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Abstract

In a world where men often demonstrated their masculine identity through violent action and sexual expression, how did the Dominican friar, forbidden to physically fight and committed to chastity, reconcile his sense of being a man with his vocational prerogatives? Often raised outside the convent and inculcated in lay understandings of maleness, the friar then entered a world of preachers, whose vocation required both commitment to conventual life, which emphasized separation from the world, and extensive involvement with lay society through pastoral work. This dissertation looks at how these two seemingly disparate behavioral codes—lay definitions of masculine behavior and religious ideals—found expression in the corporate identity of the Dominican Order from 1220-1350. In the process of defining the Order’s vocational goals, behavioral ideals, and overall function in late medieval society, the early Dominican writers simultaneously created behavioral ideals for men that reflected those defining laymen as men. By comparing the values, behavioral norms, and ideology presented in the Order’s important nascent texts with the secular ideals of masculinity described in anthropological studies, gender theory, late medieval literature, rhetorical sources, medical theory, legal records, letters, art, and religious traditions, this study explores the porous boundary between societal expectations for laymen and vocational models for Dominican friars during the Order’s formative period. Viewed through the gendered habitus of late medieval society, the Dominican Constitutions, hagiographic texts, liturgical settings, preaching manuals, and encyclical letters collectively showed friars how to simultaneously function as a Dominicans and as men, while providing a valuable window into the relationship between religion and masculinity in the late medieval period.
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</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td><strong>AFP</strong></td>
<td><em>Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASS</strong></td>
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<td><strong>GoF, Vitae</strong></td>
<td>Gerard of Frachet, <em>Vitae fratrum ordinis praedicatorum</em>, edited by Benedictus Maria Riechert, in <em>MOPH</em> 1 (Louvain, 1896).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HoR, De officiis</strong></td>
<td>Humbert of Romans, <em>De officiis ordinis</em>, in <em>Opera de vita regulari</em>, edited by Joachim Joseph Berthier, vol. II (Marietti, 1956).</td>
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</tr>
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<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPH</td>
<td><em>Monumenta ordinis praedicatorum historica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td><em>Patrologia Latina</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction: Articulating Masculine Identity Among Late Medieval Religious Men

In his mid-thirteenth century edition of Saint Dominic's vita, the Dominican writer Constantine of Orvieto described a miracle in which a certain deacon complained to the saint that he was so beset with lust that he had been forced to abandon his ministry to the general population in order to avoid temptation. According to Constantine's account, Dominic cured the unfortunate deacon by saying, "Go among the rest, go manfully, and do not despair about God's mercy. I will ask him to give fleshly continence to you." At first glance, the type of masculine religious behavior enabled by the exhortation to "go manfully" was control of the body's sexual expression and avoidance of personal sin in the face of temptation, a definition that reflected traditional monastic ideals of male behavior originating in Christianity's earliest days and extending its influence throughout the medieval monastic world. Gerard of Frachet similarly utilized this phrase when describing how a young friar received relief from his personal temptations by praying the psalm containing the phrase *age viriliter* with the Blessed Jordan of Saxony. However, the psalm to which *age viriliter* referred described how David encouraged himself to "go manfully" among his enemies, unafraid and hopeful in the Lord's promise of salvation, a passage that thematically emphasizes the need for courageous action in response to dangerous situations and appeared in medieval hagiography to encourage saints to action in the face of persecution. Thus, Constantine's story also highlights the increasing need for religious men to engage in pastoral work among the laity and to face the dangers and temptations found outside of the cloister, while still maintaining the standards of the religious ideal emphasized in the convent. As we will see, anxiety about this fundamental vocational prerogative, a marked change from the masculine monastic ideal of the previous century, which had more commonly emphasized segregation from the outside world, infused the writings of

---

3 GoF, *Vitae*, chapter 3.9, pg. 109-110
the early Dominicans.\(^5\) The great fifth master general of the Dominican Order, Humbert of Romans, for example, noted that many Dominican preachers were afraid to engage in public preaching because of the spiritual dangers to be found outside the convent walls.\(^6\) The rhetorical solution to this anxiety, articulated by Constantine of Orvieto’s Dominic then was to “go manfully.” Gerard of Frachet reiterated this fundamental message in a different miracle story in which the Virgin Mary appeared to a young Dominican, who “was greatly burdened by a certain task entrusted to him and feared the danger that threatened him,” and consoled him by saying “\textit{go manfully and let your heart be comforted}, and hope for a short time since the office which is troubling you will be a due reward and a crown for you.”\(^7\) Thus, according to these seminal Dominican writers, to act like a Dominican and a man was to face the burdensome and dangerous tasks inherent in the Order’s vocation so that fulfillment of this task would bring great reward.

**Defining Religious Masculinity: Historiography and Methodology**

Historians have paid increasing attention to masculine identity in the medieval period, looking at self-definition among men, particular behavioral expectations among various subgroups of men during the period, as well as the social implications of masculine identity. Many of these studies are undergirded by the same definition of masculine identity formation, itself founded on key expositions of gender theory, a definition perhaps most eloquently articulated by historian John Tosh who, writing about Victorian England during the nascent stages of masculinity studies, wrote the following\(^8\):

---

5 Maribel Dietz, \textit{Wandering Monks, Virgins, and Pilgrims: Ascetic Travel in the Mediterranean World, A.D. 300-800} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 69-106 and Lynda Coon, \textit{Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic Practice in the Early Medieval West} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 76-8. The Order’s repeated admonitions controlling the movements of its friars outside of the convent reflects its anxiety over being associated with the \textit{girovagi}, wandering monks generally condemned by medieval monastic rules. See, for example, C. Douais, ed. \textit{Acta capitularum provincialium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum, première province de Provence, province romaine—province d’Espagne (1239-1302)} (Toulouse: Édouard Privat, 1894), III (1241), 19; XIII (1251), 44; XVI (1254), 60; XIX (1257), 70; XXX (1268), 133; and XV (257), 508. Berenger of Landore distinguished the members of the Order’s Friars Pilgrims with the \textit{girovagi}, since the latter wandered about without gathering fruit or having license to do so in \textit{Litterae encyclicae}, appendix, I, pg. 314.


