta virginitate* or *De opere monachorum*. The citations of Isidore all refer to *De summo bono*. The *SR*’s use of the Fathers is, again, largely conventional, but one can note that Cassian and the *Vitae patrum*, both essential monastic reading, are not prominent.

William of Pagula draws on Bernard of Clairvaux (or writings attributed to him) far more often than any other writer of the twelfth century (66 citations). Hugh of St Victor (13) comes a distant second (most of these are misattributions of Hugh of Fouilloy’s *De claustro animae*). William refers to only three other writers of the long twelfth century, Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Comestor and Innocent III. William does occasionally quote other twelfth-century works, but he misattributes them to Bernard, Hugh, or a Father. This focus on Bernard was not uncommon, but it is more extreme in the *SR* than in many works.

William refers only to Thomas Aquinas among the theologians of the thirteenth century. Leonard Boyle has shown that William drew heavily on Thomas throughout his corpus, through the

---

98 Bede (2), Caesarius of Arles (3), Cassian (3), Cassiodorus (5), John Chrysostom (3), ps-Cyprian, *De XII abusivis saeculi* (1), Eusebius Gallicanus (1), Origen (1), Prosper of Aquitaine (2), *Vitae patrum* (3)

99 On the use of twelfth-century authors in thirteenth-century monastic literature, see below, section 2.3.2.

100 I have not been able to identify the source for the quotation attributed to Anselm at *SR* I.2 (5rv): “obedientia secundum anselmum est affeccio voluntatis deo coniuncta sic e contrario inobenditia est affeccio voluntatis diabolo ministrante copulata.” For Innocent III, see *SR* I.7.53 (33v) = *De miseria humanae conditionis*, II.30 (PL 217.728D); For Peter Comestor, see *SR* I.1 (2r), cf. *Historia scholastica libri I Regum*, c.9 (PL 198.1304CD).

101 See below, section 2.3.2.
intermediary of the Dominican pastoral writer John of Freiburg’s *Summa confessorum*. Nonetheless, one should not describe the SR as in any meaningful sense Thomistic, since mentions of Thomas are confined to one small section, I.9.79-83, which the table to *Abbas vel prior* aptly describes as being “about those entering religion, or transferring from one religion to another.” All of the quotations come from *Summa confessorum*, III.28 *De transitu clericorum*, and ultimately from *Summa theologiae*, Ia-IIae, Q.189. John of Freiburg had already combined Thomistic moral theology with canon law, so it was natural for William to incorporate these passages into a legal compendium. It is unclear whether William chose to include Thomas only on this specific topic, or merely never carried through a plan of incorporating more Thomistic material.

I will consider the sources for the large compendium of canon law in chapters seven through nine of the *pars prima* in chapter four, but the SR also includes two citations of canon law outside of the legal compendium. Chapter 2 *De obediencia* opens with references to *Decretum* C.8 q.1 c.10 (*Sciendum*) and C.11 q.3 c.97 (*Qui resistit*). William uses the former canon to support the biblical declaration that obedience is better than sacrifice (cf. 1 Reg. 15:22), and the latter to declare that disobedience to one’s superior is disobedience to the ordaining will (*ordinatio*) of God. William also cites *De consecratione*, D.5 c.33 (*Numquam*) near the end of chapter 21 *De accidia* on the importance of occupation as a guard against temptation. *Qui resistit* is of

---


103 “De ingredientibus religionem seu de una in alia transeuntibus” J3, fol. 69v.

104 John of Freiburg, *Summa confessorum* (Lyons, 1518), III.28.8, 15, 18, 22 (fols.140r-41v), which draws on *Summa theologiae* Ia-IIae, Q.189, aa.3, 8-9.

105 For instance, SR I.9.81 (53v), on the grounds for moving between religious houses, cites “extra de regularibus licet. et c. sane in glossa. et secundum Innocentium ibidem. secundum thomam. in summa.” John of Freiburg mentions all of these sources in *Summa confessorum*, III.28.15 (fol. 141r).

106 SR I.2 (fol.5r).

107 SR I.21 (fol.69r).
particular interest because William does not reuse it in the legal compendium, unlike the other two canons. It is not clear why William uses canon law at these two points, and not elsewhere.

1.5.2 The *Manipulus florum*

Since William was not afraid of relying on other writers, it would seem likely that he did not compose his florilegium *ex nihilo*, but used one or more previous collections. The most likely candidate for such a source would be Thomas of Ireland’s (c.1270-before 1338) *Manipulus florum* (1306), since Richard and Mary Rouse have already shown that William knew the *Manipulus*. The prologue to the *Summa summarum* is, in fact, a modified version of Thomas of Ireland’s prologue. ¹⁰⁸ The organization of the florilegium in the *Speculum praelatorum* also shares several features with the *Manipulus*. The entries are in alphabetical order, an organizational scheme that Thomas of Ireland popularized for florilegia. The *Manipulus* introduced two other organizational techniques. It identified each *sententia* with a letter of the alphabet, and it provided a list of cross references at the end of each heading to other headings that had relevant material. ¹⁰⁹ To take an example, for *Abstinentia*, Thomas provides: “Ubi *Caro* e.r., *Coniugium* c., *Consuetudo* c., *Discretio* m.n., *Elemosina* l., *Gula*, *Ieiunium*, *Infirmitas* b., *Servitium* c., *Sobrietas*, *Temperantia.*”¹¹⁰ In other words, the reader could look for further information on abstinence under, for example, the third entry on marriage, or any entry on fasting. The *Speculum praelatorum* does not use letters to mark each *sententia*, but it does provide cross-references between head-words.

Given these indications of Thomas of Ireland’s influence on William, it comes as no surprise that the *Manipulus florum* did indeed serve as an important source for the *Speculum praelatorum*, and, by extension, for the *Speculum religiosorum*. Yet William did not use it in a consistent manner. The *Manipulus* contributes long passages to the entries for *paupertas*, *castitas* and


¹⁰⁹ For the role of the *Manipulus* in alphabetization, see Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers*, 34-36. For the organization of the *Manipulus*, see ibid., 117-24.

¹¹⁰ Cited in Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers*, 120.
The final chapter of the pars prima of the SR, a long entry de statu religiosorum et beneficiis religionis, reproduces the Manipulus’ entry for religio almost exactly. Nevertheless, the Speculum praelatorum and the Manipulus share no content for many other entries with common titles, including correctio, murmur, relinquere, and solitudo. It is difficult to determine any pattern in William’s use of the Manipulus, but it does have one predictable effect on the text. The Manipulus contains extracts from the Fathers and classical sources, but not from the Bible. William, on the other hand, had access to a wealth of biblical quotations, for which he likely relied on concordances and collections of distinctions, since these were standard tools for preachers. This means that chapters with no connections to the Manipulus tend to be more biblical than those that rely heavily on it.

Much of the material in the Speculum praelatorum does not come from the Manipulus and much of the material in the SR does not come from the Speculum praelatorum, so it is likely that William had other immediate sources. In particular, he may have had access to collection of quotations from the biblical wisdom books, and to a florilegium of the works of Bernard of Clairvaux. At present, attempts to identify these putative collections have failed.

1.5.3 Silent Borrowings

The main source for the pars secunda of the SR is the Stimulus amoris of James of Milan, but William neither uses all of the Stimulus, nor relies exclusively on it. I have not been able to

---

111 SR I.5-6, 23.
112 SR I.43.
113 SR I.8, 11-12, 16.
115 For Florilegia and compilations of Bernard, see David N. Bell, An Index of Cistercian Authors & Works in Medieval Library Catalogues in Great Britain (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1994), 166-68.

identify any sources for the first two chapters of the *pars secunda*. The third, *SR II.3*, corresponds to the opening chapter of the *Stimulus*, and chapters 4 and 6 of the *SR* likewise correspond to *Stimulus amoris* I.2 and I.4. The *SR* then skips over the rest of the first part of the *Stimulus*, and takes it up again at the opening of its second part. *SR II.7-30* follows *Stimulus* II.1-III.10 exactly, omitting only *Stimulus* II.17-18.

The foregoing description passed over *SR II.5*, which does not correspond to *Stimulus* I.3, as one might expect, nor to any passage from James of Milan’s work. William gives this chapter the title *Tractatus beati bernardi de dolore beate virginis quem habuit in passione christi*. This proves to be a work generally known in modern scholarship as the *Planctus Mariae*, with the incipit “Quis dabit capiti meo aquam...,” which André Wilmart describes as “very popular at the end of the Middle Ages.” Manuscripts often misattribute it to Bernard of Clairvaux, as in this instance, or to Augustine, or, more rarely, to Anselm. The early chapters of the *Stimulus* are meditations on the Passion, and William apparently thought that they lacked sufficient Marian material.

At *SR II.31* there is an abrupt change of tone from contemplation, charity and Christocentric devotion, the main themes of the *Stimulus*, to chapters which cover such topics as discipline, correct speech, suitable gestures, and edifying reading. This change in tone corresponds to a change of source: *SR II.31-41* corresponds to Hugh of St Victor’s *De institutione novitiorum*,

---


118 The *Planctus Mariae* appears in *Speculum praelatorium* I.ii.22, after the material from the *Stimulus*. 
It is noteworthy that William borrows from Hugh silently here, while he was careful to identify him by name in the *pars prima*. It seems that William’s distinction between silent appropriation and explicit citation does not depend on the status of the author, but on the length of the material being borrowed.

*De institutione novitiorum* is built around a citation from Ps. 118:66 “Teach me goodness, and discipline, and knowledge.”

Discipline is necessary for goodness, and knowledge is necessary for proper discipline. Hugh first presents knowledge, which he divides into considering the right action in each situation (*ratio*), studying with a teacher (*doctrina*), learning from good role models (*exemplum*), meditation on scripture (*meditatio sanctorum scripturarum*), and self-examination (*inspectio operum ac morum suorum*). The second half of the work deals with discipline, which Hugh divides into discipline in appearance (*in habitu, in gestu*), speech (*in locutione*), and table manners (*in mensa*).

William largely preserves this structure intact, although he removes the prologue, shortens the section on *ratio*, and eliminates all discussion of table manners. The excerpts from *De institutione novitiorum* provide a rather jarring conclusion to the work, but given its presence in two manuscripts of the SR, it has a reasonable claim to be original.

Although William composed the *pars prima* of the SR as a patchwork of quotations, he does silently integrate one short work in its entirety: Arnulf of Bohéries’ *Speculum monachorum* (s.xii*-xiii*). This work takes up most of SRI.23 *De cogitationibus*. The following excerpts,

---


120 “Bonitatem et disciplinam et scientiam doce me.” Hugh, prol. ad *De institutione* (ed. Feiss, 18). For the argument that this is the key to the work, see van ’t Spijker, *Fictions of the Inner Life*, 61.

121 *De institutione*, cc. 1-9 (1-48).

122 *De institutione*, cc. 10-21 (48-98).
taken from the beginning and end of the *Speculum monachorum*, provide a comparison between Arnulf and the *SR*:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arnulf of Bohéries, <em>Speculum monachorum</em>, ll. 5-10, 32-34, 65-69</th>
<th><em>SR</em>, I.23 (74r, 75v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In primis ergo ex quo surgit ad vigilias, vitem sue tempus per momenta singula debet monachus computare. et videre semper ut bonum faciat et malum caveat in omni opere suo, et hoc dicat sibi ipsi: <em>Si modo morturus esses, faceres</em> istud? Ad psalmi odiem semper cor habeat nisi ad aliquid sublimius rapiatur. Sed et omnium, quae ibi dicuntur, usque ad unam litteram se pro certo noverit debitorem vel dicendi in choro suo, vel audiendo in alio...</td>
<td>Cogitet apud se religiosus omni hora hec: <em>Si modo moriturus essem facerem</em> hoc peccatum uel illud? Certe non, quia dicit Salamon: Fili, memorare nouissima tua et in eternum non peccabis. Cum psallit ad uigilias uel ad horas semper cor ad sensum psalmi habeatur nisi altius sublimiusque rapiatur. Set et omnium que ibi dicuntur, usque ad unam litteram se noverit debitorem uel dicendi in choro suo, uel audiendi in choro altero...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tedio affectus</em> componat se meditando <em>supra petram in qua lavantur mortui</em>, et cogitet apud se, quomodo tractentur usu sepeliendi: nunc in tergum, nunc in faciem versentur, quomodo nutet caput, cadent brachia, rigeant crura, tibie iaceant; quomodo induantur, consuantur, quomodo deferantur humandi,</td>
<td>Cum quia se <em>tedio</em> uel langore animi affici senserit, consociet se <em>supra petram in qua lauantur mortui</em>, et tractet apud se quomodo tractantur ibi sepeliendi, qualiter tunc in faciem et in tergum uersantur, quando mittantur in tumulum. quando puluere contegantur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


There are several modern translations of the *Speculum*, and one translation into modern Italian. I have used *A Mirror for Monks*, ed. Mark DelCogliano, “Cistercian Monasticism in the Silver Age: Two Texts on Practical Advice,” *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 45:4 (2010), 421-52 (at 437-40). For a full list of translations, see DelCogliano, “Two Texts,” 428-30.

124 Breitenstein, “*Consulo tibi,*” 147-49.
It is not clear whether the differences between the SR and the *Speculum monachorum* are a product of deliberate paraphrase on William’s part, or whether they are the result of variance within the textual tradition of Arnulf’s work.

Arnulf of Bohéries’ *Speculum monachorum* is a short text (~ 900 words) designed for personal meditation and reflection during the daily cycle of the monastic life, and its concision gave it enormous popularity throughout the Middle Ages and into the early modern period. Mirko Breitenstein has provided a provisional list of 198 manuscript copies, primarily from Central Europe and Scandinavia, but by his own admission this list is incomplete. It seems that the work was less popular in the British Isles than elsewhere, although this may reflect the severe losses sustained by British monastic libraries.\(^\text{125}\)

Breitenstein has also made the first critical evaluation since the seventeenth century of the date and authorship of the *Speculum monachorum*.\(^\text{126}\) A lone manuscript, Mechelen, Stadtarchiv MS I.1.1 (s.xiii\textsuperscript{med}), from the Cistercian abbey of Villiers-en-Brabant, attributes the *Speculum* to Arnulf of Louvain, formerly a monk of Bohéries. There was an abbot of Villiers named Arnulf of Louvain (d. 1250), who was well known for his piety. There is no evidence that he was ever at Bohéries, but this cannot be ruled out. Breitenstein argues that a scribe at Villiers may have conflated an earlier, and otherwise unknown, Arnulf of Bohéries with the beloved abbot. It seems that one can at least say that the treatise was written by a Flemish Cistercian named Arnulf, who spent at least part of his career at Bohéries.\(^\text{127}\) Breitenstein is able to provide an

---

\(^\text{125}\) Breitenstein, “*Consulo tibi,*” 128-43. Out of the 198 mss. provided by Breitenstein, only two are from the British Isles: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 36 (SC 1888), s.xiii, Carmarthen Priory (Aug. can.); Oxford, Magdalen College, MS 109, s.xv. A cursory search of medieval library catalogues has not yielded any new results.

\(^\text{126}\) For the discussion of authorship, see Breitenstein, “*Consulo tibi,*” 116-19.

\(^\text{127}\) Mark DelCogliano interprets Breitenstein to say that there is no reason to believe that Arnulf of Bohéries is the author. As I read Breitenstein, he doubts the identification of Arnulf of Bohéries with Arnulf of Louvain, not the attribution to an Arnulf. DelCogliano, “Two Texts,” 426-27, 430-34.
absolute *terminus a quo* of 1145, based on Arnulf’s sources, and *terminus ad quem* of c.1220 based on the earliest extant manuscripts. I would argue, given the similarities of the work to “silver age” Cistercian writings, such as the *Speculum novitii* (s.xiii) formerly attributed to Stephen of Sawley, that the *Speculum monachorum* was composed towards the end of Breitenstein’s range.\(^{128}\)

The opening of the *Speculum monachorum* declares that “if anyone, touched by the desire for a more perfect life... aims to correct all his flaws, let him correct the face of his interior man, as if in a mirror, by frequently reading the present work and attentively meditating upon it.”\(^{129}\) The *Speculum* falls into two halves.\(^{130}\) The first half guides the monk through the course of a single day. Arnulf enjoins a self-examination upon waking, and then discusses the need to pay attention in choir, the connection between meditative reading and prayer, the need for meditation during manual labour, prayer for benefactors, and the need for guarded speech in chapter. This first half ends by recommending another self-examination before sleep, which should form the basis for confession the next day. Arnulf then discusses the requirements for confession, whether in private or in chapter (for public sins).

The second half of the *Speculum monachorum* concentrates on monastic deportment. The monk should be silent, listening to edifying conversation and speaking plainly, if speech is necessary. The monk should avoid any particular bonds of affection, whether to his *confrères* or to his

---

DelCogliano has argued compellingly, but not definitively, that the author of the *Speculum monachorum* also wrote another short monastic treatise, the *Octo puncta perfectionis*.

\(^{128}\) DelCogliano implicitly supports this date as well.

For the *Speculum novitii*, see Stephen of Sawley [?], *Speculum novitii*, ed. Edmond Mikkers, “Un ‘Speculum novitii’ inédit d’Étienne de Salley,” *Collectanea ordinis Cisterciensium Reformatorum* 8 (1946), 19-68. This text is a variant of an unpublished work, ‘*Deo me totum*’, which is sometimes attributed to a Cistercian named Thomas of Woburn. The proper authorship and title for the work are unclear at present, but this thesis will retain the attribution to Stephen of Sawley throughout, for the sake of clarity.

\(^{129}\) Prologue to *A Mirror for Monks* (DelCogliano, “Two Texts,” 437). “Si quis, emendatioris vite desiderio tactus... universos excessus suos corrigere nititur, in presentis pagine frequenti lectione et assidua meditatione, tamquam in speculo interioris hominis sui faciem contemplatur.” *Spec. monachorum*, ll.1-5 (Breitenstein, 147).

\(^{130}\) *Spec. monachorum*, ll.5-43 (Breitenstein, 147-48); ll. 43-70 (Breitenstein, 148-49).
family, or any connections with secular magnates. The work concludes by suggesting meditation on death as a remedy for *taedium*. Arnulf skilfully employs balance and repetition to give a compact, yet thorough, course of self-examination tied to the daily cycle of monastic life. In a brief space, he manages to include many of the key themes of twelfth-century works of formation. Arnulf’s insistence on self-examination makes it an appropriate choice for part of a chapter on controlling one’s thoughts.

William also drew silently on the famous *Summa de vitiis* (c.1236) of the Dominican William Peraldus (c.1190-1271) in the *pars prima*. This substantial work consists of nine *tractatus*, on the vices in general, the seven capital vices, and the sins of the tongue. The *Summa de vitiis*, together with its companion piece, the *Summa de virtutibus*, was among the most popular works of moral theology in the later Middle Ages. It survives in several hundred manuscripts and several dozen editions, and it was one of the works that the Dominican Order required its novices to learn by heart. William uses the *Summa* for three chapters, I.19-21, on monastic pride, lust and sloth. These passages will receive more detailed attention in section 2.2.1.

### 1.5.4 Sources: General Conclusions

The *SR* is a composite work, and it makes little attempt to disguise the heterogeneity of its sources. Even when William silently appropriates a work, the reader can often recognize a

---

131 An injunction to weekly confession appears at the end of some manuscripts, and in the PL edition. Breitenstein relegates it to the *apparatus criticus* of his edition. DelCogliano, “Two Texts,” 452-53 points out that this agrees with a statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter of 1232. Although this passage was certainly a later modification of the text, it fits well with Arnulf’s concern for confession and self-examination.


133 The two *summae* were composed separately, but often circulated as a single work. Conversely, many excerpts also circulated independently. See Dondaine, “Guillaume Peyrault,” 188, 192-93.

134 Mulchahey, “First the Bow...”, 451. Ibid., 91, 110, 198, points out that Peraldus’ two *summae* were cornerstones of the formation of Dominican novices, and of the training in moral theology (*collationes de moralibus*) in the order’s schools. Dondaine, “Guillaume Peyrault,” 188-89, 192-97 provides an extensive, but, by the author’s admission, provisional list of editions and manuscripts.
change in tone and theme in the SR, as at the transition from James of Milan to Hugh of St Victor at SR II.30-31. The SR does not assert a strong authorial voice, but rather directs the reader back to the encyclopedic array of works behind the text. William does provide an overarching thematic unity for the work in the prologue. All of the disparate parts of the SR can guide the monastic reader to wisdom, and ultimately, as William says, to the *summum bonum*. The concept of wisdom, as it appears in the SR, and as a wider theme in monastic writing of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, will provide the topic for chapter 5.

William was remarkably up-to-date in his immediate sources. One might expect William to be *au courant* in canon law, and he was indeed aware of the *Clementines* soon after their promulgation in 1317. William was also aware of recent works of pastoral and devotional literature: John of Freiburg wrote his *Summa confessorum* in 1298, the version of *Stimulus* used by William appeared after 1300, and Thomas of Ireland finished the *Manipulus flororum* in 1306. William did include two well-established classics of monastic literature, Hugh’s *De institutione* and Arnulf’s *Speculum monachorum* among his immediate sources, but, for the most part, he offered the reader the fruit of the latest work in law, devotion, and popular theology.

The contemporary works that William used as his immediate sources give some idea of William’s intellectual environment, but they do not explain the context of the SR as a complete work. The full SR is neither a *florilegium*, nor a pastoral treatise, nor a work on canon law, and it differs significantly from its immediate monastic sources. This chapter has begun to address the problem of how the SR relates to William’s work as a secular cleric known for his *pastoralia*, but there is more to be said on this topic. The next chapter will investigate the broader literary context of the SR as a finished work. It will look in particular at three genres, confessional treatises and sermons for monks, and encyclopedic monastic treatises.
Chapter 2
The Literature of Pastoral Care and Monastic Formation

This chapter turns from the component parts and sources of the SR to consider the work as a whole in the context of the religious literature of the thirteenth century. In particular, I will focus on two elements of its background, namely, sermons and confession treatises for the cloistered religious, and works of monastic formation. By “works of monastic formation,” I mean works whose primary goal was to provide basic instruction in living the monastic life, as opposed to more sophisticated theological works or mystical literature. The SR is clearly a work of monastic formation in this sense, but the category, as I have briefly sketched it, is broad to the point of being unwieldy, and in this chapter I will attempt to provide a more detailed taxonomy of this literature. I will place the SR in the category of “encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation,” a term that will be explained at more length below.

The relationship of the SR to confessional treatises and preaching for the religious is less obvious, but it has been shown above that the SR drew on works associated with preaching, such as the Manipulus florum and William Peraldus’ Summa de vitiiis et virtutibus. Apart from preaching, confessional treatises were perhaps the only genre in which secular clerics wrote for a religious audience. Furthermore, William of Pagula’s reputation, both in the Middle Ages and in current scholarship, rests on his ability as a pastoral writer, and so it is also of interest to see how, if at all, this pastoral background influenced the content of his work for the religious. Therefore the first part of this chapter will consider the development of monastic confessionalia and preaching for monks, and evaluate the relationship of the SR to each genre. The SR had little relationship to literature for confession, but it drew on preacher’s aids, and its contents have close parallels in monastic preaching.

2.1 Treatises on Monastic Confession

In the period between the third and fourth Lateran councils (1179-1215) numerous treatises appeared which sought to assist priests in pastoral care, and in the practice of confession above all. The growth of scholastic theology and law during the late eleventh and twelfth centuries had led to important developments in penitential theory. The new treatises—many of them written by former students of Peter the Chanter at Paris—sought to summarize and popularize these
developments. They placed more emphasis on the circumstances of sin and the interior disposition of the sinner than older penitential manuals, which concentrated on set penitential tariffs. The production of new penitential treatises accelerated after canon twenty-one ("Omnis utriusque sexus") of the Fourth Lateran Council enjoined annual penance to a parish priest on all Christians, and the papacy commissioned the mendicant orders to hear confessions. These new penitential works gradually supplemented or replaced the older libri poenitentiales.¹

Some of these confessional treatises in the new style offered guidance on confession by monks. Although only two treatises focused specifically on this topic— the De penitentia religiosorum (s.xii) of William de Montibus, and Robert Grosseteste’s treatise De confessione ‘Perambulauit Iudas’ (-1230, likely 1215x20)²—, other works incorporated a confessional formula for monks, including: William de Montibus’ Speculum penitentis (s.xii), Peter of Poitiers’ Summa ‘Compilatio praesens’ (c.1216), Raymund of Peñaafort’s Summa de penitentia (c.1225), and the De modo confitendi (1230x36) of Cadwgan of Bangor.³ These confessional treatises, even when

---


² William de Montibus, De penitentia religiosorum; Grosseteste, ‘Perambulauit Iudas’.

addressed to the religious, were a part of secular, as opposed to monastic, clerical culture. Grosseteste and William de Montibus were secular clerics. Peter of Poitiers, Raymond of Peñafor and Cadwgan were, respectively, a Victorine canon, a Dominican friar, and a Cistercian monk turned bishop, but they wrote as the representatives of the secular hierarchy’s mission of pastoral care, addressing the clergy in general, rather than as religious addressing fellow-religious.

The writing of penitential works aimed at the religious by secular clerics was a clear sign of the sea-change in the status of cloistered monasticism that occurred between the late twelfth and the mid-thirteenth centuries. Bishops and councils had, of course, regulated monastic behaviour and condemned certain monastic practices ever since the beginning of monasticism, but the secular hierarchy did not generally address the day-to-day sins of monastic life, let alone the examination of conscience by monks. Indeed, the reverse had rather been the case; monastic confessional techniques had shaped the practice of the wider Church. For instance, the division of sin into seven or eight capital vices has its origins in monastic spiritual direction.

The system of tariffed penance that formed the backbone of penitential practice from the seventh century into the twelfth, and that continued to be influential in the later Middle Ages, originated in Irish

I have not been able to consult the unpublished *Summa confessionis* (-1215) of the Cistercian Stephen of Stanlaw (perhaps identical with Stephen of Lexington). The monastic *Liber de penitentia* printed in PL 213.863-904 (German, c.1190) is quite different from these scholastic confessional treatises.

---

monasticism.⁵ Even in the second half of the twelfth century, monks advised secular clerics on the practice of penance.⁶

This relationship is reversed explicitly in the two treatises dedicated entirely to the confession of monastics. William de Montibus and Grosseteste both claim to have written in response to a request for advice, and while this is a common trope in medieval literature, Grosseteste, at least, is clear that he was writing for a close associate. William de Montibus and Grosseteste were respected scholars, but neither of them held an ecclesiastical office with pastoral responsibility when they wrote. William de Montibus was master at the cathedral school of Lincoln, and perhaps chancellor of the cathedral, when he wrote the De penitentia. If the dating of Goering and Mantello is correct, then Grosseteste wrote the ‘Perambulauit Iudas’ before he became archdeacon of Leicester in 1229, and certainly before he became bishop of Lincoln in 1235.⁷ They were thus in quite a different position from bishops and councils issuing legislation.

These requests clearly indicate that some monks thought, as Joseph Goering puts it, “that the needs of [cloistered monks] were inadequately addressed by the current penitentials.”⁸ Nevertheless, it is not clear why they felt this concern. Monks certainly confessed more frequently than any other group, and their self-examinations were more sophisticated than those of all but the most devout laity. Cistercians, in particular, continued to produce confessional works for external and internal use.⁹ It was not uncommon for men from the schools to enter monasteries, where they might rise quickly thanks to their coveted scholastic training. They then found themselves in positions of pastoral authority with relatively brief experience of the

---

⁵ For brief account of the origin of the pentientials, with bibliography, see Peter Brown, The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 245-46.


⁸ Goering, William de Montibus, 211.

⁹ E.g. Stephen of Sawley (?), Speculum novitii.
traditions of monastic discipline, and it may be that they turned instinctively to renowned scholars for advice.\textsuperscript{10} It may also be that by the turn of the thirteenth century the prestige of the new work on penance was such that monks felt compelled to seek it out, despite having their own traditions. These solutions are not exclusive, but they are both largely speculative.

The larger penitential treatises that include short sections on monastic confession had a rather different origin and aim from the free-standing works. They were written for parish priests, and offered either encyclopedic information on a wide range of pastoral topics, or concise guides to the basic theology and practice of confession.\textsuperscript{11} In either case, these works often dealt with problems according to social roles (\textit{status}), such as married and celibate, noble, merchant, and peasant, or, in this case, religious and secular. Nonetheless, it is not clear how readers were meant to use the advice on monastic confession, since the religious generally confessed to their own superiors, or to a designated confessor within the community.\textsuperscript{12} Monasteries did own copies of these pastoral manuals, but so did many secular clerics. It may be that pastoral writers did not have solely a practical purpose, but hoped to signal that the religious fell ultimately under the pastoral oversight of the secular clergy.

Whatever the reason for the inclusion of monastic sins in penitential handbooks, the practice developed slowly. Most of the works cited here were composed during the years 1215-1235 (except for William de Montibus, who was well ahead of his peers). This was later than the period of the great manuals composed during the interconciliar period, such as Thomas of Chobham’s \textit{Summa ‘Cum miserations’}, Robert de Courson’s \textit{Summa de sacramentis}, and

\textsuperscript{10} Consider the career of Baldwin of Ford: born c. 1125, he was educated at the cathedral school of Exeter, and likely in northern France. By 1151 he was a tutor to the nephews of Eugene III. He became an archdeacon in 1162, and entered the Cistercian abbey at Ford in 1170. By 1173 he was already abbot. It must be conceded that Baldwin rapidly became at home in a monastic milieu, to judge by his surviving writings.


Robert of Flamborough’s *Liber poenitentialis*.\(^\text{13}\) These considered a wide variety of pastoral problems involving cloistered religious, but did not include lists of monastic sins. It appears that secular clerics only began to write on the confession of the religious after the “new” pastoral works had been established for a generation.

The list of monastic sins in Raymund of Peñafort’s *Summa* provides a useful example of both the vitality of monastic moral analysis in the twelfth century, and the development of secular works on monastic confession in thirteenth.\(^\text{14}\) Raymund’s discussion of monastic sins is of particular interest because it was taken over almost verbatim, first by John of Freiburg in his *Summa confessorum*, and then by William of Pagula in the *Oculus sacerdotis*.\(^\text{15}\) All three works were enormously popular, and so this became most widely-diffused list of monastic sins in the later Middle Ages:

... since the religious are separated from secular deeds, note concerning them that one should make a particular inquiry and examination according to the twelve articles or abuses of the cloister by which the estate of religion is frequently corrupted. These are: negligent superiors, disobedient subordinates, lazy youths, stubborn old men, monks at court,\(^\text{16}\) or regular canons pleading cases, precious habits, fancy meals, rumours in the cloister, arguments in chapter, laxity in the choir, irreverence towards the altar. Cloistered religious fail in these ways, and so a priest can inquire about them. Likewise he should inquire about the essentials of the rule, namely obedience, private property, and chastity or continence, whether, that is, they have committed anything against these or anything


\(^\text{15}\) John of Freiburg, *Summa*, III.34.83 (fol. 193ra); William of Pagula, *Oculus sacerdotis, Pars oculi*, c.2 (UPenn 721, fol. 36rab).

\(^\text{16}\) The ambiguous phrase “monk at court” (*monachus curialis*) could mean either a monk-courtier or a monk who is involved in legal disputes. In this period these were by no means exclusive categories, and the sense is probably “a monk who involves himself in secular business associated with princes and magnates.”
pertaining to these. Likewise, he should inquire about simony and other sins that are often committed by such people.”

The “twelve abuses of the cloister” were not original to Raymund; they come from one of the spiritual classics of the twelfth century, Hugh of Fouilloy’s (d.1174) *De claustro animae*, to be more precise, from book two, chapters eleven to twenty-three. Hugh’s career is representative of the “reformation of the twelfth century.” He was born c.1100 into a knightly family at Fouilloy, near Amiens. After a theological education, he joined a nearby religious community at Saint-Laurent-du-Bois in the early 1120s. This was one of the many tiny communities gathered around a hermit, but it grew rapidly into a substantial house of regular canons, and Hugh became prior in 1152. *De claustro animae* counts among the most successful works of the later Middle Ages, surviving in over 500 manuscripts. It describes the religious life in four books, each of which interprets the cloister according to one of the four senses of interpretation. The first, literal book praises the religious life, the second, moral book prescribes monastic discipline (including enumerating the twelve abuses), the third book allegorizes the different part of the cloister, and the fourth describes the anagogical correspondence between the earthly cloister and the heavenly Jerusalem. Book II elaborates on each of the abuses at some length.

In addition to the remarkable popularity of *De claustro animae*, the section on the twelve abuses circulated widely as an independent treatise *De duodecim abusionibus claustri*, with manuscripts

17 “Verum quia religiosi sunt a saecularibus actibus separati, circa eos nota interrogationes et examinationem faciendam specialiter super duodecim abusionibus claustri quibus frequenter religionis status corrumpitur. Sunt autem istae: Praelatus neegligens, discipulus inobediens, iuvenis otiosus, senex obstinatus, monachus curialis, seu canonicus regularis caudicus, habitus pretiosus, cibus exquisitus, rumor in claustro, lis in capitulo, dissolutio in choro, irreverentia iuxta altare. In istis delinquunt claustrales et ideo de eis poterit interrogare sacerdos. Item interroget eos de tribus substantialibus regulae scilicet oboedientia, propio, castitate seu continencia; utrum videlicet contra ista vel aliquod istorum commiserint. Item de simonia et alis quae a talibus frequentius committi solent.”

Raymund of Peñafort, *Summa de penitentia*, ed. Ochoa and Diez III.34.35 (834) (slightly modified).


19 * Archives de littérature du Moyen Âge*, “Hugues de Fouilloy,” on-line.
surviving from England to central Europe. Hugh may have originally composed *De duodecim abusionibus* as an independent work, since it is coherent in itself, and fits rather awkwardly into the larger treatise, or he may have incorporated an anonymous work that was already circulating. In any case, the text was not meant to be a guide for confession, but to help institute proper discipline in the cloister.

Raymund of Peñafort supplemented the twelve abuses with two concepts taken from more recent developments in canon law: monastic simony and the *substantialia religionis*. Monastic simony, the offering of a pre-arranged amount of money in exchange for entry into a monastery, had been accepted since late antiquity, on the grounds that the gift (*oblatio*) of oneself or one’s child to a monastery would hardly be generous without a means of support for the new member of the community. Gratian had been the first prominent thinker to argue that it was simoniacal, but the practice only became a major target for suppression in the early thirteenth century, when it was condemned successively by influential pastoral treatises, the Fourth Lateran Council, and several local councils. Canonists of the mid-thirteenth century also emphasized the concept of the “essentials of religion” (*substantialia religionis*) as a set of common principles that all religious held in common. Raymund’s interest in two major innovations in canon law for the religious is noteworthy, since he was responsible for editing the *Liber extra*.

---

**Footnotes:***

20 The following list of mss. of *De duodecim abusionibus claustri* is likely very far from complete, since I have not been able to find any study of its textual history:

Auxerre, Bib. mun. MS 146 (133) (s.xv), fol.155v; Bratislava, Archiv hlavného mesta [Municipal archive] MS EL 10 (s.xv); Cambrai, Bib. mun. MS 830, fol. 2f; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 481 (s.xiii), p.16; Dijon, Bib. mun. MS 196 (158), fol. 1v; Dublin, Trinity College MS 667 (F.5.3.); Edinburgh, University Library, MS 107, fols. 40r-60v (s.xiii-xiv, English); Erfurt, Wissenschaftl. Allgemeinbibl. MS Amplon. 4o, 104 (17), fols. 106-121 (Bib. Of Johannes de Wasia, Cologne, s.xiv²); Grenoble, Bib. mun., MS 245, fol.1f; Leiden, Bibl. d. Rijksuniv. MS Vuc. 94C, fol. 55-78v; Leipzig, Universitätsbibl. MS 384; —, MS 428; —, MS 486; Montpellier, Bib. de l’univ., Sect. de Méd. MS 413, fols. 110v-21 (s.xiii); Paris, Bib. de l’Arsenal MS 500 (T.L. 501), fol.119f; —, Bib. Mazarine MS 996, fol. 150f; —, MS 769, fol.42v; —, BNF MS lat. 11200, fol. 42vf; —, Bibl. Ste-Genève MS 237.2, fol. 126; Prague, Univerzitní knihovna [Univ. lib.] MS III.D.17 (469) (s.xiv); Vienna, ÖNB MS 3353, fol. 13vf. Items that appear in Bloomfield, no. 183 9, but not on this list are incorrect.

21 Joseph H. Lynch, *Simoniaca Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260: A Social, Economic and Legal Study* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1976), 187-90, gives particular credit to Robert de Courson’s *Summa de sacramentis* for popularizing the concept of monastic simony. Courson does not do this within the context of monastic confession. See also Peter of Poitiers, *Summa*, c.42 (51-52).

22 For more on the *substantialia*, see below, section 2.3.1 (pp. 111-22).
2.1.1 Confessionalia in the *Speculum religiosorum*

As mentioned above, William of Pagula took over Raymund’s formula for confession (via John of Freiburg) in the *Oculus sacerdotis*. Raymund had placed his list of monastic sins in the context of the question “whether the priest should question the penitent in confession, and on which matters, and in what way?”  

According to Raymund, the confessor should question the penitent, *inter alia*, about his or her role in life (*officium*), and he provides particular areas of concern for the religious (the passage quoted above), the secular clergy, rulers, soldiers, merchants, townsfolk and peasants. Among these different social roles, the religious and the clergy receive by far the most attention. John of Freiburg takes up the same *quaestio*, and provides the same answers as Raymund, although in a much more concise form. The *Oculus sacerdotis* relies on John of Freiburg, but William uses the material in a more rigorously practical way. He walks his reader through the steps of hearing a confession, and then provides the three basic categories for interrogation: the seven capital vices, the circumstances of sin, and the social role of the penitent.

In contrast to the *Oculus sacerdotis*, the *SR* does not contain the abuses of the cloister, or any other concise lists of monastic vice. Nevertheless, it contains important passages on monastic sin and confession diffused throughout the work. In some respects, as will be seen, this diffusion is the inevitable result of William’s reliance on a variety of sources. One can divide the material on confession and sin in the *SR* into three categories: first, occasional brief references and material on confession from Arnulf of Bohéries’ *Speculum monachorum*, which reflect monastic piety, rather than scholastic confessors manuals; second legislation on monastic confession; and finally the detailed account of monastic sins in *SR* I.19-21.

---

23 Raymund of Peñafort, *Summa*, ed. Ochoa and Diez III.34.30 (827); ed. Rome, 1603, III.34.28 (462b).


The non-legal material in the first half of the SR contains many brief, unconnected references to confession. A novice, like a transplanted plant, must be “fenced by circumspection, watered by devotion, pruned by confession and mulched and tended by practice and sound occupation.” Pain (dolor) causes penitents to sigh in contrition, confession and satisfaction. One of three acceptable reasons for a monk or canon to speak about himself is to declare his sins in confession. The first two steps to maintaining spiritual health (sanitas spiritualis) are contrition and confession. Taking these passages together, the reader gets the impression that confession is an integral part of the religious life, but he does not learn anything about it in detail.

SR I.23, De cogitationibus provides some detailed advice on confession, drawing on Arnulf of Bohérie’s Speculum monachorum:

Then after compline, let him come to his bed each night and hold a chapter-meeting with himself, and, calling together his thoughts, let him sit in judgment over himself, carefully considering how he has sinned by thought, word, pleasure and deed, whether privately or publicly. Washing his bed each night with his tears, that is, purifying his conscience through remorse for each of his sins, let him carefully take count of his sins one by one, so that the next day he may confess his hidden sins in private. For confession to be pure, it requires three things, namely that it be voluntary (voluntaria), bare (nuda) and clean (munda)—voluntary, for it is done from one’s own deliberation and intention, bare, so that one may confess one’s sins as one did them, clean, lest one propagate one’s sin, like Sodom. Rather let him accuse himself with a pure and straightforward intention. Let him

---


28 SR. I.26 (79r)

29 ibid., I.30 (82v)

30 ibid., I.41 (94r).
reveal in chapter the sins that he committed publicly. Let him speak, respond, and conduct himself there as if he were in the presence of God the Judge.  

This passage envisions a two-step process; first a careful examination at the end of each day, and then confession the next day, either in private or in chapter, according to the nature of the sin. The “confession in private (secreto facere confessionem)” seems to refer to confession to another monk, since if it referred merely to an interior confession to God, there would be no need to repeat the previous evening’s self-castigation. This “confession in private” likely refers to seeking spiritual council, rather than sacramental confession, since daily sacramental confession would be an exceptionally high standard, even in a monastery. The formula of voluntaria-nuda-munda, however, is one version of a common trope that usually refers to sacramental confession. In either case, the emphasis is once again on frequency and diligence in self-accusation, rather than on specific sins.

In the thirteenth century various forms of legislation had reinforced the importance of frequent confession in the religious life, and some of this legislation entered the SR. Gregory IX had made monthly confession a universal requirement for black monks in 1235, a rule reaffirmed and extended to other religious by the papal legate Ottobuono de’ Fieschi (the future pope Adrian V)

31 “Deinde cum post completorium ad lectum suum uenerit, singulis noctibus et in silencio capitulum sibi teneat, et conuocatis undique cogitacionibus suis, ponat semetipsum iudicem sibi, cum racione diligenter recogitans quid in ipso die cogitacione, locucione, delectacione et opere deliquerit publice uel priuatim, et per singulas noctes lectum suum lauans, hoc est pro singulis peccatis conscienciam suam cum dolore purificans, diligenter de singulis computet. In crastino de occultis secreto facturus confessionem [ms: confessione]. Ut autem pura sit confessio tria debet habere, scilicet ut sit voluntaria nuda et munda: voluntaria enim propria deliberacione et ex proposito facta, nuda ut prout gesserit [ms: gessit] peccata sua confiteatur, munda ne peccatum suum predicet ut sodoma. Set pura et simplici intencione se accuset. In capitulo vero de hiis que publice offendit manifeste reuelet, tamquam assistens coram deo judice in cunctis se habeat ibi loquatur et respondeat.”

SR I.23 (75r), cf. Arnulf of Bohéries, Speculum monachorum, ll. 32-42 (148).

32 A interpolation at the end of some manuscripts of the Speculum monachorum enjoins weekly confession. This interpolation likely derives from the Cistercian statutes of 1232 (see n. 34, below).

in his canon *Ad haec quia* (1268) and by the council of Vienne (1311).\(^{34}\) The SR incorporates both *Ad haec quia* and the ruling from Vienne, albeit in reduced forms.

A monk ought to confess frequently, at least once a month, and let those who do not confess frequently be gravely reproved, and induced to confess, as it says in the Constitutions of Ottobuono, in the canon *Ad haec quia*...

Item, each month, every monk must confess at least once, whether in a monastery or not. On the first Sunday of every month he ought to receive the body of Christ, unless he refrains on the advice of abbot, prior or confessor... as it says in the *Constitutiones extravagantes* of Pope Clement V, in the title *De regularibus*, in the canon *Ne in agro*.\(^ {35}\)

These statutes emphasize the importance of frequent confession for the religious, and clarify some issues of jurisdiction, but they do not have anything to say about the content of monastic confession. This is not particularly surprising in provincial and papal legislation, which naturally focused on readily enforceable standards.

The most sustained treatment of monastic sin in the SR comes in chapters nineteen to twenty-one, which cover, in turn, pride, lust and sloth as these pertain to the cloistered life. As mentioned above, the source for most of William’s material on these vices is William Peraldus’ (c.1190-1271) *Summa de vitiiis* (c.1236).\(^ {36}\) Peraldus designed his *Summa* as a resource for moral

---

\(^{34}\) Statutes of Vienne, c.14 (= Clem. 3.10.1§3) in *COD*, 346; Ottobuono Fieschi, Legatine Council of London (1268), c.53, in C&S, 791-92. Not all legislative sources required monthly confession. For weekly confession, see: Statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter (1232), c.8 in *SCGCO*, 102.