Masculinity...is both a psychic and a social identity: psychic, because it is integral to the subjectivity of every male as this takes shape in infancy and childhood; social, because masculinity is inseparable from peer recognitions, which in turn depends on performance in the social sphere. It is the uneasy and complex relation between these two elements which explains masculinity’s power to shape experience and action, often in ways beyond the conscious grasp of the participants. At one and the same time, men pursue practical goals of gender aggrandizement and are guided by unacknowledged fantasies designed to defend the psyche. That, it seems to me, is what patriarchy means.9

Central to Tosh’s definition was his sense of gendered identity as a constantly evolving dialogue between the individual’s internalization of masculine identity and changing externalized notions of what it meant to be a man. The male individual then negotiated these ideals while moving toward social advancement, material advantage, and power. Historians of medieval masculinity among religious men, a relatively small subset of medieval masculinity studies as a whole, have embraced this understanding of masculine identity as a dialogue between internalized understandings of male behavior and externalized societal pressures, discussing medieval religious masculine identity as the relationship between internalized secular ideals of masculinity acquired in a boy’s youth and the often conflicting behavioral expectations placed upon him by his religious vocation. The exact relationship between these, however, varies with the historical period in question. While scholars of the late Classical period generally point to the consistency between Roman ideals of masculine governance, rhetoric, and civic ideologies and the presentation of Christian male martyrs and early bishops, even portraying the new Christian hierarchy and the ascetic movement as repositories for Roman masculine ideals challenged first by a more powerful imperial system and then by Rome’s collapse, medieval historians have tended to see religious and secular ideals of masculinity as inherently oppositional.10 The relatively nascent research on medieval conceptions of masculinity among religious men has focused on the issues of sexual renunciation and violent action as the critical points of tension between masculine religious and secular ideals, largely portraying religious men as compensating in some way for

---


their inability to fulfill these key markers of secular masculine identity. Some authors even went so far as to claim that monks and clergymen were considered a type of third gender, held outside of the normal ways of understanding the female-male gendered dichotomy. In addition, because medieval masculine religious identity as discussed in these studies hinged on this balance between a particular order’s ideals and surrounding secular expectations, historians have also focused on the idea of medieval masculinities in crisis, that is, as undergoing periods of particularly intense change in response to ecclesiastical or social changes that challenge established conventions. Thus, for example, JoAnn McNamara spoke of the Herrenfrage precipitated by broad social changes during the twelfth century and defined by the ideological struggle of the newly celibate clergy competing for primacy within the ecclesiastical hierarchy as well as attempting to position themselves within the secular male hierarchy. Many later studies followed this fundamental understanding of the formation of medieval religious masculine identity.

While these studies have undoubtedly contributed to the development of a dialogue about medieval conceptions of masculinity among religious men, the focus on conflict between internal, secular ideals of masculinity and external, religious vocational ideals has several limitations. Although secular and religious life were certainly considered oppositional in many ways by men from all areas of medieval society, to

---


13 This idea of the “crisis of masculinity” inherent to masculine identity emerged in several gender theory texts and discussed in Brittan, Masculinity. It has also appeared in several historical studies of masculinity among the religious orders including Jo Ann McNamara, “The Herrenfrage”; Jo Ann McNamara, “An Unresolved Sylogism: The Search for a Christian Gender System,” in Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West, ed. Jacqueline Murray (New York: Garland, 1999); Nelson, “Monks,” in Hadley, Masculinity; Swanson, “Angels,” in Hadley, Masculinity; and Isabel Davis, Writing Masculinity in the Later Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

14 McNamara, “The Herrenfrage.”
simultaneously describe this conflict in terms of masculine identity proves to be more problematic. While a late medieval religious man was undoubtedly called to reject secular modes of living to some extent in his quest for holiness, was he concurrently called to reject his masculine habitus in order to fulfill his chosen vocation? Historians have overwhelmingly answered this question affirmatively, largely describing the religious man’s personal battle between his internalized, psychological ideal of secular masculinity and the externalized, “anti-masculine” expectations placed upon him by religious ideals. The dichotomous nature of this portrayal in many ways reflects Victorian perspectives that defined the clergyman who demonstrated sexuality as both a “masculine” and “faux” clergyman while simultaneously defining a celibate clergyman as both “real” and “feminine.” Although this view has extended into modern society, late medieval people did not necessarily define religious and clerical masculinity in the same way. While, as with any process of self-identification, there were certainly points of tension between the secular and religious ideals regarding masculine behavior in the medieval world—particularly in the well-studied areas of sexuality and violent action—focusing on this as a strict dichotomy obscures the areas of the masculine religious vocation where religious and secular ideals worked in constructive or even harmonious dialogue in terms of masculine expression. In addition, it flattens our understanding of both secular and religious ideals of masculine behavior, which most certainly revolved around more than these two issues. In essence, this perspective fails to achieve a holistic understanding of masculine self- and social fashioning inherent to the gendered identity of religious men in this period.

Indeed, several fundamental questions about late medieval religious masculinity require further investigation. Was a late medieval religious man’s sense of himself as distinctly male inherently challenged by his assumption of the religious habit? Was his sense of maleness defined by a struggle to re-work the secular ideals of his youth into a religious framework, in a sense, to compensate for the loss of masculine status.


inherent to the religious vocation? More fundamentally, were secular ideals of masculinity the baseline by which religious men assessed their own male status? Finally, did late medieval understandings of masculine identity include an idea of a masculine religious vocation among its variegated understandings of maleness, and, if so, what did this concept of a masculine religious vocation look like? While some short studies have sought to answer these questions of masculine self-understanding in a religious context, more in-depth and holistic research is certainly necessary to fully appreciate the complexity of masculine self-fashioning among late medieval religious men. This dissertation seeks to partially answer these questions by looking at how Dominican men gendered themselves as particularly male during the first century of the Order's existence.