For semi-annual confession to the abbot (presumably in addition to more frequent confession to a delegated confessor), see :Statutes of the Provincial Chapter of Canterbury (1278), X.1,3 in Pantin, *Documents*, 95.

Pobst, “Visititation of Religious,” mentions Eudes Rigaud’s concern for confession, but does not provide an exact standard of frequency. Cheney, *Episcopal visititations*, 70-74 gives an account of several sets of questions for visitors, but none mention confession.

\(^{35}\) “Monachi debent frequenter confiteri; saltem semel in mense. Et qui frequenter non confitentur grauiter arguantur et ad confitendum inducantur. in constitutionibus octoboni. c. ad hec quia.” *SR* I.9.56 (46v).

“Item singulis mensibus tam in monasteriis quam extra debet quilbet monachus saltem semel confiteri, in prima domenica cuiuslibet mensis recipere corpus christi, nisi omiserit de consilio abbatis prioris seu confessoribus sui... in const. extraug. pape. clementis. v. de regularibus. c. ne in agro.” *SR* I.9.63 (48r).

\(^{36}\) See above, p.79.
exhortation by preachers, not as a guide for confessors. As will be shown, the material that William borrows is consistent with moral formation, but not with detailed penitential self-examination.

William of Pagula likely included pride, lust and sloth as the most typically monastic of the seven vices. Pride, the *fons et origio* of the other vices, always demanded particular attention, but the religious had to keep a special guard against it, since humility was the essential monastic virtue, while the perfection of the contemplative life provided a constant temptation to self-satisfaction, and regular discipline inspired disobedience. In a similar manner, the religious needed to have more freedom from lust than any other group. *Accidia* had originated as a description of the distraction and boredom that could easily arise from the repetition and physical discomfort of life in the cloister. Disaffection with monastic discipline was a major theme of monastic moralists, although they often used the related terms *taedium*, *curiositas*, and *mens vagans*, rather than *accidia*. In comparison with these three vices, avarice, envy, anger and gluttony had a less prominent place in monastic moralizing.

The *SR* begins by condemning the pride of abbots and priors or other superiors. It supports this point with biblical passages on the need for humility among rulers, an example from natural philosophy— gold, the most precious metal is also the heaviest, and therefore sinks furthest— and a warning that pride is a particular danger to prelates, for obvious reasons. The *SR* then presents the four varieties (*species*) of religious pride. There are those who “believe that they are wise, and wish to govern themselves by their own lights.” Others “despise sinners living in...sapientes se credunt, et sensu suo regere se uolunt.” *SR* I.19 (65v).

---

37 A note at the end of *SR* I.21 (69r) directs the reader to “look in the *summa* that is called the *Oculus sacerdotis* for the other deadly sins, and for the remedies against them. (De ceteris peccatis mortalibus, et de remediis contra illa, quere in summa que vocatur oculus sacerdotum.)” This is a reference to *Oculus sacerdotis, Pars dextra* cc.30-45 (UPenn 721, fols. 76ra-88ra). There is, however, no meaningful correspondence between the treatments of pride and lust in the two works, and there is only a partial overlap between their treatments of sloth.

38 This is not to say that there were no concerns on these topics. Satirists of the twelfth century attacked the Cistercians for avarice, while the Cistercians levelled the same charge at black monks, but there appears to have been less concern with monastic avarice in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Gluttony, except in the most dissipated houses, expressed itself in the perennial battles over eating meat.

39 This division, superiors first, and then the religious in general, recurs in the legal compendium.

40 “…sapientes se credunt, et sensu suo regere se uolunt.” *SR* I.19 (65v).
the world, believing that they are polluted by associating with them.\textsuperscript{41} The last two categories of monastic pride address the problem of different social classes within the cloister. Monks from poor backgrounds may seek greater material comfort in the cloister, while others may take pride in the wealth and status that they have ostentatiously abandoned.\textsuperscript{42}

William’s treatment of sloth opens with the three reasons for the particular gravity of monastic sloth. Monks converse with God in prayer, and so they must be attentive. They have chosen poverty in order to correct the softness of their secular lives. Since the cloister is an enclosed garden, they have a particular responsibility to bear fruit. To these three, William adds that sloth leads to saying the hours in slipshod manner (\textit{inordinate}).\textsuperscript{43} The \textsc{SR} then turns to the general evils of sloth: poverty, baseness (\textit{vilitas}) and suffering (\textit{penalitas}).\textsuperscript{44} Finally, the \textsc{SR} offers remedies to the vice. To avoid sloth, one should vary one’s work, and meditate upon both the dangers of this life and the eternal punishment of the damned.\textsuperscript{45}

In the accounts of pride and sloth, one can see that William of Pagula is more concerned with moral exhortation than with the forensic analysis of sin, but this is particularly clear in his treatment of lust. A work for confessors would need to discuss the various categories of lust, with an emphasis on those that most affected the religious, such as sexual fantasies, masturbation, and homosexual activity, as in the following example from Robert Grosseteste:

\begin{quote}
Sometimes I have been delighted to see beautiful women and the intercourse of irrational animals, by means of which, overcome again and again by desire, I have defiled my inner sight... I have often touched forbidden organs, shameful organs, both my own and those
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{41} “...despiciunt seculares et peccatores, credentes se ex consorcio eorum maculari.” \textsc{SR} I.19 (66r). I here take it that “seculares et peccatores” is equivalent to “seculares peccatores,” since the point is that proud monks make no distinction between these terms.

\textsuperscript{42} This account of social divisions in the cloister derives from Augustine, \textit{Praecepta}, ed. Luc Verheijen, rev. and trans. George Lawless, in George Lawless, \textit{Augustine of Hippo and his Monastic Rule} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), cc.5-7 (80-83).

\textsuperscript{43} \textsc{SR} I.21 (67rv) cf. Peraldus, \textit{Summa 1668}, V.2.17 (206a-07a).

\textsuperscript{44} \textsc{SR} I.21 (68rv) cf. Peraldus, \textit{Summa 1668}, V.3.1 (207b-08b).

\textsuperscript{45} \textsc{SR} I.21 (68v-69r). cf. Peraldus, \textit{Summa 1668}, V.1.3 (169a-70a).
of others... I have also provoked others to evil many times, either through a light touch, or because I came close to them in a bold and disrespectful manner, showing them my stature, or a bodily gesture, or other things that it is shameful to say...  

The SR, in contrast, focuses only on demonstrating that lust is a more serious vice for the religious than for others. The SR makes this point with legal concepts and biblical exegesis. Lustful monks are vow-breakers, thieves who steal precious sacred vessels (the chastity that they had given to God), and frauds who live off of alms under the pretense of serving as holy intercessors. Unchastity is equivalent to apostasy, since merely abandoning the habit is apostasy, and chastity is more essential (magis substantialis) to monasticism than the habit. William also draws on a tradition that sees the host of the angels in heaven, the Garden of Eden, and the early Church in Jerusalem as archetypes of the cloister. This allows him to compare unchaste monks to the fallen angels, Adam and Eve, and Ananias and Sapphira. At no point does William so much as mention a specific act of sexual sin. The chapters on monastic vice are moral exhortation of a kind less appropriate to confession than to preaching, which will be the topic of the next section of this chapter.

2.2 Preaching for the Cloistered Religious

The other major pastoral genre in which secular clerics and mendicants wrote for cloistered religious in the later Middle Ages was the sermon, in particular the form known as the sermo modernus. The sermo modernus was the dominant form for elite preachers from the late

---

46 “Quandoque autem delectabar uidere pulcritudinem mulierum, conmixturem animalium irrationabilium, a quibus... iterum et iterum concupiscencia uictus, fedaiui meos intuitus... Palpauui sepe membra prohibita, membra pudenda, et in me et in alis... Proutocau ai eiam alios multociens ad malum, siue per leuem tactum siue quia nimir proaciter et ireuerenter obieci me eis, ostentans eis proceritatem, uel gestum corporis, uel alia que pudor est dicere.” Grosseteste, ‘Perambulauit Iudas’, cc.6, 14-15 (149, 153-54).


50 The literature on late medieval preaching is vast. For a brief introduction, see the articles and bibliographical guides in Beverley M. Kienzle, The Sermon, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge occidental 81-83 (Turnhout:
twelfth to the fifteenth century. It stood in contrast to older preaching styles of the patristic era and of the monastic milieu. Patristic-monastic preaching moved through a whole book of the Bible, or at least a large segment of a book sequentially, with a free-flowing, seemingly open-ended structure. It was suitable to preachers who expected to spend long periods of time with same audience, whether bishops preaching every week in a cathedral, or monastic preachers addressing their community.

The *sermo modernus* was more suited to the needs of itinerant elite preachers in the later Middle Ages, whether friars or bishops making a circuit of visitations.\(^{51}\) The *sermo modernus* also reflects the increased emphasis on topical preaching in Lent and on major feasts. These “new” sermons had a “deliberately obvious structure.”\(^{52}\) The preacher began by announcing his *thema*, the brief passage, normally only a single verse, or even a part of a verse, on which he intended to preach. The *thema* came from the readings for the day, or from another appropriate passage. He would then subdivide the *thema*, with each subdivision providing a section of the sermon. For each subdivision, he would supply the *membra*, that is the key topics for his interpretation of that subdivision.

The preacher, having clearly outlined the structure and major interpretative moves of his sermon, would then proceed to the *dilatio*, the fleshing out of each *membrum*. This generally involved three elements. The first was the chain of authorities; rather than provide the immediate context for the *thema*, the preacher would supply quotations, both scriptural and extra-scriptural, that shared a key word. The preacher might also define a given word, using either an etymological derivation or a theological definition. Preachers reinforced their points with *exempla*, brief moralistic stories.

---

\(^{51}\) For a concise introduction to the *sermo modernus*, see Mulchahey, *“First the Bow... ”*, 401-18. See also Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia, and Sermons*, 65-90.

\(^{52}\) Mulchahey, *“First the Bow... ”*, 405.
The *sermo modernus* tended to replace the older forms of sermons even within the cloisters.\(^{53}\)

Many of the most intellectually gifted monks in this period attended university, where they learned the dominant scholastic approach of explicit subdivision. Moreover, the talented preachers who visited the monasteries, whether bishop and legates making visitations or friars staying as guests, would have preached in the new manner. In light of these influences, it was natural that monastic preachers would change their own approach, although patristic and old-style monastic sermons continued to be popular for private reading. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries preachers influenced by humanism and then Protestantism would return to patristic models, but this development does not concern the present study.

Several genres developed to aid in the preaching of the *sermo modernus*. The most obvious was the collection of sermons, either model sermons or the transcripts of actual addresses. Model sermons tended to provide only an outline of the sermon, and even reported sermons are often somewhat abbreviated.\(^{54}\) The purpose of such collections was not generally to provide a record of one man’s eloquence or theological insight, but to a supply a handbook of workable outlines which the reader could fill out as needed to fit a given audience or occasion.

Other genres helped the preacher find material to fill out a sermon. The importance of treatises on the virtues and vices has already been mentioned above. Other genres included the biblical concordance, the collection of *exempla* or of brief lives of saints, mnemonic verses, and encyclopedias, which served as a source for etymologies and of moralizing interpretations of the properties of the natural world.\(^{55}\) The most important of these sermon aids for the present study is the *florilegium*, a collection of topically-arranged quotations.\(^{56}\)

---


2.2.1  *Ad status* collections

One can divide sermons for the religious into three major categories, visitation sermons, *ad status* collections, in which each sermon addresses a specific social group, and general pastoral sermons. Most scholarly attention to monastic preaching has focused on *ad status* sermons. Jean Longère pioneered work on this genre as part of his research into regular canons, and it has received more recent attention from Carolyn Muessig and Jessalyn Bird.\(^57\) There are only three full-fledged *ad status* collections from the twelfth and thirteenth century, those of Jacques de Vitry (c.1160-1240),\(^58\) Guibert of Tournai (c.1200-1284)\(^59\) and Humbert of Romans (c.1200-1277),\(^60\) but the attraction of *ad status* collections is obvious. The authors were among the most prominent preachers of their time, and their sermons provide ready access to their view of society. As result *ad status* sermon collections have perhaps loomed too large in sermon studies. It is not clear how influential *ad status* sermons were in terms of actual preaching, since there were relatively few collections, and, inevitably, much preaching addressed a mixed audience. Nonetheless, the religious, by the very nature of their life in community, were among the groups most suited to an *ad status* treatment.

---

\(^56\) On *florilegia*, see Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia, and Sermons*. See also several of their studies collected in *Authentic Witnesses*.


\(^59\) Marjorie Burghart is preparing a thesis edition of at least some of Guibert’s sermons under the title “Les *Sermones ad status* de Guibert de Tournai, OFM (†1284),” (PhD thesis, University of Paris II, in progress). See also Longère, “Guibert de Tournai.”

\(^60\) Humbert of Romans, *De eruditione praedicatorum*, MBVP 25. 424-567, at 456-506. For a brief introduction to these sermons, see Edward Tracy Brett, *Humbert of Romans: His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society* PIMS Studies and Texts 67 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984), 160-64.
The most developed example of *ad status* preaching for the religious is Humbert of Romans’ *De eruditione praedicatorum*, which contains sixty-eight outlines for sermons for the topic. Sermon fifteen, addressed “to every kind of monk” provides a typical example of Humbert’s approach. He begins by providing an etymological definition of the word “monk (*monachus*)” as meaning “a guardian of one person” from the Greek words *monos* and *icos* (= *oikos* [?]), which Humbert defines as “oneness (*unitas*)” and “guardianship (*custodia*)”. This, Humbert explains, is because monks do not have to take care of possessions, a household, or the cure of souls (*res, vel familiam, vel curam animarum*), but only of themselves. Yet this is still a precious treasure, threatened by powerful evil spirits, so monks must be on their guard. Humbert then offers several ways of subdividing the concept of guardianship. The monk should guard his heart from wicked thoughts (*cogitationes*), wicked pleasures (*delectationes*) and wicked sensations (*sensus*). He should guard his heart from perverse intentions, wicked affections and useless occupations. Or he should guard his tongue, or his five senses, the gates to the body. Humbert concludes by offering an appropriate *thema*: “Custodi temetipsum sollicite” (cf. Deut. 4:9). The whole sermon is only four hundred words in length, and is clearly intended to serve as an outline.

Humbert’s sermons give a panoramic view of religious diversity, as he saw it. To take only the male religious, Humbert presents the following subdivision:

The Religious in general

- Followers of the Rule of St Augustine
  - Regular canons (including the Dominicans)
- Followers of the Rule of St Augustine, with additions
  - Premonstranensians, Brothers of Val d’écoles, Sack Bros., Preaching Bros.
- Monks
  - black monks, white monks (= Cistercians), grey monks (identity unclear)

---

61 Humbert of Romans, “Sermo XV ad omne genus Monachorum,” in *De eruditione praedicatorum*, MBVP 25. 462a

62 *Icos* may be a latinization of *oikos*. If this is a correct reading, the link between *oikos* and *custodia* would be the supervisory care of the *paterfamilias*. This unusual etymology appears to have originated in the schools of Paris in the mid-twelfth century. It appears in “Hildebert of Lavardin,” [= Peter Comestor], “Sermo ad monachos benedictinos,” (PL 171.887B); Peter Comestor, *Sermo 49 ad monachos* (PL 198.1840C); Peter the Chanter, *Verbum abbreviatum*, c.153 (PL 205.366B). For the authorship of the sermon attributed to Hildebert, see M.M. Lebreton, “Recherches sur les manuscrits contenant des sermons de Pierre le Mangeur,” *Bulletin d’information de l’Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes* 2 (1953), 25-44 (at 42). I am grateful to David Porter for discussing the possible referants of *icos* with me.
- Hermits
  - Carthusians, Grandmontines
- Lesser Brothers (*Fratres minores*)
- Brothers of the Trinity
- Religious in schools
- Lay brothers (*conversi*)
  - attached to: Cistercians, Carthusians, Order of Preachers, *mulieres religiosae*
- Religious who bear arms
  - Hospitallers, Templars, Teutonic Order
- *Humiliati*
- Brothers and Sisters in hospitals
- Brothers and Sisters in leper houses
- Novices (*novi religiosi*)
- Servants (*familia*) of religious

He divides the male religious into followers of the Rule of St Augustine (including Dominicans), monks, hermits, friars, and *Humiliati*, with subdivisions into appropriate orders. For many of these groups, he provides sermons for those who are doing well, and those who are behaving inappropriately. He includes communities serving in hospitals and leper houses, and military orders. He considers religious in specific circumstances, such as novices and those attending schools. Lay brothers and servants also receive sermons. This collection of sermons is among the most thorough explorations of late medieval monasticism.63

---

63 Humbert presents a different taxonomy of canons regular than Jacques de Vitry and Guibert of Tournai. His two predecessors had made no distinction between those who followed the Rule of St Augustine *simpliciter*, and those who made worthy additions to it. Instead, Gerbert and Jacques listed seven orders of canons: the Premonstratensians, the Grandmontines, the Victorines, the Order of Arrouaise, the Order of Val des écoliers, the Caulites, and the Order of Preachers. This list is somewhat odd, since the Grandmontines and Valliscavilians followed a modified Benedictine rule. Jacques de Vitry’s *Historia occidentalis* contains a scheme that is closer to Humbert’s. The *Historia* describes “regular canons living according to the Rule of St Augustine,” followed by four more specific orders: the Premonstratensians, the Order of Arrouaise, the Victorines, and the Order of Preachers. See Jean Longère, “Les chanoines réguliers,” 262-64, 270.

Among the friars, Humbert makes no mention of the Carmelites and Augustinians, nor of the Crutched and Pied friars (the latter supressed in 1274).

2.2.2 Visitation Sermons

Visitation sermons occurred when a bishop performed a formal visitation of a monastery. By the early thirteenth century, there was a widespread expectation that bishops would regularly appear in person at the non-exempt religious houses of their diocese, both to inspect correct abuses and to affirm episcopal rights. In practice, it appears that such visitations were most frequent in England and northern France, but they did occur elsewhere. In a typical visitation, the monastic community would formally receive the bishop, thus acknowledging his rights, at which point the bishop would proceed to the chapter house, where he would preach a sermon that would set the tone for the rest of the visitation. The bishop would then investigate the financial condition of the house, its conformity to the canons, and the moral character of at least the abbot, and perhaps the individual monks.64

While the ad status collections have received a reasonable amount of scholarly attention, there is no repertory of extant visitation sermons, nor even a thorough study. C.R. Cheney, in his brief but helpful discussion, says that “some few visitation sermons have come down to us,” but provides nothing like an exhaustive list.65 Most extant visitation sermons remain unedited. The following discussion will thus be somewhat impressionistic. Cheney has claimed that visitation sermons mostly gave “instruction... strictly relevant to the business to follow,” and used a pointed thema, such as “Behold and visit this vine.”66 Monastic communities could be reluctant to recognize episcopal jurisdiction, and resentful of outside interference.67 A fine example of this

64 Cheney, Episcopal visitations, 59-64; Brentano, Two Churches, 123-25. For a recent assessment of late medieval English visitations, see Christian Knudsen, Naughty Nuns and Promiscuous Monks: Monastic Sexual Misconduct in Late Medieval England (PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 2012), 75-80.

65 Cheney, Episcopal visitations, 63. He refers to extant sermons on p.15, n.5, p.16, n.1, p.64, n.5.

66 ibid., 64, with reference to London, Brisish Library, MS Royal 8.F.IX., fol.73r.

Bishops often preached a different sermon to a mixed audience of religious and laity in the main church as well. Such sermons had less connection to visitations. See Cheney, Episcopal visitations, 64-65. For an example, see Frederico Visconti, “Sermo 53,” ed. Nicole Bériou and Isabelle le Masne de Chermont, with Pascale Bourgain et Marina Innocenti Les sermons et la visite pastorale de Federico Visconti : archevêque de Pise (1253-1277) (Rome: École française de Rome, 2001), 742-49.

67 Bouraeu, “How Law Came to the Monks,” 45-47 elevates monastic resistance to visitation to a theoretical principle of what he calls a “layered community,” in which a social entity will put aside violent internal dissent to present a united front against outside authority. One could certainly multiply spectacular examples of resistance to visitation in, for instance, the work of Matthew Paris, but the work of Phyllis Pobst and Brian Golding suggests that
genre survives as sermon 23 among the collected sermons of Thomas Brinton, the late fourteenth-century bishop of Rochester, who was himself a Benedictine monk before becoming a bishop.  

Contrary to Cheney’s claims, there are at least a few visitation sermons that address wider concerns about the monastic life. Perhaps the most sophisticated surviving example is a sermon of Robert Grosseteste on the *thema*, “non est enim veritas, et non est misericordia, et non est scientia Dei in terra” (Hos. 4:1b), which he preached at the visitation of an unknown monastery some time after 1240. Grosseteste draws a contrast between the *terra* of the active life and the *celum* of contemplation. The monastic community of contemplatives is like the harmonious motion of the heavenly bodies. He proceeds to offer three triads that are necessary for the monastic life. First there are (drawing on natural philosophy) the “powers of the essence (*virtutes essentie*)” of the monastic life: renunciation of possession, impassivity before worldly things, and the unity of the speculative intellect and the senses in contemplation.  

Second, the heavens have boundaries, and in a similar manner monks are bound by the three vows of the Rule of St Benedict to obedience, stability and conversion, to which Grosseteste adds “bending in sympathy” (*concavum compassionis*). Finally, just as the heavens must have a harmonious motion, the operation of the monastery requires the right use of temporal goods for spiritual ends, the ordering of the hierarchy by love, and maintance of tranquility by reforming abbots.

much of the time episcopal visitors and monastic communities enjoyed more harmonious relations, or at least a *modus vivendi* that had benefits for both groups.


69 Grosseteste, “Sermo ad religiosos.” For the date and audience, see Ginther, “Monastic Ideals,” 232-37.

70 Grosseteste, “Sermo ad religiosos,” cc.5-10 (248-50).

71 ibid., cc.11-14 (250-51). For Grosseteste the *concavum compassionis* means a willingness to adapt oneself to others, above all by “bending down” to relieve the wretched. Ginther, “Monastic Ideals,” 241-42 provides other uses of *concavum* and *compassio* in Grosseteste’s moral theology.

Not every bishop could match Grossesteste’s elegant synthesis of monastic norms, Dionysian theology, and medieval cosmology, but there is evidence that at least some other visitation sermons went beyond enunciating the bishop’s rights.\(^{73}\)

Grossesteste’s “Sermo ad religiosos,” bears more similarity to *ad status* preaching than it does to the standard visitation sermon. In this respect it resembles the larger body of pastoral preaching that *ad status* collections drew upon and sought to support. Such sermons might be preached by a formal visitor, whether a bishop, the representative of a provincial chapter or the mother house in orders that maintained filiation. A preacher who was merely a guest, a friar receiving a night’s hospitality, for example, might also deliver such a sermon. Most importantly sermons on the religious life were, of course, a part of the regular diet of preaching within monastic houses.\(^{74}\)

### 2.2.3 Preaching and the *Speculum religiosorum*

The first chapter of this thesis has already provided some indication of the relationship between sermons for monastic audiences and the *SR*. Many chapters come directly from the *florilegium* in the *Speculum praelatorum*, which was explicitly addressed to preachers. Much of the other material in the *pars prima* comes from either Peraldus’ *Summa de vitis* or the *Manipulus florum*, both important resources for preachers. The use of canon law in the *SR* is not as far removed from preaching as one might think. At least some preachers incorporated canon law frequently into their sermons. Thomas of Brinton, for example, incorporated citations from Gratian and the *Liber extra* into all of his sermons for the religious, not only those that were specifically concerned with visitation. The *SR* contains much that a preacher could use.

---

\(^{73}\) See Brinton, “Sermo 75,” in *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton*, II.343-45. One might also include two other examples, although it is not clear if they were preached at a formal visitation: Brinton, “Sermo 11,” in *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton*, I.37-42; Visconti, “Sermo 53,” in *Federico Visconti*, 742-49.

\(^{74}\) The preaching by monks within their own cloistered included a much wider range of topics than the nature of their monastic vocation, including the praise of various saints, the exposition of points of theology, and more general preaching on the virtues and vices. The Cistercian abbot Jacques de Furnes (modern Veurne, Belg.) preached only five sermons *ad religiosos* among the 129 of his sermons that survive. See Gérard de Martel, “La collection des sermons de Jacques de Furnes. Le sermon sur Ruth 1,22,” *Sacris erudiri* 32 (1991), 343-93. De Martel provides only the manuscript title for each sermon, and a lengthy incipit. The sermons *ad religiosos* are nos. 56-58, 74, 96 (pp. 366, 369, 373). To this one might add sermon no.55 *in capitula generali* (p. 366).
Despite the reliance of the SR on praedicabilia, there is no indication that William intended his treatise to serve as a resource for preachers. The prologue strongly implies that the work is for private, meditative reading. William enjoins the reader, identified as a religious, to eat the Speculum, a common image for internalizing a text through frequent reading. The reader is described as unlearned (indoctus), and in need of wisdom. In other words, the reader is a monk in need of edification, not a preacher seeking to provide it.

Chris Nighman has recently made a similar point about one of William`s important sources, the Manipulus florum. He argues that the Manipulus was originally intended as a work of self-formation for university students, rather than as a resource for preachers. More recent work by Marc Cels supports this conclusion. The Manipulus would therefore be a secular parallel to the SR. If this interpretation is correct, then some quotations would have originated in a collection for the self-formation of clerics, were transferred into a florilegium for preaching in the Speculum praelatorum, and then into a guide to the monastic life. In this respect, the SR demonstrates the ease with which material for religious edification could move in and out of the context of preaching in the later Middle Ages.

The SR has little connection to visitation sermons, but a comparison with ad status sermons yields a more complex picture. The first and last chapters of the pars prima, De religione and De statu religiosorum et beneficiis eius explicitly address the status of the religious. Yet the SR differs radically from ad status sermons, in that it has little interest in providing an elaborate taxonomy of monasticism. It does provide a few basic distinctions, between mendicants and non-mendicants, between monks and regular canons, and between Cistercians and other monks, but it makes no attempt to emphasize or explore them. William minimizes the difference between monks and canons by referring to them together: “monks and regular canons” and “abbot, prior or other superiors” are among his favourite phrases. A few laws in the legal compendium specify different standards for the Cistercians, but this is the SR’s only concession to variety


76 For William’s use of monastic nomenclature, see the introduction, n.1.
among monks. At every turn, William of Pagula emphasizes the homogeneity of the non-mendicant religious.

This difference in emphasis flows from changes in the place of the religious in society between the mid-thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Twelfth-century authors had already begun categorizing new forms of the religious life, and attempting to set limits on this diversity, but this problem became particularly acute in the first half of the thirteenth century. It is well known that canon thirteen of the Fourth Lateran Council forbade the adoption of new rules. At the same time Innocent III had demonstrated considerable flexibility in reconciling the *Humiliati* and supporting the Franciscans and the Order of Preachers. Questions about the role of the different monastic groups abounded throughout the thirteenth century. Could the religious perform pastoral work, and if so, which groups, when and how? What sort of rule would the Friars Minor adopt, and how should it be interpreted? Should one credit the claims of the Carmelites to go back to Elijah, and should they be mendicants or contemplative hermits? What role(s) should the regular canons fill? Could the religious participate in the universities? The most radical controversialists challenged the legitimacy of any form of religious life except for unordained monks dedicated strictly to contemplation and penance.

---

77 All the mentions of the Cistercians appear in the legal compendium: *SR* I.7.12 (27r); I.7.20 (28rv); I.9.7 (39v); I.9.37 (44r). Cf. X. 1.10.1, 3.35.3, 3.35.7, 5.3.43.


79 For the cloistered religious, see Hofmeister, “Mönchtum und Seelsorge;” Montaubin, “Les chanoines réguliers et le service pastoral.”

80 There is a vast bibliography on this topic. For a very brief introduction, see Michael Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2006), 17-18, 98-101, 119-29.


83 For the cloistered religious in the universities, see Caby, “Non obstante quod monachi.”

84 For this position, see William of St Amour, *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, ed. and trans. G. Geltner, Dallas Medieval Texts and Translations 8 (Leuven: Peeters, 2008). For the background to this anti-Mendicant
In the midst of intense and varied controversies, there was a strong imperative to insure that each monastic group had a legitimate role in the Church, and that each group should accept its assigned role. Jacques de Vitry, Guibert of Tournai and Humbert of Romans all belonged to orders at the heart of these controversies. As Carolyn Muessig has argued, the *ad status* collections helped to provide and disseminate visions of the role of the religious in Christian society. In this context, Jacques, Guibert and Humbert all found it necessary to underline the continuity of the Dominicans with the regular canons. Humbert also provides subtler examples of legitimation: for example, by assuming that some religious will attend the schools.

By the end of the thirteenth century, the situation of the religious had changed considerably. The Second Council of Lyon, in 1274, suppressed all mendicant orders, except for “the orders of Preachers and Minors [and]... the orders of the Hermits of St Augustine and of the Carmelites.” This decision not only reinforced the legitimacy of these four orders, it also grouped them together into a new category, mendicants. The *ad status* sermons had included the Dominicans with the regular canons, and would likely have considered the Augustinians and Carmelites as hermits, an understanding still evident in the nomenclature of Lyon II. Boniface VIII’s bull *Super Cathedram* (1300) then settled disputes over the pastoral work of the mendicants with a compromise that allowed the new orders to continue their activities while respecting the rights of the bishops.


85 Muessig, “‘Ad status’ Sermons,” esp. 275, where she draws explicitly on the work of Otto Gerhard Oexle.

86 Humbert of Romans, “Sermo XXVIII ad religiosos quo scumque in studio commorantes,” *De eruditione praedicatorum*, 469. For the argument that the controversies over the legitimacy of the mendicant order provided an important impetus for Humbert’s work on monasticism, see J.J. Berthier, *Introduction to Humberti de Romanis… opera de vita regulari*, 2 vols., ed. idem (Turin: Marietti, 1955), I.xx; Muessig, “‘Ad status’ Sermons,” 272-73. Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, does not mention this connection.


88 Humbert would likely have included the Augustinians among those who follow the Rule of St Augustine.

During the course of the thirteenth century, a number of developments made the distinction between the regular canons and monks, and between Cistercians and black monks rather less important. Already by the mid-thirteenth century, the Franciscans and Dominicans had taken over most of the pastoral role that the regular canons and Cistercians had exercised. By the early fourteenth century, the regular canons had blended into the landscape of cloistered, contemplative houses, particularly in England, where they had always had a relatively small pastoral role.  

At the same time, the spiritual writings of the Cistercians and Victorines became, to a large extent, the standard reading of all cloistered religious, and the intellectual activity of the religious conformed to the general forms and practices of the universities. The distinctions among cloistered religious that had loomed large in the twelfth century were far less apparent in William of Pagula’s day.

These developments encouraged a change from a rule-based taxonomy of the religious to a functional one. Most writing about the religious in the thirteenth century, with Humbert of Romans as a prime example, had emphasized the rules that each group followed. Lateran IV had attempted to forbid new rules, not new religious groups, and the Carmelites and Austin friars had survived the suppression of 1274 in large part because they were able to claim that their rules predated the Lateran ban. A different taxonomy, which one finds already in Aquinas’ *Summa theologiae*, divides the religious by function. For Aquinas, this meant three distinct groups: monks and regular canons, who live a purely contemplative life, friars (here meaning only the Dominicans and Franciscans), who devote time to contemplation, but also have an important active role in pastoral care, and primarily active groups, such as military orders and hospitals. William of Pagula leaves the active religious to one side, and presents a simple binary of mendicant and non-mendicant. The concept of “mendicants” as a coherent group was still quite

---

90 On the changing role of canons and Cistercians, see Bird, “Religious’ Role,” and Longère, “Les chanoines réguliers.” For the relative lack of pastoral activity by English canons, see Colk, “Twelfth-Century East Anglian Canons.”

91 On this point, see below, section 2.3.2.

92 The Carmelites claimed that their order went back to prophets who lived on Mt. Carmel under a rule composed by Elijah. Even in the Middle Ages there was considerable skepticism about the validity of this claim.

93 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, Ila IIae, Q.188.
new in the early fourteenth century, so William is presenting his audience with an innovative, functional taxonomy of the religious life, with a division between mendicants engaged in pastoral activities and non-mendicants who are concerned primarily with the contemplative life.94

Despite this fundamental difference between the SR and ad status sermons, it is important to note that both of them draw on a common stock of themes and images that they share with monastic preaching outside of ad status collections. For example, Humbert says that six things are useful to all of the religious: “first the teaching of the ancient fathers that pertains to religion, second the exemplary life of the holy fathers, third the diligent reading of the rule and the statutes of one’s own profession, fourth the figurative understanding of one’s own habit..., fifth the observance of what one’s elders say, sixth diligent consideration of oneself.”95 The SR does not contain any lives of saints, but it does have the teachings of the Fathers, and sections on figurative interpretation of the habit, obedience and self-examination.96 The SR also emphasizes the need to master normative texts, although William of Pagula puts papal law and provincial constitutions in place of the Rule and the statutes of an order.

Florilegia and treatises on the virtues and vices, both genres that were employed as aids to preaching, play an important role in the SR. William could not have written the work if he were not a trained preacher, aware of the latest developments in praedicabilia. Yet the SR has quite different goals from the most-studied genre of sermons addressed by members of the secular Church or mendicant orders to the cloistered, ad status sermons. Where ad status sermons tried to subdivide the religious into discrete categories, the SR allows for only one significant

94 For the development of the concept of a “mendicant order,” see Augustine Thompson, “The Origins of Religious Mendicancy in Medieval Europe,” in The Origin, Development, and Refinement of Medieval Religious Mendicancies, ed. Donald S. Prudlo, Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 3-30. One should not that this simple binary appealed more to secular clerics and the mendicants than it did to the cloistered religious, who continued to maintain separate identities based on orders and local communities.

95 “Primum est doctrina patrum antiquorum de pertinentibus ad religionem. Secundum est exemplaris vita sanctorum patrum. Tercium est lectio diligens regulae, & statutorum propriae professionis. Quartum est intellectus figurarum proprijs habitus, & aliorum corporaliun... Quintum est obseruantia eorum, quae a suis maioribus dicuntur. Sextum est sui ipsius diligentis consideracio...” Humbert of Romans, “Sermo IV ad omnes religiosos,” De eruditione praedicatorum, 458.

96 E.g. SR I.2-4 (obedience), 23, 27, 42 (clothing, interpreted allegorically).
distinction, between mendicants and non-mendicants, and treats the latter as a largely homogenous group. More fundamentally, the SR is neither a collection of sermons nor a handbook for preachers. It is a monastic treatise meant, according to the prologue, to be savoured by the reader. The final section of chapter two will consider the SR in the context of thirteenth-century treatises of monastic formation.

2.3 The Speculum religiosorum and Thirteenth-Century Monastic Literature

When assessing the place of the SR within the monastic literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, a problem of generic classification immediately confronts the reader. Put another way, to which works can one productively compare the SR? The SR draws on florilegia, canon law, treatises for novices, treatises on the virtues and vices and devotional works, while conforming to none of these genres. The following section will attempt to answer the question of the SR’s genre, and, having done so, it will explore some of the common themes of the SR and similar works.

Much of the material on which the SR draws has its origins in what Carolyn Walker Bynum calls “works [elsewhere “treatises”] of practical spiritual advice, that is, works about the soul’s spiritual and moral progress within the cloistered life.” They do not involve the highest registers of either academic theology or mystical experience, and they are designed to be accessible to a broad audience. In its original use, this category referred to texts from the mid-eleventh to early thirteenth centuries. Bynum includes in this category treatises for novices, letters of advice, and commentaries on the Rules of St Benedict and St Augustine, and other works which aimed at instructing monks in the knowledge and practices necessary for the monastic vocation (e.g. Bernard of Clairvaux’s De praecepto et dispensatione, Hugh of Fouilloy’s De claustro animae). Both the works just mentioned served as sources for the SR.

97 Bynum, Jesus as Mother, 35.
98 For a complete list of the works that Bynum used for her own research, see Jesus as Mother, 267-70. Bernard of Clairvaux, De praecepto et dispensatione; Hugh of Fouilloy, De claustro animae.
99 SR I.2 (6rv) = Bernard of Clairvaux, De praecepto et dispensatione, c.30 (274); SR I.5 (17r) = Hugh of Fouilloy, De claustro animae, I.9 (PL 176.1033CD); SR I.43 (98v-100r) = De claustro animae, II.8 (1056B), II.17 (1070B), II.18 (1070D-72B), II.20 (1073D-74A, 75A) II.21 (1078BD), II.22 (1080BD).
Nevertheless, one cannot use the category of “works of practical spiritual advice,” as Bynum conceived it, to delineate a set of suitable works for comparison with the *SR*. The “works” that she mentions include genres, such as commentaries on monastic rules, that have little or no connection to the *SR*. Furthermore, few of the works discussed by Bynum have the encyclopedic and derivative character of the *SR*. They are, for the most part, original works that address a specific audience (e.g. novices), or cover a narrow topic (e.g. precepts and dispensation). More fundamentally, William does not treat the works of the twelfth century as peers, but as authoritative texts on which he draws, often at second hand. An effective point of comparison with the *SR* would need to be closer chronologically and conceptually.

Bert Roest’s monumental *Franciscan Literature of Religious Instruction before the Council of Trent*, provides the only thorough survey of popular religious literature in the period after 1200, although, by the nature of the work, it pays little attention to the cloistered religious. Roest divides his survey into eight categories: (a) preaching; (b) rules, constitutions and commentaries; (c) treatises for novices; (d) catechisms; (e) confessional handbooks; (f) manuals for the Mass and Office; (g) works of religious edification; and (h) prayer guides. This division helpfully separates out several genres that are lumped together by Bynum, and takes account of preaching and confession. Group (g) “works of religious edification,” is something of a catch-all for Roest, including works that do not conform to one of his other categories, but that clearly aim to improve the reader’s spiritual state. In this category he places, *inter alia*, Bonaventure’s *Soliloquium*, many of Peter John Olivi’s popular works, and James of Milan’s *Stimulus amoris* (in a separate subsection on “works of devotion to the Passion”). As Roest rightly says, “manuals of religious edification can not [sic] easily be divided into neatly delineated generic corpora. They have a subject matter and goal or *causa finalis* in common, rather than shared morphological or stylistic characteristics.”

Roest’s category remains too broad to be useful here, since it includes works for the edification of the religious, secular clergy, and the laity, and treatises with a fairly narrow topical focus, such as devotion to the Passion. I will propose a new category, which builds upon the divisions outlined by Bynum and Roest, but is more suited to the specific interest of this thesis. I will call

---

100 Roest, *Franciscan Literature*, 374.
this category “encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation.” I use monastic here in the broad
sense of all those who take part in a regular life, but I exclude works aimed at a general or lay
audience (‘monastic’ seems preferable to ‘religious,’ given the potential confusion between the
medieval and modern senses of the latter word). This remains quite a heterogenous category, but
all the works within it have in common an attempt to offer a thorough guide to the monastic life.
The works are generally of a substantial length, and they cover a variety of subjects.

As Roest observes, it is difficult to make generalizations about the specific content and structure
of such works, but a brief survey of the contents of a few encyclopedic manuals may help to shed
some light on the category:

David of Augsburg, *De septem processibus religiosorum* (=*De interioris et exterioris
hominis compositione*, Bk III) (1230x46)\(^{101}\)

(a) fervour (b) work (*labor*) (c) consolation (d) temptation (e) remedies for
temptation (f) virtue, including advice on reading (g) wisdom, including
contemplation

Humbert of Romans, *De votis substantialibus* (1254x60)\(^{102}\)

(a) obedience (b) poverty (c) chastity (d) humility and pride (e) endurance
(*patientia*) (f) right orientation (*ordinatio*) to God and neighbour (g) good
works and virtues (h) temperance (i) venial sins

William Peraldus, *De eruditione religiosorum* (1260x65)\(^{103}\)

(a) separation from the world (b) comportment (*disciplina*) (c) remedies for
temptations (*De ordinatione animi*) (d) spiritual discipline (e) obedience
to superiors (f) prayer and contemplation

\(^{101}\) David of Augsburg, *De exterioris et interioris hominis compositione libri III* (Quarrachi, Italy: Typographia
Collegii Sancti Bonaventurae, 1899).

\(^{102}\) Humbert of Romans, *De votis substantialibus in Humberti de Romanis… opera de vita regulari*, I.1-42.

\(^{103}\) William Peraldus (as ‘Humbert of Romans’), *Speculum religiosorum seu institutionum vitae spiritualis… [= De
eruditione religiosorum]*, in MBVP, vol. 25, 665-753.
The content of these three works has clear parallels to the SR.

The encyclopedic manual of monastic formation was, for the most part, a genre of the thirteenth century. The genre emerged in the early thirteenth century, and the production of new works appears to have fallen off after the early fourteenth. Two factors contributed to this relative decline in production. In the first place, many of the encyclopedic manuals became established classics, with dozens of manuscripts and, later, multiple editions. Even the SR, which was by no means so prevalent, was still being copied in the fifteenth century. Secondly, fourteenth-century monastic writers turned their attention from synthesis of twelfth century spiritual writers to the origins of monasticism and to legal compilations.\textsuperscript{104}

Despite the heterogeneity of the specific contents of the above works, and others that will be discussed below, there are points of similarity that tend to unite encyclopedic manuals of religious instruction. The rest of this chapter will consider two of these points with reference to the SR. First, these works, unlike \textit{ad status} sermons, speak to a broad monastic audience, and attempt to identify a common core of the monastic life, often by adopting the concept of the essential elements (called the \textit{substantialia}, \textit{essentialia}, \textit{elementa}, or \textit{necessaria}) of the religious life or of monastic vows. Secondly, these works build self-consciously on the spiritual legacy of the twelfth century, although they are not all as derivative as the SR. This use of twelfth-century literature is selective, elevating the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor to a canonical status alongside the fathers, while passing over most others. These works aimed to form the reader in the religious life through an encyclopedic synthesis of Cistercian and Victorine spirituality, founded on legal and theological first principles.

2.3.1 The \textit{substantialia} of the religious life

As we have already seen with reference to \textit{ad status} sermons, thinkers of the twelfth and thirteenth century struggled to comprehend the diversity of monastic institutions. The concept of a core set of monastic principles, the \textit{substantialia} (and variants) developed out of this ferment. Aelred of Rievaulx’s, \textit{Speculum caritatis} (c.1142) provides perhaps the earliest example:

\begin{footnotesize}
104 For monastic origins, see Pantin, “Origins of Monasticism;” for legal compilations, see Chp. 4.
\end{footnotesize}
I do not hesitate to say that there is [not only] a rule of the monastic estate, but an
animating power of the monastic order, or rather a substance of the monastic profession,
those things which make a monk without anything else, and without which the others, I
will not say do not make a monk, but do not have the taste of one... And what are these?
stability, I say, in our monastery, the conversion of our character, and obedience
according to the Rule of St Benedict. 105

Peter of Celle, writing in 1179, expresses the idea in its most general form: “Something is
substantial to the religious life, if there is no religious life without it.”106 Innocent III used the
concept in a letter to the monastery of Subiaco, and went so far as to say that “the surrender of
property, just as the maintenance of chastity, is annexed to the monastic rule in such a way that
not even the supreme Pontiff can grant a privilege against it.”107 By the 1240s it had become an
important concept in canon law. 108 In 1234, the Premonstratensian Order revised their statutes at
the behest of Gregory IX, and the new prologue enunciated the fully-developed concept of the
substantialia:
We do not hold that the institutions which we have written down in this present book bind transgressors on pain of [mortal] sin, but only on pain of a [venial] penalty (unless someone should transgress them out of contempt), except for those three that are judged to belong to the substance of the order, namely the surrender of private property, of obedience, and of chastity or continence, which are consubstantial with the order and annexed to it to such an extent that they cannot be neglected by anyone, either tacitly or expressly.  