The early Dominican Order from its foundation until 1350 provides an excellent focal point for addressing the formation of masculine self-identification among religious men for several reasons. First, the Order represented a relatively unique modus operandi for pastoral care that emerged in the later medieval period, which placed an increasing number of religious men affiliated with a modified monastic rule in the midst of the secular world, a situation that could easily have precipitated the sort of "crisis of masculinity" typically discussed by gender historians. Although Derek Neal has convincingly argued against the centrality of crisis at the heart of historical research on masculinity, the formation of the Dominican Order, whose vocation represented a unique mixture of earlier monastic and clerical vocations, would certainly have required a pointed branding effort by the Order to justify its existence, defend its prerogatives within the educational and pastoral world, garner papal and lay support, and recruit new members. While perhaps not a "crisis of masculinity," the process of corporate identity formation required of the nascent order certainly had implications in gendering religious vocations since the early friars would have either consciously or unconsciously negotiated their particularly masculine identity in the process of negotiating their Order's overall identity, thus providing an institutionalized version of the gendered negotiation undergone to some extent by all late medieval men. In addition, the late medieval period itself provides a historiographically overlooked and particularly fruitful period of study for addressing intersections between religious, secular, and secular ideals of masculinity.

---


and masculine identity, since medieval Christianity had a long history of sorting out the gendered implications of the faith through theological writings, hagiographic texts, and monastic rules by that point. This is not to say that there did not continue to be actual points of conflict between religious and secular ideals or that certain areas ceased to be points of tension, but that religious writers had developed ideological systems for addressing the gendered implications of these conflicts to which religious men could refer during the process of negotiating their own gendered expressions. In addition, historians have produced a relatively large corpus of materials studying secular ideals of masculinity in the late medieval period based upon a variety of artistic, literary, legal, and administrative sources that allow us to access with some certainty the ideals with which medieval men had been inculcated.19

Despite the potential for studying masculine identity formation in the Dominican Order, previous studies discussing this topic within the Order are extremely limited since the field of masculinity studies itself is nascent and most gender studies focus on secular concepts of masculinity or the monastic incorporation of these ideals. John Coakley is one of the only scholars to address Franciscan and Dominican masculinity directly and he does so by focusing on the relationship between the mendicant hagiographer and the saint in question. In an early article and later book dealing with several different religious orders, he claims that “female” spirituality propelled the mendicant and the saint together, while “male” spirituality maintained a distance.20 In turn, women’s spirituality attracted friars unable to fit personal devotion to God into their active lives.21 Although an interesting and compelling use of hagiographic texts, these studies do not account for the multifaceted nature of a Dominican preacher’s masculine identity, do not make use of the wide variety of source material available within the Dominican Order, and only relate to one aspect of a friar’s existence, his relationship to holy women. The only other study of masculinity to specifically discuss the mendicants is Derek Neal’s The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England. Within a study largely devoted to secular landowners, Neal briefly mentions the mendicants as a separate group, suggesting that because of their lack

---

19 See pgs. 10-18 below.
of property, lack of households, and nomadic living patterns they were viewed as “unmanly” or even as homosexuals by men subscribing to a concept of masculinity based upon political governance and maintenance of property. The brief nature of this treatment as well as Neal’s reliance on popular songs and literature rather than the legal records used in the rest of the text leave this conclusion open to further research. Neal’s attempt to fit religious men, who seem to lack the requisite qualifications for manhood, into a paradigm of secular masculinity is both indicative of larger trends in masculinity studies and raises the question of the nature of the relationship between mendicant ideals of masculinity and secular ones. Finally, research focusing on identity formation in the Dominican Order from an educational, missionary, or inquisitorial perspective largely precludes discussions of the gendered origin, nature, and implications of this formation. This study then seeks to fill several scholarly lacunae dealing with religious masculinity in the late medieval period by first providing an extended study of masculine identity formation within a late medieval religious order that focuses on self-definitions of manliness in many different areas. Secondly, this study will look specifically at points of continuity and disjunction within the dialogue between secular and religious ideals of masculinity as a way of discussing the nature of the relationship between the two. Thirdly, the dissertation will add further nuance to discussions of Dominican masculinity in relationship to and dialogue with Dominican femininity. Finally, this study seeks to add a vantage point to the overall scholarly discussion of Dominican identity formation, which has included impressive studies of inquisitorial, educational, and missionary identities established by the Order during its nascent years.

This study then, will look at how Dominican men described themselves and their Order’s vocation as particularly masculine and how these gendered self-portraits interacted with late medieval ideas of masculine expression in general, thus exploring the psychological and social dimensions of masculinity introduced by Tosh as they presented themselves in late medieval religious masculinity. The nature of the source material, however, makes any attempt to discover gendered self-constructions problematic since Dominican writers did not regularly discuss gendered identities or classify behaviors by using specifically gendered terms, a habit

---

22 Neal, Masculine Self, 116.
that perhaps accounts for some of the scholarly reticence on the topic. While those instances in which Dominican writers do characterize certain aspects of their Order’s vocation as masculine using explicitly gendered terms provide the most immediately obvious sources of information about masculine self-identification, they only represent a single way that late medieval writers could have spoken about gendered identity. In addition to overt descriptions of particular behaviors as masculine, Dominican understandings of a particularly male vocation can also be discerned by comparing writings about and for the Order’s men with those about and for the Order’s women, a common technique often utilized by gender historians.24 Thirdly, Dominican authors could also gender particular behaviors masculine by describing them using terms, behaviors, and ideological assumptions that late medieval audiences would have considered to be inherently masculine. Finally, the expectations of particular genres also provided opportunities for portraying certain behaviors and ideals in gendered terms. In surveying Dominican writings about the Order’s identity, mission, and practice this study will make use of all four approaches, looking at overt descriptions of gendered behavior, comparing depictions of the Dominican masculine and feminine vocation when pertinent sources are available, interpreting these descriptions through the lens of late medieval understandings of masculinity, and exploring the gendered implications contained in each genre.

Fundamental to this methodological approach, then, is a discussion of the late medieval masculine habitus that functioned as the lens through which late medieval people in general, as well as the Dominican friars in question, perceived their surroundings and determined the types of behaviors that functioned as social currency in the dialogue about gendered identity.25 This focus on gendered self-identification, central to Caroline Walker Bynum’s seminal description of late medieval feminine piety in Holy Feast and Holy Fast, has only been applied in a limited way to studies of contemporary masculine piety.26 The gendered habitus of

---

24 This is especially true in studies of sainthood. See, for example, Roisin, L’Hagiographie; Weinstein and Bell, Saints, 220-238; Richard Kieckhefer, “Holiness and the Culture of Devotion: Remarks on Some Late Medieval Male Saints,” in Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Szell, Images of Sainthood; André Vauchez, The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices, ed. Daniel E. Bornstein, trans. Margery J. Shneider (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993); and Coakley, “Friars, Sanctity, and Gender.”


those Dominican writers engaged in the task of constructing the Order’s masculine identity would have been formed by both the more secular inculcation undergone from infancy until entrance into the Dominican Order and the gendered religious traditions articulated by various religious sources and emphasized during their tenure in the Order. As we will see, these two sources of masculine gendered identity were not completely separate entities since the friar would continue to engage with secular ideals of male behavior as he lived out his religious vocation while religious gendered traditions influenced secular culture through contact with religious institutions. However, given that the Dominicans themselves envisioned entrance into the Order as a process of religious inculcation separating the friar from the secular world, and that historians have also separated the two arenas in terms of masculine identity, this dissertation will initially present religious and secular masculine ideals as separate world views so as to to better see how they interact with, oppose, or overlap with each other in the Dominican texts studied here.  

Background: Behaving Like a Man in Late Medieval Europe

While the majority of pertinent background information relating to specific aspects of secular and religious masculine ideals will be worked into the discussion of Dominican textual material, it seems appropriate to set the stage for this discussion with a very brief overview of the fundamental secular ideals of masculinity since these concepts provide the methodological “other” to which the Dominican texts under study will be compared. In addition, such a brief introduction will avoid repetition later in the discussion as these fundamental ideals of male identity largely transcended genres and appear in some form throughout the following discussion. Finally, since this dissertation seeks to rely upon a broader definition of secular masculine identity than that used by many prior studies of medieval religious masculinity, which mainly centered on sexual expression and performance of violence, it seems appropriate to provide a brief description of this definition here. This definition of secular masculine behavior is culled from the various micro-histories of late medieval masculinities, which describe specific models of masculine behavior.

demonstrated by various male subgroups. While these micro-histories have successfully challenged the monolithic concept of hegemonic masculinity in the later medieval period considered by early gender theorists and have provided valuable insight into the dynamism of late medieval concepts of masculine expression, they also run the risk of ignoring broader cultural assumptions about masculine identity that undergirded all of these seemingly disparate behavioral models, discernment of which the micro-studies themselves make possible. If we see each of these specific cultural models as a unique balance of behavioral expressions based on relatively consistent and fundamental ideas about maleness, it is possible to speak more broadly about several core understandings of manhood in the late medieval period.

In surveying existing historical research on late medieval masculine identity, three fundamental assumptions about the nature of late medieval masculine identity emerge: competition within a public, masculine hierarchy, demonstration of governance, and defense of the individual and corporate public image. Rather than speaking about these ideas in overtly gendered terms, however, medieval sources largely relied on the idiom of honor to discuss masculine identity. For medieval men, honor was a transitory attribute assigned by social judgment and based upon an individual’s public performance, behavior, and appearance that could be augmented, decreased, or lost with each public performance. Much more than a set of social rules governing behavior; however, honor was permanently embedded in an individual’s sense of identity. Possession of honor and honorable performance in many different areas of social relations determined the kinds of expectations a man could have of others, the demands others could make on him, his choice of marriage partner, his children’s marriage prospects, his economic position, and his legal status.

Maintenance of honor also determined a man’s relative maleness in late medieval society as it was the idiom

---

28 See, for example Brittan, Masculinity, 1-18 and 108-141; Ruth Mazo Karras, From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 3; and Jacqueline Murray, introduction to Murray, Conflicted Identities, ix-xx.


30 Many anthropologists and historians have labelled honor as a specifically masculine characteristic and shame a particularly feminine one, particularly in the Mediterranean. For a good summary and critique of this positions, see Christian Giordano, “Mediterranean Honour Reconsidered: Anthropological Fiction or Actual Action Strategy?,” Anthropological Journal on European Cultures 10, no. 1 (2001): 42.


through which men strove to demonstrate their gendered status in relation to other men. Those lacking honor entirely were excluded from this process of demonstrating socially recognizable masculine identity and were not considered "unmanly," but rather social non-entities. Thus, a medieval man did not simply seek to "be a man", in our modern colloquial sense, but to be "an honorable one."

As anthropological research, gender theory, literary, and historical studies of gender repeatedly stress, the process of competing with and dominating other men in the public sphere was a primary means by which a man established his gendered identity. This striving for honorable status created a masculine hierarchy in which men, in order to be considered as men, displayed social markers, behaviors, and characteristics defining them as such. The accumulation of masculine status, then, was active, public, and relative to other men. While late medieval people undoubtedly held views about women that defined them as opposite and inferior to men, late medieval men did not necessarily seek to prove themselves as "not women," but rather as more manly—or less feminine—than other men. In other words, manhood meant displaying more characteristics socially defined as masculine and fewer ones defined as feminine than other men—a sort of competition that does not appear with regularity in late medieval sources by and about women.

---


36 Brittan, Masculinity, 1-18.

37 Mazo Karras, From Boys, 10-11. Likewise, some medieval men hurled insults at one another containing either overt charges of femininity or application of characteristics socially labeled as feminine, as men attempted to feminize their enemies in relation to themselves. Louise Mirrer, "Representing 'Other' Men: Muslims, Jews, and Masculine Ideals in Medieval Castilian Epic and Ballad," in Lees, Medieval Masculinities, 171 and Steven F. Kruger, "Becoming Christian, Becoming Male?," in Becoming Male in the Middle Ages. Eds. J.J. Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler (New York: Garland, 1997), 21-41.