The concept is still rare in monastic treatises of the first half of the thirteenth century, but as we shall see below, it became a commonplace of the encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation after 1250.

The quotations above from the Premonstratensian constitutions and Aelred of Rievaulx present two different versions of the substantialia. The brothers of Prémontré, like Innocent III, identified the three substantialia of religion as poverty, chastity and obedience. This form may have a scholastic, rather than monastic, origin.  

Aelred refers to the substance, not of religion, but of the “monastic profession.” The profession in question is the profession of a Benedictine monk, and Aelred takes it substance to be three vows of obedience, conversion and stability.  

Writers employed both uses throughout the thirteenth century. The more all-encompassing of these interpretations of the substantialia was appropriate for situations in which the author wished to emphasize the unity of the religious, or to identify the absolute minimum requirements for the monastic life, in order to ensure the greatest flexibility of practice. Writers used the three

109 “Institutiones vero, quas in presenti libro conscriptus, non ad culpam obligare intelligimus transgressores, sed ad penam, nisi aliquis eas transgredi presumptur ex contemptu. Excipiuntur tamen illa tria que de substantia Ordinis esse dinoscuntur, uidelicet abdicatio proprii, votum oboedientie et votum continentie siue castitatis, que adeo consubstantialia sunt Ordini et eidem annexa, quod a nullo possunt tacite uel expresse remitti.”  


110 The earliest reference to the form of the substantialia that I have found is Sicard of Cremona, Mitralis de officiis (c.1191), ed. Gabor Sarbak and Lornez Weinrich, CCCM 228 (2008), 2.1 (76): “Monachi... cum habitum humilitatis suscipient, ad obedientiam se obligant et castitatem, habitum uestitum et abrenuntiationem propriorum.” For Sicard’s education at Bologna and Paris, see Sarbak and Weinrich, Introduction to Mitralis de officis, VII.

111 See Regula S. Benedicti, c.58.
vows of the Benedictine Rule when they wished to emphasize the unity of the Benedictines (including Cistercians and others) over against other forms of monasticism. The different versions of the *substantialia* could either affirm the common basis of the religious life, or emphasize, within this broader framework, the particular role of monks who followed the Rule of St Benedict.

The vocabulary used to discuss both concepts of the *substantialia* varied. As we have seen, most writers referred to the trio *poverty-chastity-obedience* as the “substance of religion” (*substantia/substantialia religionis*) or the “things annexed (annexa) to the rule or order (regulae ordini).” Aquinas, however, preferred to speak of the “essential things (essentialia) of religion.”¹¹² Writers referred to the trio *obedience-conversion-stability* as the “substance (substantia/substantialia) or elements (elementa) of the monastic profession or rule (professionis/ordini monasticae),” or more simply as the “substantial vows” (*vota substantialia*). Writers who followed the rules of St Augustine or St Francis could also refer to *poverty-chastity-obedience* as the substantial vows.¹¹³

The Dominican order appears to have been responsible for the incorporation of the *substantialia* into encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation. Humbert of Romans led the way with his *De votis substantialibus* (1254x60), a broader work than its title would suggest.¹¹⁴ William Peraldus (c.1190-1271), whose *Summa de vitis* served as an important source for the *SR*, wrote an *Expositio professionis monachorum* (before 1265) for the monks of Cluny, which also included an encyclopedic range of topics.¹¹⁵ The *substantialia* served as a compliment to *ad status* sermons. In mid-century controversies around the religious life, the *ad status* sermons legitimated the diversity of religious institutions, while the *substantialia* provided assurance that they all rested on a common foundation. In the preaching role of the friars, the *ad status*

---

¹¹² *Summa theologiae*, IIa-IIae, Q.186, a.2, Q.188, a.2.

¹¹³ For this usage, see, e.g., Humbert of Romans, *De votis substantialibus*.

¹¹⁴ For its contents, see p.111.

collections provided material for specific audiences, but one could always preach on the *substantialia* before any religious audience.

Peraldus’ exposition of the Benedictine *substantialia* presumably grew out of his work as a preacher. It certainly seems to have struck a chord, since it survives in over seventy manuscripts. Furthermore, Bernard Ayglier (c.1210-1282), abbot in succession of the venerable abbeys of Lérins and Monte Cassino, used Peraldus’ structure in composing his own *Speculum monachorum* (1272x74).\(^{116}\) Monastic writers continued to be interested in the Benedictine *substantialia* into the fourteenth century, when Uthred of Boldon (c.1320-1397), one of the most important Benedictine intellectuals of the century, wrote a treatise *De substantialibus regulae monachalis*.\(^{117}\)

William of Pagula, in keeping with his decision to address the religious in general in his *SR*, employs the trio *obedience-poverty-chastity*. He refers to these in the first chapter as the necessities (*necessaria*) of religion, “which make the religious very praiseworthy.”\(^{118}\) The following five chapters (I.2-6) discuss the three necessities in detail, and provide a transition from the general consideration of regular discipline as wisdom in the prologue to the compendium of canon law.

William treats obedience and disobedience in three chapters, each of which concludes with a list of seven items. The first chapter (SR I.2) opens with some commonplaces on the importance and nature of obedience. “Obedience is the sole virtue which keeps the other virtues in the mind, for

---

\(^{116}\) Bernardi I abbatis Casensis speculum monachorum, ed. P. Hilarius Walter (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1901). Bernard borrowed Peraldus’ structure, but most of the content was his own. This relationship was identified by Walter, “Der Speculum Monachorum des Abtes Bernard I von Cassino,” *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benedict. und Cistercienser Orden* 22 (1902), 35-46.; idem, Prol. ad *Speculum monachorum*, xv-xvi.


\(^{117}\) W.A. Pantin, “Two Treatises of Uthred of Boldon,” 368-74.

\(^{118}\) “In religione sunt tria necessaria et quae faciunt religiosum ualde laudabilem, videlicet obedientia paupertas et castitas.” *SR* I.1 (2v).
obedience is better than sacrifices...He who resists his prelate, resists the will of God."  

This leads into Bernard of Clairvaux’s important distinction between pure good, which one should do even without a command, pure evil, which one should not commit even under obedience, and middling things (media), which are good or bad depending on circumstance. In these ambiguous situations, one should always obey one’s superior. 

The SR also offers Bernard’s distinction between venial disobedience through absentmindedness (per obliuionem) and mortal disobedience through contempt (ex contemptu). This section ends with a list of seven things that make obedience easier: the suppleness of humility (exilitas humilitatis), custom (assuecio [sic]), the fire of divine love (ignis divini amoris), theunction of divine grace (divine gracie vnccio), the example of irrational creatures (exemplum creaturarum irrationabilium), the humility of the superior (modestia imperantis), and its manifold benefits (multiplex utilitas).

The second section on obedience opens by lamenting the disobedience of the clergy and religious of William’s day, despite their learning, in contrast to the obedience of the early fathers. William holds up Christ as the ultimate example of obedience in adversity. The chapter then lists the five parts of obedience, the six effects of obedience, and the seven steps of obedience. The chapter on disobedience is most notable for its examples of disobedient biblical figures who come to a bad end: Adam and Eve, the wife of Lot, Saul, and the unnamed prophet sent to condemn the shrine at Bethel (III Reg. 13). William makes the transition to the other two

---

119 “Obedientia sola virtus est que menti ceteras uirtutes custodit. Melior enim est obedientia quam victima et obedientia uictimis preponitur quia per uictimas caro mactatur per obedientiam uero uoluntas mactatur... Qui resistit prelato suo resistit ordinacioni dei.” SR I.2 (5r).

120 Ibid, quoting Bernard of Clairvaux, Epistolae, 7.4, in SBO, vol. 7, 34.

121 SR I.2 (6rv).

122 SR I.2 (6v-7v).

123 SR I.3 (9rv).

124 SR I.3 (9v).

125 SR I.3 (10r-12v).

126 I would encourage readers to look this up, as it is one of the more baffling passages in the Bible.
substantialia by saying that poverty and chastity are like the two wings by which obedience flies to heaven.

The chapter on poverty sets out the classic account of poverty for the cloistered religious. There are three kinds of poverty. First, there are those who are poor, but not by choice, and who probably want to be rich. Not only is their poverty of little spiritual value to them, but it can be disastrous to accept these poor into a monastery, where they will tend to think about physical comfort and ostentatious display. Then there is the aurea paupertas of those who have possessions, but do not care about them. This is possible because true poverty is an inward condition, consisting of humility, a diffidence concerning one’s own strength (diffidencia de propriis viribus), and contempt for worldly things. Finally, there is the voluntary poverty, which pagan philosophers call frugalitas (chapter five draws heavily on Seneca). Pagan frugalitas is still not enough. One must pursue voluntary poverty for its proper end, union with God through following Christ. Socrates, Aristotle, and other pagan philosophers could not do this, but the religious follow the example of Benedict, Bernard, Francis, Dominic and others. This Christ-like poverty is a form of martyrdom, which carries an eternal reward.

Chapter six, on chastity, is a notable example of William failing to integrate fully his source material. The chapter includes several passages that seem to apply only to the married. One could admit an allegorical interpretation of: “She is called a chaste virgin who maintains her loyalty and love for her husband, and serves him and no others... a chaste woman justly deserves to delight and rest in her bedchamber with her husband.” Such a reading would be more difficult for: “If you abstain without the permission of your wife, you give her permission to

---

127 SR I.5 (15rv, 17r).
128 SR I.5 (17r, 19v). The three qualities correspond to the rational, irascible and concupiscible faculties.
129 SR I.5 (17r).
130 SR I.5 (14v-15r). Despite the reference to Francis and Dominic, there is no discussion of the controversy over different varieties of monastic poverty.
131 SR I.5 (15v).
132 “...dicitur casta virgo que conseruat fidem et amorem marito et obedit illi et non alii... ad meritum casta enim mulier meretur gaudere et quiescere in cubili cum marito.” SR I.6 (20v)
fornicate, and her sin is imputed to your abstinence.”

Apart from these passages, most of chapter six contains standard imagery for chastity that is unremarkable in a monastic context. Chastity is a lily, a precious gem, ivory. Inviolate chastity requires zealously guarded enclosure (clausura studiosa). Virginity is superior to widowhood, which is in turn superior to marriage. The SR also emphasizes the danger of taking pride in one’s continence, describing a proud virgin as “a prostitute of the Devil (diaboli prostitulum).” In short, chapter six offers the reader a conventional account of the unique value of virginity preserved in a monastic life, despite a few jarring passages that concern the married, rather than the religious.

William’s treatment of the substantialia in the SR demonstrates the influence of preaching, with chains of quotations from patristic, monastic and pagan sources, the frequent use of lists, and the general tone of moral exhortation. The content of these chapters reflects a consensus going back to patristic times, filtered through the authors of the twelfth century, above all Bernard of Clairvaux. The next section will address the authority of these twelfth-century authors in encyclopedic manuals of religious formation.

2.3.2 The Canon of Monastic Literature

The authorship of the spiritual writings from the mid-eleventh to the late twelfth century reflect the diversity of monastic movements during this period. Any current survey of such literature would include the black monks John of Fécamp, Anselm of Canterbury and Peter of Celle, the nun Hildegard of Bingen, the Carthusian Guigo II, the regular canons Hugh of Fouilloy and Hugh and Richard of St Victor, and the hermit Peter Damian, at the least. Among Cistercians, current scholarship tends to emphasize the independent contributions of Bernard of Clairvaux, Aelred of Rievaulx and William of St Thierry, among others, rather than the unity of the order’s

133 “Si abstines sine vxoris licentia tribuis ei et fornicandi licencia et peccatum illius tue imputatur abstinencie.” SR I.6 (24r).
134 SR I.6 (21rv).
135 ibid. (22r).
136 ibid. (22v).
137 ibid. (24r).
spiritual tradition. Even less famous authors, such as Baldwin of Ford, have received detailed attention.\footnote{For a brief treatment of many of these figures together, see Thomas H. Bestul, “Meditatio/Meditation,” in The Cambridge Companion to Christian Mysticism, ed. Amy Hollywood and Patricia Z. Beckman (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012), 157-66. Jean Leclercq is responsible for the re-emergence of some of these figures in modern scholarship. See his La spiritualité de Pierre de Celle (1115-1183) (Paris: J. Vrin, 1946); idem, with Jean-Paul Bonnes, Un maître de la vie spirituelle au XVe siècle: Jean de Fécamp (Paris: J. Vrin, 1946). Lauren Mancia is now preparing a thesis on John at Yale University. John of Fécamp and Anselm of Canterbury are major figures in Fulton, From Judgement to Passion. Anselm has an extensive bibliography, as do Hugh and Richard of St Victor. There was little scholarship on Hildegard before the mid-1950s, which saw new editions and textual scholarship. The International Medieval Bibliography now lists over 500 entries, and Hildegard is both a Doctor of the Church and the subject of a feature film: Vision: aus dem Leben der Hildegard von Bingen, dir. Margarethe von Trotta (2009; Toronto: Mongrel Media, 2011), DVD. For a selective bibliography, see Werner Lauter, “Bibliography of Hildegard of Bingen,” online, www.hildegard.org. For Hugh of Fouilloy, see above chp. 2, n.18. Aelred of Rievaulx and William of St Thierry are now often the subjects of multiple sessions at the annual Cistercian Studies Conference in Kalamazoo, MI. For Baldwin of Ford, see David N. Bell, “The Ascetic Spirituality of Baldwin of Forde,” Cîteaux 31 (1980), 227-50; Carlos Hallet, “El amor en la obra de Balduino de Ford,” Studia monastica 40:2 (1998), 281-290.}

The situation in the thirteenth century was quite different. Monastic writers of this period were most concerned to produce a practical synthesis of twelfth-century writings. As Mark DelCogliano puts it, there was “a taking stock, a reflection upon great achievement... there was no need to repeat [the] achievement [of the twelfth century], but rather to interpret it and re-express it, in a way that would help ordinary monks live their day-to-day lives.”\footnote{DelCogliano, “Two Texts,” 423.} This synthesis was an extension of a universalizing tendency that Mirko Breitenstein has already seen in twelfth-century “works of practical spiritual advice.”\footnote{“sind die “Traktate zur praktisch-spirituellen Unterweisung” inhaltlich universell und nur bedingt einer bestimmten Gemeinschaft zuzuordnen.” Breitenstein, Das Noviziat, 330. Das Noviziat, 329-37 discusses treatises for novices, with a particular focus on Cistercian works in general, and Aelred of Rievaulx’s Speculum caritatis in particular.} In the synthesis that resulted from this taking stock and re-expression, Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor were the dominant figures. William Peraldus’ De eruditione religiosorum, for example, contains about fifteen references each to Bernard and Hugh, but only a single reference to another twelfth-century author, Richard of St Victor.\footnote{These numbers are based on my own reading of Peraldus, De eruditione religiosorum.} Even Bernard Ayglier of Monte Cassino, a black monk writing for his own brothers, assumed that Bernard was the twelfth-century monastic author; his
Speculum monachorum cites Bernard forty-seven times against one reference to Hugh of St Victor, one to Anselm’s Meditations, and none to other twelfth-century authors.¹⁴²

The excellence of the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor does much to explain and justify their prominence, but the intellectual climate of the first half of the thirteenth century also played an important role. The Cistercians led the way in synthesizing their heritage of spiritual writing, and in the production of of sermons and florilegia.¹⁴³ The black monks appear to have focused more on historical writing and legislation, rather than the literature of spiritual formation. The Cistercians also received the most support from the ecclesiastical hierarchy as exemplars of holiness and active agents of reform.¹⁴⁴

If the Cistercian tradition represented for many the epitome of the ascetic ideal in the early thirteenth century, intellectuals coming out of the secular schools often had contact with Victorine writings. One can see this intersection of the Cistercian and Victorine traditions in Edmund of Abingdon’s (c.1175-1240) Speculum religiosorum (1214x33).¹⁴⁵ Edmund was a scholar at Oxford and Paris, and then an ecclesiastical administrator, ending his career as archbishop of Canterbury.¹⁴⁶ He never became a monk, but he spent a year at the Augustinian priory of Merton, and maintained close ties to the Cistercians throughout his adult life; he made retreats to Cistercian houses, his sisters became Cistercian nuns, and several of his students joined the order at his behest. Edmund’s Speculum, a guide to the religious life, is a deeply

¹⁴² For Ayglier’s citation of sources, see P. Hilarius Walter, Appendix II ad Bernardi I abbatis Casinesis speculum monachorum, 230-32.

¹⁴³ On the key role of the Cistercians in the early production of preaching florilegia in the thirteenth century, see Rouse and Rouse, Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons, 15-16.

¹⁴⁴ On the role of the Cistercians in thirteenth-century reform, see introduction, n.35.


Victorine work, as Helen Forshaw has pointed out, but it integrates Cistercian themes into a Victorine framework.\(^{147}\)

The Dominican brother Robert Bacon was a close associate of Edmund, and it seems probable that Edmund might have joined the new order of Friars Preachers, had he been a generation younger. Michèle Mulchahey has pointed out that the Dominicans, unlike the Franciscans, did not develop a strong, distinctive tradition of piety and spiritual formation, and tended to rely on established spiritual classics of the twelfth century.\(^{148}\) As we have seen, the Dominicans often presented themselves as regular canons, and so were natural heirs to the Victorine integration of monastic piety and scholastic learning. The Dominicans’s need to form large numbers of new recruits, and their mission of teaching and pastoral care naturally led them to continue the work of synthesis and popularization that the Cistercians had already undertaken. This chapter has already demonstrated the importance of Humbert of Romans and William Peraldus as producers of encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation.

The immense prestige of Bernard and Hugh became a self-feeding process as copyists and compilers attributed more and more works to them.\(^{149}\) An edition purporting to contain some of Bernard’s short works, printed at Modena in 1491, contained only two genuine works out of nine

---


The contents of the *Speculum religiosorum* are: (a) self-analysis (b) separation from family ties (c) contemplating God in his creatures (d) moral material (ten commandments, works of mercy, beatitudes, etc.) (e) meditations on the Passion keyed to the canonical hours (f) Trinitarian theology (g) contemplation (h) love for neighbour


\(^{148}\) Mulchahey, “First the Bow...”, 109, 112. Mulchahey, 448 also points out that the Dominicans made little contribution to the development of florilegia.

Many pseudo-Bernardine works were new productions by Cistercian authors, but scribes attributed many texts of the long twelfth century to him as well, including John of Fruttaria’s (d. c.1050) *De ordine vitae et morum institutione* and Guigo the Carthusian’s *Scala claustralium*.¹⁵¹ For Hugh the most common misattribution was Hugh of Fouilloy’s *De claustro animae*. Later copyists also misattributed many twelfth-century works to patristic authors. The writings of John of Fécamp circulated almost exclusively under the name of Augustine, for example, as did the *De spiritu et anima* sometimes erroneously attributed to Alcher of Clairvaux.¹⁵² A late medieval reader might easily sit down with works written by five or six different authors over two centuries, and believe that he was reading only three authors, Augustine, Bernard and Hugh.

One can get a sense of the perception of spiritual writers in early fourteenth-century England from the *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*.¹⁵³ This was a catalogue compiled by the Franciscan convent at Oxford from the libraries of 185 religious houses.¹⁵⁴ Its purpose was to identify potential exemplars for texts in which the Franciscans were interested. The *Registrum* has a definite bias towards *spiritualia*, which makes it useful for the present investigation.¹⁵⁵ The coverage of religious houses is highly idiosyncratic, but the large number of libraries included insures that the sample is reasonably representative.¹⁵⁶ In fact, the

---

¹⁵⁰ Wilmart, *Auteurs spirituels*, 76-77.


¹⁵⁴ Rouse and Rouse, Appendix to *Registrum Anglie*, 245-324.

¹⁵⁵ Rouse and Rouse, Introduction to *Registrum Anglie*, lxxiii.

¹⁵⁶ Rouse and Rouse, Introduction to *Registrum Anglie*, lxx.
*Registrum* is arguably a less biased source for medieval monastic libraries than either surviving manuscripts or library catalogues, which tend to favour a few large institutions.

It is possible to approach the question of canonicity in the *Registrum* in several ways. First, one can look at the range of twelfth-century spiritual authors recorded in the catalogue. Cistercian authors dominate the list, but it includes second-tier authors such as Baldwin of Ford, Gilbert of Hoyland, Geoffrey of Auxerre, John of Ford, and Odo of Cheriton, in addition to Anselm, Aelred, Bernard, and Hugh and Richard of St Victor.\(^{157}\) When one considers which authors the Franciscans wanted to find, however, it becomes clear that the list is misleading. The editors of the catalogue collected entries by sending out visitors to the various houses.\(^{158}\) It seems clear that the visitors carried a formal or informal list of desirable authors. Rouse and Rouse have attempted to reconstruct this list by identifying the authors that appear regularly in the submissions from different monasteries. It included only Anselm, Bernard, and Hugh and Richard of St Victor, and perhaps Aelred. John and Baldwin of Ford appear only because they caught the interest of a visitor using his own discretion. The same may be true of Gilbert of Hoyland, or he may have been conflated with the desirable Gilbert of Poitiers. In a similar way, Odo of Cheriton was conflated with several other Odos, all of whom acquired the prestige of Odo of Cluny. The core list of desired spiritual authors from the twelfth century included only four, or at most five, names.

It is also instructive to look at which works are attributed to Bernard and Hugh in the *Registrum*. In both cases, spurious works play a significant, although not overwhelming, role. The entry for Bernard contains fifty-one titles, of which sixteen, just under a third, are misattributions.\(^{159}\) One can divide these misattributions into three categories. First there are works by less prominent Cistercians, such as William of St Thierry, Geoffrey of Auxerre and Nicholas of Clairvaux.\(^{160}\)

---

\(^{157}\) Rouse and Rouse, Introduction to *Registrum Anglie*, vi-vii.

\(^{158}\) On the composition of the *Registrum*, see ibid., lxix-xcvi.

\(^{159}\) *Registrum Anglie*, pp. 170-77.

\(^{160}\) ibid., nos. 34.2, 9, 23, 39, 43.
Next there are texts by the black monk Arnaldus of Bonneval. The largest category includes a selection of the vast body of spiritual literature that remains stubbornly anonymous. The *Registrum* includes, among others, the *Meditaciones* that often circulated under Bernard’s name, the *De visitatione infirmorum* normally attributed to Augustine, and a work *De filia Jephte* often associated with Hugh of St Victor. The entry for Bernard also contains a *florilegium* of his work. The ps.-Bernardine material does not overwhelm the genuine works, but it does represent a substantial supplement to them.

One finds a similar pattern in the entry for Hugh of St Victor: twenty-six, or roughly one third, of the seventy items are either spurious or doubtful. It is more difficult to arrive at certain number for Hugh, because there remains debate about his authorship of a number of works. As one might expect, *De claustro animae* has a prominent place, with some form of it appearing in four entries. It is also unsurprising to find the ps-Hugonian *Expositio Regulae b. Augustini*. Hugh’s genuine writings reflect diverse academic interests, and the *Registrum* assigns him a variety of anonymous theological sentence collections and biblical commentaries, some of which cannot be identified, and even grants him Peter the Chanter’s *Verbum abbreviatum* to him. There are also misattributions of spiritual works beside *De claustro*, such as Richard of St Victor’s *De statu interioris hominis* and the anonymous *De diligendo Deo*.

---

161 ibid., 34.7, 13.
162 ibid, 34.44,46, 51.
163 ibid., 34.19, “Defloraciones eius.”
164 ibid, pp. 228-39.
166 *Registrum Anglie*, nos. 97.31, 41, 43, 54.
167 ibid. 97.23.
168 ibid., 97.11, 13, 22, 30, 32, 55, 60.
169 ibid. 97.47.
170 ibid., 97.52, 65. Rouse and Rouse suggest that *De diligendo* is Bernard of Clairvaux’s treatise, but it may well have been the work with the same name sometimes misattributed to Alcher of Clairvaux (PL 40.847-74).
The entry also appears to include one *florilegium*. Once again, the *Registrum* presents a thorough guide to Hugh’s genuine works, but one supplemented by a variety of apocrypha.

The creation of the Bernardine-Hugonian canon affected how late medieval readers saw monastic literature of the twelfth century, but it also affected how they perceived Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor. Certain misattributed texts were central to their reputation. The best example for Bernard is William of St Thierry’s *Epistola ad fratres Montis Dei*: one out of every six citations of “Bernard of Clairvaux” in Bernard Ayglier’s *Speculum monachorum* refers to the *Epistola*. When late medieval readers thought of Hugh of St Victor as a spiritual author, they thought of him as the author of *De claustro animae*. The universalizing synthesis presented by encyclopedic works of monastic formation was both a product of and a support for this view of Bernard and Hugh (and Augustine).

In the *SR*, misattribution to Hugh of St Victor is common, but most citations of Bernard of Clairvaux are correct. Of the fourteen passages attributed to Hugh, not one comes from a genuine work. Ten of the references are to *De claustro animae*, but Hugh also gets credit for passages from the commentary on the Augustinian Rule, Richard of St Victor’s *Benjamin maior*, and Bruno of Cologne’s *Expositio in litteram ad Colossienses*. I have not been able to identify one passage, although it is similar to the *Sermones ad fratres in eremo commorantes*, a twelfth-century work that the manuscripts often attribute to Augustine. The *SR* also attributes *De duodecim abusionibus claustri*, an excerpt from *De claustro animae*, to Augustine. More remarkably, a passage from Peter of Blois appears under the name of Peter Chrysologus. The situation is quite different for Bernard of Clairvaux. These citations appear to be accurate most of the time, although I have not been able to identify some passages. The only significant misattribution is the anonymous *Planctus Mariae*, which William includes in its entirety under the title “tractatus beati bernardi de dolore beate virginis...”. The prominence accorded to

---

171 ibid., 97.46, “Compendium eiusdem.”
172 *SR* I.1 (3), I.23 (71v-72r), I.43 (100r).
173 See above, p.37.
174 See above, p.74.
Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor reflects broader practice in manuals of monastic formation, and in devotional literature more generally, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

2.4 The *Speculum religiosorum* as a Monastic and Pastoral Work: Conclusion

The *SR* has a complex relationship to three genres discussed in this chapter, confessional treatises, sermons and aids to preaching, and encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation. One might have expected a close connection between the *SR* and confessional literature. William of Pagula enjoyed a high reputation in the Middle Ages as a writer on confession, and most modern scholars consider him as a writer of *pastoralia*. Pastoral writers of the early thirteenth century had drawn on monastic treatises and canon law to create a body of *confessionalia* for the religious that formed an important subcategory of writing of confession. William de Montibus and Robert Grosseteste, two of William’s most illustrious predecessors as English pastoral writers, had written entire treatises on monastic confession. Despite all this, confessional treatises exercised little influence on the *SR*. The excerpts from Arnulf of Bohéries’s *Speculum monachorum* in *SR* I.23 do contain some detailed advice on confession, but they do not discuss monastic sins. William’s discussions of monastic sins, as in *SR* I.19-21, are much closer to a preacher’s exhortation than they are to a confessor’s analysis.

It would be fair to call the first part of the *SR* a “preacherly” work, in the sense that *praedicabilia* fostered much of its content. This should not be surprising, since William of Pagula included a massive sermon cycle, and a *florilegium* for preachers in the *Speculum praelatorum*. The vast size of the *Speculum praelatorum*, and the lack of any record of William’s actual preaching, has led scholars to underestimate this aspect of his corpus. William Peraldus’ *Summa de vitiiis et virtutibus*, an important tool for preachers, served William as an important reference on monastic sin. Nevertheless William meant for the *SR* to be a resource for the private reading of monks, not for preaching. In this respect it resembled another of William’s sources, Thomas of Ireland’s *Manipulus florum*. The *SR* as a whole demonstrates William’s ability to use the same material in different generic contexts to serve different ends.

The *SR* belongs to a genre (if that is not too generous a term) that I have called “encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation.” As the name suggests, works of this kind sought to provide a thorough guide to the monastic life, and addressed themselves to a broad audience of less
experienced and less educated monks who needed this relatively basic guidance. At the same
time, many of these works sought to guide the reader up from the basics of monastic practice to
union with God in contemplative prayer. Works of this kind appeared most often between the
mid-thirteenth and mid-fourteenth centuries, a period marked by the condensation of the legacy
of the twelfth century, and, in particular, the elevation of Hugh of St Victor and Bernard of
Clairvaux (or ps.-Hugh and ps.-Bernard) as the monastic authors *par excellence*.

Encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation generally sought a broad audience of the religious
as a whole, or at least of all the cloistered religious, as in the *SR*. In this they provided a contrast
to *ad status* sermons, which sought to speak to the particular character of each religious order.
The identification of poverty, chastity and obedience as the *substantialia* of religion— the
essential elements of the monastic life— provided a key means of overcoming the diversity of
religious groups. Whatever their particular practices, they had to follow these three principles.
The concept of the *substantialia* appeared first in monastic writers of the twelfth century, and
then in canonical commentaries, and finally in the monastic manuals of the mid-thirteenth
century Dominicans. William follows in this tradition, and devotes the early chapters of the *SR* to
the *substantialia*.

The *SR* differs from other manuals of monastic formation by including a large collection of
canon law. Chapter four will investigate William’s approach to monastic law, and the role of law
in the *SR*. First, however, chapter three will provide a general overview of the development of
canon law for monks from Gratian’s *Decretum* to the early fourteenth century.
Chapter 3

Canon Law and Cloistered Monasticism, c.1140-c.1340

This chapter will examine the legal compendium in SR I.7-9 within the context of the history of canon law for the cloistered religious from the publication of Gratian’s Decretum around 1145 to the promulgation of the Clementines in 1317. The chronological parameters of the chapter coincide with William of Pagula’s own use of canon law, but they are also defensible in and of themselves, since they cover the major legal collections that would come to be considered as part of the Corpus iuris canonici, the standard body of canon law in the western Church.¹ Within this time frame, the chapter will consider papal law and the provincial law of the archdiocese of Canterbury, as well as the statutes of English episcopal synods. It will not cover internal monastic law, such as the statutes of provincial and general chapters and customaries, except insofar as these may be significant for understanding papal and episcopal law.²

The history of monastic law coincides with the history of canon law in general. Dom Jacques Hourlier has argued that Alexander III, Innocent III, Gregory IX, Boniface VIII and Benedict XII were the most important legislators for the religious, and the first four names would also appear on a list of the most important papal legislators in general.³ The reign of Gregory IX was particularly important for monastic legislation, since he not only oversaw the compilation the Liber extra (1234), but also promulgated an influential set of statutes for the black monks (1235-37). After a relative lull in papal legislation for the cloistered religious in the half century between 1240 and 1290, there was another burst of activity from the pontificate of Boniface VIII

---

¹ The full body of medieval canons law includes two collections after this period, the Extravagantes Iohannis XXII (c.1327) and the Extravangantes communes (c.1500, covering papal law to 1484). The status of these collections is somewhat ambiguous, since they were never officially promulgated, although they do appear in the official Editio romana of 1582. They do not contribute significantly to monastic law.

² There are several reasons for excluding this material. Customaries have a quite different purpose and authority from statutory law. The capitular statutes are comparable in form to statutes of synods and canons of councils, but they pertain only to specific orders, and thus have less relevance to William of Pagula’s interest in law that pertains to all cloistered religious.

(who promulgated the *Liber sextus* in 1298) to the publication of the *Clementines* (1317). In English provincial law, the key texts are Archbishop Stephen Langton’s Council of Oxford in 1222, which influenced later diocesan statutes, the statutes of the legate Otto of Monferrato for the black monks in 1237, and the statutes of the council held at London by the legate Ottobuono de’ Fieschi in 1268.

### 3.1 Gratian’s *Decretum*

Gratian’s *Decretum* occupies a unique place in the history of canon law. It is not a collection of canons in the same sense as later compilations of papal law. Rather, it is a textbook designed to teach students how to interpret legal texts effectively. The work has four main parts. The *Pars prima* consist of a series of *distinctiones*, each of which treats a particular point of law. For instance, *distinctio* sixty-nine considers when an abbot can confer orders. The *Pars secunda* is a series of *causae*, model cases, which are often highly artificial so as to include as many legal points as possible. Gratian divides the *causae* into *quaestiones*, each of which treats a point that is in some way relevant to the case. The third part, *De consecratione*, is made up of distinctions which deal specifically with things and people who are consecrated in some way. Within the *pars secunda* C.33 q.3 is a long, self-contained *Tractatus de poenitentia*. Each *distinctio* or *quaestio* contains a series of canons, which are often at least apparently conflicting. Gratian adds his own commentary on these canons in brief *dicta*, but much of the work of harmonization is

---

4 Benedict XII’s extensive legislation for the specific orders lies outside the scope of the present study.

5 It is well known that there is no good critical edition of the *Decretum*. For this project, I have used *Decretum Gratiani... vna cum glossis Gregorii XIII Pont.Max. iussu editum* (Rome, 1582) (a copy is available on-line through U.C.L.A.: http://digital.library.ucla.edu/canonlaw/index.html). This is a post-Tridentine revision of both the main text of Gratian and the Gloss, although the full extent of this revision has never been determined. All quotations are from this edition, unless otherwise stated, but I have also consulted *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, in *Corpus iuris canonici*, vol. 1, ed. Emil Friedburg (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1879). I have taken advantage of the searchability of *Decretum Gratiani... denuo edidit Aemilius Ludovicus Richter*, PL 187 (available on-line at the Patrologia Latina Database: http://pld.chadwyck.com). The exact wording of a given canon is rarely terrifically important for the most part, because canonists treated the canons as a source for general principles that could be used to support an argument, rather than dwelling on textual minutiae. When William of Pagula refers to *xvij q. ii c. si quis abbas*, he no more expected his audience to have the exact wording on hand than a modern preacher does when he makes a reference to “the story of the Good Samaritan.”

The development of the Ordinary Gloss to the *Decretum Gratiani* is a topic of considerable interest, but since this thesis focuses on the period 1250-1350, after the completion of the Gloss, I have treated it, for the most part, as a finished work. For the date of the Gloss, see Rudolf Wiegand “The Development of the *Glossa ordinaria* to Gratian’s *Decretum.*,” in *HMCLCP*, 88-91, where he argues that Bartholomeus Brixiensis had finished his revision by 1241. Pp. 91-95 of this article contain an account of the various printed editions of the Gloss.
left to the reader. In practice, later canonists often paid relatively little attention to the grand
design of the work, and raided it for canons or dicta that they could apply to their own argument,
often by drawing out analogous principles. There is law for the religious throughout the pars
prima and pars secunda, and to a lesser extent De consecratione, but the highest concentration
comes in causae sixteen to twenty, which form a small corpus of monastic law.6

Little is known about Gratian’s life. John Noonan has demonstrated that there is no foundation to
the tradition that Gratian was a Camaldolese monks.7 Some scholars continue to support twelfth-
century claims that he was a monk of some kind, and Henri Delhounge has shown that Gratian
he had a detailed knowledged of some contemporary monastic practices.8 Anders Winroth has
persuasively argued that he became bishop of Chiusi shortly before his death in 1145,9 but it was
quite possible to be both a monk and bishop. At present, there is need for a thorough study of
Gratian’s attitude to both monks and regular canons in the context of other twelfth-century
canonists, which may shed light on whether he is truly favourable to monks, or has an unusual

6 Only a few scholars have dealt with monastic law in the Decretum directly. The most important studies are:
Hourlier, Les religieux; Mario Sinopoli, “Influenza di Graziano nell’evoluzione del diritto monastico,” Studia
Gratiana 3 (1955), 322-48. Both of these are now somewhat dated.

See also: Suso Brechter, “Die Regula Benedicti im Decretum Gratiani,” Studia Gratiana 2 (1954), 1-11; Henri
Règle de saint Benoît, source du droit monastique,” in Études d’histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel Le
Luigi Prosdocimi, “A proposito della terminologia e della natura giuridica delle norme monastiche e canoniche nei
secoli XI et XII,” in La vita comune del clero nei secoli XI et XII. Atti della Settimana internazionale di studio,
vol. 3 (1976), 602-18.


8 Henri Delhounge, “Traces de la Règle de saint Benoît chez Gratien,” RTAM 39 (1972), 165-67. For the claim that
Gratian was a monk, see Summa Parisiensis on the “Decretum Gratiani”, ed. Terence McLaughlin (Toronto:
Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1952), ad C.2 q.7 d. p. c.52 et C.16 q.1 c.61 (pp. 115, 181). Stephan
Kuttner, “Gratien,” in Dictionnarie d’histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques, vol. 21 (Paris: Letouzy et Ané,
1986), 1236, says: “...la tradition ancienne qui parle de lui comme étant moine est bien attestée et ne saurait être
mise en doute.”

9 Winroth, “Where Gratian Slept.”
knowledge of monasticism. Nevertheless, the results of such study would be suggestive at best.

Recent scholarship has significantly improved our knowledge of the stages of the Decretum’s composition, but it remains remarkably difficult to fit all of the available evidence into a coherent synthesis. One can say with certainty that an early version, which survives in a few manuscripts, circulated shortly after 1139, although Gratian may have been working on it for several years. By c.1145, the Decretum had doubled in size, either through Gratian’s own efforts or those of his students. In the next few decades other scholars added supplementary canons, known as palae, to produce the vulgate text. There continues to be controversy about the exact stages of composition before 1145, but it is not necessary to attempt an answer here, since subsequent medieval canonists concerned themselves solely with the vulgate text.

Travis Baker is currently completing a study of monastic law in the Decretum. As part of this work, he has performed the first analysis of the formal sources of Decretum, CC.16-20, which deal with the religious. Baker has found that Gratian relied on three main sources. The largest single source was the Collection in Three Books, which provided the source for forty-seven canons, thirty-nine of them in causa sixteen. Gratian’s second major source was the Collectio

---

10 For this point, see Winroth, Making of Gratian’s Decretum, 8.
11 See, in particular,
14 I am grateful to Mr. Baker for sharing a draft version of parts of his Oxford DPhil thesis, “Law and Monasticism in Gratian’s ‘Decretum’.”
15 Collectio canonum trium librorum, ed. Giuseppe Motta, 2 vols (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vatican,
tripartita (versions A and B), which provides twenty-seven canons, most of them in causae sixteen and twenty. Baker has not been able to identify the source for fifty-four canons, but he argues that many of these came from an unknown collection of monastic privileges, of the sort found in Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 276.

3.1.1 Causae 16-20: A Corpus of Monastic Law

The majority of the material on the religious in the Decretum is found in CC. 16-20, which form a coherent body of monastic law, a sort of tractatus de regularibus. However, Gratian does not attempt to treat all topics of monastic law in a systematic fashion, or to gather all of his material on the religious in to one place, but choses several hotly contested issues for particular consideration. The Gregorian Reformation had significantly altered the role of the Church in society, and so CC. 16 and 18 deal with the place of the religious in relation to the laity and the episcopal hierarchy. During the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, the increase in the number of adult converts, new legal and theological interest in consent, and competition between new and old forms of monasticism all raised difficult problems about the boundaries of the religious life. Gratian considers these boundaries in CC. 17, 19, and 20. In C. 17 Gratian asks whether a priest who, when gravely ill, declared his intention to become a monk and entered a monastery, could leave without breaking a vow (q.1), and whether he should recover his benefice and the possessions that he gave to the monastery (qq.2-4). C. 19 asks whether a cleric needs episcopal permission to enter the monastic life (qq. 1-2), and whether a regular canon can become a monk (q.3). The ability of oblates to return to the world (q.1), the entry of minors without parental permission (q.2), forced entry into a monastery (q.3), and transfer to a stricter house (q.4) are all addressed in C. 20.
In these causae, Gratian struggles to balance new ideas of consent and free choice with older traditions. He allows parish clergy to enter monasteries, and monks to move to stricter houses against the wishes of their superiors. However, on the vexing question of whether unwilling oblates can leave the monastic life, he makes little attempt to reconcile conflicting positions. At the beginning of his discussion, he unequivocally re-affirms the tradition that “... a profession that is offered to God by the parents should be preserved inviolate,”19 but elsewhere he appears to contradict this. Girls who have “been forced to put on the habit of virginity” can abandon it against the wishes of their parents at age twelve, and a boy who protested joining a monastery with his father must be permitted to leave.20 C.19 q.2 c.2 (Duæ sunt) allows clerics to enter a monastery without episcopal permission, on the grounds that human law should not oppose a Spirit-inspired desire for perfection.21 On the other hand, C.19 q.3 c.1 forbids regular canons to become monks, since it is equally possible to attain salvation in either way of life.22

19 “… quae a parentibus Deo offertur professio, inuiolatam sermoni oportet.” C.20 q.1 d. p. c.1


22 Cf. the ability of monks to leave their house over the objection of the abbot to seek a stricter (and so more certainly salvific) rule (C.20 q.4 c.1, Gl. Monasterium ad c.3). According to Gl. Dignior ad C.19 q.2 c.2, there are
The question of the relationship between monks and regular canons suggests the wider issue of the place of the religious in the Church of the Gregorian Reformation, an issue which CC. 16 and 18 take up. Patristic sources typically assumed that monks were not priests, and emphasized the penitential nature of their lives and their submission to ecclesiastical authority. However, ordination, episcopal office, and, most controversially, pastoral care, were common for many monks and regular canons. C.18 deals with the potentially fraught relationship between bishops and abbots in two situations: the division of the wealth of a monk-bishop between the monastery and the cathedral church (q.1), and the interference of bishops in elections, or other aspects of monastic life (q.2). C.16 q.1, deals, at great length, with one of the bitter ecclesiastical disputes of Gratian’s day, pastoral care by monks.\(^{23}\) C.16 qq. 2-7 address the related issue of the possession of churches by monasteries.\(^{24}\) Quaestio 7, on whether or not monasteries can accept churches from laymen who relinquish their control, provides a particularly good example of Gratian’s concern for the place of monks in the on-going process of ecclesiastical reform.

Both the Gloss and Gratian recognize that there are contradictions between canons affirming monastic independence, and those stressing episcopal control, but they use different principles to reconcile this seeming contradiction. Gratian, faced with the problem of canons both opposing and affirming the appointment of abbots by bishops, makes a moral distinction: most monks can have their independence, but if monks are “indomitably stiff-necked and unrestrainedly proud,” such that they will not choose a good abbot, then the bishop must take control.\(^{25}\) The Gloss limits to the freedom to seek one’s own salvation in cases where the harm to the social order would be too great. One spouse cannot enter the cloister without the permission of the other (C.27 q.2 c.22), a child cannot do so without paternal consent (C.20 q.2 c.2), nor a bishop without the permission of the pope (X. 3.31.8).

\(^{23}\) The discussion in C.16 q.1 is notable for being thorough and nuanced. Gratian suggests that monks who are priests have the same power to teach, preach and administer the sacraments as other priests, and a monk-priest can exercise these powers with the consent of the bishop, his abbot, and the people. Nonetheless, monks should not, in general, have direct cure of souls. See C.16 q.1 d. a. c.1, d. p. c.3, d. p. c.19, d. p. c.25, d. p. c.34. Cf. Berlière, “Exercice du ministère paroissiel,” 345.

\(^{24}\) For monastic tithes, see Constable, Monastic Tithes.