38 Indeed, late medieval hagiographers seemed to ascribe the same value system where masculine traits were considered superior in their assessment of women, rarely describing a woman as more feminine than other women and certainly not in a positive way while simultaneously labeling exceptionally admirable behavior as viriliter to distinguish exceptional women from their peers. See, for example, John Kitchen, Saints’ Lives and the Rhetoric of Gender: Male and Female in Merovingian Hagiography (New York, 1998), 102-105; Lisa Lampert, Gender and Jewish Difference from Paul to Shakespeare (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 29-30; and Bynum, Holy Feast, 318-19, ff. 68.
this placement along the masculine hierarchy also involved distinction between mature masculinity and youth, in which each category was defined by culturally specific behavioral patterns.\(^{39}\) In addition, youth was considered to be a particular stage of life, not necessarily dependent on chronological age, that was governed by a separate set of expectations and ultimately conferred fewer privileges than did mature masculinity.\(^{40}\) The ideological rhetoric of the immaturity/maturity continuum, along with its gendered connotations, was also affiliated with class, since the governing classes associated the lower classes with uncontrolled violence, sexuality, and other markers of youth.\(^{41}\) This status sometimes even operated independently of gender since higher class women were afforded more of the privileges associated with mature masculinity than men of


lower classes (although never the same amount as men of their own class) and thus were able to exhibit some of the markers of mature masculinity denied to lower class men.\footnote{42}

In other words, mature masculinity was largely defined by patriarchal authority, that is, governance over oneself, one’s dependents (both male and female), and, among wealthier members, one’s neighbors.\footnote{43} The concept of governance became increasingly important to masculine identity in the later medieval period and was the foundation of late medieval conceptions of patriarchal ability at all levels since a man had to demonstrate control of his own public behavior in terms of sexual, emotional, violent, and linguistic expression before being considered suitable to govern others.\footnote{44} In all of these areas, a mature man acted to reinforce his role as a patriarchal figure relative to his social class, utilizing his emotions, violent potential, and speech to solidify his position and establish himself as a self-governed man.\footnote{45} A mature man, having shown himself to be self-governed, could then govern others in various ways.\footnote{46} First, he was responsible for his immediate household, controlling their sexual activities, protecting their social reputations, representing them legally, and even providing them with military protection.\footnote{47} A man’s responsibility for household

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item Shannon McSheffrey, “Men and Masculinity in Late Medieval London Civic Culture,” in Murray, Conflicted Identities, 25-43.
\item Maddern, “Honour,” 360-2.
\end{itemize}}
members also extended to apprentices, servants, and slaves, for whom a patriarch and his wife often acted as parental figures, and the public actions of these individuals reflected on the patriarch's own social identity. Late medieval society considered this self-control and control of the household to be the foundation of the ability to bear positions of informal civic government, arranging a marriage between local people or settling disputes between neighbors, and formal political governing reserved for the highest social echelons. Thus, the concept of governance formed a pervasive element in late medieval hierarchical constructions of masculine identity, the expression of which established a man as honorable in the eyes of his peers and earned him the social, economic, and political benefits associated with this status.

If establishing masculine identity in late medieval Europe meant successfully competing with other men in the public sphere by demonstrating a certain level of governance, being a man also meant successfully defending that public masculine identity from those seeking to impugn it through personal insult, violent attack, or injury to a man's property or dependents. According to anthropological research, the major criteria for accruing and maintaining honor was the ability and readiness to use physical violence, while most other behaviors merely served to augment a position of honor gained by violent means. Historians have largely agreed with the centrality of violent action to late medieval constructions of masculine identity and to the daily processes through which men contested status, struggled for power, and gained access to necessary economic resources. The most idealized and mythical presentation of masculine violence and honor was, of course, associated with the late medieval knight who established his honorable masculine identity through his
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49 McSheffrey, "Men and Masculinity."


51 Pitt-Rivers, Fate of Shechem, 8; Black-Michaud, Cohesive Force, 180; and Caro Baroja, "Honour and Shame," 90-1. For historical studies, see Edward Muir, "The Double Binds of Manly Revenge in Renaissance Italy," in Gender Rhetorics: Postures of Dominance and Submission in History, ed. Richard Trexler (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1994); Edward Muir, Mad Blood Stirring: Vendetta and Factions in Friuli during the Renaissance (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1993); Oren Falk, Mark D. Meyerson, and Daniel Thiery, conclusion to Meyerson, Thiery, and Falk, 'A Great Effusion of Blood?, 319; and Rafael Narbona Vizcaíno, Malheores, Violencia y Justicia Ciudadana en la Valencia Bajomedieval (1360-1399) (Valencia: Ayuntamiento, 1990). For the incorporation of violent rhetoric into monastic life see Jacqueline Murray, "Masculinizing Religious." Derek Neal has argued that it was husbandry rather than physical violence that was central to masculine status in The Masculine Self.
connection to a lord, effective performance on the battlefield, and successful navigation of courtly culture. By the late medieval period, however, the presence of actual knights had faded as economic, social, and political power had gradually transferred into the hands of wealthy urban patricians, while the figure of the knight took on a more idealized and literary character.

More commonly actualized on the streets of late medieval Europe were demonstrations of personal honor through participation in feuding culture. Although the definition of the feud is highly controversial, numerous historical studies have indicated the presence of bands of men united by a web of patronage and formed for the purpose of violently defending the honor of the group in many different late medieval communities. These groups then engaged in both strategic and non-strategic violent confrontations with one another in a generally reciprocal pattern that was, to some extent, controlled by social expectations and regulations. The members of this group worked to defend the honor of the entire group through such activities as duels, nocturnal ambushes, assassinations, and group brawls. In turn, each individual augmented his own honorable standing by subsuming their individual identities within the group's identity since their participation in the group provided them with, in Pierre Bourdieu's words, the "backing of the collectivity-owned capital." The group's collective honor and resources were certainly not negligible since such feud support groups could function as small-scale political entities. Thus, active participation in a feud group lent the individual man more publicly demonstrated personal honor, reinforced his masculine identity, and provided a vehicle through which he could defend his own masculine honor.