\(^{25}\) “indomitae cervicis et ineffraenatae superbiae” C.18 q.2 d. p. c.8.
addresses the problem with a legal distinction between exempt and non-exempt houses, although it does allow some room for Gratian’s argument in the case of the non-exempt.\textsuperscript{26}

### 3.1.2 Monastic Law outside of Causae 16-20

There is a considerable amount of monastic law outside of CC.16-20, including some that establishes important legal principles, but Gratian often places it amidst material that does not have much obvious connection to monasticism, and it is a laborious task to gather the relevant canons together. As a result, scholars, both medieval and modern, demonstrate remarkably little agreement on which canons are relevant to monasticism, particularly in the Prima pars. To take one example, Jacques Hourlier, in his introduction to medieval monastic law, cites eleven canons from the Prima pars, and William of Pagula cites twelve in the SR, but they cite only one canon in common.\textsuperscript{27} In a similar way, none of the modern scholarship that I have consulted cites the De consecratione, but William of Pagula found a few canons there (including perhaps the longest on monastic canon in the Decretum).\textsuperscript{28} No source, medieval or modern, has suggested any relevant material in the Tractatus de poenitentia, nor have I found any.

The problem of the role of monks within the hierarchical structure of the Church provides a link between the monastic corpus (C.18) and other parts of the Decretum, since it is treated in several other places. As mentioned above, the appearance of ordained monks meant that Gratian, or the glossators, had to revise much of the patristic legacy. For instance, when, in a discussion of papal primacy, Gratian provides a canon from Pope Sylvester that assigns monks the lowest rank of all clergy, the Gloss points out that this was the case when monks were not ordained to the priesthood, but now abbots out-rank other clerics.\textsuperscript{29} Similarly, C.7 q.1 c.45, which comes ultimately from the Eastern Fourth Council of Constantinople, states that a bishop who gives up his diocese to become a monk can never resume episcopal office, because “the monastic life has

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} Gl. Ordinationem ad C.18 q.2 c.6.
\item \textsuperscript{27} D.69 c.1. For the canons in the SR, see Appendix I. Hourlier cites: D.18 c.16; D.27 cc.4-5, 8-9; D.53 c.11; D.54 c.20; D.56 c.1; D.58 \textit{(in toto)}; D.69 c.1; D.88 c.1.
\item \textsuperscript{28} \textit{De cons.} D.5 c.33. This is a long extract of advice on the monastic life from Jerome, \textit{Ep. 114 ad Rusticum}. William also uses \textit{De cons.} D.4 c.103 and D.5 c.32. To these one could add D.4 c.104.
\item \textsuperscript{29} “Hodie maior honor debitetur abbatibus, quam aliis clericis” Gl. Abb\textit{as ad D.93 c.5.}
\end{itemize}
a role (lit. “word” verbum) of subjugation and of receiving instruction, not of teaching, or of presiding, or of nourishing others.”

This strong exclusion of monks from ecclesiastical authority could not fit with the situation in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and so the Gloss affirms that monks can hold episcopal office, and suggests that the canon applies only to bishops who have been sent to monasteries as a punishment.

Many topics of significant importance in later monastic legislation have only a small place in Gratian’s Decretum. It is not surprising that liturgy makes no real appearance, since its regulation was usually left to customaries. The universities had not yet acquired their dominant place in education, so issues relating to the secular schools are not prominent. The role of abbots in diocesan synods is discussed only in two palea. Gratian devotes only one canon to the consumption of meat and fowl, a topic that is prominent in later papal legislation, although it is notable that he edits the canon so that it supports a rigorist position. Gratian limits the discussion of monastic economies to extensive material on tithes, generalities about avoiding negotia, and one canon barring monks from holding land in farm.

---

30 “...monachorum enim vita subjectionis habet verbum et discipulatus, non docendi, vel praesidendi, vel pascendi alios.” The odd expression verbum discipulatus/docendi/etc. is likely an echo of 1 Cor. 12, 8: “Alii quidem per Spiritum datur sermo sapientiae: alii autem sermo scientiae secundum eundem Spiritum.”

31 Gl. Ulterius ad C.7 q.1 c.45. cf. Gl. Maiorem ad D.58 c.2, Gl. Ut quidam §2 ad C.2 q.7 c.58.

32 De cons. 5.33 contains some general advice on prayer. On customaries and the monastic liturgy, see Hourlier, Les Religieux, 31. For the liturgy in a customary roughly contemporaneous with Gratian, see Liber ordinis Sancti Victori Parisiensis, ed. Luc Jocqué and Ludo Milis, CCCM 6 (1984), in which one third of the chapters are devoted to the liturgy (cc. 42-66).

33 C.1 q.1 c.45 requires that all prelates have sufficient education, although Gl. Nisi praecellat softens this. Gl. Cum pastoris §2 ad C.2 q.7 c.58 discusses monks in the schools.

34 D.18 cc.11, 16. Canon sixteen assumes that abbots will attend annual synods, but canon eleven holds that bishops can only compel attendance for a “reasonable cause” (rationabilis causa). Gl. Vocatione ad C.18 q.2 c.16 strengthens this requirement for compulsory attendance to a “great need” (necessitas magna). For William of Pagula’s treatment of this issue, see below, p.194.

35 De cons. D.5 c.32 (= Fructuosus of Braga, Regula, c.5). Gl. Seruo tamen adds an excised portion of the canon, which allows monks to eat fowl on a journey, and meat at the invitation of a prince. For the importance of this debate for monastic law, see Alain Boureau, “‘Prout moris est iure.’ Les moines et la question de la coutume (XII-XIIIe siècle),” Revue historique 618 (2001), 363-402. For concern about meat in later legislation, see below, 143-45, 148-50, 161, 164, 169.

36 D.86 c.26 (Co. of Chalcedon, c.3); Gl. Conductiones permits this in case of necessity, citing X 3.30.8. Holding land “in farm (ad firmam) meant holding a piece of land at a fixed rent. Monasteries rented out land ad firmam so
The amount of space devoted to a topic does not necessarily correspond to its later influence. Arguably the most important contribution of Gratian to monastic law is his brief discussion of monastic simony (C.1, q.2), which Joseph Lynch has discussed in his foundational study.\(^{37}\) To summarize briefly, the practice of requiring an entry payment of some kind from both oblates and converts was widely accepted until the early twelfth century. Beginning in the 1120s, Lynch found evidence for new concern that such payments were simoniacal, but Gratian was the first to bring this concern into the main stream of canonical discussion. He puts forward a distinction between voluntary gifts, which are commendable, and required payments, which are forbidden.\(^{38}\) His most important authority was a spurious decretal attributed to Boniface I that had not appeared in any earlier canonical collections (C.1, q.2, c.2). This canon forbids offering money as an inducement to enter religion, but says nothing about demanding payment. The other canons in C.1 q.2 have no direct connection with monastic entry payments for a monastery.\(^{39}\) Despite the lack of any canon explicitly addressing this topic, subsequent glossators accepted the broad outlines of Gratian’s proposal, while expanding and clarifying it.\(^{40}\)

that they would not need to directly supervise its exploitation. There was a temptation to give land \textit{ad firmam} to a single brother, who would be more trustworthy than other tenants, and would need no profit for himself. This risked violating the renunciation of private property and the requirement to live in community. On this point, see Knowles, \textit{Monastic Order}, 442-44.

\(^{37}\) Lynch, \textit{Simoniaca.} Entry.

\(^{38}\) d. a. C.1 q.2 c.1.

\(^{39}\) C.1, q.2, c.3, a text from the Council of Melfi (1089) does explicitly condemn entry payments, but the canon is a \textit{palea}. Lynch accepts the dating of this canon to 1089, which would seem to move the earliest evidence for monastic simony back thirty years from his date of c.1120, but he does not address this problem.

\(^{40}\) “In summation, a practice that had been normal and respectable before 1130 had become a crime by 1230.” Lynch, \textit{Simoniaca.} Entry, 224. Lynch sees the pontificate of Innocent III as the key period for promulgating the positions of the canonists and “the Chanter’s circle” throughout Christendom. See ibid., chp. 3 “Innocent III and Simoniaca. Entry,” 179-202. The two most important pieces of legislation were Lateran III, c.10 (\textit{COD}, 217) and Lateran IV, c.64 (\textit{COD}, 264-65), which became X 3.35.2 and 5.3.40, respectively. Several inter-conciliar pastoral treatises show an interest in monastic simony. See, Robert de Courson \textit{Summa de sacramentis}, VIII.13 (Paris, BN MS lat. 14524, f.38rv); Robert of Flamborough, \textit{Liber poenitentialis}, III.113, 118 (pp. 125, 129-30); Peter of Poitiers, \textit{Summa}, cc. 42, 51. Regional legislation, and the legislation of the monks themselves, also address this problem. For monastic simony in local legislation, see below, p.160.
3.1.3 The *Decretum*: Conclusion

It is fitting to place simony at the end of any discussion of the *Decretum Gratiani*, because it reflects Gratian’s careful attention to recent development in societal attitudes towards monasticism. On the crucial issues of the boundaries of the monastic life, and the place of the religious in a reformed ecclesiastical structure, Gratian includes recent legislation, or apocryphal canons of obscure origin that expressed contemporary concerns. In some matters, such as the performance of pastoral care, or the relationship between regular canons and monks, Gratian’s balanced presentation formed the basis for later consensus, in part, perhaps, because these issues became less fraught as the centre of gravity in the Church moved away from cloistered monasticism. The condemnation of monastic simony went beyond the major concerns of the “reformation of the twelfth century;” even the strictest orders had not been concerned to distinguish between gifts and payments, and Gratian could find little mention of the topic even among apocryphal statutes. Nonetheless, his opinion provided the starting point for a significant change in the attitude of ecclesiastical officials toward a monastic practice.\(^{41}\)

3.2 Papal Law I: The *Liber extra*

The law contained in the *Liber extra* represents the work of the legislative activity of the papacy from the mid-twelfth century to the work’s completion in 1234, as well as pre-Gratianic law that had not made it into the *Decretum*. Raymund of Peñafort, the noted penitential writer, oversaw the compilation of the work. It rests on five earlier compilations of papal law, known as the *Quinque compilationes antiquae*.\(^{42}\) All six collections had a structure of five books on judges (*iudex*), procedure (*iudicium*), clergy (*clerus*), marriage (*conubium*), and crime (*crimen*), which were further divided into titles that contained canons on more specific topics. The canonist Bernard of Pavia developed this structure in his *Breviarium decretalium* (better known as the *Compilatio prima*). Bernard was also responsible for grouping much of the monastic law into five titles of book three on entrance into religion, the conversion of married couples, the state of

\(^{41}\) This is an instance where it is appropriate to speak of Gratian’s opinion, since it is his unusually long *dicta*, rather than the canons, that drove later discussion.

the religious, the authority of bishops over the religious, and religious chapels.⁴³ As in the
Decretum, much monastic law appears outside of this core group, particularly in the titles on
clergy and secular business, privileges, and excommunication.⁴⁴

Gert Melville has recently provided a thoughtful study of the law for the religious in the Liber extra, as it was interpreted by thirteenth-century canonists. He groups this law around five key principles:

a) “the spiritually-grounded substantialia of the religious.”

b) “behavioural norms derived from [the substantialia]”

c) “the position of the individual in relation to the interests of the community of the
cloister with a particular emphasis on the personal right of decision”

d) “essential organizational structures, such as the control of the superior, or the
implementation of the general chapter and visitations”

e) “essential modules of hierarchical classification in the episcopal system of the
universal Church.”⁴⁵

This list is a helpful starting point for analysis, although it is in need of some qualification.

The substantialia do not have any presence in the Liber extra itself; the canonists introduced this concept in their commentaries. Of the three substantialia, poverty receives the most attention.

Chastity, on the other hand, rarely appears in monastic legislation, as several scholars point out.⁴⁶ Innocent III pairs poverty and chastity as essential elements of religion, but does not add

---

⁴³ In the Liber extra they are: 3.31 De regularibus et transeuntibus ad religionem; 3.32 De conversione coniugatorum; 3.35 De statu monachorum et canonicorum regularium; 3.36 De religiosis domibus, ut episcopo sint subiectae; 3.37 De capellis monachorum et aliorum religiosorum. The titles had different numbers and slightly different names in earlier collections.

⁴⁴ X 3.50; 5.33; 5.39.

⁴⁵ “Die spirituell begründeten substantialia des Religiosentums... die daraus abzuleitenden Verhaltensnormen... die Position des Einzelnen gegenüber den Belangen der klösterlichen Gemeinschaft unter besonderer Hervorhebung persönlichen Entscheidungsrechts... die wesentliche Organisationsstrukturen wie die Kontrolle der Klostervorsteher oder die Durchführung von Generalkapitel und Vistationen... wesentliche Module tierarchischer Einordnung in das episkopale System der Gesamtkirche.” Melville, “Recht des Religiösen,” 186.

⁴⁶ Hourlier, Les religieux, 227; Joseph Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers dans les conciles et synodes des XIIIe et XIVe siècles,” in Moines et monastères dans les sociétés de rite grec et latin, ed. Jean-Loup Lemaître, Michel Dmitriev et Pierre Gonneau (Gèneve: Droz, 1996), 326; Ludo Milis, “Reformatory Attempts within the Ordo Canonicus in the Late Middle Ages,” in Reformbemühungen und Observanzbestrebungen im spätmittelalterlichen
obedience to his list. It is therefore difficult to speak of norms being derived from the substantialia. Nonetheless, one can say that the canonical use of the substantialia was an important response to the reality that “canon law... increasingly assimilated the regular canons to the monks, under the one designation of regulares.”

3.2.1 Consent and the Religious Life

Among Melville’s five points on law in the Liber extra, he devotes the most attention to the third, the emphasis on individual choice within the community. In this matter, the Liber extra continues a trend that was evident already in Gratian and the Decretists to make freely given consent the foundation for entry into religion. This is most evident in the treatment of the noviciate. The title “on those entering religion, or moving from one house to another,” opens by stressing that no one can be bound to the religious life who has not given his consent freely at a mature age, and it returns to this theme many times. By the same token, free consent, in the form of a solemn vow, is binding, without any externals. The position is well summed-up by a statement of Clement III that “regular profession, not the habit, makes a monk.”

The Liber extra places the importance of the free consent of the individual within a general “constitutionalization” of religious law, which sought to clarify the legal personality of the

---

*Ordenswesen*, ed. Kaspar Elm (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 1989), 65. Despite this observation, Hourlier uses the three substantialia as an organizing principle in his own book, but then finds himself with nothing to say on the subject of chastity.

47 See above, p.113.


50 X 3.31.17.

various actors within the monastery, and harmonized practice across different communities.\textsuperscript{52} If
ovices were to give their informed consent, then they needed a set period of time in which to
engage in reflection (\textit{deliberatio}), not merely a period of training in their monastic vocation.\textsuperscript{53}
This period of decision also needed a definite limit, lest the monastery be disrupted by the long-
term presence of someone not fully committed to its way of life. Several canons in the \textit{Liber}
\textit{extra} set the length of the noviciate at one year, clearing up previous confusion.\textsuperscript{54} The clear
establishment of the one-year probationary noviciate largely protected the ability of novices to
leave before they gave consent, but it also meant that anyone who voluntarily stayed in a
monastery for more than one year had given a binding tacit consent.\textsuperscript{55} Consent was thus placed
firmly within a system of general norms.

3.2.2 Provincial chapters

Among Melville’s “institutional structures,” the most ambitious was requirement for the black
monks and regular canons to hold provincial chapters, a plan first enunciated at Lateran IV.\textsuperscript{56}
The basic outline of the plan was straightforward: every three years all the black monks (or
regular canons) of each ecclesiastical province would gather for a chapter meeting that would
draw up legislation, settle disputes, and so forth. The chapter would appoint visitors who were to
tour the houses of the province, investigating the moral and economic state of each house.

A number of potentially contrary tendencies run through the plan for the provincial chapters. On
the one hand, this plan represents a willingness “to recognize the internal law of the religious.”\textsuperscript{57}
The religious would be entrusted with formulating their own laws, and policing their
enforcement. The Cistercians, the Premonstratensians and the Cluniacs all used such a system of

\textsuperscript{52} On this point see Melville, “Recht des Religiösen,” 182; Hourlier, \textit{Les religieux}, 528-29.
\textsuperscript{53} Melville, “Recht des Religiösen,” 177-78, discusses the transition from a “period of learning (\textit{Lernphase})” to a
“period of time (\textit{Zeitschnitt}).” For \textit{deliberatio}, see his references to Abbas Antiquus and Innocent IV.
\textsuperscript{54} Hourlier, \textit{Les religieux}, 177, citing X 3.31.16, 21-22 over against D.53 c.1; C.17 q.2 cc.1, 3; C.19 q.3 c.6.
\textsuperscript{55} X 3.31.4, 23.
\textsuperscript{56} X 3.35.7, citing Lateran IV, c.12 (\textit{OCD}, 240-41). Maccarone, “Le constituzioni del IV Concilio lateranese,” 25
suggests that the regulars canons were included in this decree at the last minute.
\textsuperscript{57} Michele Maccarone, “Le constituzioni del IV Concilio lateranese,” 5.
chapters and visitation, which Melville sees as demonstrating a unique degree of rationality, in the Weberian sense of producing an internally-consistent system of behaviour, that reflected the “creative force” of the religious.\textsuperscript{58} The jurisdiction of the chapters cuts across diocesan boundaries, and the visitors were in potential conflict with the system of episcopal visitation.\textsuperscript{59} Yet Lateran IV imposed on all the cloistered religious a system that expressed the “creativity” of only a minority, and created geographical centralization at the expense of bonds of shared tradition and local custom.\textsuperscript{60} The visitors did not have ordinary jurisdiction, but acted as permanent papal legates.\textsuperscript{61} The provincial chapters represented a compulsory autonomy, underwritten by an unprecedented use of papal authority.

The tensions within the plan for the provincial chapters may explain why they never worked well in practice. In 1203, Innocent had laid the groundwork for the Lateran decree by calling provincial meetings of all monks in Perugia, Piacenza, Paris, Limoges, Cluny, and London, although a record of the meeting only survives for Piacenza.\textsuperscript{62} In the decade after the council there were chapters at Oxford, Mainz, Hirsau, Speyer, St Quentin, and Reims, but only in England did the chapters become an effective institution.\textsuperscript{63} Even in England the meetings were

\textsuperscript{58} “[Monastic institutional structures] draw attention to a degree of rationality which, through the creative force of religious forms... was realized to a greater extent that in other social formations of the same time. (...richiamano l’attenzione su un grado di razionalità che per la forza creativa delle forme religiose fu raggiunto... in misure maggiore rispetto ad altre formazioni sociali di ogni tempo)” Gert Melville, “Alcune osservazioni sui processi di istituzionalizzazione della vita religiosa nei secoli XII e XIII,” Benedictina 48 (2001), 393.

\textsuperscript{59} Hostiensis specified that bishops had priority over capitular visitors, if they both happened to arrive at the same time. Cited in Maccarone, “Le constituzioni del IV Concilio lateranese,” 23, n.60.

\textsuperscript{60} On this point, see Maccarone, “Le constituzioni del IV Concilio lateranese,” 26. For the legal creativity of some monasteries attempting to maintain independence, see Boureau, “Prout mos est iure.” Maccarone, Studi su Innocenzo III, chp. 3, “Reforme e innovazioni di Innocenzo III nella vita religiosa” (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1972), 228 sees unification as the central element in Innocent III’s plan for the religious life.

\textsuperscript{61} Innocent IV makes it clear that the visitors have their authority from delegatio papae, not ordinaria iurisdictio. Cited in Meville, “Recht des Religiösen,” 183. cf. Maccarone, “Le constituzioni del IV Concilio lateranese,” 22-23.


\textsuperscript{63} For the early chapters, see Maccarone, “Le constituzioni del IV Concilio lateranese,” 29-31. On the post-1215 chapters, Maccarrone Studi, 254-55, says “Under [Honorius III] chapters were held in France, Germany, and above all in England, where the institution was applied more thoroughly, and proved its usefulness... even with the succeeding popes, Gregory IX and Innocent IV, the concern to hold chapters appears, but these become ever rarer
far from triennial, and some of the most powerful monasteries refused to attend. Benedict XII attempted to revive the institution, but with limited success. It would be easy to put the failure of the provincial chapters down to intransigent independence or sloth on the part of the black monks, and there is surely some truth to these allegations. It may also be that the provincial chapters were too artificial in their geographical unification. The network of monasteries centered on Melk in the early fifteenth century certainly demonstrated that it was possible for an energetic reform to take hold in a region when it developed organically out of monastic culture.

### 3.2.3 *Cum ad monasterium* (X 3.35.6)

The Lateran council attempted to establish an institutional framework for reform, but Innocent III had already gone further in the decretal *Cum ad monasterium* (X 3.35.6), a letter to the monastery of Subiaco, in which he gathered a small compendium of monastic law that addresses problems of discipline that arise within the daily life of the monastery rather than issues at the meeting between the monastery and the *saeculum*, such as relations with bishops, the entry of novices and monastic simony. In this respect, *Cum ad monasterium* became a model for later papal legislation on monastic discipline, including the statutes of Gregory IX for the black monks, the statutes of the legates Otto and Ottobuono, and the Council of Vienne’s canon *Ne in agro.*

---


65 For Benedict XII’s attempt to revive the chapters, see Boehm, “Papst Benedikt XII,” 304-05; Maccarrone, *Studi*, 255.

66 For this argument, see Felten, “Die Ordensreformen Benedikts XII,” 433-435; Maccarone, “Le constituzioni del IV Concilio laterinese,” 26.

67 For a brief introduction to the reforms of Melk, see Clark, *Benedictines*, 280-81. For a longer account, see Meta Niederkorn-Bruck, *Die Melker Reform im Spiegel der Visitationen* (Oldenbourg/ Munich/ Vienna: Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 1994).
Much of *Cum ad monasterium* discusses basic points of monastic discipline, such as one might find in a customary, a treatise for novices, or perhaps a sermon. Innocent is particularly concerned to forbid private property, declaring that proprietors who die unrepentant are to be buried in the “dung hill (*sterquolinium*)” outside the walls. Monks should not wear a linen undershirt (*linea camisia*). They should eat no meat (except for the sick, who may need the richer food), and they should dine together in the refectory or the infirmary, although abbot can take a few brothers to his table for better food as an indulgence. The abbot should supervise the distribution of special food for those with a particular dietary need (*debilis, delicatus*). There must always be silence in the dormitory, the oratory and the refectory, and there should be appropriate silence in the cloister “according to the ancient custom of the monastery.”

The reference to the monastery’s “custom” is significant, since it establishes a new relationship between the specific regulations of daily life embodied in customaries, or in the oral customs of the monastery, and papal legislation. The Pope does not presume to alter what was in the “ancient customs,” but he is capable of addressing general topics that would be governed by customs, such as the nature of meals, the care for the sick, and the maintenance of silence. This perceived need to correct basic elements of monastic discipline is an innovation. *Cum ad monasterium*’s interest in the *minutiae* of daily observance would become a hallmark of later papal legislation.

Jacques Hourlier argues that *Cum ad monasterium* is the foundational text for papal control of the monastic life, and he focuses in particular on a description of the abbot at the end of the canon:

> Let the abbot, whom all must reverently obey in all things, be with the brethren in the convent as often as possible, exercising a vigilant care and diligent concern for all, so that he can offer a worthy account of his duty to God. For if he should be a transgressor of the order, or has contemptuous pride, or he is negligent and remiss, let him know for certain that he is not only to be deposed from his office, but also to be punished in other ways.

---

68 “...secundum antiquam consuetudinem monasterii.” X 3.35.6.

according to the Rule, since he is responsible not only for his own offenses, but for those of others. Nor let the abbot think that he can allow any monk to have private possessions by dispensation, since the renunciation of property, just like the maintenance of chastity, is so annexed to the monastic Rule that not even the Pope can grant a dispensation from it.  

For Hourlier, this canon is representative of the regimentation of monastic life, and the atrophy of the older demand for absolute obedience to the abbot. “We must ask ourselves,” he says, “what part obedience can truly have in a more and more minutely regulated religious life?” For Hourlier, Cum ad monasterium is representative of the answer: “To submit to this regimentation is precisely to carry out the work of obedience, and the role of the superior is to oversee it.”

Hourlier’s interpretation overlooks the abbot’s extensive powers of dispensation. Innocent allows the abbot to grant dispensations from dietary restrictions “as an indulgence (indulgentia).” The gloss on the word indulgentia goes further, and states that “therefore the abbot can dispense from the monastic rule with regard to eating meat.” The glossator links this to other instances of abbatical dispensation, such as reconciling those who had received holy orders while excommunicate, or providing for the construction of individual cells for some brothers. There is a tension between the Gloss’s brief and open-ended defence of the abbot’s power to allow meat and the passage it comments upon, but Cum ad monasterium does not present the abbot as the

---

70 “Abbas vero (qui omnes in omnibus reuerenter obediunt) quanto frequentius poterit, sit cum fratribus in conuentu: vigilem curam & diligentem sollicitudinem gerens de omnibus: vt de officio sibi commisso dignam Deo possit reddere rationem. Quod si praevaicator ordinis fuerit, aut contemtor, seu negligens aut remissus, pro certo se nouerit non solum ab officio deponendum, sed & alicui modo secundum regulam castigandum: cum offensa non solum propria, verum etiam aliena, de suis manibus requirant. Nec estimet Abbas quod super habenda proprietate possit cum aliquo monacho dispensare: quia abdicatio proprietatis, sicut & custodia castitatis, adeo est annexit regulae monachali, vt contra eam nec summus Pontifex possit licentiam indulgere.” X 3.35.6.

71 “On se demandera quelle pouvait être en réalité la parti d’obéissance dans une vie religieuse de plus en plus réglée. Se soumettre à cette réglementation est précisément faire œuvre d’obéissance et le rôle des supérieurs est d’y veiller.” Hourlier, Les religieux, 225.

72 “Porro debiles & infirmi... non seorsum in cameron, sed omnes in infrimitorio, quæ necessaria fuerint sibi tam in carnibus quam in alijs, recipient competenter. Quamquam ex indulgentia possit Abbas interdum aliquos fratrum, nunc hos, nunc illos (prout necessitas postulauerit) aduocare, ipsoisque secum in camera sua melius & plenius exhibere.” X 3.35.6.

73 “Sic ergo Abbas potest dispensare in regula monachali quantum ad esum carnium: vt hic, & arg. de consec. dist. 5. carnum.” Gl. Indulgentia ad X 3.35.6.
mere administrator of binding regulations. It does set limits to this power of dispensation in matters of poverty and chastity, and identifies certain uses of it as abusive.

3.2.4 Monks and Bishops

The last major topic that Melville identifies in the Liber extra is the relationship between the religious and the episcopal hierarchy. This topic takes up most of X 3.36 “On religious houses, that they should be under the authority of bishops,” and X 3.37 “On the chapels of monks and of other religious.” Both Melville and Hourlier see the Liber extra as a defense of episcopal rights of non-exempt houses, but one that ensures that they use their authority to maintain discipline. Bishops have the right to oversee all monastic houses in their diocese in spiritualia, and they have a responsibility to ensure a correct way of life. Houses must have legitimate proof of their exemption. Monks can act as the rectors of parishes, but to fulfill the daily pastoral responsibilities, the monks must ask the bishop to install a chaplain. The bishop should take the monks’s advice (consilium) in choosing a chaplain, but all matters of discipline or removal pertain to the bishop alone. Although the Liber extra reaffirms episcopal control within certain limits, it does not show the serious concern about the abuses of exempt houses in the manner of the later legislation in the Liber sextus and the Clementines.

3.3 Papal Law II: The Statutes of Gregory IX for the Black Monks

Gregory IX, in addition to issuing the Liber extra, launched a series of reforms of the cloistered religious. These reforms included new statutes for Cluny in 1231 and a revised customary for the Premonstratensians in 1234, but Gregory’s most important piece of reforming legislation was a set of statutes for the black monks throughout Christendom, promulgated in 1235 and revised in

74 “De religiosis domibus, ut episcopo sint subiectae;” “De capellis monachorum et aliorum religiosorum.” Both of these titles go back to the Compilatio prima, where they are I Comp. 3.32-33.
76 X 3.36.3, 7.
77 X 3.36.8.
78 X 3.37.1, with Gl. Solius.
79 See below, sections 3.4, 3.6.
1238. These statutes were copied widely throughout Europe, and became a key touchstone for later legislation affecting the Benedictines. Originally promulgated in 1235, the stringency of some provisions met with vocal resistance from the black monks, and Gregory issued revised statutes in 1237. The fifty-four canons of Gregory’s Statutes follow a fairly clear topical order: general decorum and liturgical practice (cc.1-4), novices (5-8), officers (9-14), food and dress (15-25), financial management (26-29), private property (30-32), relations with the secular world (33-43), miscellaneous matters (44-49), and enforcement of the statutes (50-54).

Gregory’s legislative program constituted an unprecedented intervention in the monastic communities of Christendom, and an important extension of Innocent III’s regulation of the monastic life. Cum ad monasterium had originally addressed only one house, and Gregory had already sponsored the new statutes for the Premonstratensians and Cluniacs, but the statutes for the black monks were an important step beyond this earlier legislation in two respects. First, the Cluniacs and the Premonstratensians were both exempt orders, enjoying libertas romana under the direct authority of the Holy See. Michele Maccarone has suggested that from the time of Innocent III onwards there was an increasing shift in the understanding of libertas romana from preserving the independent character of the monastery to papal supervision. Secondly, as discussed above, both orders sought a high degree of centralization and uniformity in their own practice. The papacy could not claim a direct jurisdiction over all Benedictine monasteries, and their organs of centralization had themselves been imposed by the papacy. The statutes of

---


81 Clark, Benedictines, 290.

82 Both the original version of 1235 and the revised version of 1237 had only fifty-three canons. The final canon in 1235 (fifty-four in Auvray’s edition) states that the statutes apply to nuns, mutatis mutandis, but in 1237 it was replaced by a canon (Auvray’s fifty-three) requiring visitors to make a quinquennial report to the Apostolic See.


84 For the development of centralization among the Cluniacs, see Barret, “Regula Benedicti, Consuetudines, Statuta;” Melville, “Action, Text, and Validity;” Neiske, “Reform oder Kodifizierung?;” Oberste, Visitation und Ordensorganisation; Cygler, Das Generalkapitel.
1235/37 represent an innovative claim, building on the example of Innocent III in *Cum ad monasterium* and Lateran IV, to draw up statutes for any and all religious.

The opening canons of the statutes seek to preserve the *opus dei* of prayer in the office and the eucharistic liturgy. Monks are not to put anything ahead of the office, and to say it in its entirety. They have to make a full confession at least once a month, “so that they may offer a sacrifice of praise, the fruit of their labours, to God with a clear conscience and devoted mind.” They are to receive communion on the first Sunday of each month. The fourth canon enjoins discipline in chapter and silence in the church, cloister, refectory and monastery. Gregory’s statutes thus open with a picture of a harmonious community, uniting external discipline with personal purity, and offering constant praise to God.

The statutes next discuss the formation of novices in some detail. Every monastery must supply a “trustworthy teacher” (*fidelis instructor*) for the novices, who is required to explain the Rule of St Benedict three times during the one-year novitiate, with a particular emphasis on the harsh way of the life (*dura et aspera*) in the house. For good measure, the abbot (or a representative) should expound the Rule in the vernacular in chapter for the sake of the younger monks (*minores*). The Rule, however, should not be the starting point for the instruction of novices: “three things should be explained to those wishing to enter religion more often and in more particular, namely, obedience, continence, and living without private property.” Gregory presents the Benedictine Rule as one particular form of the more general principles of the religious life, and it is these that a novice must understand above all.

---

85 “principium, medium et finem horarum tenentes.” Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” c.1 (ed. Auvray, 319). At Durham in the fifteenth century, monks with doctorates were excused from the night office, but it is unlikely that this was occurring at such an early date. See Dobson, *Durham Priory*, 69.

86 “…ut in puritate conscientie et animi devotione Deo offerant sacrificium laudis fructum laborum suorum...” Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” c.2 (319). For the frequency of monastic confession, see above, pp.91-92.

87 Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” c.6 (319) I take it that the statute envisions something akin to a scholastic *lectio*, in which the master reads through and expounds a portion of the text each day. One presumes that each iteration would become more sophisticated.

88 ibid., c.45 (329).

89 “Omnibus autem ad religionem ingredi volentibus exponantur sepius et specialius ista tria, scilicet: obedientia, continentia et sine proprio vivere.” ibid., c.5 (319).
The primacy of the *substantialia* should not suggest any marginalization of the Rule of St Benedict, which provides a constant touchstone in the canons. “All monks... should serve the Lord with fear and reverence in the church, according to the Rule.” “From the Ides of September until the start of Lent, let them eat at nones, according to the Rule of the blessed Benedict, and at other times, according to the same Rule.” “Let no monk... eat meat, except according to what the Rule contains.” “Let them sleep clothed and girded, as in the Rule.” “We understand what private property is... according to what the blessed Benedict says in the Rule.”90 At the end of the statutes, Gregory requires that all superiors enforce them, “nonetheless preserving and keeping the Rule of the blessed Benedict in all these things aforesaid.”91 The statutes present themselves as a sort of authoritative commentary on the Rule.

In interpreting the Rule, Gregory has an almost obsessive concern with two particular monastic abuses: eating meat and wearing ostentatious or excessively comfortable clothing.92 No fewer than four canons (16, 18-20) condemn eating meat, culminating in canon twenty, which declares that, “if anyone shall have presumed to go against this regulation, if he is (only) a cloistered monk, let him submit to a serious penalty; if he should hold a rank or an administrative office, let him lose it.”93 The statutes dwell in even greater detail on inappropriate clothing, forbidding or restricting the use of a long list of garments, ornamentation and fabric, with the goal of removing anything that is ostentatious or excessively comfortable.94

90 “Omnes monachi... cum timore et reverentia Domino in ecclesia serviant, secundum Regulam.” ibid., c.1 (319); “Ab idibus autem septembris usque ad caput Quadragesime, secundum Regulam beati Benedicti reficiantur ad nonam, et in aliis temporibus, secundum eandem Regulam.” ibid., c.16 (323); “Nullus monachus... carnes comedat, nisi secundum quod in Regula continetur.” ibid., Redaction B, c.19 (324); “…vestiti dormiant et cincti, sicut in Regula continetur.” ibid., c.24 (323); “Propriam autem intelligimus quod sit... secundum quod dicit beatus Benedictus in Regula.” ibid., c.32 (327) (The wording is slightly different in Redaction B).

91 “salva nichilominus et servata in predicitis omnibus beati Benedicti Regula.” ibid., Redaction B c.50 (332).

92 On the problem of meat, see Knowles, *Religious Orders*, I.281-83.

93 “Si quis in esu carnium contra hunc ordinem facere presumperit, si claustralis fuerit, gravi culpe subjaceat; si dignitatem vel administrationem habet, eandem amittat.” Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” Redaction A, c.20 (323). These harsh penalties became a focus for protest against the statutes, and in 1237 Gregory emended this canon to enjoin brief fasts for a first offense, and deposition only for the contumacious.

94 ibid., cc.23-25 (323-25). The cowl (*cuculla*) is mandated. There are restriction on the use and fabric of outer garments (*capa, coopertorium*). High-quality wool (*brunetum*) and skins are forbidden in general, as are linen undergarments (*lineae/linteamines camiseae*). Ornate riding gear is a particular concern.
The statutes have a significant concern with the relationship between monks and the secular world. Abbots and other officials are not to show any favouritism to their relatives, or to include them in their retinues. Women are only to be admitted into the cloister for the dedication of a church, a funeral or a major feast, unless they are nobles whom it would cause grave scandal to refuse. In a more positive vein, monks should provide hospitality, especially to the poor and to religious. The regulation of food and dress is not merely for the sake of proper discipline; it also ensures that the almoner can distribute excess food and old clothing to the needy. The statutes try to balance the appropriate place of noble patronage and monastic charity against the dangers of embroiling the monastery in a network of familial obligations, or exposing the monks to scandalous rumour.

The statutes also attempt to find balance in the constitutionalization of the monastic life. There was a long tradition that the abbot would have to render account (rationem reddere) for his actions to God, and should consult the senior brothers on important matters. Gregory formalizes the duty of abbots to consult the chapter, and he shifts the emphasis from the abbot rendering account to God to rendering account to the monastic community. In the first redaction, abbots who wished to take a loan had to consult not only the brethren, but the members of their own household and local boni viri, and the abbey cannot be held to account for loans made without such consultation. The abbot must give a semi-annual account to the chapter (or to the

95 ibid., cc. 34, 36, 42 (327-29).
96 ibid., cc. 35, 42 (327-29). Monasteries often provided hospitality for the upper nobility.
97 ibid., c.37 (327). Redaction B weakens this canon (328).
98 ibid., cc. 38-39 (327-29)
100 “Precipimus insuper ut omnes abbates et piores, consilio fratrum quibus presunt, et familie, cum testimonio bonorum viorum qui ad eundem locum pertinent [B consilio omnium fratrum quibus presunt, vel majoris et sanioris partis ipsorum], cum faciendum est mutuum vel innovandum...” Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” c.26 (325-26) “Si vero abbas vel prior sine consensu conventus contraxerit mutuum, non teneatur monasterium...” ibid., c.28 (325). By the 1230s, it was common for abbot to maintain separate estates, which would require their own officials.
seniores among the brethren), officers must give a quarterly account to the abbot and the seniores, and the abbey is to keep a central written account. The abbot cannot remove conventual priors from office without a good reason (rationabilis causa). In these respects Gregory supports the development of a legal personality on the part of the convent, which can place checks on abbatial conduct, not merely as a matter of prudence, but as a matter of law. Yet Gregory also restrains excessive attempts to formalize the division between the abbot and the convent. In particular, he condemns the practice of giving priors charters (litterae confirmationis) granting them an office for life, and the related practice of demanding pledges (firma, plegium) from obedientiaries.

Gregory’s interest in mechanisms of consultation and accounting within the monasteries relates to another important aspect of his statutes, the attempt to develop detailed structures to ensure their implementation. The abbot must enforce the statutes on pain of deposition. Visitors must “proceed according to this ordinance of ours in correction and reform,” and several canons mention the role of visitors in their enforcement. In the second redaction, Gregory decided to have visitors send a quinquennial report to the Holy See, in addition to their annual report to the presidents of the provincial chapter. Abbots were to read out and explain all the statutes in the octave of Christmas, Easter and the feast of the Assumption, and canon thirty-one, on the

This seems to be the meaning of the familia. The boni viri may be local magnates who patronize the monastery, or legal experts. For the abbot’s council, see Knowles, Religious Orders, I.271-72.

101 ibid., cc.26-27, 47 (325, 329).
102 ibid., c.11 (321).
103 ibid., cc. 11, 13 (321).
104 ibid., c.50 (331). Redaction B softens deposition to “regular punishment” (regulariter punire) (332).
105 “...visitatores... secundum hanc ordinationem nostram in correctione et reformatione procedant.” ibid., c.52 (331). See also ibid., cc. 9, 21, 27, 37, 50 (B) (319-27, 332)
106 ibid., Redaction B, c.53 (331).
renunciation of private property, on Christmas Day, Easter Sunday, and Pentecost. Gregory fully integrated his statutes into the structure of visitations, and into the practice of expounding the Rule in chapter. The latter development, in particular, would have a long future in the English Church, thanks to the work of the legates Otto of Monferrato and Ottobuono de’ Fieschi, to be discussed below.

3.4 Papal Law III: The Liber Sextus

After the work of Gregory IX, there was a relative lull in papal legislation for the cloistered religious until the reign of Boniface VIII. Neither of the two general Councils of Lyon legislated extensively for the cloistered religious. In part, this was because the intense debates around the role of the mendicant orders overshadowed other concerns, and in part because there was simply less need for monastic legislation after the monumental efforts of the 1230s. Boniface did not take up the detailed regulation of monastic life that one finds in *Cum ad monasterium* or Gregory’s statutes for the black monks; instead, he focused on further clarifying three areas of monastic law: the novitiate, exemption and, in a less direct manner, monastic “constitutionalization.” Boniface promulgated his monastic legislation, along with other papal decretals after the *Liber extra*, in the *Liber sextus*.108

The *Liber sextus* contains two tendencies in dealing with the relationship between the abbot, the convent and individual monks. On the one hand, many canons seek, at least implicitly, to restore abbatial authority; on the other, the *Sext* develops the legal personality of the convent. The clearest statement of the abbot’s authority comes in VI 1.6.27, which declares that a religious who has been elected to a “prelacy” (*praelatio*) cannot consent to the election without the permission of his superior.109 His “will is not his own, since he has no ‘yes’ or ‘no’ (*velle vel*
nolle non habeat), but it depends upon the will of him whom he has placed over his own head in the place of God, and to whose command he has subjected himself.¹¹₀ The expression velle vel nolle non habeat runs as a leitmotif through Boniface’s thought on the religious: he uses it to explain why they need the permission of a superior to serve as an executor, and why they cannot chose their place of burial.¹¹¹ Despite this emphasis on the authority of the abbot, Boniface recognizes that the convent can have a right to decide whether to admit postulants together with (insimul) the abbot, and, where this is the case, the convent can admit novices even during a vacancy.¹¹² In a similar way, Johannes Andreae argues that VI 2.10.2 allows the abbot and the convent to send separate legal representatives to a court to make contradictory arguments.¹¹³ The law of the Sext thus reaffirms the authority of the abbot, but gives the convent a significant legal personality.

The Liber sextus’ most important contribution to monastic reform is arguably book five, title seven, De privilegiis, which clarifies the law pertaining to monastic exemption, that is, the freedom of certain monasteries (or sometimes whole orders or networks of affiliated houses) from the authority of the local bishop.¹¹⁴ The exact extent and nature of this freedom varied considerably, but it generally forbade the bishop to perform a visitation, reserved the punishment of monks to the abbot, and allowed the community to look to any bishop for the benediction of a

who were part of larger orders, and would require the permission of a superior in the order (and perhaps the brothers of their house as well). Praelectiones might also include abbacies, since it was fairly common for a religious to be elected as the head of another house.

¹¹₀ “...cuius arbitrium non ex sua, cum velle vel nolle non habeat: sed ex illius, quam vice Dei supra caput suum posuit, & cuius imperio se subiecit, voluntate dependet...” VI 1.6.27.

¹¹¹ VI 3.11.2, 3.12.5.

¹¹² VI 3.14.6. Gl. Pertineat says that the convent can gain this right through a custom, through a privilege, or de iure. Gl. Creari specifies that the right to admit during a vacancy does not apply where the abbot only has to consult the convent (de consensu vel consilio). Gl. Ad vtrumque even allows for the possibility that the convent, rather than the abbot, might have the sole right of admission.

¹¹³ Gl. Illos ad VI. 2.10.2.

¹¹⁴ For Boniface VIII’s concern about the abuse of exemption, see Hourlier, Les religieux, 448.
new abbot. Many exempt houses also enjoyed freedom from tithes on at least a few of their lands. By the thirteenth century, most monastic orders, such as the Cluniacs and the Cistercians, and a small minority of autonomous houses enjoyed some degree of exemption. The topic was a constant source of friction between bishops and religious houses.

*Liber sextus 5.7* clarifies when and how monastic exemption applies, and it curbs the pretensions of exempt abbots to quasi-episcopal powers. The *Sextus* restrains the ability of abbots to bless the people, or to confer tonsure, and regulates their ceremonial dress. Most importantly, Boniface distinguishes those papal privileges that confer exemption from those that merely convey a more limited form of papal protection. Boniface VIII made an important effort to correct practical and symbolic abuses of the privilege of exemption, and to clarify the law on this topic.

Boniface VIII’s concern about monastic privileges would be echoed in the complaints of the bishops at the Council of Vienne. Before turning to Vienne and the *Clementines*, however, it will be useful to consider the local legislation of the thirteenth century, since many scholars have seen the statutes of Vienne as a summation of this legislation.

### 3.5 English Provincial Law

#### 3.5.1 Provincial, Legatine and Diocesan Statutes

The following section will consider monastic law in provincial, legatine and diocesan legislation, with a particular focus on England. This legislation shaped the reception of papal law, since administrators would tend to read *ius commune* through the lens of local statutes that emphasized certain laws, and, in some cases, adapted the law to local conditions. This legislation is a key part of the legal compendium in the *SR*. After a consideration of local legislation for the religious in general, I will look more closely at three important English collections: Stephen Langton’s provincial statutes issued at Oxford in 1222, the statutes of the legate Otto of Monferrato for the

---

115 On exemption, see Jacques Dubois, “Esenzione monastica,” in *DIP*, vol. 3 (1976), 1295-1306; Constable, *Reformation*, 240-49; Lemarignier, “L’exemption monastique.” Bert Roest has recently emphasized the constant negotiation of the terms of exemption in local struggles for power between houses, bishops and patrons. See *Order and Disorder: The Poor Clares between Foundation and Reform* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 69.

116 VI. 5.7.7, 10.
black monks (1238), and the statutes of the council held at London in 1268 by the legate Ottobuono de’ Fieschi.

One can divide local legislation according to the three groups who promulgated it: legates, archbishops and bishops. Each of these had a different scope, and related to papal law in a different way. Bishops promulgated legislation in local synods. Although the synods often addressed specific disputes and incidents in the diocese, synodal statutes tended to draw on a standard body of legislation, with much borrowing from one diocese to another. In a similar manner, archbishops might hold provincial councils, and promulgate statutes there. The pope typically sent legates to address specific problems, but by the thirteenth century legates often held general reforming councils as well. These councils allowed the legate to learn about matters of particular concern in the region, and to bring papal priorities in reform to the attention of bishops.

In what follows, I have concentrated on English local law, since it is immediately relevant to the SR, and used French statutes as a point of comparison, which allows me to draw on the work of Joseph Avril on local legislation for the religious in France. There has been no comparable study for England, and so I have combined Avril’s research with my own work on English law. I have not considered local law in other regions, partly for reasons of space, but also because the ecclesiastical situation in Italy or Poland, for example, differed considerably from that in England. I have considered legatine, provincial and diocesan law for both France and England.


118 For local law outside of England and France, see, in addition to the statutes in Mansi, G. Briacca, Gli statuti sinodali novaresi di Papiniano della Rovere (a. 1298) (Milan: Pubblicazioni dell’Univer. Cattolica del S. Cuore,
The relationship of provincial, legatine and diocesan statutes to papal law is a complex one. Jacques Hourlier has argued that such local canon law is merely a re-promulgation of papal law.\footnote{Hourlier, \textit{Les religieux}, 27-28.} To some extent this is true, since the papacy set the overall direction for the Church in the ecumenical councils and the official collections of canons, but Hourlier’s interpretation is too simplistic. The direction of legislative influence need not flow only downwards from the papacy. For instance, the first draft of Gregory IX’s statutes for Black monks forbade the religious to admit postulants under the age of fifteen, but the revised statutes increased the age of admission to eighteen, bringing it into line with the legislation of local councils and Benedictine provincial chapters.\footnote{Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” Redactions A and B, c.8 (319-20). Cf. Legatine council of Paris, 1213, II.22 (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 331); Provincial Council of Rouen, 1231, c.48 (ibid.); Provincial Council of Oxford, 1222, c.49 (C&S, 122); Synodal Statutes of an Unknown English Diocese, 1222x25, c.66 (C&S, 151). The monks themselves required that novices be nineteen upon entry, and twenty at full profession. Statutes of the Provincial Chapter of Canterbury, 1219, c.9 (Pantin, \textit{Documents}. I.10); Statutes of the Provincial Chapter of Canterbury, 1278, VII.1 (ibid., I.99). Gregory IX had previously required novices to be eighteen only in houses with strict customs (\textit{dura congregatio}) (see X 3.31.6).}

The papacy had to rely on bishops to instantiate \textit{ius commune} at the local level, and this involved a certain amount of adaptation. Innocent III, in the canon \textit{Cum ad monasterium}, forbade monks to wear linen shirts, but he devoted much more space and attention to restrictions on the consumption of meat.\footnote{Clothing: Provincial Council of London, 1200, c.16 (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 328); Decrees of Galo, 1208, c.5 (ibid.); Paris, 1213, II.21 (ibid.); Oxford, 1222, c.39 (C&S I.118); English dioc., 1222x25, c.76 (C&S I.153); Synodal statutes of an unknown diocese, 1225x30, c.66 (C&S, I.191-92); Synodal statutes of Bordeaux, 1234, cc. 92, 96 (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 328); Provincial Council of Rouen, 1231, c. 39 (ibid.); Legatine Council of Beziers, 1233, c.15 (ibid.); Provincial Council of Saumur, 1276, c.5} Local legislation condemns luxurious and ostentatious clothing frequently, but it makes no reference to meat, except in legatine councils, which have a closer connection to papal law.\footnote{See section 3.3.} Local legislation therefore provides an important witness to the background and reception of papal law.

---

Local constitutions often focus on matters that were of particular concern to bishops. Many English statutes attempted to enforce episcopal rights of oversight and consultation in a variety of contexts, and to prevent monks from withholding tithes.\textsuperscript{123} (Neither of these problems appear to have been a significant concern in French statutes, although it is not clear why this is the case.) Bishops had a responsibility to retrieve apostate monks, and many statutes deal with the problems of wandering and apostasy, although concern about this problem seems to have abated in England after c.1230.\textsuperscript{124} Bishops also had a role to play in ensuring the temporal well-being of religious houses, and the statutes are keen to ensure that houses remain financially stable by limiting the number of brethren,\textsuperscript{125} enjoining regular accounts,\textsuperscript{126} requiring episcopal permission to take loans,\textsuperscript{127} or through general expressions of concern.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{123} Episcopal authority: Oxford, 1222, c.54 (C&S, I.123); Diocesan statutes of Winchester, 1224, cc.68-69 (C&S, I.136); English dioc.,1225x30, c.91 (C&S, I.196); Diocesan statutes of Worcester, 1240, c.81 (C&S, I.316); Diocesan statutes of Salisbury, 1238x44, c.48 (C&S, I.384); Diocesan statutes of Norwich, 1240x66, c.61 (C&S, I.358-59).

\textsuperscript{124} Tithes: English dioc., 1222x25, c.77 (C&S, I.153-54); English dioc., 1225x30, c.91 (C&S, I.196); Salisbury, 1238x44, c.49 (C&S, I.384-85); Diocesan statutes of Wells, c.1258, c.59 (C&S, I.616-17); Diocesan statutes of Winchester, 1262x65, c.36 (C&S, I.709).


\textsuperscript{126} Oxford, 1222, c.55 (C&S, I.123-24); Provincial council of Langeais, 1255, c.12 (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 325); London, 1268, c.49 (C&S, II.788).

\textsuperscript{127} Oxford, 1222, c.38 (C&S, I.118); London, 1268, c.50 (C&S, II.788-89).

\textsuperscript{128} Diocesan statutes of Worcester, 1240, c.81 (C&S, I.316); Norwich, 1240x66, c.61 (C&S, I.358-59).
Local legislation has little to say about the conduct of daily life within religious houses. Far and away the greatest concern in this regard is private property. Several French statutes specifically condemn the practice of giving each brother a sum of money to purchase clothing, rather than providing it from a common stock. Strangely, the English legislation is mostly silent on this issue. The condemnations that survive are not general attacks on property, but narrower criticism of a few specific practices: individual monks holding land ad firmam, monks acting as executors, and the breakdown of communal life, particularly in eating. It may be that the general condemnation of private property, as part of the papal plans for monastic reform, appears more often in provincial and legatine councils, while diocesan synods concern themselves with more specific, and more public, problems. A bishop did not need to be as concerned about a monk hiding a pouch of silver, as he did about inappropriate land tenure.

Some of the central concerns of the Liber extra make little or no appearance in local legislation. The questions about entry into a monastery from X 3.31 are almost entirely absent, except for the requirement that postulants to be eighteen years old. Joseph Lynch has argued that another

---

128 Paris, 1213, (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 325); Bordeaux, 1234, c.125 (ibid.); Angers, 1262, c.3 (ibid.).
129 Paris, 1213, II.19 (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 323); Provincial council of Château-Gontier, 1231, c.25 (ibid.); Béziers, 1233, c.14 (ibid.); Bordeaux, 1234, c.96 (ibid., 324); Provincial council of Laval, 1242, c.7 (ibid.); Samur, 1253, c.16 (ibid.); Angers, 1262, c.3 (ibid.); Provincial council of Bourges, 1286, c.19 (ibid.); Liège, 1288 (ibid.); Synodal statues of Tournai, XX.6 (ibid., 324); Livre rouge du chapitre d’Auch, (ibid., 324); Diocesan statutes of Ely, 1238x56, c.40 (C&S, I.523); London, 1268, c.40 (C&S, II.785).
130 Bordeaux, 1234, c.85 (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 325); Tours, 1239, c.10 (ibid.); Laval, 1242, c.7 (ibid.); Synodal statutes of Angers, 1292, III.152-54 (ibid.); Oxford, 1222, c.48 (C&S, I.121-22); London, 1268, c.41 (C&S, II.785-86).
131 Ad firmam: Oxford, 1222, c.57 (C&S, I.124); Worcester, 1240, 60 (C&S, I.310-11); London, 1268, 43 (C&S, II.786). On holding land ad firmam, see above, chp.3, n.36.
132 See above, n.122.
key concern of canonists and pastoral writers in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, monastic simony, largely decreased in significance as a problem for male religious after 1230.\textsuperscript{133} The evidence of the local legislation bears out this point. Avril claims to have found no statutes condemning monastic simony after 1215, and it is a concern of English councils only in the 1220s.\textsuperscript{134} 

One must admit that legislation for the religious made up only a small part of local ecclesiastical legislation, and some collections of statutes provide only one or two canons on the religious. Nevertheless, some legislators made a clear attempt to include coherent sections on the religious within their statutes.\textsuperscript{135} Avril claims that the statutes of Bordeaux of 1234, which have a section titled “De abbatibus et statu regularium,” were the first local statutes to have such a section,\textsuperscript{136} but England provides earlier instances at the diocesan level.\textsuperscript{137} There are a few examples from later in the century.\textsuperscript{138} In England, two of the most influential pieces of local legislation throughout the later Middle Ages, Stephen Langton’s provincial statutes of Oxford (1222) and the legatine statutes of London promulgated by Ottobuono de’ Fieschi (1268), both contain robust sections on the religious.\textsuperscript{139} Since these statutes were widely diffused, they made up, to some extent, for the relative paucity of other local monastic law.

\textsuperscript{133} Lynch, \textit{Simoniacal Entry}, 224-25.

\textsuperscript{134} For France, see Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 331. For England: Oxford, 1222, c.42 (C&S, I.120); English dioc., 1222x25, c.75 (C&S, I.153).

\textsuperscript{135} The titles for these subsections differ between collections and between manuscripts (when any title is provided), but they mostly take the form \textit{De religiosis/regularibus} or \textit{De statu religiosorum/regularium}.

\textsuperscript{136} Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 318, citing Bordeaux, 1234, cc.85-97.

\textsuperscript{137} English dioc., 1222x25, cc.66-77 (C&S, I.152-54); English dioc., 1225x30, cc.62-67 (C&S, I.191-92). One might also include Salisbury, 1217x19, cc.100-102 (C&S, I.92-93), and the legatine council of Paris, 1213, II.19-22.

\textsuperscript{138} Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 318 cites the synodal statutes of Liège, Tournai, Angers and Cambrai. To this one can add Ely, 1238x56, cc.38-43 (C&S, I.522-23).

\textsuperscript{139} Oxford, 1222, cc. 38-42, 48-59 (C&S, I.118-19, 121-25); London, 1268, cc. 38-53 (C&S, II.784-92).
3.5.2 The Statutes of Stephen Langton (1222)

Langton’s statutes for the religious have a general topical order, and deal with superiors first (cc.38-42), and then with the religious in general (cc.48-59). The section on superiors concerns the need for accountability, above all in financial matters. Abbots, as well as obedientiaries, should provide a quarterly financial account, either to their superior, or to a committee of monks, and abbesses are not to grant corrodories (that is agreements whereby a lay person would be supported by the monastery for life in exchange for a grant of property) without the bishop’s permission.\textsuperscript{140} Monastic simony is condemned in terms strongly reminiscent of Lateran IV.\textsuperscript{141} Abbots are to change chaplains annually, so that they can always have a reasonably independent witness to their behaviour.\textsuperscript{142} This emphasis on oversight and accounting anticipates the legislation of Gregory IX.

The canons for the religious in general pick up many of the themes that have been discussed above. The religious must live in common, and eat a restrained amount of the same food in a common refectory, giving the excess to the poor.\textsuperscript{143} They must maintain an attitude of penitential silence in the cloister, and only the most trustworthy religious may travel for a compelling reason.\textsuperscript{144} Postulants must be at least eighteen years old.\textsuperscript{145} Bishops have a say in admission to all houses, over the appropriation of tithes, and over the property of nuns.\textsuperscript{146} The religious (except for obedientiaries) may not hold manors \textit{ad firmam}, purchase their own clothing, or make wills.\textsuperscript{147} In most respects Langton’s statutes are a good summary of the concerns of local legislation.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{140} Oxford, 1222, cc. 38, 41 (C&S, I.118-19).
\item \textsuperscript{141} ibid., c. 42 (C&S, I.119).
\item \textsuperscript{142} ibid., c.40 (ibid.).
\item \textsuperscript{143} ibid., cc. 48, 50, 59 (C&S, I.121-22, 124-25).
\item \textsuperscript{144} ibid., cc. 51-52 (C&S, I.122-23).
\item \textsuperscript{145} ibid., c.49 (C&S, I.122).
\item \textsuperscript{146} ibid., cc.54-55, 58 (C&S, I.123-24).
\item \textsuperscript{147} Oxford, 1222, cc. 48, 56-57 (C&S, I.121-22, 123-24). On holding land \textit{ad firmam}, see above, chp. 3, n.36.
\end{itemize}
3.5.3 The Statutes of the Legate Otto of Monferrato (1238)

The role of enforcing Gregory IX’s monastic reform for the religious in England fell to Cardinal Otto of Monferrato, who arrived as a legate in 1237. Otto came to a country well supplied with monastic legislation. The English Benedictines had actually been holding provincial chapters, and we have already seen that there was a growing body of diocesan statutes, although English bishops may not have been active as visitors. Gregory had already ordered visitations of the non-exempt houses in 1232, and of the exempt houses the following year. Otto, too, had a background in monastic reform; as a legate to Germany and Denmark in 1228-1230, he had made visitations in several German dioceses, where he had provided monastic statutes.

On the octave of Martinmas (November 17), 1237, Otto held a council of the English bishops of Canterbury and York in London, at which he promulgated a set of statutes. As Dorothy Williamson remarks,

“no legatine constitutions previously published in England had the unusual authority which those of Otto and his successor Ottobuono retained throughout the middle ages [sic]... there is evidence of their inclusion in almost every library of any size. They profoundly influenced the episcopal legislation of the century, they were absorbed into the church law of Scotland and Ireland.”

Although Otto’s statutes are important, they made little contribution to monastic law, particularly when compared with Langton’s statutes. In the only statute on monastic matters, he commends

---


151 ibid., 168-69.

152 C&S, I.245-59.

the recent chapter of black monks for forbidding meat and requiring the presidents of the chapter to punish any abbot who does not compel his novices to make a formal profession after one year. He extends these provisions to all regular canons and nuns.\footnote{154}{Legatine Council of London, 1237, c.19 (I.253-54). Williamson, “Cardinal Otto.” 167 claims that this statute was never enforced, except at Durham.}

At the council of 1237, Otto made it clear that he intended to publish separate legislation for the religious through their chapter meetings, and, indeed, he promulgated a detailed set of statutes for the black monks early in 1238.\footnote{155}{“On other matters, which we know to pertain to the correction or reformation of both the canons and other regulars, we intend to provide... and we will order statutes to be solemnly published through their chapters. (Super aliis vero, quæ ad correctionem vel reformationem tam canoniciorum quam aliorum regularium noverimus pertinere, providere intendimus... et statuta mandabimus per eorum capitula sollemniiter publicari.)” Matthaei Parisiensis monachi Sancti Albani chronica majora, ed. H. R. Luard, vol. 3, RS 57 (1872-1883), 433. Matthew Paris provides the statutes in “Statuta nigri ordinis reformandi,” in Chronica majora, III.499-516.}

In 1239, he presented these statutes to the bishops as a guide for visitation, but he followed Gregory’s lead in tempering some of his sterner pronouncements.\footnote{156}{Williamson, “Cardinal Otto,” 170.} Otto is at pains to underline the derivative quality of his statutes: “We have caused to be gathered and recorded certain things from the Rule of the holy father Benedict, as well as from the sacred councils and canonical sanctions, as well as from the statutes of the abbots of the same order of the blessed Benedict.”\footnote{157}{“quaedam tum ex sancti Benedicti patris regula, tum ex sacris conciliis et canonicis sanctionibus, tum ex statutis abbatum ordinis ejusdem beati Benedicti colligi fecimus et notari.” Otto, Proemium ad “Statuta nigri ordinis,” (Paris, Chronica, III.499).} Most of Otto’s statutes will indeed be familiar from the legislation that has already been discussed.\footnote{158}{Note that, in keeping with the interests of papal law over against diocesan synods, he condemns meat. Otto, “Statuta nigri ordinis,” c. 10 (III.502).} Otto continues Gregory’s attempt to integrate statutes into monastic practice, and to associate them with the Rule of Benedict:

Now that these [statutes] have been read through, let the assembled abbots and priors, hearing that holy religion, reformed not a little through them, may take in a bountiful harvest, receive this word as if it were the Host sent down from heaven, with all speed, having them published in their chapters, compelling transgressors by regular discipline.
Let all of them, moreover, have an authentic copy of these statutes written in their martyrology, so that, recited more often in chapter, they may lodge in the hearts of the listeners, just as the Rule of the blessed Benedict.  

Otto did make one significant innovation at the end of his statutes. In canon sixteen, he declares that, “abbots and priors should have written immediately after the Rule those constitutions and sanctions of the supreme pontiffs that pertain to their orders in particular, which are contained in the compilation of the lord Pope Gregory IX, written under the following titles.” He then lists fourteen canons, taken from six titles, “On Guarantors” (X 3.22.4), “On Payments” (X 3.23.2), “On Seculars Entering Religion” (X 3.31.22-24), “On the Religious State” (X 3.35.2, 6-8), “On Simony” (X 5.3.40) and “On the Sentence of Excommunication” (X 5.39.2, 24, 32-33). As we will see below, Otto’s successor Ottobuono de’ Fieschi took up this project as well, and through him it formed the core of the legal compendium in the *Speculum religiosorum*, and of others compilations of monastic law in the fourteenth century.

### 3.5.4 The Statutes of the Legate Ottobuono de’ Fieschi (1268)

The council of the legate Ottobuono de’ Fieschi, held at London in April, 1268, came after a lull of thirty years in important monastic legislation at the provincial level. It marked the culmination of Ottobuono’s three year mission in England. His primary purpose was to support Henry III in the civil war of the 1260s, but he also found time to exercise the papal right to visit exempt houses. He used proxies to carry out most visitations, but he did make one extensive visitation

---

159 His igitur perlectis, abbates et priores congregati, audientes quod sancta religion per haec non modicum reformata felix suscipseret incrementum, verbum quasi hostiam caelitus missam cum omni alacritate susceperunt, facientes haec in suis capitulis publicari, transgressores disciplina regulari percellendo. Fecerunt autem quamplures haec in martirologio autentice scribi, ut sepius in capitulo recitata, sicut solet regula beati Benedicti, audientium cordibus inhereant. c.31 (III.517)

160 “Item statuimus quod abbates et priores continue juxta regulam scribi faciant constitutiones et sanctiones summorum Pontificum, ad eos et eorum ordines praeceptae pertinentes, quae in compilatione domini Gregorii Papae noni sub infra titulis scriptis continetur...”Otto, “Statuta nigri ordinis,” c.17 (III.503).

161 *De fideiussoribus, De solutionibus, De saecularibus transeuntibus ad religionem, De statu monachorum, De simonia, De sententia excommunicationis.*

in person, of the female house at Sempringham, probably in October, 1267, after which he drew up revised statutes for the Gilbertine Order. Brian Golding has recently provided an insightful account of this visitation and the attendant statutes in light of episcopal legislation. He concludes “that Ottobuono used what he had found at Sempringham... as a blueprint for decrees to be observed by all English nunneries.” Ottobuono was therefore able to draw on recent personal experience of monastic conditions in England, as well as a substantial body of provincial and papal law, when he issued statutes at his council in 1268.

The statutes of 1268 “became the most important single collection of local law for the English Church,” surviving in over seventy manuscripts. The division of canons in the manuscript copies is quite uniform, which strongly suggests that Ottobuono promulgated an official text that spread quickly. There is ample evidence from extant manuscripts and medieval catalogues that monastic communities owned copies of them. Almost one third of the fifty-three canons address the religious life. It is reasonable to say that the statutes of Ottobuono were the single most important collection of monastic law in medieval England.

Ottobuono went on to become Pope Adrian V, dying after only a month in office. One might speculate as to whether, had he lived, he would have issued a set of reforming statutes for the cloistered religious, as Gregory IX had done, and as Benedict XII would do. Ottobuono also took

---


For one particularly difficult visitation, see Graham, “Cardinal Ottoboni and the Monastery of Stratford Langthorne.”

163 Golding, “Keeping Nuns in Order.”

164 ibid., 678.

165 C&S, II.739.

166 C&S, II.740.

167 See, *inter alia*: mss. D1 and D3 above (pp. 55, 61); Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 39 (SC 1892) (St Mary’s York, c.1313); Richard Sharpe, et al., eds. *English Benedictine Libraries. The Shorter Catalogues*, CBMLC 4 (1996), B43.41c, B64.10, 120.595b, 599 (226, 323, 743). These entries refer to a Glastonbury catalogue of 1342x75, a fifteenth-century catalogue of Norwich cathedral priory, and an early fifteenth-century catalogue of St Mary’s, York. For a copy at Sempringham, see Golding, “Keeping Nuns in Order,” 670.
two futures popes as secretaries: Teobaldo Visconti (Gregory X) and Beneditto Caetani (Boniface VIII). Neither of them carried out a legislative program similar to Ottobuono’s statutes. Gregory X had an enormous influence on the friars at the Second Council of Lyon, but he made little contribution to law for the cloistered religious. Boniface VIII legislated extensively for monks and canons, but, as has been shown, his interests lay with issues of jurisdiction and privileges, rather than with the reform of monastic behaviour in general. Clement V would be the true successor to Ottobuono as a legislator.

The influence of the statutes of Gregory IX and Otto of Monferrato for the black monks is evident throughout, and Ottobuono makes few significant innovations. Novices must take a vow after one year, and novice masters are to ensure that they know the relevant rule by heart. Monks should not have private property, including purchasing their own clothing, or holding manors ad firmam, and they are not to engage in business for excessive profit (lucrum). The religious cannot live alone at churches or estates. Ottobuono condemns meat, but it is rather surprising to find no condemnation of inappropriate dress. The economic health of the monastery must be preserved by maintaining the “ancient” number of brothers and by not selling the rights to revenues (liberationes). Finally, Ottobuono renews Gregory’s requirement of monthly confession, although he shifts the emphasis from receiving communion to celebrating the Eucharist as a priest. Canon thirty-nine, Porro cum ignorantia, reissued Otto’s list of fourteen statutes from the Liber extra, adding the requirement that they should be read out “twice in the year in each monastery, that is, on the first day of Advent and at the start of Lent, with

168 For their role in the legation, see T.S.R. Boase, Boniface VIII (London: Constable and Co., 1933), 11-13; Powicke, King Henry III, 527.
169 London, 1268, c.38-39 (C&S, II. 784-85). Ottobuono refers to “the Rule of the blessed Benedict or of St Augustine, or whatever other.” (regula beati Benedicti vel sancti Augustini seu quacumque alia).
170 ibid., cc. 40-41, 43, 51 (II.785-86, 788). On holding land ad firmam, see above, chp. 3, n.36.
171 ibid. c.42 (II.786)
172 ibid., cc.44-47 (II.786-87).
everyone gathered in chapter.”\textsuperscript{175} The requirement to read these canons appears in the same canon as that requiring novices to learn their rule by heart.

The most notable innovation in Ottobuono’s statutes is his technology of enforcement. He maintains the reading of statutes and the requirement for the abbot to give an annual (not semiannual) account of finances to the convent or the \textit{senior pars}.\textsuperscript{176} The statutes of Gregory and Otto had relied heavily on the supervision of visitors, and made only vague pronouncements about abbots enforcing their regulations. Ottobuono completely ignores the institution of visitors, but he gives detailed instructions for proactive enforcement on the part of the abbot and other officials. The abbot is to hold a semi-annual inquisition (\textit{inquisitionem facere}) into private property. The prior or subprior should vigilantly inquire (\textit{vigilanter perquire}) into the condition of the infirmary, thus, in a striking phrase, “applying the practice of visitation (\textit{vistationis exercitium adhibens}).”\textsuperscript{177} Ottobuono
decrees that abbots or priors or, when they are absent, subpriors, frequently ask (at least once a month) the confessors appointed to the monks for the names of the monks who have confessed, so that they can sternly reprove those who do not confess frequently and induce them to confess. We command the same thing to be observed concerning monks established in the priesthood who do not celebrate frequently.”\textsuperscript{178}

Ottobuono casts the abbot and other senior officials in the role of visitors, carrying out an inquisition, for which he provides fairly detailed instructions.\textsuperscript{179} One can understand

\begin{footnotes}
\item[175] “\textit{Predicte vere constitutiones in singulis monasteriis bis in anno, in principio scilicet Adventus domini et in capite Quadragesime, omnibus convocatis in capitulo perlegantur.” ibid., c.39 (II.785). Ottobuono may have taken inspiration from the Statutes of the Provincial Chapter of black monks, 1249, c.44, which order that the statutes of 1249, Gregory IX’s statutes, and the relevant statutes of Lateran IV be read out annually (Pantin, \textit{Documents}, I.45).
\item[176] London, 1268, c.50 (C&S, II.788-89).
\item[177] ibid., c.47 (II.787).
\item[178] “\textit{...statuimus quod abbate seu piores seu subpiores, eis absentibus, frequenter requirant, saltem semel in mense, confessores monachis deputatos de nominibus confitentium monachorum, ut sic illos qui non frequenter confitentur graviter arguant et ad confitendum inducant; quod etiam mandamus circa monachos constitutos in sacerdotio qui non frequenter celebrant observari.” ibid., 1268, c.53 (II.792).
\item[179] The language of investigation (\textit{inquisitio}, \textit{perquirere}, \textit{requirere}) would have associations not only with episcopal and capitular visitations, but the papal inquisition into heresy and the inquests of the royal courts. For the
\end{footnotes}
Ottobuono’s desire to create effective structures of enforcement within the cloister, but the language of his statutes suggests a strange distance between the senior officials and the convent. The abbot, with his separate income, and often separate household may have become a remote figure in many houses, but was the subprior so out of touch that he had to make a visitation of the infirmary?

If Ottobuono’s statutes largely repeat the legislation for the black monks of Gregory IX and Otto of Monferrato, they are still significant because they moved these provisions into the common law of the English Church. The reformers of the 1230s had worked through the internal legislative mechanisms, the *ius particulare*, of various religious orders. Otto had explicitly chosen not to legislate for the religious in his legatine council (with minor exceptions), but rather to issues statutes at provincial chapters, or to revise the statutes of particular orders. The distinction between the general law of the Church (whether papal or local) and the internal law of religious orders was an important distinction in late medieval canon law. Gert Melville has shown that many canonists were reluctant to comment on monastic *ius particulare*, but they had no such reluctance about legatine statutes, as shown by the commentaries of John Acton and William Lyndwood.

3.6 Papal Law IV: The Council of Vienne and the *Clementines*

The *Clementines* were the last significant body of universal monastic legislation before the Council of Trent. They are also connected more closely than any other body of medieval canon common language of the last two entities, see Richard Fraher, “IV Lateran’s Revolution in Criminal Procedure: the Birth of *Inquisitio*, the End of Ordeals, and Innocent III’s Vision of Ecclesiastical Politics,” in *Studia in honorem eminentissimi cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, ed. Rosalio José Castillo Lara, Studia et textus historiae iuris canonici 7 (Rome: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1992), 97-111.


182 For these commentaries, see chp.1, n.48.
law to a single event, the ecumenical council held at Vienne in 1311. The bulk of the Clementines represent the official promulgation of the acts of the council by John XXII in 1317, but the process of moving from the legislation drawn up at the council to the official promulgation was exceptionally convoluted. The lengthy interregnum between the death of Clement V and the election of John XXII was partially responsible for the long delay in promulgation, but it is clear that some canons were revised and new canons added, so that the text of the Clementines is not an accurate guide to what the council declared. It is the Clementines that concern us here, however, since they represent the official form of the text that became the standard point of reference for canonists.

Joseph Avril and Jacques Hourlier have both seen Vienne as the summation of local legislation for the religious (incorrectly, in my opinion—see below), and the papal curia certainly carried out an innovative consultation of the Church during the preparation for the council. Clement V divided Christendom into “nations” (rather than ecclesiastical provinces), and allowed each nation to submit petitions to the curia. A committee of cardinals then received these petitions and compiled them into dossiers (rotuli) for each nation, containing abuses (gravamina) that required correction. The committee then re-organized the gravamina under topical rubrics, and attached proposed solutions (remedia). The major categories were abuses by temporal lords, the morals of the clergy, the relationship between the papacy and the episcopate, and the exemption of the religious. In addition to these formal depositions, the council was also

---


184 The list of canons that appears in COD is based on Müller’s identification of the genuine canons of the council. Lecler and Menache appear to have accepted Müller’s work in this regard.

185 For this consultation, see Menache, Clement V, 284-85, whose bibliography improves upon Lecler, Vienne, 57-61. The nations were: Italy (including Sicily) (7 rotuli), Iberia (5), France (10), England (1), Ireland and Scotland (1), “Denmark” (i.e. Scandinavia) (1), Germany (4). Germany certainly included the entire Empire north of the Alps, and presumably Poland and Hungary as well.

186 Lecler, Vienne, 61.
influenced, to at least some extent, by William Durandus the Younger’s *De modo generalis concilii celebrandi*, and by a burst of polemical literature on religious exemption.\(^{187}\) There is ample evidence that Clement made a considerable effort to consult the broader church.

The apparent interest in consultation was not reflected in the meeting of the council, to which Clement invited only a representative selection of bishops.\(^{188}\) At the end of the council, Clement declared that he had not formally read out some statutes, and that these would be delivered to the universities at a later date.\(^{189}\) According to Johannes Andreae, some canons were read again at a meeting at Montreux in 1314, with more canons added. The exact status of the canons was still uncertain at the time of Clement’s death, although unofficial copies were in circulation. Many contemporary commentators charged that Clement had ignored the consultative role of the council.\(^{190}\)

The canons in the *Clementines*, as one would expect from their background, reflect a mixture of the concerns expressed in the petitions and those in the papal and legatine legislation. The most-discussed *gravamina* of the religious were various abuses of exemption, and these hold a prominent place in the *Clementines*. Many of the abuses condemned at Vienne have parallels in French councils of the late thirteenth century. For instance, Clement condemns exempt monks who absolve excommunicates, especially in reserved cases.\(^{191}\) One should not overstate how much the canons on exemption reflect local legislation, since the *Liber sextus* had already addressed the problem, and some condemnations in the *Clementines* are effectively reinforcement of Boniface’s program.\(^{192}\)


\(^{189}\) On promulgation, see Lecler, *Vienne*, 145-46; Müller, *Vienne*, 390-408.

\(^{190}\) Menache, *Clement V*, 288.

\(^{191}\) Clem. 3.6.1, 5.7.1. Cf. Bourges, 1276, c.15; Angers, 1279, c.3; Vienne, 1289, c.33 (Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers, 320).

\(^{192}\) E.g. a concern about violating interdicts. Clem. 5.10.1; cf. VI. 5.7.8.
The centerpiece of the law for the cloistered religious in the *Clementines* is undoubtedly canon 3.10.1, *Ne in agro*, a long compendium of regulations on variety of topics. Clement, in *Ne in agro*, does not depend primarily on local legislation (*pace* Avril and Hourlier), but on the statutes of Gregory IX, and, explicitly, on *Cum ad monasterium*. There are parallels to local legislation, but Gregory IX clearly shaped Clement’s concerns; detailed parallels abound. The superior must explain the Rule in the vernacular, for the sake of the *iuniores*, and there must be a competent novice master. Monks must make a monthly confession. Priors must be ordained as priests. The requirements for confession are related to a general concern about the maintenance of proper worship as the central activity of the monastery. Other concerns appear in both Gregory’s statutes and local legislation, such as monks living alone, and the need for proper clothing, which here receives exceptionally detailed attention. Clement ends by reaffirming (*innouamus et approbamus*) Innocent III’s legislation *circa statum monachorum*, with a special emphasis on the provincial chapters and on the provisions of *Cum ad monasterium*.

It would be wrong to see *Ne in agro* as merely a repetition of the Gregorian program for reform. Clement does not mention some of Gregory’s most important concerns, and he adds others that have no parallel in the statutes of the 1230s, or in local legislation, for that matter. Clement omits

193 Clem. 3.10.1§2 ; cf. Vienne, c.14 (348-49). Cf. Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” c.45 (329). Joseph Goering has pointed out to me in private correspondence that *iuniores* (here) could be a variant of *minores* (the word used in the statutes of Gregory IX), due to misconstruing the minims in “iuni-“ and “min-,” which might appear identical in a gothic hand without careful demarcation of the ‘i’s. Both terms appear in monastic literature, and might refer to less experienced and less educated, as well as younger, brethren.


198 Clem. 3.10.1§1. See also Clem. 3.1.2 = Vienne, d.9 (*OCD*, 341). Cf. Greg. IX, “Statuta ordinis nigri,” 23-24 (323); Provincial Council of London, 1200, c.16; Decrees of Galo, 1208, c.5; Paris, 1213, II.2; Bordeaux, 1234, cc. 92, 96; Rouen, 1231, c. 39; Beziers, 1233, c.15; Saumur, 1276, c.5; Saumur, 1294, c.1; Angers, 1298, c.1; Liège, 1288 (all cited in Avril, “Les moines et les chanoines réguliers,” 328); Oxford, 1222, c.39 (*C&S* I.118); Eng. dioc., 1222x25, c.76 (*C&S*, I.153); Eng. dioc., 1225x30, c.66 (*C&S*, I.191-92).

199 Clem. 3.10.1§11.
any mention of meat or communal dining.\textsuperscript{200} There is no mention of monastic charity and
hospitality.\textsuperscript{201} Most remarkable of all, there is no mention of the dangers of private property. It is
conceivable that there had been some improvement in the first two concerns, but the endless
litany of local legislation against \textit{proprietarii} suggests that it was an on-going concern. It may be
that Clement thought that there was no point in repeating the extensive legislation of his
predecessors in this matter. Clement also has less concern for enforcement. Apart from
reaffirming the need for provincial chapters, the mechanisms of rendering account and
performing investigations within the cloister, which became increasing elaborate from Gregory
IX through to Ottobuono, are entirely absent from the \textit{Clementines}.\textsuperscript{202} \textit{Ne in agro} is a
substantially different document from Gregory’s statutes, even if it relies on them at many
points.

\textit{Ne in agro} discuss several issues that had not yet appeared in papal legislation. It condemns
hunting by monks, and restricts hunting by the monastic household. The hunter-monk is a well-
known figure, thanks to Chaucer’s anti-monastic satire, but neither papal, episcopal nor capitular
legislation had addressed the problem, although it does appear in \textit{confessionalia}.\textsuperscript{203} Many
statutes of the thirteenth century condemn wandering monks, but Clement is much more specific:

\begin{quote}
Not a few monks... after abandoning their own monasteries... wander about the courts of
princes, and unless their superiors grant their request for a benefice or a stipend, they,
conspiring against them... they have ...their monastery ruined...\textsuperscript{204}
\end{quote}

Monks malingering at courts is one of the “twelve abuses of the cloister” that became a staple of
confessional literature.\textsuperscript{205} Two qualities unite Clement’s additions to the “Gregorian” catalogue

\begin{enumerate}
\item ibid., c.37-39 (327-29).
\item See above 150-51, 164-65.
\item Geoffrey Chaucer, \textit{Canterbury Tales}, “The General Prologue,” ll. 165-207; Stephen of Sawley [?], \textit{Speculum
\item “Quia vero nonnulli monachorum... (proprijs relictis monasterijs se in eis secure morari non posse fingentes, vel
alio colore quesito) per curias principum euagando discurrunt: & nisi à praelatis eorum petitæ oensio ve subuentio
assignetur eisdem, conspirantes in illos... ipsorum... monasteria comburi procurant.” Clem. 3.10.1§7.
\end{enumerate}
of monastic abuses: they seem to go beyond the legislative tradition to draw on confessional and moralizing literature, and they identify gross violations of the monastic order, rather than creeping abuses caused by lax discipline and pragmatic compromise.

It has been common to see Ne in agro as the culmination of the local legislation of the thirteenth century, but it is more accurate to consider it as a reiteration of the papal catalogue of monastic abuses, which we have already encountered in Cum ad monasterium, the statutes of Gregory IX, and the legatine legislation of Otto and Ottobuono. There is much overlap between papal and local legislation, and one should see them as mutually informing, but it is clear that papal law provided the starting point for Clement’s work. Furthermore, Ne in agro modifies its papal exemplars in subtle but important ways, and the impetus for these changes does not appear to lie in local statutes. It appears more likely that Clement combined material from confessionalia and moralizing literature more broadly with specific incidents of serious abuses. Ne in agro is a supplement to previous legislation, not merely a recapitulation of it.

3.7 Monastic Law: General Conclusions

The overall assessment of monastic law in the late Middle Ages has not been positive, even by those who have devoted much effort to studying it. Franz Felten, Joseph Avril and Jacques Hourlier have all made the same criticism: canon law was an artificial imposition that focused too much on prohibitions. There is a tendency to contrast the perceived failure of monastic law with the success of the reformers in the early fifteenth century associated with the abbey of Melk and the Carthusians in southern Germany (one might also think of the Bridgittines in northern Europe). On this reading, the profusion of law did little in the absence of authentic spiritual and intellectual renewal.

Bert Roest, in his work on Franciscan nuns, has put forward a similar argument, contrasting confessors, who understood the spiritual aspirations and time-honoured customs of particular

205 See above, pp.86-88. Gl. Curias principium ad Clem. 3.10.1 points out this connection.

religious communities, and lawyers who wanted to impose an artificial uniformity, and who often failed to appreciate the nuns’s devotional lives. It might be better to refer to inquisitors, rather than lawyers, since many of those who were involved in drawing up statutes or making visitations did not have professional legal training. Benedict XII (Jacques Fournier), for example, is famous as both an inquisitor and a monastic legislator, but he was a theologian, not a canonist. Nevertheless, granted this modification to the typology, there was clearly tension between specific communities and those who worked closely with them as patrons or counselors on the one hand, and those who wished to maintain standards by employing outsiders as the enforcers of central legislation on the other. We have seen the latter instinct running through the legislation of Innocent III, Gregory IX, Otto of Monferrato and Ottobuono de’ Fieschi.

Avril, Hourlier and Felten seem to have expected too much from law. Law is by its nature more prohibitive than prescriptive, and most legislators would have been aware that they were trying to ensure a practical mediocrity. That said, monastic law did have underlying positive ideals, above all the role of monks and canons as worshipers and intercessors before God through the Office and the sacrifice of the Mass. Education became another ideal of monastic law in the early fourteenth century. The personal responsibility of the novice to discern his vocation was another important positive element of late medieval law. Even when all this has been said, it is certainly true that law, and the various mechanisms of enforcement, could not produce the conditions for spiritual renewal. Nevertheless, monks were quite interested in acquiring and organizing canon law, as the following chapter will demonstrate.

---

207 In personal communication.
Chapter 4
The Speculum religiosorum as a Legal Compilation

The section that follows will consider William’s use of canon law in more detail, and suggest a wider context for his activity as a compiler. The first part of the chapter will survey the contents of the legal compendium in the SR, and then investigate the development of collections of monastic law in England during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The second part of the chapter will look more closely at William’s legal methodology. It will consider his selection and presentation of canons and glosses, the role of canon law in the SR, and the place of the SR in the monastic use of canon law in general. I will argue that his work is much more sophisticated than other compendia of the same period.

4.1 The Contents of Speculum religiosorum, I.7, 9

The legal compendium in the SR presents an impressive array of texts from the whole body of universal and English canon law. It includes seventy canons from Gratian’s Decretum: thirteen from the Pars prima, fifty-three from the Pars secunda, and four from De consecratione. It refers to fifty-seven canons from the Liber extra, fourteen from the Liber sextus and seventeen from the Clementines. It also incorporates the work of several major canonists. The Speculum includes twenty-eight canons from English law, mostly from the provincial council of Stephen Langton at Oxford in 1222, and from the council held by the papal legate Ottobuono de’ Fieschi at London in 1268, although a canon each is included from the legatine council of Otto of Monferrato at London in 1237 and the provincial council of John Pecham at Lambeth in 1283.

The legal material in the Speculum religiosorum falls into two parts. The first, corresponding to chapter seven, concerns abbots and other monastic prelates. The second, chapter nine, contains canons that apply to the religious in general. Chapter seven opens with a forceful declaration of the importance of canon law:

An abbot or prior or other superior desiring that he and his convent serve God faithfully and devoutly ought to know the canons and the rules of the holy fathers and the provincial constitutions that pertain to them and their order in particular, and ensure that they are observed by his subordinates. For he who does anything recklessly against the sacred canons, or presumes to speak against them, or willingly consents to those wanting
to act against them, blasphemes against the Holy Spirit... and he who does not wish to obey sacred canons is not worthy to minister at sacred altars.¹

At the outset of William’s compendium of monastic law, he puts the accent on the sacred character of canon law, and its connection to the role of monks as servants of God and intercessors through frequent celebration of the eucharistic sacrifice. He provides as support for his position several canons from the *Decretum, Causa* twenty-five, *quaestio* one.² He then offers his own help to the monastic superiors who find themselves faced with the duty of mastering the canons:

Lest ignorance of the regular canons and aforesaid constitutions may be able to turn any religious from their observance, all the canons and rules and constitutions touching those who do not beg (*non mendicantes*) are here explained simply, and where and from what places they are taken are briefly put into this *summa.*³

William’s opening provides a useful guide to his approach. He intends his work to be a thorough overview of law that can apply to all the non-mendicant religious. He appears to be fairly consistent in calling the provincial legislation of the English church “constitutions (*constitutiones*)” and laws from the *ius commune* “canons and rules (*canones et regulae*).” It seems that one should consider “canons” and “rules” to be synonymous, as reflected in the usage “regular canons (*canones regulares*),” that is, canons that form part of the rule of law. William certainly never refers to monastic rules in the narrow sense of the phrase. The term “holy fathers” is somewhat ambiguous, potentially covering both the popes and the Fathers whose writings Gratian incorporated into the *Decretum.*

¹ “Abbas uel prior seu alius presidens, desiderans se et conuentum suum seruire deo fideliter et deuote, debet scire canones ac regulas sanctorum patrum et constitutiones prouinicales ad eos et eorum ordini precipue pertinentes, et eas tenetur observare, et a suis subditis facere custodiri. Quia qui contra sacros canones aliquid pro terue agit. aut loqui presumit aut facere uolentibus sponte consentit, spiritum sanctum blasphemat xxv. q. i c. nulli fas et c. violatores. Et qui noluerit sacris canonibus obedire non est dignus sacris altaribus ministrare. xxv. q. i c. hac consona et c. generali et c. omnia.” SR I.7.1 (25r).