---

52 For a complete discussion of the knightly ideal as a masculine model see Karras, From Boys, 22-65.
53 Karras, From Boys, 20-22.
56 Pierre Bourdieu, “Forms of Capital,” 248-9 and Daniel Smail also notes how membership in a band was a form of social capital by which individuals gained personal honor in "Hatred as a Social Institution in Late-Medieval Society" Speculum 76 (2001): 112-3.
57 Hyams, "Was There," 157 and Smail, “Faction and Feud.”
In addition to utilizing individual or corporate physical violence to defend personal honor, increasing evidence from late medieval sources indicate that men could have also used legal or ideological violence to achieve a similar goal depending on various social, economic, and political factors that often made physical violence impractical. Rhetorical abilities, for example, were more valued in many social settings than physical violence and could impinge upon another man's honorable reputation as effectively as a physical blow, since insults functioned as actions and were actionable in return. In many parts of late medieval Europe individuals perceived little difference between the amount of personal damage incurred by verbal affronts and the damage incurred by physical blows as both actions were classified as impingements on personal honor often resulting in long or short-term violent relationships. While men were expected to control their language more than women, their words were also considered as weapons to be deployed on the field of honor as a form of violence. Finally, legal courts provided some recourse for those pursuing restitution after a slight of honor, and the mobilization of the "state" against an enemy was a form of non-physical violence utilized by many people in this period. Although feud has traditionally been viewed as extra-legal and evidence of a weak judicial system, recent research on feuding and legal culture argues that these two institutions often existed alongside of each other and that medieval people viewed legal recourse as one of many options open for resolving conflicts involving honor. Although it is unclear exactly how recourse to legal action was perceived in terms of masculine identity, the frequency with which individuals at all social levels and both genders took their grievances to court suggests that court systems functioned as a reasonably honorable form of personal vengeance by the later medieval period. Thus, while the threat of physical violence was, in many ways, the most basic aspect of public masculine behavior, an increasing amount of

58 Bardsley, Venomous Tongues, 52; Solterer, Master and Minerva, 11-12.
60 Nirenberg, Communities of Violence, 30.
61 For a thorough introduction to historical studies on the feud see, Jeppe Büchert Netterstrøm, "Introduction: The Study of Feud in Medieval and Early Modern History" in Netterstrøm and Poulsen, Feud in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. This idea of that the growing strength of the state eventually led to the eradication of extra-legal feuding behaviors ultimately derives from Norbert Elias, The Civilizing Process (New York: Urizen, 1978). For studies defending the coexistence of these institutions, see Hyams, "Was There," 168-9; Muir, "The Double Binds," 72-6; Robert Bartlett, "Mortal Enmities': The Legal Aspect of Hostility in the Middle Ages," in Tuten and Billado, Feud, Violence, 197-212 and Smail, "Hatred."
evidence from the later medieval period shows that men did not always choose violent action in response to insult, but instead chose a course of action based upon a myriad of economic, social, and political factors.62

This dissertation, then, will explore the ways in which late medieval Dominicans constructed a specifically masculine identity for the Order as a whole in relation to these more broadly defined ideals of secular masculinity, while incorporating traditions of religious masculine behavior. Since masculine identity is such an elusive topic in medieval source material, this study will be organized around the types of sources, thus allowing for appropriate contextualization of each source and maximization of the thematic material contained within it. The sources are also presented in relative chronological fashion so as to facilitate a discussion of a developing Dominican identity through the first century and a half of its existence. The first chapter will begin by looking at the institutionalized hagiographic legacy of the Order’s founding saint, Dominic of Guzmán. Successively rewritten between 1231 and 1256 by some of the Order’s most prominent members as a way of solidifying Dominic’s saintly and ideological legacy to the Order, these vitae provide a detailed look at the process of the self-identification and individuation undergone by the nascent Order. The official hagiographic text was also incorporated into Dominican liturgical life, becoming an important point of internal identity cohesion for the brothers, and was presented to the wider public, thus helping to define public perceptions of the Order. The second chapter will then look at three normative sources also specifically aimed at collective self-fashioning: the Dominican Constitutions, the collection of stories about the brothers compiled by Gerard of Frachet, and the preaching manual written by Humbert of Romans delineating ideological and behavioral guidelines for the Order’s preachers. Together these texts form a body of material that provided practical behavioral guidelines and inspirational stories for the fratres communes involved in conventual and preaching life and were intended to create a sense of collective identity within the Order in the face of outside persecution. Rather than the lofty ideology found in Dominic’s hagiographic ideal, these texts instead dealt with more mundane and practical aspects of Dominican self-fashioning, internal identity, and communal values. The dissertation will then turn to the Order’s later saintly models in chapter three looking at construction of an official and externalized Dominican ideal in the vitae of Peter Martyr and Thomas Aquinas. In addition to functioning as important points of ideological cohesion for the brothers

themselves, since they represented the Order’s heroic figures at the apex of Dominican vocational goals, these texts also highlight the relationship between Dominican identity and larger ecclesiastical traditions. These *vitae* also played a role in how the Order framed its vocation to others, since the stories contained in the text found their way into the public consciousness through sermon material, art, and literature, and thus represent a strong externalization of the Dominican ideal. The final chapter will turn away from the illustrious world of the Order’s saints and return to the more internalized efforts at self-fashioning found in the annual encyclical letters sent by the Order’s master general. These letters contained a distillation of the vocational directives found elsewhere in the Dominican corpus and presented to the brothers in compact, lyrical, and recurring form that in many ways functioned as the ideological heart of the Order’s legislation and behavioral directives. Additionally, their annual appearance and preservation demonstrates shifts in the Order’s process of self-identification for the entirety of the period under discussion. Together, these sources provide a look at the process of both internal and external Dominican masculine identity formation between 1220 and 1350 from various vantage points.
Chapter 1. The Founder Effect: Depicting a Masculine Saint in the Vitae Dominici