² C.25 q.1 cc.4-5, 11-13.

³ “Ne autem ignorancia canonum regularum ac constitutionum predictarum ab earum obseruantia quemquam religiosum possit auertere, omnes canones et regule ac constituciones tangentes non mendicantes hic faciliter exponitur, et ubi et de quibus locis assumuntur in hac summa breuiter inseruntur.” SR I.7.2 (25v)
William organizes chapter seven by both topic and source. The chapter opens with a consideration of the qualities of a good prelate, and then shifts to a variety of other topics. There is a clear division between canons from Gratian and papal law, which come first, and later material from the provincial councils. Chapter seven refers to the *Clementines* only three times, and each citation comes in the “provincial” section, often in conjunction with one of Ottobuono’s statutes. Except for these few citations of the *Clementines*, the division of the chapter corresponds to the two types of law that abbots need to know, “the canons and rules of the holy fathers and the provincial constitutions.”

William’s advice to monastic superiors begins with a standard list of desirable qualities in an abbot: “careful in governing, humble, chaste and merciful, sober and demonstrating the divine precepts by word and example.” Superiors should be first in holiness, and if possible, knowledge. They should exercise appropriate care and discipline for each individual, since they bear responsibility for their souls. Monks should, in turn, obey their superior in everything that is not illicit. After this catalogue of the general qualities of a good abbot (or other superior): the topical order of the chapter becomes quite loose. It includes the abbot’s powers of dispensation, ordination, the punishment of serious public offences, the limits of abbatial dignitas in relation to bishops, and the relationship between the abbot and the convent. The final section

---

4 *SR* I.7.39 (30v) cites London, 1268, c.22 (*C&S*, II.770) and Clem. 3.12.1 on the need for guest houses. *SR* I.7.41 (31r) cites London, 1268, c.42 (*C&S*, II.786), Clem. 3.10.1§8, and X 3.35.2.5; 3.37.4 against monks living alone. *SR* I.7.48 (31v-32r) cites Clem. 3.4.1 against abbots simoniacally giving obedientiaries for life.

5 “...cautus in regimine, humilis, castus et misercors [sic], sobrius ac diuina precepta verbis et exemplis ostendens. xvij q. ii c. si quis Abbas.” *SR* I.7.3 (25v-26r) citing C.18 q.2 c.15.

6 *SR* I.7.4-5 (26r).

7 *SR* I.7.6-9 (26rv).

8 *SR* I.7.3 (26r).

9 *SR* I.7.10-11 (26v-27r)

10 *SR* I.7.13-16 (27rv)

11 *SR* I.7.17-19 (27v-28r)

12 *SR* I.7.20-24 (28rv)
of *SR* I.7 turns to English provincial law, which amounts to a reiteration of the constitutions of Ottobuono that are relevant to superiors. William adds only two canons from Langton’s statutes of Oxford. The first requires superiors to change their chaplains annually so as to have more character witnesses. The second modifies a statute of Ottobuono forbidding superiors to sell revenues (*liberationes*) by allowing this when in financial need, with the consent of the bishop. Chapter seven also contains the *SR*’s lone citation of the conciliar statutes of Otto, the canon *Sane*. Chapter seven provides a reasonably thorough, if not particularly organized, collection of law pertaining to monastic superiors.

The contents of chapter seven are not limited only to law. The final section of the chapter (§49-59; fols. 32r-34r) consists of patristic and biblical writings in a “florilegium” style. Indeed, this material comes from several entries in the third part of the *Speculum praelatorum*. William has thus made some effort to include all of the material relevant to religious superiors, whether legal or otherwise, in one chapter. In this respect, as noted above in chapter one, the *SR* is a significant advance in the integration of legal and non-legal material over the *Speculum praelatorum* and *Abbas vel prior*. It is not clear whether William intended to pursue this integration further.

After the intervening non-legal material in chapter eight, chapter nine, “On the canons that monks and regular canons ought to know,” opens with Ottobuono’s statute *Porro cum ignorantia*, which required superiors to read out a list of fourteen canons from the *Liber extra* semi-annually. At the end of the canon, William adds, “and since not all religious remember

---

15 Oxford, 1222, c.40 (I.119)
16 Ibid., c.41 (I.119), modifying London, 1268, c.48 (II.785). Langton’s statute originally applied only to nuns.
17 On *Sane*, see above, chp. 3, n.154.
18 See above, p.51.
19 On this list, and *Porro cum ignorantia*, see above 161-64.
these constitutions, I here touch briefly on the effect of these constitutions, insofar as they pertain to them.\textsuperscript{20} The next fourteen canons of chapter nine are those contained in \textit{Porro cum ignorantia}.

The inclusion of \textit{Porro cum ignorantia} at this point contributes to our understanding of William’s method of assembling his legal compilation. It seems likely that William originally began his compendium of monastic law with the contents of chapter seven, that is, law that pertained to superiors. \textit{Porro cum ignorantia} would have been an appropriate conclusion to such a compendium, since chapters seven opens by explaining that superiors had to know canon law, and would end by showing which canons superiors had to expound to their communities, much as Otto of Monferrato had done when he first promulgated this list of required reading in 1238.\textsuperscript{21} It seems that William decided to carry on and add all the other canons that he thought were relevant to the religious. When he expanded \textit{Abbas vel prior} into the \textit{SR}, \textit{Porro cum ignorantia} provided a natural point of division between two chapters.

Chapter nine largely preserves the distinction between \textit{ius commune} and provincial legislation. William includes considerably more material from the \textit{Clementines} than in chapter seven, but once again, it is not integrated with the other papal law, appearing toward the end of the chapter, after the provincial constitutions. It is likely that William had already come close to completing his compendium when he gained access to the \textit{Clementines}, some time in late 1317 or 1318, and he never fully incorporated them into the main body of papal law. This would suggest that he had already begun his work of legal compilation while he was working on his doctorate in the 1310s, and had largely completed it by 1318.

William makes little effort to organize the canons by topic, beyond grouping two or three together. Paragraphs seventeen to twenty take a hard line against pastoral care, and worldly entanglements of any kind, emphasizing that monks should maintain an attitude of penitential

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{...et quia non omnes religiosi habent memoriam illarum constitucionum, effectum illarum constitucionum, quantum ad eos pertinet hic tango sumaria breuitate.” SR I.9.1 (37v)}

\textsuperscript{21} See above, p.164.
solitude and focus on the psalter, the study of scripture, and the battle against the vices.\textsuperscript{22}

William later concedes that monks can have the charge of churches, but only by dispensation, not by common law, unlike regular canons.\textsuperscript{23} William emphasizes the inappropriateness of cloistered monks exercising pastoral care, and the need for them to return to a contemplative, penitential vocation.

A canon forbidding the study of civil law and medicine provides a natural transition between secular entanglements and the more specific issue of study in secular schools.\textsuperscript{24} This section is notable both for its relative length, and for the heavy reliance on commentators, rather than the text of the canons themselves. The section opens with a canon from Boniface VIII that forbids professed religious to remove their habit in schools, and establishes \textit{ipso facto} excommunication for any religious who engages in \textit{studia litterarum} without the permission of a superior.\textsuperscript{25}

William then adds a quotation from Guido da Baysio on the two requirements for studying sacred scripture (\textit{sacrae litterae}) at a secular school (\textit{studium publicum}). The religious must wish to remain in the cloister, and only agree to go under obedience. When at school, he must aim at wisdom, not glory. After fulfilling these two conditions, a monk “can change his way of life according to his needs.”\textsuperscript{26} To this William adds a passage from Hostiensis on the \textit{Liber extra}, to the effect that religious can become masters, if their superiors order them to do so. This is justified by “usefulness to his own monastery, and to the Church in general.”\textsuperscript{27} Hostiensis concludes by countering two favourite quotations of those who wished to keep the religious out

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} William refers to C.16 q.1 cc.1 (w/ Gl.), 4, 5, 8, 10-11, 36; \textit{De cons.}, D.5 c.33, X 1.39.1. He also inserts a quotation from Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{Sermones in assumptione beati Mariae Virginis}, in \textit{SBO}, vol. 5, 4.3 (246).
\item \textsuperscript{23} \textit{SR} I.9.27 (44r) says that “once monks could not have charge of churches, except by necessity; today they can by compelling utility, but regular canons can licitly be elected to the governance of churches even by common law. (Monachi non poterant olim prefici ecclesiis nisi ex neecessitate; hodie possunt utilitute suadente set regulares canonici licite possunt eligi ad regimen ecclesiarem etiam de iure communi).” William cites C.16 q.1 \textit{in summa} and Gl. \textit{Regimen in presbyteros} ad X 3.35.5.
\item \textsuperscript{24} \textit{SR} I.7.22-24.
\item \textsuperscript{25} VI 3.24.2.
\item \textsuperscript{26} “monachus... potest agere et mutari quantum pertinet ad propriam necessitatem.” \textit{SR} I.9.23 (43v) citing Guido da Baysio, \textit{Apparatus} in VI 3.24.2.
\item \textsuperscript{27} “utilitatis proprii monasterij et generalis ecclesie.” \textit{SR} I.9.23 (43v).
\end{itemize}
of the schools: “Monks do not have the office of teaching, but of lamentation,” and “A good monk scarcely ever makes a good cleric.” William draws extensively on the commentators to present a positive, if cautious, picture of monastic studies, a position that may have grown out of friendly contact with monastic scholars at Oxford.  

Paragraphs forty-nine to sixty-seven cover English provincial law. In chapter nine, unlike in chapter seven, William draws on canons from Langton’s council at Oxford and from Ottobuono’s statutes in roughly equal amounts. He includes Clement’s constitution *Ne in agro* with these provincial constitutions, rather than with the rest of the *Clementines*. There is also some evidence early in chapter nine that he had begun to more fully integrate provincial and papal law, since he adds provincial law to the fourteen canons from *Porro cum ignorantia* where their topics overlap. The integration of different legal sources is more developed in chapter nine than in chapter seven.

William follows the provincial constitutions with a thorough collection of monastic law from the *Clementines*, as one might expect from chapter seven, but the final portion of chapter nine is rather surprising. William suddenly turns to a discussion of entry into religion, and his material comes not from law, but from Thomas Aquinas via John of Freiburg’s *Summa confessorum*. It is not clear why he includes this in chapter nine, but John of Freiburg who is known for

---

28 Other topics covered in chapter nine include promotion to bishop, pope prior (*SR I.9.30-32* [44rv]), legal procedure against the religious (*SR I.9.35-36* [45r]), tithes and other ecclesiastical revenues (*SR I.9.37-38* [45rv]), avoiding cares and distractions (*SR I.9.41-44* [45v-46r]), and fornication or other inappropriate contact with women (*SR I.9.47-49* [46r]).


30 *SR I.9.6* (38v-39v) provides the text of X 3.35.6 (*Cum ad monasterium*), but also cites London, 1237, c. 19 (I. 253-54), London, 1268, c.44 (II.786) and Clem. 3.10.1§11 (*Ne in agro*). Otto and Ottobuono are relevant because they both condemn the eating of meat. The last paragraph of *Ne in agro* reaffirms *Cum ad monasterium*. William recognizes a line running from *Cum ad monasterium* through the legatine legislation of the thirteenth century to Clement V’s canon *Ne in agro*.

31 *SR I.9.7* (39v-40r) cites X 3.3.5.7, which establishes the provincial chapters, but also cites Lambeth, Prov, 1281, c. 16 (II. 911). This is the sole citation of Pecham’s council, and it appears here because he orders the presidents of the provincial chapters to take measures against secular interference in monasteries.

31 *SR I.9.79-83* (53r-54r) citing *Summa theologiae*, Ila-IIae, Q.189, aa. 3, 8-9 via John of Freiburg, *Summa*, III.28.8, 15, 18, 22 (140r-41v). William explicitly cites Aquinas, not the *Summa confessorum*. 

integrating theology and canon law, did add legal citations to the material from Aquinas, which may have merited its inclusion with law.\textsuperscript{32} It could also be that William thought that Aquinas merited inclusion because he provided a good, succinct account of the complex issues of entry into religion.

The extent to which the \textit{SR} includes the available monastic law varies greatly depending on which body of law one considers. For English provincial law from the province of Canterbury, he is notably thorough. He includes all relevant canons from Ottobuono’s provincial statutes. His coverage of Archbishop Langton’s statutes of Oxford is more selective, but still extensive. The canons that he passes over are either redundant, or difficult to reconcile with later law. The provincial statutes of Otto of Monferrato and John Pecham contained much less monastic law. William provides the reader with a thorough collection of English provincial law, in which the statutes of Ottobuono provide the core of the legislation.

The \textit{SR}’s coverage of Gratian’s \textit{Decretum} is harder to assess, due both to the enormous size of Gratian’s work, and the difficulty of determining what qualifies as a “monastic” canon. As a starting point for assessing his approach, one can compare his selections from the \textit{Decretum} to the ones made by Mario Sinopoli and Jacques Hourlier, who wrote the most extensive modern studies of monastic law in the \textit{Decretum}.\textsuperscript{33} In the \textit{Pars prima}, there is not a single canon cited by both the \textit{SR} and either Sinopoli or Hourlier. In large part this is because William, as a typical medieval jurist, is much freer than modern scholars in interpreting canons that appear to have little or nothing to do with monastic law.\textsuperscript{34} Hourlier and Sinopoli provide a representative sample of the corpus of monastic law in \textit{Causae} sixteen to twenty, but William is more selective. He devotes most of his attention to C.16 q.1, and to \textit{Causa} eighteen; he never cites C.16 qq.2-7, and cites \textit{causae} seventeen, nineteen and twenty only once each. Outside of C.16-20, William largely agrees with modern commentators in identifying the most important parts of the \textit{Pars secunda} as C.1 q.1, C. 11 q.1, C.12 q.1 and \textit{Causa} twenty-seven. The \textit{SR}, however, includes canons from \textit{De}

\textsuperscript{32} C.19 q.2 c.2; Gl. ad X 3.31.18; Innocent IV, \textit{Apparatus in X} 3.31.18.

\textsuperscript{33} Sinopoli, “Influenza di Graziano;” Hourlier, \textit{Les religieux}.

\textsuperscript{34} This also highlights a significant weakness of the work of Sinopoli and Hourlier: they both largely ignore the Gloss and other indications of medieval reception of the canons.
consecratione, which neither Hourlier nor Sinopoli mention. William of Pagula, in comparison with modern scholars, found more monastic law through creative interpretation of the Pars prima, but he provided less thorough coverage of causae sixteen to twenty.

William’s approach to the Liber extra resembles his treatment of the Decretum: he draws on canons widely, but he does not thoroughly cover the core titles on monastic law. He never cites X 3.36 De domibus monachorum, ut sit episcopo subiectae, and he cites X 3.37 De capellis monachorum only once. He includes only a third of the canons from X.3.31 De transeuntibus ad religionem. His coverage of X 3.35, on the other hand, is notably thorough. The main criterion for omitting canons appears to be redundancy, either because the title contains a large number of canons that cover the same ground, as in X 3.31, or because William cites similar canons from other sources, which appears to be the case for X 3.37. The omission of any canon from X 3.36 is somewhat harder to explain.

For the Liber sextus, he once again makes sparing use of titles where there is some redundancy, including 3.14 de transeuntibus ad religionem, 3.18 de capellis monachorum and 5.7 de privilegiis. William does use the only canon in 3.16 de statu monachorum, the famous bull Periculoso on the claustration of nuns. He extracts from this source the principle that one can impose a stricter life on the religious against their will. The SR includes almost all of the relevant canons from the Clementines. The only notable omission is Clem. 5.6.1, which condemns a long list of abuses that secular prelates commit against the religious.

William refers to only a small number of the most prominent commentators on canon law. For the Decretum, this means the Glossa ordinaria. For the Liber extra, William uses the Glossa ordinaria, Innocent IV’s Apparatus, and Hostiensis’ Lectura (but not the Summa). For the Liber sextus he refers to Johannes Andreae’s gloss, Guido da Baysio’s Apparatus and Johannes Monachus’ Glossa aurea, and it is possible that William used a manuscript that combined these

35 Cited with Innocent IV, Apparatus in V libros decretalium (Frankfurt, 1570), in X 3.31.9.
36 I have used the Glossa ordinaria as it appears in Corpus iuris canonici... (Rome, 1586).
37 Innocent IV, Apparatus (Frankfurt, 1570); Hostiensis, In primum decretalium librum commentaria.... (Venice, 1581, reprint, Turin: Bottega D'Erasmo, 1965).
three commentaries into a single text.\textsuperscript{38} He uses no commentary for the \textit{Clementines}, since he was writing before Johannes Andreae wrote his gloss on them. William’s use of commentators does not demonstrate a deep knowledge of the canonists, but it compares favourably with William’s near-contemporary John Acton, who relied largely on Guido da Baysio for his commentary on the statutes of Otto and Ottobuono.\textsuperscript{39}

William’s treatment of monastic law covers all of the major themes that have been discussed above, but certain topics do appear more or less prominent in the \textit{SR} than in canon law as a whole. Entry into religion, the relationship between monks and bishops, privileges and restrictions of pastoral care occupy relatively little space in the \textit{SR}. William does not neglect these topics, but the legislation was vast and often contradictory or redundant, so he was able to summarize and harmonize it in a few paragraphs. Education, in contrast, has a more prominent place in the \textit{SR} than it does in canon law as a whole. This may reflect the strong interest in fostering education during William’s lifetime, as demonstrated by Boniface VIII’s bull \textit{Cum ex eo}, several canons of the \textit{Clementines}, and the statutes of Benedict XII for the religious.\textsuperscript{40}

William also dedicates disproportionate attention to provincial law, which is understandable, since this law formed a manageable body, and it included the provisions that primates and legates had taken particular care to enforce in the English church.


4.2 Compilations of Monastic Law

William of Pagula’s compendium was not an isolated work; rather, he participated in a larger intellectual project to organize monastic law.\textsuperscript{41} The following section will survey other legal compendia in late medieval England, and situate William’s work within this genre. William’s compendium stands out for its size and sophistication. He includes more canons than any other compiler, and he makes references to commentaries, as well as to the canons themselves. The following section will show that although William of Pagula was not the only compiler of monastic law in late medieval England, but he was probably the best.

The legate Otto provided the first attempt at a compendium of monastic law in England when he promulgated his list of fourteen statutes from the \textit{Liber extra}.\textsuperscript{42} Ottobuono re-promulgated this list in 1268 in the canon \textit{Porro cum ignorantia}, and ordered them to be read out regularly in chapter.\textsuperscript{43} There is evidence for many copies of Ottobuono’s statutes in medieval monastic libraries, so knowledge of this list was widespread.\textsuperscript{44} There is also evidence of stand-alone lists of the fourteen canons in full. For example, two manuscripts in the 1389 catalogue of St Mary’s Priory, Dover contain such a compilation, as does Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, Misc. Charter 5725r.\textsuperscript{45} William of Pagula used \textit{Porro cum ignorantia} as a starting point for chapter nine of the \textit{SR}.\textsuperscript{46} It was still being copied at Durham in the early fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{47}

It was a common practice for monastic compilers to combine the fourteen statutes with English provincial legislation, either Otto’s statutes of 1238, or, later, Ottobuono’s statutes of 1268. This

\textsuperscript{41} James Clark, \textit{Benedictines}, 233 comments that “to [the academic legal curriculum] the monastic canonists made no original contribution. Yet it appears they did develop new approaches in the narrower study of canons that addressed the monastic orders directly.”

\textsuperscript{42} See above, p.164.

\textsuperscript{43} See above, p.166-67.

\textsuperscript{44} See above, chp.3, n.169.


\textsuperscript{46} See above, p.178-79.

\textsuperscript{47} Durham, B.IV.41 (\textit{DI}), fols. 31v, 120v-22v.
is how Otto’s statutes appear in the *Chronica maior* of Matthew Paris.\(^{48}\) British Library, MS Stowe 930, a miscellany composed at Durham in the third quarter of the thirteenth century, contains Otto’s list of canons and a selection from his statutes (fols. 73r-74).\(^{49}\) After 1268, it became common to combine the fourteen canons with the legatine statutes of Ottobuono as well. Entry no.1552n in the fifteenth-century catalogue of St Augustine’s abbey, Canterbury, records “Statuta summorum pontificum et ottonis et ottobonis de statu monachorum.” It appears that the manuscript dates to the last quarter of the thirteenth century.\(^{50}\) One cannot know which “statuta summorum pontificum” were included in this lost compilation, but it is reasonable to suppose that it included at least the fourteen canons commended by Otto and Ottobuono.\(^{51}\) Bodleian MS Bodley 39 (SC 1892), fol. 38r-52r, from St Mary’s Abbey, York, dating to 1310 x 1320, contains the canons pertaining to the religious from Ottobuono’s statutes of 1268, along with the now familiar fourteen canons.\(^{52}\) By the time of the *SR*, the compilations formed by some combination of the provincial statutes of Otto and Ottobuono and their list of fourteen essential canons were a well-established part of monastic libraries.\(^{53}\)

This “legatine” compilation had an enduring appeal, since it provided an officially-sanctioned list of the bare essentials of monastic law, but its usefulness was limited. It hardly provided a satisfactory guide to monastic law as a whole, since it ignored Gratian’s *Decretum*, and gave only a cursory selection of canons from the *Liber extra*. The problem became more acute after

---

\(^{48}\) See above, chp. 3, n.157.


\(^{50}\) B. C. Barker-Benfield, ed., *St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury*, vol.2, CBMLC 13 (2008), no.1552 (1461-65). Parts of this manuscript survive as London, British Library MS add. 27660, although the extant version lacks the collection of statutes.

\(^{51}\) Barker-Benfield, *St Augustine’s Abbey*, no. 1550a (1458) records “Decretales et constituciones legatorum super ordinem monachorum.” This may be another copy of the work in *St Augustine’s Abbey*, 1552n. One cannot date this manuscript with any precision.

\(^{52}\) For this manuscript see Pantin, *Black Monks*, I.61-62.

\(^{53}\) Not all compilations conformed to this model. Cambridge, UL ii.i.5, fols. 64r-69v, an early fourteenth-century manuscript of unknown origin, contains a list of canons “De statu monachorum” that begins with X 3.35.2 (*Monachi*) and ends with canon forty-seven (*De infirmis*) of Ottobuono’s 1268 statutes. This text may be incomplete. For this manuscript, see Pantin, *Black Monks*, 62-63.
the promulgation of the *Liber sextus* in 1298 and the *Clementines* in 1317. It is therefore not surprising that more extensive compendia of monastic law appeared in the fourteenth century.

The most important compendium in England, apart from William of Pagula’s work, is a collection that I will call ‘*Abbati vel monacho*’, after its incipit. This is an impressive compendium that covers canon law from Gratian’s *Decretum* to the *Clementines*. There are five known copies of ‘*Abbati vel monacho*’, although two of these are now lost. The extant copies come from Durham: B.IV.26, 127v-42v (s.xiv
ex
), and B.IV.41, fols. 30r-31r (s.xv) and fols. 113r-20r (these copies were made separately, and only later bound into the same manuscript). One can note that both of these manuscripts contain copies of *Abbas vel prior*. The copy in B.IV.41, fols. 113r-20r likely dates to between 1416 and 1430, since it is in the hand of John Fishburne, the librarian in this period, whose copying activity seems to have coincided with his time in office. The copy in B.IV.41, fols. 30r-31r provides only a list of references to the canons (e.g. “abbati d.liiij”), not their full texts. The two lost copies appear in the catalogue of Dover Priory made in 1389. ‘*Abbati vel monacho*’ was present in monastic libraries at opposite ends of England, which had no particular connection to each other.

It is impossible to determine the geographical origin of *Abbati vel monacho*, or to establish when it was composed with any specificity. It is possible to provide a *terminus a quo* of 1317, since it includes the *Clementines*, and a *terminus ante quem* of 1389, since it appeared in the Dover priory catalogue that year. This means that it cannot be older than William’s compendium, and may be one or two generations later. It would be tempting to identify Durham as the place of composition, since that house clearly had an interest in legal compendia going back to the mid-

---

54 I discuss these manuscripts above as D1 and D3.
55 Pantin, *Black Monks*, II.xii. For Fishburne’s circle, see above p.43.
56 Stoneman, *Dover Priory*, nos. 206e, 278op (107, 125). Entry 278 records two halves of the compendium as two separate works.
57 Dover priory was nominally a dependent priory of Christ Church, Canterbury. It had, however, been an independent house before the mid-twelfth century, and there was a long struggle for authority between the priory, Christ Church, the archbishop of Canterbury and the Crown. As a result, St Mary’s retained more autonomy than most dependent priories. William Page, ed., “Houses of Benedictine Monks: The Priory of Dover,” in *A History of the County of Kent*, vol. 2, Victoria County History (London: The St. Catherine Press, 1926), 133-137, online, British History Online.
thirteenth century, but the extant copies from Durham post-date those from Dover. Whatever the place of origin, it seems likely that the meeting of national, rather than provincial, chapters of Black monks after 1336 helped to spread such texts widely. One might compare the movement of *Abbas vel prior* from Durham to Reading.\(^{58}\)

*Abbatii vel monacho* includes seventy-six canons, twenty-eight from Gratian’s *Decretum*, thirty from the *Liber extra*, ten from the *Liber sextus*, and eight from the *Clementines*.\(^{59}\) It begins with *Decretum* D.54, c.22 (*Abbatii vel monacho*) and ends with Clem. 3.10.1 (*Ne in agro*). The SR and *Abbatii vel monacho* share twelve canons in the *Decretum*, nineteen in the *Liber extra*, five in the *Liber sextus*, and five in the *Clementines*. In other words, about half the canons in *Abbatii vel monacho* also appear in the SR. There is more overlap between the two collections when one looks at titles, rather than specific canons. Both works draw on X 1.5 (*De electione*), X 1.9 (*De renuntione*), X 1.11 (*De temporibus ordinationum*), X 2.28 (*De appellationibus*) and X 3.1 (*De vita et honestate clericorum*), but they select different canons from these titles. The two collections also have a similar emphasis at certain points. In the monastic corpus of *Decretum*, CC.16-20, they focus almost exclusively on C.16 q.1 and C.18 q.2. The most significant divergence involves titles X 3.35 (*De statu monachorum*) and X 3.37 (*De capellis monachorum*). William of Pagula covered X 3.35 extensively, and ignored X 3.37; *Abbatii vel monacho* gives X 3.35 only cursory coverage, but includes most of X 3.37.

The reader may have noted that many of the examples of legal compendia discussed above come from three libraries: Durham Cathedral Priory; St Augustine’s, Canterbury; and St Mary’s, Dover. This probably reflects bias in the available sources more than the situation in the Middle Ages. St Augustine’s and Durham did have impressive libraries, and the profusion of monastic *legalia* at Durham may reflect a particular interest there, but exceptionally good evidence survives for the libraries of these three houses. The catalogues of Dover and St Augustine’s are among the best from medieval England, while manuscripts from Durham have survived in large

---

\(^{58}\) Benedict XII had reorganized the meetings of the Benedictine Chapters into larger geographical territories, rather than ecclesiastical provinces. There were, for example, four chapters in Germany and one in England. See Boehm, “Papst Benedikt XII,” 304-05; Pantin, “Provincial and General Chapters,” 212-15; idem, *Documents*, II.v.

\(^{59}\) I base my comments on the canons as they appear in Durham, B.IV.26, fols. 127r-42v. The number of canons in the extant versions varies slightly.
numbers, and they are exceptionally easy to identify.\textsuperscript{60} The less extensive catalogues and less well-preserved libraries of other houses mean that it is difficult to assess their use of monastic law. For example, one would dearly like to know more about the contents of the work that a late fourteenth-century catalogue of Peterborough Abbey lists as “Quedam decretales epistole ad ordinem monasticum pertinentes,”\textsuperscript{61} but there is no way to do so.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 271 provides another example of the difficulties of dealing with this material. On fol. iv\textsuperscript{v} a neat fourteenth-century textualis hand has added fifteen “decretales ad monachos pertinentes,” which proves to be the list of Otto and Ottobuono, with addition of a single canon from the Liber sextus, VI 3.14.2 (Non solum) which deals with the probation of novices. This list takes the form of a branching diagram arranged by book, title and canon. The volume comes from the library of St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury, but the medieval catalogue describes only the principle works in the volume, as is typical in such catalogues.\textsuperscript{62} Had the manuscript disappeared, the medieval catalogue would be of no help, and a modern scholar would be hard pressed to find the extant text, but for the thorough work of M.R. James.

There is a considerable similarity in the contents of the manuscripts containing the compendia of monastic law discussed above, as the following table makes clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>SM1</th>
<th>SM2</th>
<th>SM3</th>
<th>SM4</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard, \textit{De praec. et disp.}</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Regula S. Benedicti}</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of Chapters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{60} James Carley made the point about Durham’s exceptional status in personal communication.


\textsuperscript{62} Barker-Benfield, \textit{St Augustine’s Abbey}, no. 1632 (II.1542-43).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langton, Statutes, 1222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict XII, Statutes, 1336</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto, Statutes, 1237</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottobuono, Statutes, 1268</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1 = St Augustine’s 1552
Y = Bodley 39
U = Cambridge, UL II.1.5
SM1 = St Mary’s, Dover, 206
SM2 = St Mary’s, Dover, 212
SM3 = St Mary’s, Dover, 277
SM4 = St Mary’s, Dover, 278
D1 = Durham, B.IV.26
D2 = Durham, B.IV.41
C2 = St Augustine’s, 1550

There seems to be a clear “package” of texts that accompany the monastic legal *compendia*, including the *Rule of St Benedict*, Bernard of Clairvaux’s *De praecepto et dispensatione*, the statutes of various provincial and general chapters, and Benedict XII’s statutes (for manuscripts after 1336). English legislation, apart from the legatine statutes, appears infrequently. This suggests a coherent intellectual project across time and across different houses. It is worth noting that although *Abbas vel prior* appears in compilations of this kind, the *SR* appears in a much wider variety of manuscripts.

At the present stage of research, I am not able to say to what extent these compilations were an English phenomenon. I have made some preliminary soundings in library catalogues from monasteries associated with the reform of Melk, but I have yet to find more than one or two canons together. A fifteenth-century manuscript from Melk, Stiftsbibliothek MS 420 (H37), fol.
24, contains a text titled “Innocentius III libro III Decretalium de regularibus.” This proves to be *Cum ad monasterium*, without its opening sentence (so that the incipit is “Prohibemus quoque districte”). Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek MS 662 (1369), fols. 103r-09v, which was composed at the Swabian abbey of Ottobeuren, shortly after the monastery was reformed according to the customs of Melk, includes a work “De statu monachorum exordium.” This appears to be the full text of *Cum ad monasterium* and *Ne in agro*, and perhaps a few other canons from the *Liber extra*. These large canons were themselves small compendia of monastic legislation, but there is no evidence of an attempt to collect multiple canons.

William of Pagula’s compendium of monastic law is clearly a part of these wider efforts, but he demonstrates more sophistication than any other compiler. Alone among the compilers, he introduced a topical division, even if a rudimentary one, between law for monastic superiors and law for the religious in general. William includes legal commentators, as well as canons, and he integrated different canons on the same topic into a single coherent text. Other compilations of monastic law were mere lists of canons; William’s compilation is a synthesis of monastic law as it appeared in the standard legal scholarship of the early fourteenth century. The following section explores William’s methodology in detail.

### 4.3 William of Pagula’s Legal Methodology

The SR differs from other compendia of monastic law in bringing together canons on the same topic, and in referring to academic commentators. Although William refers to commentators, he does not set out to compose a legal commentary. His typical approach is to provide an

---

63 [Vinzenz Staufer], *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum qui in Bibliotheca monasterii Mellicensis O.S.B. servatur*, vol. 2 (Photocopy of manuscript; First volume printed Vienna, 1889), 580. It is unfortunate that this manuscript is too late for inclusion in Christine Gläßner, with Alois Haidinger, *Inventar der Handschriften des Benediktinerstiftes Melk*, vol. 1, *Von den Anfängen bis ca. 1400*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Schrift- und Buchwesen des Mittelalters 2.8.1 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000).

64 For *Cum ad monasterium*, see above, section 3.2.3.

65 Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek MS 662 (1369), fol. 103r-09v. For the reform of Ottobeuren, see Niederkorn-Bruck, *Die Melker Reform*, 202.

66 *Abbati vel monacho* in Durham, B.IV.41, fols.30r-31r does including a subtitle “De constitucionibus clementinis pape. v. in vij’ monachorum ordinem Et [sic] abbates concernentibus,” but this does not correspond to an actual topical division, only to a conceptual distinction.
abbreviation or paraphrase of the relevant canon, often incorporating excerpts from commentators, as he believes them to be useful. The following table provides with the text of *SR* I.7.6, *Decretum*, C.23 q.4 c.28, and the Ordinary gloss on the words *Sine paenitentia* in the same canon. The bold text indicates words that are common to the *SR* and the *Decretum*; the italicized text represents common words in the *SR* and the *Gloss*. I have included words that are not identical when it is clear that William is modifying a word that he has found in one of the other texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>SR</em> I.7.6 (26r)</th>
<th>Gratian, <em>Decretum</em>, C.23 q.4 c.28</th>
<th>Gl. <em>Sine paenitentia</em> ad C.23 q.4 c.28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abbas</strong> grauiiter <strong>offendit</strong>, qui subditum suum contra deum delinquentem <strong>dimittit</strong> inpunitum, quia ea que nobis comittuntur faciliter possumus dimittere. <strong>Ea vero que in deum sunt comissa cum magna discrecione, nec tamen sine penitentia, possumus relaxare.</strong> Et intellige penitentiam, scilicet, interiorem, id est cordis contricionem, sine qua nulli datur venia. <strong>Habita ergo cordis contricione potest abbas partem, plerumque uel totum remittere secundum qualitatem loci et temporis.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Si is, qui praelatus est, debitori Dominico culpas impune dimittit</strong>; non mediocriter profecto <strong>offendit</strong>, qui debita caelestis regis, &amp; Domini sua praesumptione resoluit. <strong>Ea namque, quae in nos comittuntur; facile possumus dimittere: ea vero, quae in Deum comissa sunt; cum magna discrecione, nec sine penitentia debemus relaxare.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sine paenitentia* interiori, scilicet cordis contritione, sine qua nulli datur venia, vt 24 q.2. legatur. &amp; j(^{a}) ea. est iniusta. 50. dist. si quis diaconus habita ergo cordis contricione potest abbas partem uel totum remittere secundum qualitatem personae, loci &amp; temporis, vt 26. q.7. de hiis.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William has reproduced most of the canon, although he makes the general reference to a prelate a specific one to an abbot (a frequent move), and he removes the imagery of debt. He then appends an important gloss to the canon, which explains the nature of penitence. The paragraph, as it stands, is a self-sufficient text that provides a concise version of the original canon with an explanation of its most important ambiguity. The reader is saved from any need to consult the original, let alone the potentially confusing subtleties of the commentators. William, however, is careful to provide his sources, so that a reader who has the ability to work with the original can do so.

The previous example was relatively straightforward, but William can display a remarkable complexity in this work of synthesis. For example *SR* I.7.16, he cites D.69 c.1, with the gloss on the canon, X 1.14.11 and VI 5.7.3, with its gloss. The result is a sophisticated compression of a complex canonical discussion, woven into a seamless whole. In order to produce a coherent text, William has to add more of his own wording. In the table below, sources are identified by different typefaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>SR</em> I.7.16 (27v)</td>
<td>Gl. Tonsura vero ad D.69 c.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.1.14.11</td>
<td>VI. 5.7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gl. Conuolauerint et Quasi episcopalem ad VI 5.7.3</em></td>
<td>Abbas potest conferre <strong>primam tonsuram et minores ordines usque ad lectoriatum</strong> inclusiue, et <strong>per talem tonsuram confertur ordo clericalis</strong>. Isto<strong>s tres ordines</strong> conferre potest, videlicet psalmistatum, hostioratum et lectoriatum, set non potest conferre exorci<em>statum uel acolitu</em>um, nec potest Abbas conferre primam tonsuram et dictis minores ordines quibuscumque, set tantummodo monasteriorum conuersis et illis qui ad monasterium suum conualuerint, ut ibi <strong>fiat monachi</strong> uel canonici, et illis in quos Abbas habet <strong>quasi episcopalem iurisdiccionem</strong> ex iure spirituali. <strong>Ut si Abbas in aliquo loco habeat iurisdiccionem in spiritualibus</strong> ex privilegio spirituali (quam iurisdiccionem episcopus debet alias de iure habere), tunc Abbas <strong>poterit clericare</strong> proprios laicos in quibus habet huiusmodi iurisdiccionem, <strong>etaim non conuersos nec conuertendos, et</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
aliter non, sicut episcopus non potest ordinare laicum alterius iurisdiccionis sine licentia sui episcopi. 67

The SR often presents the solution to a complex canonical debate without referring to the debate itself. In the example that follows, William removes any reference to the large and prima facie conflicting body of canons on the attendance of abbots at synods. For the reader, the Gloss’s solution becomes the sole voice in which canon law speaks on this topic, and one loses the sense of the law as a careful balance of the competing claims of authority. Yet the SR does direct the interested reader back to the Gloss, where he would find the discussion laid out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR, 1.7.26 (29r)</th>
<th>Gl. Diocesana ad X. 1.33.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbas habens populum tenetur uenire ad synodum nisi fuerit exemptus. set abbas non habens populum non tenetur venire nisi causa rationabilis subsit. vnde abbates ordinis cysterciensis eciam si non essent exempti non tenerentur ad synodum uenire quia non habent populum extra de maiortitate et obediencia. c. quod super hiis [X. 1.33.9] in glossa et extra de excessibus prelatorum. c. nimis. 2. [X. 5.31.17] in glossa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesana</td>
<td>Sed quare vocantur abbates ad synodum, contra illud quod legitur 18. dist. episcopus. [c.12] et 18 q. vlt. §fi [C.18 q.2 d.p. c.31]. Respondeo, abbates habentes, populum tenentur venire ad synodum: de quibus loquitur 18. q.2. abbates. [c.16] sed non habentes populum, non tenentur venire, nisi causa rationabilis subsit, vt dicitur in illa palea. 18. distin. episcopus. vnde Cistercienses etiam si non essent exempti, cum non habent populum, non tenentur venire: exempti enim qui populum non habent, non tenentur venire. 18. q. 2. quàm sit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 “An abbot can confer the first tonsure, and minor orders up to and including that of lector, and through this tonsure the clerical order is conferred. He can confer these three orders, that is the psalmist, the porter and the lector, but he cannot confer the orders of exorcist or acolyte, nor can he confer the first tonsure, and the aforesaid minor orders on anyone whomever, but only on lay brothers of the monastery and those who are living in the monastery with intention of becoming monks or canons, and those over whom the abbot has quasi-episcopal jurisdiction through a law governing spiritual matters. For if the abbot has spiritual jurisdiction in any place from a privilege concerning spiritual matters (otherwise the bishop has this jurisdiction according to law), then the abbot can ordain his own laity, over whom he has this jurisdiction, even if they are not lay brothers, and have no plans to convert, and otherwise he cannot do so, just as a bishop cannot ordain a layman of another jurisdiction without the permission of the layman’s bishop.”
William discusses various methods of legal scholarship in the *Summa summarum*, his treatise on canon law. He suggests that this genre is more useful than long-winded academic commentary, because “a question is proposed and then answered at once, the exact source of the question and the answer being given without fail.” It provides quick answers to “the many doubtful cases” “in the Roman *curia* and the *curia* of archbishops and other magnates and in various consistories and even rural synods.” At the same time, it guides the more leisurely reader back to the full academic discussion. The compendium of monastic law, in its original context in the *Speculum praelatorum*, furnished prelates and their officials with a useful reference. They had to perform visitations of religious houses, preach to cloistered audiences, and hear lawsuits involving monks, all of which required a sound knowledge of monastic law. The compendium would also be useful for abbots and monastic officials for the same reason.

Administrative practicality played a significant role in the legal compendium’s original context, but this leaves unanswered an important question: how does it fit into the *SR*, a work of devotion and spiritual formation? We have seen that William took considerable pains to integrate his legal compendium into a larger treatise, rather than leaving it in the less developed form of *Abbas vel prior*. The answer to this question requires a close reading of the prologue to the *SR*, which the next chapter will provide.

### 4.4 Law in the *Speculum religiosorum*: Conclusions

William of Pagula’s compendium of monastic law, which appears in the *Speculum praelatorum*, *Abbas vel prior* and the *SR*, belongs to a series of monastic legal compilations that were a staple of at least some late medieval English monastic libraries. Many of these compilations involved some combination of the statutes of Otto of Monferrato for the Black monks, promulgated in

---

1238, the 1268 legatine statutes of Ottobuono de’ Fieschi, and the fourteen canons from the *Liber extra* that both Otto and Ottobuono had commended to the religious. Compendia of this sort appear in the mid-thirteenth century, and they were still being copied in the fifteenth. In the fourteenth century, there is evidence for at least two more extensive legal compilations, William’s and the anonymous collection that I have called *Abbati vel monacho*. *Abbati vel monacho* covers Gratian’s *Decretum*, the *Liber extra*, the *Liber sextus* and the *Clementines*, although it is still significantly shorter than William’s collection, which also includes local legislation from Ottobuono, Stephen Langton, and, to a lesser extent, Otto and John Pecham.

William’s work is not only longer and more thorough than other collections, it is also more sophisticated. He uses the major canonical commentaries, as well as the texts of the canons themselves. Rather than merely producing a list of canons, he carefully edits each canon to bring out its essential point, or weaves together excerpts from several canons and commentaries to create a coherent whole. Other legal compendia offered more or less thorough guides to monastic canons, but William presents a synthesis of monastic law as it was taught in the legal schools of the early fourteenth century. In the next chapter, I will demonstrate that in the *SR* William goes beyond the norms of legal scholarship to present law as a form of wisdom.
5.1 The Text of the Prologue to the *Speculum religiosorum*

The prologue to the *SR* provides a rare moment of guidance on how to approach the heterogeneous material in the rest of the text. The prologue does not identify the author or any specific recipient for the work, but it does suggest how and why one should read the work. William offers a concise answer: to acquire wisdom. He devotes the entire prologue to understanding the nature of the wisdom that the reader will find in this book.\(^1\) Since the prologue contains the most important discussion of wisdom in the *SR*, I here present it in full.\(^2\)

Prologue on Wisdom\(^3\)

1. Take, you religious, this mirror and eat it, for just as honey is good and honeycomb is most sweet to the taste, so is the teaching of wisdom to your souls, as it says in Proverbs 24[:13-14a]. Come to me, therefore, you unlearned and enroll yourselves in the house of discipline, and furnish yourselves with wisdom without money, and submit your necks to her yoke, so that your souls may take up wisdom and regular discipline, as one gathers from the last chapter of Ecclesiasticus\(^4\) and Isaiah 55.\(^5\) And if you seek the way of discipline and wisdom, says Ambrose in a certain letter, to worship God and be subject to him is wisdom, to keep from sin is

---

1. William uses *sapientia* as the standard word for wisdom in the *SR*. *Prudentia* appears only twice, and in both instances he treats it as a synonym for *sapientia*, without any further explanation of the relationship between the two terms.
2. The text is based on Gray’s Inn 11 (*G*), fols. 1r-2r. I provide the full Latin text in Appendix I. For ease of reference, I have added paragraph divisions to the text.
3. The prologue has no title within the text, but the title “Prohemium de sapientia” comes from the table of contents on *G*, fol. i’.
4. cf. Ecclus. 51:31, 33a-34. “Come to me, you unlearned/ and gather yourselves into the house of discipline/... furnish yourselves with [wisdom] without money/ and submit your neck to the yoke/ and let your soul take up discipline.”
5. cf. Isa. 55: 1b-3a: “...come, buy wine and milk without money/ and without payment/ ... Listen, you who listen to me, and eat what is good/ and you soul will delight in the abundance/ Incline your ear, and come to me:/ listen, and let you soul live...”
discipline. Whence discipline is the ordered correction of behaviour, and the observance of the rule of our forebearers.

2. The path of wisdom is two-fold: one of the wicked and one of the good; the first should be reproved, the second approved. Concerning the first path, it is said in James 3[:15]: This is not the wisdom that comes from above, but it is worldly, carnal and diabolical. For the ‘moles’ of this world have worldly wisdom, that is, those who have a passionate desire for the world, just as a mole thinks itself wise underground, but sees nothing above ground. Luke 16[:8]: The children of this world are wiser than the children of light in their generation. This is not true wisdom, to put one’s treasure where one cannot remain long, like a pilgrim—and we are all pilgrims here. Psalm 38:13b: For I am a foreigner and a pilgrim before you, and the wisdom of this world is foolishness before God, as it says in 1 Corinthians 3[:16].

3. Carnal people have a carnal wisdom in preparing pleasures. Romans 8[:6a]: the prudence of the flesh is eternal death. Gloss: He is worthy of eternal death who has the prudence of the flesh, that is, he who more zealously carries outs those things that are of the flesh than those that are of the Spirit. They who are wise in preparing evils and misdeeds have a diabolical wisdom. For the Devil always endeavours to do evil and to snatch others away, and they who are wise in deceiving others act in the same way. Jeremiah 4[:22b]: They are wise in committing evil, but they do not know how to do good. And, according to Gregory in the tenth book of the Moralities: The wisdom of this world is to produce artifice by controlling one’s heart, to conceal one’s meaning with words, to make what is false seem true, to show that what is true is false. Those who understand this wisdom despise others in their pride; those who do not understand it are afraid of and subjected to those who do.

---


7 ps-Cyprian of Carthage, De duodecim abusivis saeculi, c.11 (PL 4.880A).

8 Peter Lombard, Collectanea in epistolam ad Romanos, in Rom. 8:6 (PL 191.1435A). This passage does not appear in Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria (Strasbourg, 1480/81. Reprint Turnhout: Brepols, 1992) or Bibliorum sacrorum glossa ordinaria... cum postilla Nicholai Lyrani (Venice, 1603).

9 cf. Thomas of Ireland, Manipulus flororum, “Sapiencia uel sciencia,” l. ex Gregory the Great, Moralia in Job, vol. 1, 10.29 (143.570-71).
4. Concerning the second wisdom, that is, concerning the wisdom of the good, it is said in Ecclesiasticus 44[:15]. Let the people recount their wisdom, and let the church declare their praise. Whence Bernard: You have found true wisdom if you weep for the sins of your past life, if you care little for the desires of this world, if with all your desire you long for your eternal homeland; you have found the fullness of wisdom, if these things taste to you as they should. And Gregory says in the tenth book of the Moralities: True wisdom is to counterfeit nothing through display, to make one’s meaning clear through words, to delight in truth, to avoid falsehood, to produce good things freely, to bear evils more readily than to commit them, to seek no vengence for injuries, to consider it gain to suffer insults for the truth. This simplicity of the just is derided, and held to be folly by worldly wisemen. For what is more foolish in this world than not to seek what one has lost, to yield one’s possessions to robbers, to return no vengence for the injuries that one has received, but rather to demonstrate patience?

5. Yet nevertheless this is true wisdom, and they who are deceived by the false wisdom of this world cannot attain this wisdom. Augustine says in On the Freedom of the Will: Do not think true wisdom to be anything other than the Truth, in which the highest good is discerned and held. You religious ought to love this wisdom above all, and to desire it with all your strength, since it is said in Wisdom 7[:9b]: All gold, in comparison to this wisdom, is a little sand, and silver is valued as mud when set beside it. You will easily acquire this wisdom, if you observe the things that are contained concisely in the summa before you.

6. And I ask the Lord Jesus Christ, my patron, that he may direct this summa to his praise and honour, and may render it useful to its readers, and may grant that I may come to my reward.

5.2 Law and Wisdom in the Speculum Religiosorum

William opens his text with quotation from the book of Proverbs, an instruction to “eat” the Speculum, and taste its sweetness. This imagery is part of a tradition that connected the

10 Bernard of Clairvaux, Sermones de diversis, in SBO, vol. 6.1, 15.4  (142).
internalization of a text through meditative reading to tasting, chewing the cud, and digestion.  

As Hugh of Fouilloy put it in the De claustro animae: “It sometimes happens that some, through the gift of heavenly grace, perceive the word of teaching, and also sweetly feed their neighbours with the fodder of truth, which they ruminate inside themselves sweetly... The book which is devoured and eaten becomes sweet as honey in the mouth.”  

Arnulf of Bohéries expresses this succinctly in a passage quoted in the SR: “During the time for reading, when you read, do not seek knowledge, but sweetness.”  

Studying the scriptures (or another edifying text) was both sweet tasting and healthful, forming the reader according to the example of holiness contained in the text.  

The metaphor of reading as eating could apply to almost any text, but medieval authors applied the language of sweetness to the study of scripture in particular, building on language in the Old Testament that described God and His Law as sweet.  

Thus, Anselm of Canterbury, in a particularly florid passage, advises a monk to: “Chew on the honeycomb of [Christ’s] words, suck the flavour, sweeter than honey, swallow the healthful sweetness. Chew by thinking, suck...  

---

14 “Et fit quandoque ut tales quique ex dono gratiae coelestis etiam verbum doctrinae percipiant, atque de veritatis pabulo, quod ipsi dulciter intrinsecus ruminant, et proximos suos suaviter pascent... Liber qui devoratur, et comeditur, dulcis in ore sicut mel efficitur.” De claustro animae, IV.33 (PL 176.1171D), cited in Carruthers, Book of Memory, 209.  
15 “Tempore leccionis cum ad legendum accedit non querit scientiam set saporem.” Arnulf of Bohéries, Speculum monachorum, l.12 (148) = SR I.23 (74r).  
16 For the connection between sweetness and healthfulness in medieval medical theory, and for concepts of assimilation of eater to food, see Rachel Fulton, “‘Taste and see that the Lord is sweet’ (Ps. 33:9): The Flavor of God in the Monastic West,” The Journal of Religion 96 (2006), 195-99.  
by understanding, swallow by loving and rejoicing. Rejoice in chewing, giving thanks in sucking, be glad in swallowing.”

Few medieval authors cite Proverbs 24:13 (which is rather surprising, given the ubiquity of images of sweetness), but the history of the interpretation of this passage places it at the centre of this tradition of reading as eating. The main commentary tradition originates with Bede, who identifies the *doctrina sapientiae* as the exposition of scripture. He distinguishes the honey (*mel*), which signifies the literal or moral sense, from the honeycomb (*favum*), which represents allegorical interpretation. Any reader can apprehend easily the honey of the literal meaning, but the sweetness in the honeycomb of the spiritual sense tastes better, but is harder to obtain. This interpretation passed from Bede into the *Gloss ordinaria*, and then the postill associated with Dominican master Hugh of St Cher. The mid-thirteenth century Franciscan commentator Alexander the Minorite offers a different interpretation, but one that still connects the passage to the study of scripture. Alexander, in keeping with his Joachimite views, does not distinguish between the honey and the honeycomb, but rather identifies the sweetness in general as the history of salvation that the scriptures recount.

The opening words of the *SR* send its readers a clear message about the way in which they are to approach the work. The reader should savour the sweetness of the contents of the *Speculum*, and

---


19 Bede, *In parabolae Salomonis libri III*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL 119B (1983), II.24 (121); *Bibliorum sacrorum glossa ordinaria... cum postilla Nicholai Lyrori*, vol. 3 (Venice, 1603), Gl. *Comedite fili mi ad Pr. 24:13* (1709). Hugh of St Cher, *Postilla in librum Proverbiarum in Hugonis de Sancto Caro... opera omnia*, vol. 3 (Venice, 1703), 53v. Hugh of St Cher adds another interpretation: the honey and honeycomb represent the doctrine of the divine and human natures of Chirst, the sweetest of all doctrines.

20 “Holy scripture is similar to honey, about which it is said, “Eat honey, my son, for it is good, and honeycomb is most sweet to your taste.” I eat honeycomb with my honey, since it is pleasant, like honey, and medicinal, and sweet. It is sweet, when it recounts the creation of the heavens and the earth, medicinal, when it recounts the restoration of the world, and sweet, when it recounts the giving of gifts (Scriptura ergo sancta melli est similis, de qua dicitur: Comede, fili mi, mel, quia bonum est, et favum dulcissimum gutturi tuo. Et comedii favum cum melle meo, quia ad instar mellis est suavis, est medicinalis, est dulcis. Suavis est, cum recitat caeli et terrae creationem, medicinalis, cum mundi reparationem, dulcis dum praeemii donationem).” Alexander the Minorite (*or of Bremen*), *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, ed. Alois Wachtel, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Wiemar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1955), c.10 (219).
digest them in the memory. In this way the reader will acquire the *doctrina sapientiae*, which consists of the scriptures and the corpus of theological and devotional texts that supplemented them. William, towards the end of the *pars prima*, explicitly tells the reader that they will be required to instruct others in wisdom, both through their knowledge and the example of their lives, informed by the properly digested contents of the *SR*.  

This reading is not merely a passive reception of information; it involves a response that reshapes the reader’s character. William equates internalizing the contents of the *SR* with entering a “house of discipline” and submitting to a yoke. The reader is a pupil or docile farm animal, the *SR* is the teacher or ploughman. William goes on to say that the reader will acquire wisdom only if he “observes” the contents of the *SR*. The verb *observare* can mean “pay close attention to *x*,” but in both a monastic and legal context, it has the meaning of “keeping a rule.” The reader must internalize the words of the *SR*, and then put them into action.

Robert Sweetman has called this approach to the text a “performative reading,” in contrast to analytical reading of the schools. By this Sweetman does not mean that the reader performs, in the modern sense, but rather that the reader allows the text to per-*form* him, that is, in the sense of the Latin *performare*: to shape and mold. The scholarly reader, in contrast, is detached from the text, and comes to it looking for solutions to intellectual and practical problems. The standard approach to canon law, as taught in the schools and practiced in the courts, was scholarly and professional. A practising canonist brought different canons and glosses together and applied them creatively to various cases, whether this was a proceeding in court or a theoretical case designed to stimulate legal reasoning. Such an approach did involve learning an enormous number of legal citations by heart, but, unlike monastic reading, it was not self-reflexive. An effective professional canonist was not necessarily a holy man in the same way that an effective monastic reader would be. William does not invite readers to take this approach to the *SR*. It is a

21 “[A religious] ought to teach healthful wisdom, just as a painter teaches his apprentice, by his work and by spoken instructions. For teaching without a good life is like a letter without a seal, which does not have trustworthy authentication (...debet docere sapienciam salutare sicut pictor discipulum operando et loquendo. Doctrina enim sine bona uita est sicut littera sine sigillo, que non facit firmitatem fidei).” *SR* I.40 (93v).

text that should shape one’s life, and part of this shaping involves living in conformity with the canons.

The structure of the *Speculum* reinforces the message of the prologue. One can see a progression from the most basic essentials of the monastic life, up to devotion and contemplation (with a return to regular discipline at the end). This structure parallels that of many well-known monastic treatises, including William of St Thierry’s *Epistola ad fratres Montis Dei*, David of Augsburg’s *De septem processibus religiosorum* and Edmund of Abingdon’s *Speculum ecclesiae*.  

Edmund’s work provides the most instructive comparison. It opens with a discussion of conversion from the world, and then moves on to an exposition of the beatitudes and articles of the faith, and then to meditations on the Passion and contemplative theology. William has placed canon law where Edmund put the beatitudes. When one considers law as a form of wisdom, the value of William’s synthetic legal method in the context of the *Speculum religiosorum* becomes clear; too much sophisticated scholarship could become the distracting sophistry that so many monastic writers decry.

There is evidence that William was not alone in presenting canon law in a “performative” manner in a monastic context. In 1224 Agnellus of Pisa arrived in England as the provincial minister for the Franciscan order. Bartholomew of Pisa tells us that:

> Agnellus took care for study, establishing humble schools. Later he regretted this, when he saw that the brothers studied trivialities, abandoning necessities. For, when on a certain day he wished to see how the brothers were getting on, he entered to find a disputation, and when he heard them in a noisy crowd, asking each other, “Whether God exists?,” he cried, “Alas! Woe is me! Simple brothers penetrate the heavens, and the learned dispute whether God exists.” And on this account he sent ten pounds sterling to the *curia*, to buy books of decretals, so that the brothers might study them, having put away frivolities.”

---

23 See above, pp.119-21.

24 “Hic Agnellus Anglorum pueros ad ordinem recepit, et scholas humiles statuens sollicitus fuit de studio. De quo aliquando postea doluit, quando vidit, quod fratres studebant in vanis, necessariis praetermissis. Nam, cum die quadam vellet videre, quomodo fratres profecissent, intravit ad disputationem, et cum tumultuantes audiret quærere
One can presume that Agnellus did not intend for his friars to take up the subtle disputations of the decretalists. The point of this anecdote is that he saw canon law as containing the most important things for a friar to know, which would include guidelines for living a holy life, and perhaps also moral instruction for pastoral care and spiritual guidance for the laity. The paradigm for the study that he anticipates is a “performativ e,” monastic model, not the detached argumentation of the schools.

Amos Corbini draws attention to another striking comment on monastic law in the *Somnium de quadam diffinitione* of the fourteenth-century Cistercian theologian Peter of Ceffons (fl. c.1350). Peter, in an account of his studies, reflects on the difficulty of knowing all the precepts of the monastic life:

> It seemed that I should say that among one hundred thousand monks, scarcely one thousand may be found who know what these prohibitions and precepts are... I myself do not know their number... For when I consider the Bible, the precepts of the old law and a great volume which is called “the Decretum,” and the seven books of the Decretals, not to mention the *extravagantes*, as well as the ancient councils and synods, which fill a huge volume, and which are hardly included in the Decretum... when I consider that the proper abbots, the father abbots, priors, subpriors and other who have the power to prescribe and prohibit do not cease to do so, now orally, now in writing, it seems to me, considering all this, that none of us lack for precepts... And that is not to mention all the

---

25 I have rendered literally the Latin *abbates proprii*. This expression appears to be a parallel to the *proprius sacerdos*, the parish priest to whom each lay person had to confess annually, and who therefore bore direct responsibility for the souls of his flock before God. The *abbas proprius* would be the abbot with full authority over an independent house, who would have to “render an account” (*rationem reddere*), as monastic writers liked to say, for his brothers. I am grateful to Robert Sweetman for making this point to me in personal communication. See also McGuire, “Taking Responsibility.”
prohibitions and precepts of the metropolitans and bishops, when I think about us in particular, to say nothing of the statutes of the lord pope Benedict XII of blessed memory... I recall in particular that in a certain college I have seen a parchment full of statutes and precepts, called “Reform”... And if you were to say, beloved, “There are not so many precepts as you say, first because all of them are reduced to one or two, secondly because those volumes that you have enumerated are not entirely full of precepts, since many things are found in them that are not precepts,” I would reply, “Granted that all precepts are reduced to one, on this account the multitude of them is not removed. Granted that all sins my be reduced to one of these, either to use what should be enjoyed, or to enjoy what should be used, on this account it is does not follow but that there is a great multitude of sins.”

Peter is here describing his experience at the College of St Bernard in Paris, which, as Corbini points out, is the anonymous college mentioned in the passage. The volume called “Reform” may be a compilation of the statutes of the Cistercian general chapters.

Corbini expressed considerable surprise at finding a reference to a substantial legal library at the College of St Bernard, since Cistercians were forbidden to study canon law in numerous statutes throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. At first this does appear to be surprising, but one should note that the prohibitions are not as sweeping as Corbini suggests. The *Libellus antiquarum definitionum* (1289) is the most extreme in its condemnation: “in those places where studies are allowed, outside of the boundaries of the *studium*, and everywhere else, let no one of

26 “Sed videtur mihi dicendum quod vix inter centum milia monachorum reperientur mille qui sciant quod sunt eis inhibitiones et precepta... Non ego certe ipsorum numerum scio... quando enim considero Bibliam, precepta veteris legis ac unum magnum volumen quod dicitur Decretum et septem libros Decretalium, ut taceam de extra vagantibus, item concilia antiqua et synodos antiquas, quae maximum volumen implent, ac in Decreti volumine minime continentur... cum etiam considero quod abbates proprii et patres abbates priores, suppriores et ceteri qui potestatem habent precipere et inibiere non cessant nunc ore, nunc scripto; appareat mihi omnibus consideratis, quod non est alicui nostrum penuria de preceptis. Et ut sileam de cunctis metropolitanae episcoporumque inhibitionibus et preceptis, cum de nobis specialiter cogito, facendo de statulis domini memoria Benedicti pape duodecim... In mente tamen specialiter revolvi quod in quodam collegio vidi pellem pergamen plenam statuti et preceptis, que Reformatio dicitar. Et si dicas, carissime: ista precepta non sunt tot sicut dicis, primo quia omnia reducuntur ad duo vel ad unum, item nec volumina illa que tu numerasti sunt plena totaliter preceptis, cum multa interferantur que precepta non sunt; respondeo: licet omnia precepta reducuntur ad unum, non propter hoc tollitur multitudo [sic] ipsorum; licet enim omne peccatum reducatur alterum istorum, quia vel est uti fruendi, vel frui utendis, non ex hoc sequitur quin sit multitudine maxima peccatorum.” Cited in Corbini, “Pierre de Ceffons,” 556-59.

the Order presume to hear or study the laws [i.e. canon and civil law].”

The statutes of 1331 repeat this prohibition almost exactly, but in 1333 the General Chapter allowed that “monastic students... can hear or study the aforesaid studies [i.e. canon law] within the boundaries of the aforesaid studia, at an hour and time, and not otherwise, at which the study of theology may not be impeded.” So there was some room to study law in a formal setting, provided that theology remained the main field of study, and the monk remained within his studium.

On a more fundamental level, Corbini misses a distinction between the study of law that the Cistercian statutes condemn, and the experience that Peter of Ceffons describes. In the condemnations the study of canon law is paired with the study of civil law, which was forbidden to all monks on pain of excommunication. The statutes also use the wording “legere vel audire,” which suggests participation in a course of academic lectures. The statutes clearly have in mind formal legal studies, of the kind that could lead to a career as a lawyer or academic canonist. Such a study, although it might have practical benefits for a monastic house, was not good for the monk’s soul, since it involved disputation, hair-splitting, and the corrupting influence of law courts.

One should note that Peter never mentions any formal study of the law, nor any commentaries or other apparatus for such a study. Furthermore, Peter makes no strong distinction between the Bible, law of the Corpus iuris canonici, local legislation, statutes for particular orders, the Rule of St Benedict, and the decisions of particular monastic superiors. These are all parts of a body of normative texts that is reducible to the love for God and neighbour, but that the monk must still


30 “monastici studentes... infra tamen septa dictorum studiorum, audire vel legere dicta studia poterunt, hora et tempore, et non aliter, quibus theologiae lectio non poterit impediri.” Canivez, Statuta, 1333, c.3 (3.401), cited in Bock, “Les Cisterciens,” 21.

31 X 3.50.3, 10.
learn in all its multiplicity. Peter, by implication, is approaching law as he would approach the Bible or the Rule of St Benedict, that is, as a reader who must digest the text so that it can shape his life. The College of St Bernard has books of canon law, because the Cistercians, like Agnellus of Pisa, recognized that they contained the necessary foundations of the monastic life. It is the need to perform that makes the scale of the extant law daunting. Peter would, it seems, have been happy to have a concise legal handbook, such as William of Pagula offers.

The Speculum monachorum (c.1271) of Bernard Ayglier (c.1210-1281), abbot of Montecassino, provides another example of a work that treats the Bible, canon law, and the Rule of St Benedict as part of a single normative body, although Bernard’s approach is somewhat different from that of the authors already discussed.32 He begins his work by explaining that he had “gathered various relevant passages from sacred scripture, canon law, and the doctores,”33 that is, the Fathers. Canon law is the least in evidence of these three sources. He only quotes Gratian by name twice, and both references are to dicta Gratiani, Gratian’s own comments on the canons.34 Bernard refers to canon law explicitly on only one other occasion, in a passage on negligence in reading.

We can note that from... neglect of reading, there follows the disparagement of the gravity of sins... It is known to me that in certain regions and in certain orders not a few of the gravest sins are considered to be trivial, or no sins at all, on account of ignorance of sacred scripture and of the canons. For example, when the scourge of simony is not recognized, it is not avoided, but publicly committed. Read the Decretum and the title On simony in the Decretals, and you will find that this most wicked and detestable vice is pursued seriously by God and the holy fathers with penalties and condemnations. He who does not apply himself to the sacred scriptures and to the readings from canon law cannot understand this correctly.35

---

32 For Walter’s edition, see above, chp. 2, n.116.
33 “diversa sacrae scripturae iurisque canonici ac doctorum exemplaria lectitavi.” prologus ad Speculum monachorum (ed. Walter, 2).
34 Speculum monachorum I.7 (57), III.1 (162) refering to De poen. d. p. c.34 and D.36 d. p. c.36, respectively.
35 “…notare possimus quod ex defectu et negligentia lectionis sequitur vilipensio gravium peccatorum... Expertus sum quod in quibusdam regionibus et quibusdam religionibus nunnulla peccata gravissima propter ignorantiam
As Joseph Lynch has pointed out, monastic simony only received definitive formulation in canon sixty-four of the Fourth Lateran Council, which was incorporated into the Liber extra. Bernard has to make explicit appeal to canon law here, because the reader would find no mention of monastic simony in the Bible or the Fathers, or even in the early Cistercians.

Bernard twice puts canon law beside the Bible and the Fathers as an essential source for the monastic life, but his work appears to contain very few explicit references to it. Yet if one looks closer, it becomes clear that this is far from the full story. Bernard misattributed many of his patristic quotations, and Hilarius Walter, the editor of the Speculum, has pointed out that several of the misattributions can be found in the Decretum. Walter did not notice that many of the correct patristic quotations are also found in the Decretum. All three of the passages misattributed to Jerome are found in the Decretum, as are four of the six correctly attributed passages. The following table shows an instance in which the Decretum has collected and rearranged material from two places in Jerome’s Letter 125, and Bernard has followed Gratian closely.

|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|

sacrae Scripturae et canonum sunt reputata minima vel nulla, inter quae: dum simoniae flagitium non cognoscebatur... non vitabatur, sed publice commitebatur... Lege decretum et in decretalibus de simonia titulum, et invenies hoc pessimum et destestabile vitium a Deo et sanctis Patribus et a summis Pontificibus graviter persecutum poenis et sententiis. Quod quidem non bene intelligit, qui sacris Scripturis et sanctorum canonum lectionibus non intendit.” Speculum monachorum, III.5 (204-05).

36 Lynch, Simoniocal Entry, 192, 213. See above pp.140-41.
Hoc dico, ut etiam si clericatus te titillat desiderium, discas, quod possis docere, et rationabilem hostiam offeras christo, ne miles antequam tiro, ne prius magister sis, quam discipulus. non est humilitatis meae, neque mensurae iudicare de ceteris...

[9.] ...Primumque tractandum est, utrum solus an cum aliis in monasterio uiuere debeas. mihi placet, ut habeas sanctorum contubernium nec ipse te doceas et absque doctore ingrediaris uiam, quam numquam ingressus es...

[17.] Ita ergo age et uiue in monasterio, ut clericus esse merearis... [18.] si tamen uita comes fuerit, et te uel populus uel pontifex ciuitatis, in clerum adlegerit, agito, quae clerici sunt, et inter ipsos sectare meliores...

Multo tempore disce, quod doceas.

Ait enim Hieronymus ad Rusticum monachum, epist. 4... Sic viue in monasterio, vt clericus esse merearis. & infra. ¶ Multo tempore disce, quae postmodum doceas: & inter bonos semper sectare meliores. Quod si populus, vel episcopus te in clericum elegerit; age ea, quæ clerici sunt.

Idem ad eundem eadem epistola superius...Si clericatus te titillat desiderium; discas quod possis docere: & rationabilem Christo hostiam offeras: ne miles ante quàm tyro, ne prius magister sis, quàm discipulus. ¶ Non est humilitatis meæ, neque mensuræ iudicare de clericis... Primumque tractandum est, vtrum solus, an cum aliis in monasterio viuere debeas. Mihi quidem placet, vt habeas sanctorum contubernium: nec ipse te doceas, & absque doctore ingrediaris viam, quam numquam ingressus es.

Unde Hieronymus ad Rusticum: “Sic vive in monasterio, ut clericus effici merearis. Multo tempore disce, quae postmodum doceas.”

Idem eodem: “Non prius miles sis quam tiro; nec prius magister sis quam discipulus;” et post aliqua: “Nec ipse te doceas et absque doctore ingrediearis viam, quam numquam ingressus es.”

Bernard never makes it clear that these passages came from the Decretum, and never uses legal citations; instead, he introduces them with ut ait Hieronymus, or a similar formulation. He
clearly knew the *Decretum* well, and wanted his audience to do so, but he treats it as a patristic florilegium, not a legal text. He makes no clear distinction between patristic and biblical citations in general, and those that had been formally recognized as part of the *ius commune*. When he refers to Gratian by name, he is quoting the opinions of a specific twelfth-century master. One should not think of his three sources—the Bible, canon law, and the *doctores*—as distinct categories, but as overlapping sources of authority. Some scholars, including Titus Lenherr, John van Engen and Anders Winroth, have emphasized the close relationship between canon law and theology in Gratian’s work, and his lack of knowledge of Roman law, so Bernard’s approach may be closer to Gratian’s self-understanding than one that strongly divides law from other disciplines. One may also speculate that the *Decretum* may have played a wider, and insufficiently appreciated, role as a source for knowledge of the Fathers.

Bernard suggests that canon law served as a supplement to the scriptures for those seeking to lead a monastic life, and assumed that it should be part of the reading, not only of university-trained scholars and administrators, but also of the *simplices*, the main body of literate monks within the cloister. Bernard provides two models of reading canon law for these monks. Implicitly, he shows that the monastic reader can mine Gratian’s *Decretum* for patristic and Biblical quotations that apply to the “form of the monastic profession.” This reading of Gratian as a *florilegium* need not be limited to sections that treat monasticism explicitly: indeed, many of Bernard’s selections do not do so. To supplement this implicit way of reading canon law, he explicitly tells his audience to read Gratian and the *Liber extra* as a source for important regulations of the monastic life.

William’s approach to canon law is not identical to that of Agnellus of Pisa, Peter of Ceffons or Bernard Ayglier. Nonetheless, they all participate in a culture of performative reading of law in a monastic context. In this light, the apparent heterogeneity of the contents of the *SR* do not appear to be so unusual. Many of William’s sources, the Bible, the writings of the Fathers, a treatise for

---

novices, and formal canon law were part of a body of normative texts that all had to be mastered as part of the monastic life.

When William inserted his legal compendium into the *SR*, he placed it within a text that he meant the reader to approach using the techniques of meditative reading and personal appropriation that monks used for studying the scriptures. In this respect, too, he was participating in a larger monastic intellectual culture. There is evidence for a similar approach to law from English Franciscans in the 1220s, Mediterranean Benedictines in the 1260s and monk-scholars at Paris in the 1350s. Some monastic writers did not treat law as imposed from outside, as several modern scholars have suggested, but rather a part of one’s own self-formation. It is not my intention to suggest that this was the only way in which monks read law, or that there was no tension between outside authority and monastic practice. Monks trained as canonists, and they used their training in pursuing lawsuits. Heavy-handed application of the “inquisitorial” approach to the pastoral care for monks led to resistance, both active and passive. Yet the *SR* suggests that internalizing the law is a key part of attaining true wisdom. The remainder of this chapter consider William’s interpretation of wisdom in greater detail.

5.3 The Wisdom Books in the *Speculum religiosorum*

In each of the following four sections I will examine a different aspect of wisdom in the *SR.* First, I will look at the use of biblical wisdom literature in the prologue and throughout the *pars prima* of the *SR.* Next I will turn to William of Pagula’s use of the thought of St Augustine in the prologue. The third section will investigate the imagery of tasting and eating in the prologue, building on the discussion of this motif in chapter four. Finally, I consider the ancient tradition that monasticism is the true philosophy.

The biblical citations in the *pars prima* of the *SR* demonstrate the importance of wisdom as a theme in the work. The wisdom books—Proverbs, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus (or Sirach), and Job—appear with great frequency in the first part of the *SR.* William cites Ecclesiasticus sixty-one times, and Proverbs fifty-four times, Job twenty times, and the book of Wisdom twelve

---

38 See above, pp. 167-68, 173-74.
For individual books and authors, this puts Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus well behind the Psalms (106 citations), but with roughly the same number of citations as the Gospel of Matthew (68), Bernard of Clairvaux (66) and Gregory the Great (61). If one takes the sapiential books together, they appear 147 times, considerably more often than any other category of biblical literature. These citations reinforce the sapiential character of the SR that the prologue establishes.

The prominence of the wisdom books in the SR may reflect their general importance in the culture of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Beryl Smalley has argued that commentaries on the wisdom books became more frequent after c.1200. Yet it is difficult to determine how much affinity the SR has with the academic commentary tradition, since Smalley, the only scholar to provide an overview of this exegesis, was interested primarily in the role of the sapiential books as a source of political theory and natural philosophy, topics of little relevance here. A full assessment of this exegesis, much of it unpublished, lies outside the scope of this thesis, but there are at least some parallels between the SR and the commentary of Peter John Olivi on Proverbs, which will be discussed below. Nonetheless, it does not appear that academic exegesis of the sapiential books exercised any direct influence on William of Pagula’s use of them.

The link between the SR and traditional monastic exegesis of the wisdom books is much closer. Monastic exegesis interpreted the three books attributed to Solomon—Ecclesiastes, Proverbs and the Song of Songs—as a three-part work of spiritual formation. Ecclesiastes teaches us to reject the vanities of worldly life, Proverbs teaches right conduct, and the Song of Songs guides the reader to union with God. In this interpretative scheme, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and, to some

39 These numbers are based on SR I.1-6, 8, 10-42.
40 Wisdom: 147; Gospels: 128; Psalms: 106; Prophets: 63; Pentateuch: 50; Pauline Epistles: 40; Catholic Epistles: 18; Historical books: 18; Acts: 10; Revelation: 7. There are twelve citations of the Song of Songs, and these could be counted with the wisdom books, or as a separate category.
extent, Job could occupy the same role as Proverbs.\textsuperscript{42} The classic statement of this position appears in the Bernard of Clairvaux’s first sermon on the \textit{Song of Songs}. The teaching (\textit{doctrina}) of Proverbs is “the hoe of discipline (\textit{sarculum disciplinae}),” cutting away excessive growth to shape and correct (\textit{emendare, informare}) the reader’s character (\textit{vita et mores}).\textsuperscript{43} Ecclesiastes teaches the beginning of wisdom, the contempt for worldly desire; Proverbs offers the consummation of wisdom in good deeds according to God’s commandments. Both books are only a foundation for “the holy and contemplative teaching” of the Song of Songs.\textsuperscript{44}

Hugh of St Victor’s \textit{De institutione novitiorum}, large parts of which William incorporates into the \textit{pars secunda} of the \textit{SR}, provides a good example of how monastic writers might use the wisdom books for an audience of beginners. \textit{De institutione} does not cite the Bible frequently, but a preponderance of its citations come from either Proverbs (cited forty times) or Ecclesiasticus (8 times). Hugh cites the Psalms only seven times and the Gospels only six times. For Hugh, as for Bernard of Clairvaux, the wisdom books are appropriate content for those engaged in learning the basic elements of the monastic life.

Despite Hugh’s use of the sapiential books, wisdom (\textit{sapientia}) is not an important concept for him; he prefers to talk about knowledge (\textit{scientia}) that leads to discipline (\textit{disciplina}). The only significant passage on wisdom comes in chapter six, where Hugh contrasts the “worldly wisdom (\textit{sapientia huius mundi})” which is interested in proving itself right in arrogant disputation, with the “wisdom from on high (\textit{quae desursum venit}).”\textsuperscript{45} Those who have this wisdom “both humbly take up [instruction in the truth] shown to them by the wise, and also do not arrogantly scorn it

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The classic monastic exposition of Job, Gregory’s \textit{Moralia}, is a reading of the text \textit{moraliter}, at the same middle level as Proverbs. William sites the \textit{Moralia} twenty times in the \textit{SR}.
\item Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{Sermones in Cantica canticorum}, in \textit{SBO}, vol.1, 1.2 (3).
\item The understanding of wisdom, and of the sapiential books of the Bible, as a source for morality also appers in the \textit{Liber de sapientia et scientia} that appears with the \textit{SR} in Egerton 746 (see p.38). This work opens with a reference to the book of Wisdom, making a contrast between \textit{scientia dei} and the \textit{sapientia huius mundi}. The work as a whole is a guide to the virtutes and vices, similiar to Peraldus’s \textit{Summa}. Wisdom hear means a sound command of moral theology.
\item “hunc sacrum theoricumque sermonem,” Bernard, \textit{Sermones in Cantica} 1.2-3 (4).
\item Hugh of St Victor, \textit{De institutione novitiorum}, c.6 (36-38).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
when it is brought by the simple.” Hugh here echoes the language of James 3:15, a verse that William includes in the prologue to the SR: “This is not the wisdom that comes from above, but it is worldly, carnal and diabolical.” Hugh uses the verse to distinguish between the arrogant disputation of the secular schools and true learning, but the dichotomy between diabolical and true wisdom is a common motif, appearing, for instance, in Bonaventure’s well-known work on the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The SR fits reasonably well into this tradition of using the sapiential books to form monastic conduct. At the beginning of the prologue, William, quoting Ecclesiasticus, addresses his audience as *indocti*, either unlearned, in the sense of having only the basic Latin education common to all male religious, or uninstructed, meaning novices and those relatively new to the monastic life. Yet this is only one element in the complex presentation of wisdom in the prologue to the SR. William does not use the three-fold division of wisdom literature into rejection of the world, moral formation, and advanced teaching on contemplation. The SR, both in the prologue and in the body of the text, accommodates beginners, but does not make a sharp break between elementary topics and more advanced matters. To express the continuity of practical and contemplative wisdom, William turns to the thought of St Augustine.

### 5.4 Augustinian wisdom

William’s clearest and most technical account of what he means by wisdom comes in a quotation from St Augustine’s *De libero arbitrio* near the end of the prologue: “do not think true wisdom to be anything other than the truth, in which the highest good (*summum bonum*) is perceived and grasped.” This is a key sentence for the Augustinian conception of wisdom. Augustine’s

---

46 “eam [doctrinam veritatis] et a sapientibus exhibitam humilter suscipiunt, a simplicioribus quoque administratam arroganter non contemnunt.” ibid. (40).

47 “Non est ista sapientia desursum descendens, set est terrena, carnalis et diabolica.” Cf. proem. ad SR §1 (1r)


49 “…non alienam putas sapientiam veram nisi veritatem in qua cernitur et tenetur summum bonum.” Proem. ad SR §5 (2r), quoting Augustine of Hippo, *De libero arbitrio*, II.9.26 (254). As noted above, William probably took this quotation from the *Manipulus florum*.
analysis begins with a Stoic maxim that “wisdom is knowledge of human and divine things.”

Augustine modifies this maxim by making a distinction between “knowledge (scientia),” and “wisdom (sapientia),” corresponding to the distinction between human and divine things.

‘Knowledge’ applies to our understanding of the temporal world, including moral reasoning, but “wisdom” refers to the contemplation of the divine.

Augustine lays out this interpretation in the twelfth book of De trinitate.

When we live according to God, our mind, intent on His invisible things, must be formed continually by His eternity, truth, and love; yet a part of our reasonable attention... must be directed to the use of changeable and corporeal things... not in order that we may be conformed to this world by placing our final ends in such goods... but that whatever we do in the use of temporal things under the guidance of reason, we do it with our gaze fixed on eternal things... But there is a difference between the contemplation of eternal things and the action by which we use temporal things well; the former is called wisdom, the latter knowledge... I find it written in the book of Job, where that same holy man is speaking: ‘Behold, piety is wisdom, but to abstain from evil is knowledge.’ In this distinction it is to be understood that wisdom pertains to contemplation, knowledge to action. For by piety in this passage he means the worship of God... And what else is the worship of Him if not the love of Him, by which we now desire to see Him and believe that we shall one day see Him... But to abstain from evil things, which Job calls knowledge, undoubtedly belongs to the category of temporal things. Wherefore, whatever we do prudently, courageously, temperately, and justly... pertains to that knowledge or discipline, wherewith our action is conversant in avoiding evil and desiring good.


“...cum secundum deum uiuimus, mentem nostram in inuisibila eius intentam ex eius aeterntitate, ueritate, caritate proficienter debere formari, quiddam uero rationalis intentionis nostrae... in usum mutabilium corporaliumque rerum... dirigendum, non ut conformetur huic saeculo finem constituento in bonis talibus... sed ut quidquid in usu
Contemplation of the divine is the proper end of human life, and we must order all our actions to this end. Contemplation is also the true form of worship (cultus dei). Humans fall into evil when they set up some object of knowledge as an end in itself, rather than subordinating it to the pursuit of true wisdom in contemplation. There is a reciprocal relationship between wisdom and knowledge, in that good action depends on recognizing our end in contemplation of the Good, but final attainment of contemplation depends upon a life of holiness. This is the understanding of wisdom that lies behind the quotation in the prologue to the SR.

William discusses wisdom at length in only one place in the body of the SR, and this passage is also consonant with the Augustinian distinction between knowledge, whose goal is practical action, and wisdom, whose goal is contemplation. Chapter twenty-eight of the Pars prima concerns “clothing oneself (induere).” William interprets the act of clothing oneself allegorically, with various ‘garments’ as good qualities that a religious must “put on.”

The life of the religious, like that of the other [elect], oscillates between two states, i.e. those of sin and grace, between two fortunes, adverse and prosperous, between two ways of life, the active and the contemplative. In the state of sin, there is need of the garment of penitence; in the state of grace, the garment of constancy; in adversity, the garment of patience; in prosperity the garment of mercy; in the active life, the garment of justice; in the contemplative life, the garment of wisdom; in all states, the garment of a good way of life. Therefore wise men are clothed first with the garment of penitence as a sign of sorrow... Sixth, they are clothed with the garment of wisdom as a sign of spiritual love.

Wisdom 7[:28]: Since [God] loves no one except him who dwells with wisdom.
Ecclesiasticus 27[:9]: If you pursue justice, you will lay hold of her, that is wisdom, not in
feasting and drunkeness, but let us put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and take no care for the desires of the flesh. [Rom. 13:13-14] But rather let us imitate Christ, and, whatever you do, may you always meditate on the end of your action.53

Wisdom is a contemplative virtue, not an active one, although the pursuit of justice in the active life leads to wisdom. Wisdom is connected to “spiritual love,” the highest level in a three-fold scheme of carnal, rational and spiritual love employed by Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St Thierry.54 It requires the rejection of “the desires of the flesh,” and the consideration of every action in light of our ultimate end. William does not explain the link between justice and wisdom implied by the quotation from Ecclesiasticus. There may be here an echo of the idea that wisdom, as the highest gift of the Holy Spirit, supplements the cardinal virtues, and is particularly appropriate for the life of the religious.55 Whatever the precise connection between wisdom and justice that William intends, chapter twenty-eight of the SR reflects the Augustinian conception of wisdom, although it is not laid out as clearly as in Augustine’s own work.

Augustine, at the end of the quotation from De trinitate discussed above, equates knowledge (scientia), the understanding of the temporal order necessary to live well, with discipline (disciplina). William uses a similar pairing of “wisdom” and “discipline” when he invites the unlearned reader to take up wisdom and “regular discipline” together.56 William includes a

53 “Uita religiosorum sicut aliorum vertitur in duos status, scilicet culpe et gracie, inter duas fortunas, aduersam et prosperam, inter duas vitas, actium et contemplatium. In statu culpe indiget indumento penitentie; in statu gracie indumento constancie; in aduersis indumento paciencie; in prosperis indumento misericordie; in actiuam indumento iusticie; in contemplatiua indumento sapiencie; in omnibus indumento conuersacionis honeste. Induuntur ergo sapientes primo indumento penitentiie in signuum doloris... [82v] Sexto induuntur indumento sapiencie in signum spiritualis amoris. sap. vij. quia neminem diligit nisi eum qui cum sapiencia inhabitat. ecclesi. xxvij. si sequaris iusticiam, apprehendes eam, scilicet sapienciam, non in commessacionibus et ebrietatibus, set induimini dominum ihesum christum et carnis curam ne feceritis in desideriiis. Set christum imitemur et quicquid agas operis semper finem mediteris.” SR I.28 (82rv)


55 For the tradition in monastic theology that associates the virtues with beginners, the gifts of the Holy Spirit with proficiences, and the Beatitudes with the perfecti, see Andrew Seeley, St. Thomas Aquinas on the Necessity of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit for Salvation (PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 1995), 66-67. Seeley, 313-15, shows that for Thomas the gift of wisdom opens one to the guidance of Holy Spirit, which leads to the life of charity.

56 proem. ad SR §1 (1r).
quotation from Ambrose that makes it clear that wisdom and discipline are complimentary but not identical, since “wisdom is to worship God and to be subject to him, and discipline is to abstain from sin.”[^57] Here Ambrose draws on the same verse from Job that Augustine uses in De trinitate, and he agrees with Augustine’s position that wisdom means the worship of God, while his definition of “discipline” resembles the Augustinian conception of scientia/disciplina.

The pairing of wisdom and discipline also appears in the exegesis of the Book of Proverbs, whose opening verses read, “The Parables of Solomon, the son of David, the king of Israel, for the understanding of wisdom and of discipline.”[^58] The Glossa ordinaria interprets this “understanding” as “how one ought to believe and live rightly, where one ought to direct the intention of one’s heart.”[^59] Peter John Olivi draws out this relationship at greater length in his commentary:

> [Wisdom and discipline] can be understood as one and the same thing under different ways of speaking, that is the moral and virtuous life ordered and governed in a wise and disciplined manner. Or by “wisdom” one can understand the knowledge and truth of God and of divine things; by “discipline” on the other hand the truth of moral and human matters.[^60]

Olivi appears to favour the latter interpretation, since he goes on to outline a fuller Augustinian understanding of wisdom, using the same passage from De libero arbitrio as the SR:

> He is properly called wise who adheres to the truth and the highest goods without error, and knows how to adhere to them, and knows how to hold to the paths that lead to the

---

[^57]: “...colere deum atque ei subditum esse sapientia est, abstinere autem a peccato disciplina est.” proem. ad SR (1r), citing Ambrose, Epistulae et acta, vol. 1, ed. O. Faller, CSEL 82.1 (1968), 6(28).4 (41).
[^58]: “Parabolae Salomonis filii David regis Israhel ad sciendam sapientiam et disciplinam...” Pr. 1:1-2.
[^59]: “Quodomodo recte credere & viuere oporteat quemque, quo dirigere intentionem cordis.” Gl. Ad sciemad sapientiam & disciplinam ad Pr. 1:2 (Venice, 1603), III.1600.
[^60]: “Potest autem per hec due intelligi idem sub diuersis rationibus scilicet uita moralis et uirtuosa sapienter et disciplinate composita et gubernata. Vel per sapientiam potest intelligi notitia et ueritas Dei et diuinorum per disciplinam uero ueritas moralium et humanorum.” Peter John Olivi, Lectura super Proverbia et Lectura super Ecclesiastem, ed. Johann Schlageten, Collectio Oliviana 6 (Grottaferrata, Ita.: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 2003), c.1 (245-46).
highest good, and unerringly holds to them, such that in all things he knows how to choose and chooses his own good, and he knows how to avoid and avoids every hurt and trouble. Whence, according to Augustine in the second book of De libero arbitrio, “Wisdom is that by which we discern and keep to the highest good.”