By the fifteenth century, the cell walls of the Novitiate in the Dominican convent of San Marco in Florence featured eight images of St. Dominic engaged in different devotional postures before the crucified Christ. Unlike the frescoes adorning the convent’s other cells, which focus on Biblical scenes, these images concentrate on Dominic’s fluctuating postures of prayer in response to a static, crucifix-like Crucifixion scene, postures modeled after his devotional text de modo orandi. Both the text and its artistic representation in San Marco were directed at the Order’s novices, who were presented with Dominic’s words and image as a method of inculcating them into Dominican pious practice and conventual life.1 Unlike his saintly contemporary Francis of Assisi, whose charisma created an immediate, widespread, and enduring cult of personality, Dominic of Guzmán initially remained a relatively obscure figure both inside and outside of the Order.2 Indeed, Jordan of Saxony wrote in the prologue to his Libellus de Principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum, which chronicled the Order’s foundational years and contained Dominic’s initial hagiographic representation a decade after his death, that some brothers “who had seen and heard Christ’s venerable servant Dominic, the first founder, master, and brother of this Order,” had investigated and discovered the information in the book for those “brothers desiring to know...how the Order had been established, what type of people the first brothers of our Order had been, and how they grew in number and were comforted by grace.”3 That the brothers requested information about the Order as a whole, rather than the founder himself, suggests that Dominic’s initial legacy to his Order was that of an institutional founder rather than the personal exemplar that Francis had been. Francis’ biographer, in contrast, introduced his lengthy Legenda prima Francisci by writing that he “had striven to relate those things which he had heard from Francis’ mouth or learned from faithful and trustworthy witnesses, since no one’s mind could hold everything Francis did and taught in its


3 “Flagitantibus pluribus fratrum et scire cupientibus, qualiter hic Ordo Predicatorm...sumpsert institutionis exordium, qualesque exterint qualiterve numero multiplicati fuerint et confortati per gratiam primitivi ordinis nostri fratres, iam dudum investigatum est et compertum ab eisdem fratribus, qui novellis interfuere primordis, quique viderunt et audierunt venerabilem servum Christi magistrum Dominicum, primum religionis huius institutorem, magistrum et fratrem...” JoS, chap. 2, 25.
entirety.”

It seems that Dominic, unlike Francis, was lost as a historical figure among his early fratres. Given the lack of attention paid to the saint in the Order’s nascent years, especially in light of this stark contrast with the Franciscans, Dominican historians have tended to overlook Dominic’s personal influence within the Order itself, focusing instead on his legal and institutional legacy.5

Dominic’s artistic presence in the novices’ cells at San Marco in the 15th century, however, would suggest that even if the idea of Dominic as a figure for personal emulation within the Order was a late blooming flower, it did flower nonetheless. In fact, Dominic’s personal example was increasingly held up for adoration and emulation among the brothers as the thirteenth century progressed, largely at the instigation of the Order’s leaders who actively promoted their founder’s cult among the brothers.6 His image increasingly adorned the walls of Dominican convents and churches, partially at the repeated commands of the General Chapter, while the Order funded and constructed an elaborate tomb for him in Bologna, the site of a flourishing cultic center, and encouraged the brothers to procure church foundations to honor the saint.7

Dominic’s liturgical presence was significant from the very beginning since his feast day was celebrated with a
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4 “...quia omnia, que fecit et docuit, nullorum ad plenum tenet memoria, ea saltem, que ex ipsius ore audivi, vel a fidelibus et probatis testibus intellexi...studui explicare.” Thomas of Celano, “Tractatus primus super vitam sancti francisci de assisi,” in St. Francis of Assisi According to Brother Thomas of Celano: His Descriptions of the Seraphic Father, A.D. 1229-1257 (London: J.M. Dent, 1904), prologue, 4-5.


rare and prestigious *totum duplex* accompanied by a rhythmic liturgical office. Liturgical celebrations of the founding saint were also steadily increased throughout the thirteenth century until he was remembered in all feasts of nine lessons (1239), mass was said in his honor every week (1239), his prayer was read regularly (1244), the friars had to bow at the mention of his name in choir (1249), his name was in the litany (1254), the friars had to fast on his vigil (1276), and his name was added to the *Confiteor* (1282). The Masters of the Order also explicitly held Dominic up as the foundational model of Dominican life in their annual encyclical letters, exhorting the brothers “to pay attention above all to saint Dominic, as if toward a rock from which the Lord wants us to be hewn...” and “to strive toward this formative Abraham, our father St. Dominic, by whom our Order was founded with divine mediation.”

At the heart of these cultic manifestations within the Order was, in fact, Dominic's hagiographic legacy consisting of four *vitae* written between 1231 and 1256 by Jordan of Saxony, Peter Ferrando, Constantine of Orvieto, and Humbert of Romans, which provided the anecdotal fodder for various fresco scenes, the liturgical readings heard by the brothers, and the sermon material used to promote his legacy. Although hagiographers in general were less concerned with accurate representation of their subject as a historical figure than with producing a identifiable and imitable model of sanctity that balanced the demands of the saint’s cult, canonization requirements, and larger historical pressures, Dominic’s lack of personality made him an even more flexible subject for hagiographic representation than saints such as Francis. In
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8 *ACG* I:11 (1239); I:43 (1249); I:70 (1254); I:185 (1276); I:189 (1277); I:218 (1282); I:222 (1283); I:227 (1285); I:231 (1286); and I:236 (1286); William R. Bonniwell, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1944), 232-3, ff. 20-1; and Maura O’Carroll, “The Cult and Liturgy of St. Dominic,” in Centro Italiano, *Domenico di Caleruega*, 577-610.

9 “Attendite insuper ad beatum Dominicum, tanquam ad petram, de qua voluit dominus nos excidi...” and “hunc Abraham patrem nostrum beatum Dominicum, a quo mediante divino consilio nostro religionis status sumpset exordium, attendite figurantem...” *Litterae encyclice* XXIII, 88 (1272) and XLI, 145-6 (1290). See also, IX, 43 (1257); X, 47 (1258); XIIb, 57 (1260); L, 166 (1296); LXXI, 224 (1319); LXXV, 235 (1323); LXXV, 224 (1323); LXXVI, 238 (1324); and LXXVIII, 240 (1326).


addition, early thirteenth-century canonization proceedings did not require a hagiographic text and Dominic was canonized without an official vita so his hagiographers were relatively free from papal prerogatives while constructing their texts. With his relative lack of strong historical identity, lack of personality cult, and freedom from canonization requirements, the Dominic presented in the vitae was largely a hagiographic construction, more of what Delooz called "a product of collective representation" than a biographical reality. The successive reconstructions of the early vitae Dominici, therefore, simultaneously reflect the attempts of the Order's hagiographers to establish an enduring legacy for Dominic and to define the Order's corporate identity through his legacy. As the collective subject of Jordan's Libellus suggests, Dominic's vitae represent the purposefully constructed and institutionalized embodiment of the Order's collective ideals even while ostensibly focusing on the saint himself. Both Luigi Canetti and Christine Caldwell Ames have utilized these lives to discuss the evolution of Dominican identity in such areas as poverty and inquisitorial identity, but one neglected area of study is the gendered ideals contained in these texts. This chapter, then, will investigate how these seminal hagiographers represented a masculine behavioral ideal for the friars through the successive revisions of Dominic's life. In consciously crafting Dominic as a behavioral model for Dominican institutional identity, these hagiographers also, perhaps unconsciously, provided idealized male models within the context of a religious vocation.