The pairing of “wisdom” and “discipline” allows William of Pagula to connect the Augustinian understanding of wisdom as contemplation of the highest good to the moralistic understanding of wisdom that he found in works of monastic formation. The SR teaches its readers both “wisdom,” that is contemplative knowledge of the divine that orders all other actions, and “discipline,” here meaning right conduct, for which the sapiential books of the Bible provide a guide. William goes further than Augustine, Ambrose or Olivi by specifying that he is offering the reader a form of discipline that involves adopting a life regulated by monastic rules and customs (regularis disciplina/observatio). This is a natural move to make; where could one find contemplation and disciplined action united more perfectly than in a monastery?

5.5 The Taste of Wisdom and the Spiritual Senses

This chapter began by investigating the connection between imagery of swetness and self-formation through reading, but the prologue also contains an allusion to an interpretive motif that played on the words sapientia and sapor, often in the context of the “spiritual senses.” This word play goes back at least as far as Isidore of Seville, who said that the word “wise (sapiens)” comes from “flavour (sapor),” for just as taste (gustus) is suited to distinguishing the flavour of food, so the wise man is suited to the determining things and causes, for he determines each one, and distinguishes by the sense of truth. His opposite

61 “Sapiens enim proprie dicitur ille qui absque errore adheret et scit adherere ueris et summis bonis et qui uias perducentes ad summum bonum inerrabiler scit tenere et tenet, ita quod in omnibus scit eligere et eligit suum melius et scit uitate et uitate omne damnum et incomodum.Vnde secundum Augustinum secundo De libero arbitrio ‘Sapientia est in qua cernitur et tenetur summum bonum’.” Olivi, Lectura super proverbia, c.1 (254).

is the fool (insipiens), because he lacks taste (sapor), nor does he have any discernment or sense.

In the passage from Isidore, wisdom appears to be something like Augustine’s scientia, a knowledge about temporal things in this world, and he emphasizes the discernment of the taster’s palate, rather than the pleasure of the flavour.

Most later writers, in contrast, treat “sweet” wisdom as a mystical experience of the divine goodness. Taste, a sense that involves direct bodily contact and a strong instinctive response, provides a better analog for the intimacy and immediacy of this encounter with God than the more mediated senses of sight or hearing. For example, William of St Thierry’s understanding of wisdom as a “taste” of the divine closely approximates Augustine’s sapientia. It pertains to an intellectual faculty of the soul, it comes about through divine grace, and it orients us towards our proper end. Bonaventure sees the wisdom that comes through “tasting the divine sweetness (degustando divinam suavitatem),” as an “experiential understanding of God (cognitio dei.

“Sapiens dictus a sapore; quia sicut gustus aptus est ad discretionem saporis ciborum, sic sapiens ad dino- centiam rerum atque causarum; quod unumquodque dino- scat, atque sensu veritatis discernat. Cuius contrarius est insipiens, quod sit sine sapore, nec aliquis discretionis uel sensus.” Isidore of Seville, Etymologiarum librum XX, X.240. None of the scholars in the previous note cite this passage.

See Ella Johnson, Liturgical Exercise as a Theological Anthropology in Gertrud the Great of Helfta’s Documenta spiritualium exercitationum (PhD Thesis, Toronto School of Theology, 2010), 64. Rudy, Mystical Language, 57-61.

“For the mind is a particular power of the soul, whereby we cleave to God and enjoy God. This enjoyment is a certain divine savour [sapor], so that ‘wisdom’ [sapientia] comes from ‘savor’ [sapor]. This savour is a sort of tasting [gustus]. And no one is worthy to articulate this tasting, not even he who has deserved to taste [gustare], for Scripture says: ‘Taste and see that the Lord is sweet’ [Ps. 33:9]. By this tasting, according to the Apostle, one tastes the good Word of God and the riches of the world to come [cf. Heb. 6:5].”


For William of St Thierry’s understanding of the spiritual senses, see J. Walsh, “Guillaume de Saint-Thierry et les sens spirituels,” Revue d’ascétique et de mystique 35 (1959), 27-42.
experimentalis)’ that goes beyond the Augustinian concept of wisdom as “knowledge of God according to piety (cognitio dei secundum pietatem).”

Bernard of Clairvaux speaks of the sweetness of wisdom in the context of union with Christ, but he also uses it in a way that connects to moral action. As Gordon Rudy puts it, Bernard “uses the language of taste to articulate the immediate action of the Holy Spirit in us, and its transformative effects.” Wisdom-as-sweetness is an affective love for God, conferred by divine grace, that restores our desire to live virtuously, and refines our moral discernment. Bernard expounds this understanding of wisdom at length towards the end of *Sermons on the Song of Songs*.

If anyone defines wisdom as the love of virtue, I think that he is not far from the truth. For where there is love, there is no toil, but a taste [sapor]. Perhaps wisdom [sapientia] comes from taste [sapor], because, when it is added to virtue, like some seasoning, it adds taste to something which by itself is tasteless and bitter. I think it would be permissible to define wisdom as a taste for goodness. We lost this taste almost from the creation of our race. When the old serpent’s poison infected the palate of our heart, because the fleshly sense prevailed, the soul began to lose its taste for goodness, and a harmful taste crept in… Now wisdom always prevails over malice [cf. Sap. 7:30] in the minds that it has entered, and drives out the taste for evil which the other has brought to it, by introducing something better. When wisdom enters, it makes carnal sense taste, it purifies the understanding, cleanses and heals the palate of the heart.

---

66 Cited in Solignac, “Sagesse,” 107. There is a debate about the exact role of the spiritual senses in Bonaventure’s theology of union with God that goes back to Karl Rahner and Hans Urs von Balthasar. For a recent discussion, see Rudy, *Mystical Language*, 103-09.


68 For this interpretation of Bernard, see Rudy, *Mystical Language*, 61-64; Fulton, “Taste and See,” 192-93.


“Et si quis sapientiam virtutis amorem diffinerit, non mihi a vero deviare videtur. Ubi autem amor est, labor non est, sed sapor. Et forte sapientia a sapore denominatur, quod virtuti accedens, quoddam veluti condimentum, sapidam reddat, quae per se insulsa quodammodo et aspera sentiebatur. Nec duxerim reprehendendum, si quis sapientiam saporem boni diffiniant. Hunc saporem perdidimus, ab ipso pene exortu generis nostri. Ex quo cordis palatum, sensu carnis praevalente, infectit virus serpentis antiqui, coepit animae non sapere bonum, ac sapor noxius subintrare... Et
The association of wisdom with sweetness allows Bernard to bring together contemplation, right conduct, and the affective devotion.

This inclusive understanding of wisdom is appropriate to William’s purpose in the prologue of the *SR*, and so it is not surprising that he draws on Bernard’s concept:

You have found true wisdom if you weep for the sins of your past life, if you care little for the desires of this world, if with all your desire you long for your eternal homeland; you have found the fullness of wisdom (*sapientia*), if these things taste (*sapere*) to you as they should.\(^{70}\)

Here again we find the key notes of William’s monastic-Augustine conception of wisdom. Wisdom orients one’s life to the eternal end of union with God, and the practical outcome of this is penitence and separation from the *saeculum*. All three of these elements—penitence, separation and contemplation—were pillars of the cloistered monastic life.

### 5.6 Monasticism as Philosophy

The most unusual aspect of William’s prologue is his specific identification of wisdom with monastic discipline. None of the passages quoted above explicitly equate wisdom with the monastic life, nor do they add the qualification “*regularis*” to discipline. It is possible that William, in making an explicit connection between wisdom and monastic discipline is drawing on a tradition of describing monasticism as “Christian philosophy.” Jean Leclercq has shown that this was a common motif from the patristic era to the late twelfth century, even in secular thinkers such as John of Salisbury. The primary meaning of *philosophizare* before c.1100 was

\[ nunc \textit{assidue sapiens} \textit{vincit malitiam in mentibus ad quas intraverit, saporem mali, quem illa invexit, sapore exterminans meliori. Intrans sapientia, dum sensum carnis instatat, purificant intellectum, cordis palatum sanat et reparat.} \]


\(^{70}\) “inuenisti ueram sapienciam si prioris uite peccata defleas, si desideria huius seculi paruipendas, si eternam patriam toto desiderio concupiscas; inuenisti plene sapienciam, si ista tibi sapient prout sunt.” William is quoting from Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones de diversis*, in *SBO*, vol. 6.1, 15.4 (142).
“to live as a monk.” Guerri of Igny, preaching on the feast of St Benedict, provides an example of this usage that includes the terms ‘wisdom’ and ‘discipline’: “You are blessed, my brothers, who have enrolled yourselves in an education (disciplina) in wisdom and in the school of Christian philosophy.”

In the twelfth century, and even more in the thirteenth, “philosophy” came to mean an academic subject, largely divorced from disciplina, in the sense of a regulated life. Yet if the older sense of monasticism as a “philosophical” discipline declined, it did not disappear entirely, as evinced by a fourteenth-century English work De philosophia monachorum. It survives in two English monastic miscellanies, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 137, fols. 1r-33r (s.xiv) and BL, MS Sloane 1934, fols. 33r-80v (s.xiv-xv).

In the prologue, the anonymous author says that:

There is need to invest the talent given to me by God (cf. Mat. 25:14-30), so that my will may meditate on the law of the Lord day and night (Ps. 1:2). For this is the only law that converts souls, the faithful testimony of the Lord offering wisdom to little children (Ps. 18:8). You therefore who have converted so that you might become a little child (Mat. 18:3), desire this wisdom, and say to her, “You are my sister,” (cf. Prov. 7:4) and all good things will come to you together with her (Sap. 7:11). It is wisdom who cries, “Let the little children come to me, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. (Mat. 19:14)” If you wish to attain the summit of true philosophy, diligently investigate the beginning and the

---


rudiments of the monastic life of monks, which you have professed, since you will only
train to great things through small things (cf. Luke 16:10).\footnote{75}

Here we see familiar themes: the monastic life as the true wisdom, and the work as a guide to
this wisdom for “children,” meaning those who lack education and experience, but who have the
requisite humility to learn. The rest of the work is an introduction to the monastic life in five
books. Book one describes the vanity of worldly life, with a particular emphasis on the evils of
wealth. The second book discusses obedience and the need for good examples in the context of
charity. Book three condemns fornication, both literal and metaphorical, and other monastic sins.
The fourth book is a guide to confession. The final book guides the monk through Lent and
Easter, and concludes with advice on prayer and meditation.

Corpus Christi 137, which belonged to Christ Church Cathedral Priory, contains many works
that appear in the \textit{SR}. The rest of its contents are:

\begin{itemize}
\item fols. 33v-92v  Bernard Ayglier of Montecassino, \textit{Expositio in Regulam S. Benedicti}\footnote{76}
\item fols. 93r-117r  James of Milan, \textit{Stimulus amoris}\footnote{77}
\item fols. 117r-122r  Expositions of prayers and devotions\footnote{78}
\item fols. 122r-23v  ps.-Bernard of Clairvaux [= Richard Rolle], \textit{Speculum peccatoris}\footnote{79}
\item fols. 123v-32v  Hugh of St Victor, \textit{De institutione novitiorum}\footnote{80}
\end{itemize}

\footnote{75}“Negociari igitur opus est talento michi diuinitus collato vt voluntas mea meditetur in lege domini die ac nocte.
Ipsa est enim sola que conuerit animas testimonium domini fidele sapientiam prestans paruulis. Tu ergo qui
conuersus es vt efficiaris paruulus hanc sapiencia concupisce et dic ei quia soror mea es et venient tibi omnia bona
pariter cum illa. Sapientia est que clamat sinite paruulos venire hic ad me talium est enim regnum celorum. Si vis
igitur vere philosophie culmen attingere principium atque rudimenta vite monachorum monastice quam professus es
diligenter inuestiga, quia non nisi per minima pertinges ad maiora.”

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 137, fol. 1v.

\footnote{76}Bernard Ayglier of Monte Cassino. \textit{Expositio in Regulam S. Benedicti}, ed. A.M. Caplet (Monte Cassino, 1894).

\footnote{77}See above, Chp. 1, n.2.

\footnote{78}Including Bloomfield, \textit{Incipits}, nos. 1092, 8637.

William incorporates long passages from the *Stimulus amoris* and *De institutione novitiorum*, into the *SR*. The homilies of Eusebius Gallicanus appear as a source in the *pars prima*. William also includes the lamentation of a female figure at the death of Jesus, although in the *SR* it is the Virgin Mary, rather than Mary Magdalene. Corpus Christi also comes from a familiar context, the fourteenth-century library of an English monastic cathedral priory. It appears that the idea of monasticism as the true philosophy was in the air of English monastic culture when William composed the *SR*.

### 5.7 Wisdom in the *Speculum religiosorum*: Conclusions

William of Pagula never lays out his understanding of wisdom in a systematic manner, but it is possible to reconstruct his ideas about wisdom with some clarity. He brings together two conceptions of wisdom that were widespread in the later Middle Ages. The first comes from Augustine; it identifies wisdom as contemplative knowledge of the divine, as opposed to *scientia*, moral and practical knowledge of temporal matters. One is truly wise when one’s entire life is oriented towards enjoyment of God as the paramount end of human life. The second conception of wisdom comes from monastic exegesis of the sapiential books of the Old Testament. Here wisdom is the guide to right conduct that these books contain. This wisdom is

---

80 See above, Chp. 5.3.
81 Hugh of St Victor, *De conscientia*, PL 184.551-60.
82 Eusebius Gallicanus, *Homeliae ad monachos*, 1-2, 5-6, 8, PL 50. 833-36, 844-54.
an appropriate topic for those beginning the monastic life, before they move on to the higher things associated with exegesis of the Song of Songs. William is able to bring these two understandings of wisdom together through the term “discipline.” Augustine had used *disciplina* as a synonym for *scientia*. William identifies this *disciplina* with “discipline according to a rule (*regularis disciplina*)” or “the observance of a rule (*regularis observatio*),” that is, monastic practice. The moral reading of Proverbs (and other wisdom literature) laid the foundation for this discipline. The monastic life exemplifies the integration of a disciplined life with a life of contemplation, and the contents of the *SR* provide a concise guide to this two-fold wisdom.

William may also want the reader to make implicit associations with two other medieval conceptions of wisdom. His emphasis at the very opening of the work on the sweetness and healthful properties of wisdom alludes to the play on “wisdom (*sapientia*)” and “flavour (*sapor*).” This could refer both to a discerning “taste” for the virtues, or to the immediacy and sweetness of “tasting” God in a loving union. Language of sweetness thus provided another way to bring together a moral and a contemplative understanding of wisdom. William, in identifying *disciplina* with *regularis observatio*, may be drawing on a tradition which described monasticism as “Christian philosophy.” This idea appears to have enjoyed a small revival in the English monastic culture of William’s day, if, indeed, it ever went away.

One can now return to consider the place of law within the *SR*, equipped with a fuller understanding of William’s use of the concept of wisdom as a governing theme for the work. This task is more difficult because although William makes a conceptual distinction between discipline and wisdom, he never says whether any of the material applies to one or the other. William’s presentation of spiritual formation does not make use of stages; he appears rather to think of two mutually-informing aspects of one life: discipline leading to contemplative wisdom, and wisdom guiding discipline. Nonetheless, it seems that canon law applies, for the most part, to discipline, avoiding sin and observing the Rule. This should not imply that law is only something for beginners; William provides the reader with law that abbots and priors need to know, after all. Law is one part of the sweet-tasting “teaching of wisdom” that William offers the reader to eat. He does not dwell on which parts of the *SR* apply to contemplation or discipline, rather he emphasizes the need to savour all of it and then to put it into practice in the religious life.
Conclusion

The previous chapter has outlined William’s combination of an Augustinian concept of wisdom as the worship of God through contemplation with a tradition of using the wisdom books of the Bible as an introduction to monastic formation, and the Bernardine interpretation of wisdom as sweetness. Wisdom in the SR is the apprehension of the *summum bonum* through a life of *regulares disciplina*. The theme of wisdom provides an organizing principle for the heterogenous content of the work. Most of these contents reflect two developments in literature for the cloistered religious in the century after the Fourth Lateran Council. The first is the synthesis of the monastic literature of the twelfth century in manuals of monastic formation, *florilegia* and *praedicabilia*; this synthesis provided the main topic for chapter two. The second is the growth of canon law for the cloistered religious, a topic addressed in chapter three, and its organization into compendia. Chapter four investigated William’s approach to monastic law in light of these developments.

The *SR* falls into a genre that I call “encyclopedic manuals of monastic formation.” Such manuals attempted to provide thorough guides to the monastic life for an audience that included less educated and less experienced monks. They had a similarity of purpose, but differed greatly in their form and organizing principles. In this respect, one might draw a parallel between these works and pastoral *summae*, another diverse group of texts that tried to synthesize a large body of literature into an accessible form.

Manuals of monastic formation often used techniques and content borrowed from the *sermo modernus*, a new style of preaching associated with scholastic theology that became dominant in the thirteenth century. Manuals shared with preaching such techniques as distinctions on a word, divisions of a main topic, and chains of supporting quotations. They also shared an approach to the monastic literature of the twelfth century. Both genres treated twelfth-century writers as *auctoritates*, in a manner similar to the Bible and the Fathers. As earlier generations

84 See above, pp. 109-12. All subsequent notes in the conclusion refer to the appropriate discussion in the body of the thesis.

85 Pp. 95-98.
had excerpted scriptural and patristic quotations and synthesized different writers into a canonical consensus, thirteenth-century manualists and preachers did the same thing with more recent monastic authors. This synthesis and canonization involved elevating Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor, and spuriously attributing many works to these two masters. Much of the content of the SR came originally from the florilegia for preachers in the third part of William of Pagula’s own Speculum praelatorum. Two important resources for preachers, Thomas of Ireland’s Manipulus florum and William Peraldus’ Summa de vitis et virtutibus, provided material for the SR.

Scholarship on scholastic preaching for the religious has devoted most of its attention to ad status collections. The collections exercised little influence on the SR, or on monastic manuals in general. Ad status sermons categorized the different groups of religious according to the rule that they followed, and offered norms for each group. This was an attempt to ensure each group legitimacy in response to the controversy around new religious orders, in particular the friars. Monastic manuals, in contrast, generally addressed a broad audience of religiosi or monachi. William of Pagula divides the religious into only two categories based on their function in the Church, not on their rule: mendicants and non-mendicants.

The second major historical context for the SR is the growth of monastic law from Gratian’s Decretum through the Clementines. In England, the provincial statutes of Stephen Langton in 1222 and the legatine statutes of Ottobuono de’ Fieschi in 1268 offered an important supplement to papal law. Several difficult and contentious problems recur in this legislation, including entry into the monastic life, the relationship between the religious and bishops, pastoral care, and the development of the provincial chapter and visitation. Perhaps the two most important canons were Cum ad monasterium (X 3.35.6) and Ne in agro (Clem. 3.10.1), which, together with

86 Pp. 119-27.
87 Pp. 48-51, 72-73, 79, 92-95, 103-09.
88 Pp. 98-100, 103-09.
89 Pp. 161-68.
Gregory IX’s statutes for the Black monks, represented an innovative attempt to legislate on details of monastic discipline.  

The statutes of the legate Otto of Monferrato for the Black monks in 1238 and the legatine statutes of Ottobuono de’ Fieschi in 1268 provided an impetus for English monks to organize this legislation. The legates enjoined monks to copy and study a list of fourteen canons from the Liber extra. Many subsequent attempts at organizing monastic law in England reproduce this list, either on its own, or together with the statutes of Ottobuono. In the fourteenth century more extensive legal compilations appeared. There is evidence of compiling activity at St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury; St Mary’s Priory, Dover; St Mary’s Abbey, York; Peterborough Abbey; and Durham Cathedral Priory. The legal compilations in these monastic libraries often travelled in a manuscript “package” with the Rule of St Benedict, Bernard of Clairvaux’s De praecepto et dispensatione, the legislation of provincial and general chapters, and (after 1336) Benedict XII’s statutes for the Black monks.

William of Pagula’s legal compendium clearly belongs to this tradition. Indeed, the early version of William’s SR, Abbas vel prior, survives only in manuscripts from Durham that include the normative “package” described above. William’s legal compilation is considerably more sophisticated than any other extant work in this genre. He alone makes use of canonical commentaries and combines excerpts from multiple canons on the same topic to provide a single coherent text. William’s legal compendium is the fruit of mature canonistic scholarship, rather than a mere list of canons.

William’s inclusion of law within the framework of performatory reading and wisdom offers an important correction to the scholarly assessment of monastic law. While recognizing the intellectual energy behind monastic legislation, scholars including Joseph Avril and Jacques Hourlier have critiqued canon law as sterile, and too focused on prohibitions, in contrast to

---

91 Pp. 185-91.
92 Pp. 191-95.
genuine spiritual renewal.\textsuperscript{93} Law could, at best, maintain a rather artificial mediocrity. Bert Roest has compared legislators unfavourably with confessors; legislators attempted to impose uniformity, and failed to appreciate the value of innovative devotional practices.\textsuperscript{94} There is some truth to these criticisms, but the \textit{SR} suggests a more intimate link between law and spiritual formation. For William, law, as much as the Scriptures or the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor, must be savoured in meditative reading, and then expressed as part of one’s monastic observance. William is not unique in this approach to law. There is evidence of monks and friars from across Europe approaching legal texts in similar ways throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This devotional approach to law supplemented scholastic and professional approaches, and may help to explain why the religious were so eager to master these texts.\textsuperscript{95}

Preaching and law are both in some sense pastoral genres; they involve guiding the religious development of monks. Many of the writers who contributed to these genres had wider pastoral responsibilities, as did William of Pagula. Yet the \textit{SR} is not in a pastoral mode. It is a manual of monastic formation intended for the private, meditative reading by monks and canons. The authorial voice of the \textit{SR}, in so far as it has one, is that of an insider, not an outsider. It was exceedingly rare for secular clerics to write for the male religious in this manner. Given this unusual characteristic of the \textit{SR}, it is unfortunate that one cannot say anything definite about the circumstances of the composition of the \textit{SR} in its final form. William, with characteristic self-effacement, tells us nothing in the prologue about his reasons for composing the work or about any direct recipient or dedicatee, and it appears in a variety of manuscript contexts, and has no particular connection to any one religious community. Nonetheless, there is no reason to doubt William’s authorship.\textsuperscript{96} The circumstance of William of Pagula’s decision to write a guide to the monastic life must remain the most important unanswerable question about his work.

---

\textsuperscript{93} Pp. 173-74.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} Pp. 199-211.
\textsuperscript{96} Pp. 66-67.
William opens the *SR* by instructing the reader to take and eat, and he offers them a rich and varied banquet. One finds an introductory section on the *substantialia* of religion, a compendium of canon law, and chapters ranging from silence in the cloister to devotion to the crucified Christ. William draws on similarly varied sources, including canonical commentaries, *florilegia*, monastic treatises, the wisdom books, and a Franciscan devotional work. He holds this diversity together under the rubric of wisdom. The *SR* is a testament to William of Pagula’s encyclopedic knowledge and his interest in the pastoral care of all parts of the Church. It demonstrates that derivate works can still be sophisticated and worthy of study. Its heterogeneity is a reminder that scholars should not be too quick to divide the garment of late medieval religious literature into different categories and opposing schools. The *SR* does not allow for a rupture between *pastoralia* and *spiritualia*, between monastic and scholastic theology, or between law and personal piety.
Appendix I: Latin Text of the Prologue of the *Speculum religiosorum*

Prohemium de sapientia

1. [1r] Accipite uos religiosi hoc speculum et comedite, quoniam sicut mel est bonum et fauum dulcissimum gutturi, sic et doctrina sapientie animabus uestris, ut dicitur Prouer. xxiii.  
Apropriate ergo ad me indocti, et aggregate uos in domum discipline, et comparate uobis sine argento sapientiam, et colla uestra subicite iugo eius, ut suscipiant anime uestrre sapientiam et regularem disciplinam, ut colligitur Ecclesi. ultimo  
Et si queratis viam discipline et sapientie, dicit Ambrosius in quadam epistula, colere deum atque ei subditiit esse sapientia est, abstinere autem a peccato disciplina est.  
Unde diciplina est ordinata morum correccio, et maiorum precedentium regularis observacio.  

2. Via sapiencie est duplex: vna est malorum, secunda bonorum; prima est reprobanda, secunda approbanda. De prima dicitur Iac. iii non est ista sapientia desursum descendens, set est terrena, carnalis et diabolica.  
Terrenam enim sapentiam habent talpe huius mundi, id est cupidi in amore terre, sicut talpa in terra sapienter se habet supra nihil uidet. Luc. xvi filii huius mundi prudenceores sunt filiis lucis in generacionibus suis.  
Hec non est uera sapientia ibi thesaurizare vbi non potest diu manere, ut peregrinus— et nos omnes sumus hinc peregrini. Psalm. Aduena

---

1 The text is based on Gray’s Inn 11, fols. 1r-2r. The prologue has no title within the text, but the title “Prohemium de sapientia” comes from the table of contents on fol. iv.  
2 Pr. 24:13-14a.  
3 cf. Ecclus. 51:31, 33a-34. “Appropiate ad me, indocti,/ et congregate vobis in domum disciplinae/ ...Comparate vos sine argento/ et collum vestrum subicite iugo:/ et suscipiat anima vestra disciplinam.”  
4 cf. Isa. 55: 1b-3a: “…venite, emite absque argentō/ et absque ulla commutatione vinum et lac/ ... Audite, audientes me, et comedite bonum,/ et delectabitur in crassitudine anima vestra./ Inclinate aurem vestram, et venite ad me:/ audite, et vivet anima vestra...”  
6 ps-Cyprian of Carthage, *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*, c.11 (PL 4.880A).  
7 Iac. 3:15.  
8 Luc. 16:8
ergo sum et peregrinus apud te, \textsuperscript{9} et sapiencia huius mundi stulticia est apud deum, ut dicitur i. Cor. iiij. \textsuperscript{10}

3. Carnalem sapenciam habent carnales in preparacione deliciarum. Ro. viii. prudentia carnis mors \textsuperscript{[1v]} est eterna. \textsuperscript{11} Glossa. dignus est morte eterna qui habet prudenciam carnis, hoc est studiosius implet ea que carnis sunt quam ea que sunt spiritus. \textsuperscript{12} Diabolicam sapenciam habent illi qui sunt sapientes in preparacione malorum et nequiciarum. Diabolus enim semper intendit malum facere et alios deripere, et sic qui sapientes sunt ad decipiendum alios. Iere. iiiij. Sapientes sunt ut faciant mala; bene autem facere nescierunt. \textsuperscript{13} Et secundum Gregorium. x. Mor. Sapentia huius mundi est cor machinacionibus regere, sensum verbis velare, que falsa sunt uera ostendere, que uera sunt falsa demonstrare. Hanc sapienciam [MS: sapiam] qui sciunt ceteros superbiendo despiciunt; hanc qui nesciunt subiecti sunt et timidi aliis qui sciunt. \textsuperscript{14}

4. De secunda sapiencia, scilicet de sapiencia bonorum, dicitur Ecc. xliij. Sapientiam ipsorum narrunt populi et laudem eorum nunciet ecclesia. \textsuperscript{15} Unde Bernardus: inuenisti ueram sapienciam si prioris uite peccata defleas, si desideria huius seculi paruipendas, si eternam patriam toto desiderio concupiscas; inuenisti plene sapienciam, si ista tibi sapiant prout sunt. \textsuperscript{16} et dicit Gregorius x Mor. Vera sapiencia est nil per ostentacionem fingere, sensum verum aperire, uera diligere, falsa deuitare, bona gratis exhibere, mala libentius tollerare quam facere, nullam

\textsuperscript{9} Ps. 38:13b.
\textsuperscript{10} 1 Cor. 3:16.
\textsuperscript{11} Rom. 8:6a.
\textsuperscript{12} Peter Lombard, \textit{Collectanea in epistolam ad Romanos}, in Rom. 8:6 (PL 191.1435A). This passage does not appear in \textit{Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria} (Strasbourg, 1480/81, reprint Turnhout: Brepols, 1992) or \textit{Bibliorum sacrorum glossa ordinaria... cum postilla Nicholai Lyrani} (Venice, 1603).
\textsuperscript{13} Ier. 4:22b.
\textsuperscript{14} cf. Thomas of Ireland, \textit{Manipulus florum}, “Sapiencia uel sciencia,” l. “Huius mundi sapiencia est, inquit, cor machinacionibus tegere, sensum uerbis uelare, que falsa sunt uera ostendere, que uera sunt falsa demonstrare. Hanc qui sciunt ceteros superbiendo despiciunt; hanc qui nesciunt subiecti et timidi in aliis ipsam mirantur.” Cf. Gregory the Great, \textit{Moralia in Job}, vol. 1, 10.29 (143.570-71).
\textsuperscript{15} Ecclus. 44:15.
\textsuperscript{16} Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{Sermones de diversis}, in \textit{SBO}, vol. 6.1, 15.4 (142).
ulcionem iniurie querere, pro ueritate contumeliam pati lucrum putare. Hec iustorum simplicitas deridetur, et a mundi sapientibus fatuitas reputatur. Quid enim in hoc mundo stultius quam amissa non querere, possessa rapientibus relaxare, nullam ulcionem pro acceptis iniuriis reddere, immo pacienciam prebere?\textsuperscript{17}

5. [2r] Et tamen hec est vera sapiencia, et ad hanc sapienciam peruenire non possunt qui falsa sapiencia [\textit{MS:} false sapiencie] huius mundi decipiuntur. Et dicit Augustinus de libero arbitrio: 
\textit{non aliam putas sapientiam veram nisi veritatem in qua cernitur et tenetur summum bonum.}\textsuperscript{18} Hanc sapienciam debitis uos religiosi amare precipe et totis viribus concupiscere [\textit{MS:} concupisci], quia dicitur Sap. vij: 
\textit{omne aurum in comparatione illius sapiencie harena est exigua, et tamquam lutum estimabitur argentum in conspectu illius.}\textsuperscript{19} Quam quidam sapienciam faciliter adquiretis si ea obseruetis que in presenti summa breuiter continuntur.

6. Et rogo dominum Iesum Christum patronum meum, ut hanc summam ad laudem suam dirigat et honorem, ac eam convuertat ad vtilitatem legentium, et mihi ad meritum peruenire concedat.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Manipulus florum}, “Sapiencia uel sciencia,” m. “Iустorum, inquit, sapiencia est nil per ostentacionem fingere, sensum uerbis aperire, uera ut sunt diligere, falsa deuitare, bona gratis exhibere, mala libencius tollerare quam facere, nullam iniurie ultionem querere, pro ueritate contumeliam lucrum putare. Hec iustorum simplicitas deridetur et a mundi sapientibus fatuitas reputatur. Quid enim in hoc mundo stultius quam admissa non querere, possessa rapientibus relaxare, nullam pro acceptis iniuriis reddere, immo adiunctis alis pacienciam prebere?” Cf. Gregory the Great, \textit{Moralia in Job}, vol.1,10.29 (CCSL 143.571)


\textsuperscript{19} Sap. 7:9b.
Appendix II: Legal Contents of the *Speculum religiosorum*

**Gratian's Decretum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decretum</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Decretum</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Decretum</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.20 c.2</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>D.86 c.3</td>
<td>c.7, 25v</td>
<td>C.8 q.1 c.13</td>
<td>c.7, 26v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.38 c.4</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>D.93 c.9</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
<td>C.11 q.1 c.38</td>
<td>c.7, 29v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.54 c.22</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>D.93 c.5</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
<td>C.11 q.3 c.3</td>
<td>c.7, 26v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.77 c.9</td>
<td>c.9, 45v</td>
<td>C.1 q.1 d.p. c.44</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
<td>C.11 q.3 c.91</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.81 c.9</td>
<td>c.9, 45v</td>
<td>C.1 q.1 c.45</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
<td>C.11 q.3 c.92</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.83 c.2</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>C.1 q.2 c.2</td>
<td>c.9, 54r</td>
<td>C.11 q.3 c.99</td>
<td>c.7, 25v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.83 c.3</td>
<td>c.7, 25v</td>
<td>C.1 q.4 c.13</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>C.12 q.1 c.11</td>
<td>c.9, 43v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.83 c.3</td>
<td>c.7, 25v</td>
<td>C.5 q.4 c.3</td>
<td>c.9, 45v</td>
<td>C.12 q.2 c.37</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.86 c.1</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
<td>C.7 q.1 d.a. c.1</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.2</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.86 c.26</td>
<td>c.7, 25v</td>
<td>C.8 q.1 c.10</td>
<td>c.7, 25v</td>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.10</td>
<td>c.7, 30r; c.9, 42v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 dict. ante c.1</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
<td>C.17 q.1 c.11</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 d. p. c.8</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.1</td>
<td>c.9, 42v</td>
<td>C.17 q.1 c.12</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.13</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.3</td>
<td>c.9, 44v</td>
<td>C.17 q.4 c.40</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.14</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.4</td>
<td>c.9, 42v</td>
<td>C.18 q.1</td>
<td>c.9, 44v</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.15</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.5</td>
<td>c.9, 42v</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.1</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.16</td>
<td>c.9, 44v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decretum</td>
<td>SR I</td>
<td>Decretum</td>
<td>SR I</td>
<td>Decretum</td>
<td>SR I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.8</td>
<td>c.9, 42v</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 d. p. c.1</td>
<td>c.7, 30r; c.9, 45v</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.21</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.11</td>
<td>c.9, 42v</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.2</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.22</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.35</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.3</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.23</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.36</td>
<td>c.9, 42v</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.5</td>
<td>c.9, 44v, 45v</td>
<td>C.19 q.2 c.2</td>
<td>c.9, 53v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.16 q.1 c.37</td>
<td>c.7, 31r</td>
<td>C.18 q.2 c.7</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
<td>C.20 q.4</td>
<td>c.7, 26v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.23 q.4 c.28</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
<td>C.25 q.1 c.12</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>D.4 de cons c.103</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.25 q.1 c.4</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>C.25 q.1 c.13</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>D.5 de cons c.32</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.25 q.1 c.5</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>C.33 q.2 c.8</td>
<td>c.9, 53r</td>
<td>D.5 de cons c.33</td>
<td>c.9, 43r; c.21, 69r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.25 q.1 c.11</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liber extra**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>c.7, 25r</td>
<td>1.31.7</td>
<td>c.7, 28r; c.7, 29v</td>
<td>1.33.10</td>
<td>c.7, 28r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.15</td>
<td>c.7, 27r</td>
<td>1.31.13</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
<td>1.39.1</td>
<td>c.9, 43r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1</td>
<td>c.7, 27r</td>
<td>1.33.4</td>
<td>c.7, 25v</td>
<td>2.20.31</td>
<td>c.7, 29r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.5</td>
<td>c.7, 26r; c.7, 27v</td>
<td>1.33.5</td>
<td>c.7, 25v; c.2, 5v</td>
<td>2.28.32</td>
<td>c.7, 28r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14.1</td>
<td>c.7, 27v</td>
<td>1.33.9</td>
<td>c.7, 29r</td>
<td>3.22.4</td>
<td>c.9, 42r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>SR I, fol. in G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SR I, fol. in G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SR I, fol. in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23.2</td>
<td>c.9, 37v; c.9, 42r</td>
<td>3.35.6</td>
<td>c.7, 26r; c.7, 26v; c.9, 37v; c.9, 39v</td>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24.3</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>3.35.7</td>
<td>c.9, 37v; c.9, 40r</td>
<td>5.9.6</td>
<td>c.7, 26v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31.7</td>
<td>c.7, 27r</td>
<td>3.35.8</td>
<td>c.7, 29r; c.9, 37v; c.9, 41r</td>
<td>5.31.12</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31.9</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
<td>3.37.4</td>
<td>c.7, 31r</td>
<td>5.31.16</td>
<td>c.7, 29r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31.10</td>
<td>c.7, 27v</td>
<td>3.50.7</td>
<td>c.9, 44v</td>
<td>5.33.3</td>
<td>c.9, 45v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31.18</td>
<td>c.7, 27rv</td>
<td>3.50.10</td>
<td>c.7, 27r; c.9, 43r</td>
<td>5.33.14</td>
<td>c.7, 29v/ c.9, 44v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31.22</td>
<td>c.9, 37r; c.9, 37v</td>
<td>5.1.11</td>
<td>c.9, 43r</td>
<td>5.39.2</td>
<td>c.9, 37v/ c.9, 41r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31.23</td>
<td>c.9, 37r; c.9, 37v</td>
<td>5.1.26</td>
<td>c.9, 45r</td>
<td>5.39.24</td>
<td>c.9, 37v/ c.9, 41v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35.2</td>
<td>c.9, 37rv; c.9, 38v; c.9, 44v; c.7, 31r</td>
<td>5.3.7</td>
<td>c.9, 37v; c.9, 41r</td>
<td>5.39.32</td>
<td>c.7, 26v; c.9, 37v; c.9, 42r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35.3</td>
<td>c.9, 45r</td>
<td>5.3.25</td>
<td>c.9, 41r</td>
<td>5.39.33</td>
<td>c.9, 42r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35.5</td>
<td>c.7, 31r; c.9, 44r</td>
<td>5.3.43</td>
<td>c.7, 26r/ c.7, 28v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Liber sextus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
<td>3.24.2</td>
<td>c.9, 43v/c.9, 43v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16.9</td>
<td>c.7, 29r/c.9, 46r</td>
<td>3.12.15</td>
<td>c.9, 53r</td>
<td>5.7.3</td>
<td>c.7, 27v/c.9, 42v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17.1</td>
<td>c.2, 5v</td>
<td>3.14.6</td>
<td>c.7, 29v</td>
<td>5.7.6</td>
<td>c.7, 29v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.2</td>
<td>c.7, 29r</td>
<td>3.16.1</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
<td>5.11.24</td>
<td>c.9, 52v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clementines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clem.</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Clem.</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Clem.</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1</td>
<td>c.8, 37r</td>
<td>3.8.1</td>
<td>c.9, 51v</td>
<td>3.14.2</td>
<td>c.9, 51r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2</td>
<td>c.9, 47v</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>c.9, 51r</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.3</td>
<td>c.9, 51r</td>
<td>3.10.1</td>
<td>c.7, 31r/c.9, 39v/c.9, 49v</td>
<td>5.7.1</td>
<td>c.9, 52v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>c.7, 31v</td>
<td>3.12.1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5.10.1</td>
<td>c.9, 53r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>c.9, 51v</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
<td>c.9, 52r</td>
<td>5.11.2</td>
<td>c.9, 45r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### English Canon Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langton</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Langton</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Langton</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.38</td>
<td>c.9, 47r</td>
<td>c. 41</td>
<td>c.7, 31v</td>
<td>c. 53</td>
<td>c.9, 47v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.39a</td>
<td>c.9, 47r</td>
<td>c.42</td>
<td>c.9, 47r</td>
<td>c. 57</td>
<td>c.9, 46v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.39b</td>
<td>c.9, 47r</td>
<td>c.43</td>
<td>c.9, 50v</td>
<td>c.59</td>
<td>c.9, 50v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.40</td>
<td>c.7, 31v</td>
<td>c.48</td>
<td>c.9, 47v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>SR I, fol. in G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 19</td>
<td>c.7, 30v; c.9, 39v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ottobuono</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Ottobuono</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>Ottobuono</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.22</td>
<td>c.7, 30v</td>
<td>c.43</td>
<td>c.9, 46v</td>
<td>c.49</td>
<td>c.9, 46v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.38</td>
<td>c.7, 30v</td>
<td>c.44</td>
<td>c.9, 39v</td>
<td>c.50</td>
<td>c.7, 31r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.39</td>
<td>c.9, 37v</td>
<td>c.45</td>
<td>c.9, 46v</td>
<td>c.51</td>
<td>c.9, 46v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.40</td>
<td>c.7, 31r</td>
<td>c.46</td>
<td>c.7, 31v</td>
<td>c.53</td>
<td>c.9, 46v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.41</td>
<td>c.9, 46v</td>
<td>c.47</td>
<td>c.7, 31v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.42</td>
<td>c.7, 31r</td>
<td>c.48</td>
<td>c.7, 31v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pecham</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.16</td>
<td>c.9, 40r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentaries**

**Glossa ordinaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GO</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>GO</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
<th>GO</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad D.54, c.22</td>
<td>c.7, 30r</td>
<td>ad C.12 q.1 c.11</td>
<td>c.9, 43v</td>
<td>ad C.18 q.2 c.7</td>
<td>c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad D.69 c.1</td>
<td>c.7, 26rv</td>
<td>ad C.12 q.1 c.37</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
<td>ad C.18 q.2 c.16</td>
<td>c.9, 44v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad D.93 c.5</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
<td>ad C.16 q.1 c.1</td>
<td>c.9, 42v</td>
<td>ad C.23 q.4 c.28</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad C.7 q.1 c.?</td>
<td>c.9, 45v</td>
<td>ad C.16 q.1 c.3</td>
<td>c.9, 44v</td>
<td>ad X 1.11.5</td>
<td>c.7, 28r, 29v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad C.11 q.1 c.38</td>
<td>c.7, 29v</td>
<td>ad C.18 q.2 c.5</td>
<td>c.9, 44v</td>
<td>ad X 1.33.9</td>
<td>c.7, 29r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GO**        | **SR I**    | **GO**        | **SR I**    | **GO**        | **SR I**    |
| ad X 1.33.10 | c.7, 28r   | ad X 3.35.5   | c.9, 44r   | ad X 5.1.11   | c.9, 43v   |
| ad X 2.28.32 | c.7, 28r   | ad X 3.35.6   | c.7, 26rv; c.9, 37v; c.9, 39v | ad X 5.1.26   | c.9, 45r   |
| ad X 3.24.3  | c.7, 30r   | ad X 3.35.8   | c.7, 29r   | ad X 5.3.43   | c.7, 26r   |
| ad X 3.35.2  | c.9, 38v   | ad X 3.50.3   | c.7, 27r   | ad X 5.31.16   | c.7, 29r   |

**Innocent IV, Apparatus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inn. IV</th>
<th><strong>SR I, fol. in G</strong></th>
<th>Inn. IV</th>
<th><strong>SR I, fol. in G</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in X 1.9.15</td>
<td>c.7, 27r</td>
<td>in X 3.31.9</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in X 1.10.1</td>
<td>c.7, 27r</td>
<td>in X 5.1.26</td>
<td>c.9, 45r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in X 1.11.15</td>
<td>c.7, 26r</td>
<td>in X 5.33.14</td>
<td>c.7, 29v; c.9, 44v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in X 1.31.7</td>
<td>c.7, 28r; c.7, 29v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hostiensis, *Lectura*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host.</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>super X 5.5.4</td>
<td>c.9, 44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>super 5.33.14</td>
<td>c.7, 29v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guido da Baysio, *Apparatus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guido</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in VI 1.2.3</td>
<td>c.7, 26v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in VI. 1.16.9</td>
<td>c.7, 29r; c.9, 46r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Johannes Andreae, *Glossa*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andreae</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad VI 1.4.3</td>
<td>c.7, 28v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad VI 2.10.2</td>
<td>c.7, 29r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad VI 5.7.3</td>
<td>c.7, 27v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Johannes Monachus, *Glossa aurea*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monachus</th>
<th>SR I, fol. in G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad VI 1.17.1</td>
<td>c.2, 5v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad VI 2.10.2</td>
<td>c.7, 29r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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