**Dominican "Masculine" Sanctity: Sources and Methodology**

Despite the scholarly attention devoted to the topic of a particularly female sanctity since the emergence of gender studies in the 1970's, it has only been relatively recently that scholars have begun the search for the characteristics of a particularly male sanctity. One early work attempting to create a typology of both male and female pious expression was Weinstein and Bell's Saints and Society, in which the authors analyzed a wide body of hagiographic material throughout the medieval period in order to identify statistical
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12 Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 506.
trends of sainthood. In focusing on differences between male and female saints, Weinstein and Bell identified a "masculine type"—a holder of ecclesiastical or temporal power, missionary, fiery preacher, and heroic defender of personal virtue—and an "androgynous type" defined by penitential asceticism, private prayer, mysticism, and charity. The androgynous type contained forms of spiritual expression found more often in women, but displayed by both sexes. The next major attempt at defining a masculine spirituality was undertaken by Richard Kieckhefer, who surveyed the differences between men and women in areas such as eucharistic devotion, art, reading, education, and activism, ultimately concluding that there was no unifying motif in the pious expressions of male saints comparable to the role of food in female lives. These male saints, he claims, were "preoccupied with the varying circumstances of their active lives [and] dedicated to the pursuit of multiple goals, both public and private." Finally, John Coakley’s work on Franciscan and Dominican saints looks specifically at the emotional, psychological, and hagiographic relationship between friars and holy women, concluding that the affective, personal, and mystical relationship with God pursued by these women was attractive for friars, who were too occupied with their pastoral missions to devote themselves to this “feminine” piety. Thus, while these studies have proven invaluable in initiating scholarly research into a typology of medieval male sanctity, their results are hardly comprehensive or definitive.

In addition to their nascent and limited scope, all of these studies employ a common methodology: they isolate gendered ideals in hagiographic texts by comparing the way that male and female saints are represented differently within a text or a defined body of texts as a way of targeting the hagiographers’ or society’s perspectives on gendered sanctity. While particularly fruitful for determining perspectives on feminine sanctity, defined more strictly in opposition to male sanctity, this method is less useful for
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16 Weinstein and Bell, Saints, 237.
17 His point of comparison was Bynum, Holy Feast.
19 See, for example, Coakley, “Friars, Sanctity;” “Friars as Confidants;” and Women, Men. Jacques Dalarun also addressed this relationship between holy men and women, focusing on women’s perception of Francis of Assisi and his appeal to them. Jacques Dalarun, Francis of Assisi and the Feminine (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 2006).
20 See Kitchen, Saints’ Lives, which compares male and female lives written by the same authors; Weinstein and Bell, Saints; Goodich, Vita Perfecta; John Coakley, “Representations”; Coakley, “Friars, Sanctity”; Kieckhefer, “Holiness.”
determining masculine sanctity, which was more often defined in opposition to other men, children, and animals, especially when used as the sole methodological approach. This methodology is especially problematic in reference to early Dominican hagiography due to the historical realities of the Order’s development, notably, the absence of a well-developed branch of female Dominicans in the Order’s initial stages requiring a distinctly feminine model of sanctity. While Dominic’s vitae were written by and for men, contain only a few references to women, and were actively promoted by the Order’s leaders, the earliest collection of vitae providing holy models for female Dominicans, the Vitae sororum, was written by a Dominican nun nearly a century after the Order’s foundation without official support from the Order and was only directed at a single convent. In addition, while there were, as we will see, certain Dominican holy women associated with the Order that achieved some widespread recognition in the late 13th and early 14th centuries, the first Dominican female saint to achieve canonization was Catherine of Siena, who was officially canonized in 1461. The closest chronological and vocational model to Dominic was the Blessed Diana d’Andalo, who founded the female Dominican convent in Bologna and corresponded with Jordan of Saxony in a series of well-studied letters. The account of her life, however, was not an official hagiographic text, but a short excerpt in her convent’s chronicle, which was never circulated beyond the city. Thus, there was no obvious Clare of Assisi providing an immediate feminine foil for Dominic’s biographers. Dominic’s hagiographers, then, were likely not concerned with presenting male lives in contradistinction to a feminine ideal of sanctity, but with defining an ideal of sanctity that would place Dominic and the early Dominicans within contemporary ideals of maleness.
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21 See above introduction, 12-13.
Given the relatively homosocial nature of the nascent Order and lack of a clear female foil, this chapter will instead seek to establish a masculine Dominican model of sanctity by comparing his hagiographic representations to both religious traditions of male behavior and the secular ideals of masculinity learned by the friars in their youth and encountered in their daily lives. While the common hagiographic trope indicating saintly withdrawal from lay society would seem to preclude any positive formative influence of masculine secular ideals on Dominican hagiographers, it seems unlikely that the secular ideals of manhood that had formed a crucial part of the friars’ early development had no impact on their view of the spiritual world. In addition, the historically unique position of the Dominicans and other newly formed mendicant orders likely made secular ideals more influential than they were on earlier saints’ lives. This is because the Dominicans in the first century after their foundation primarily focused their recruitment efforts on young, university educated laymen, rather than the young boys who had formed the main group from which many other Orders had traditionally gained their members. In addition, the Dominicans, unlike more cloistered Orders, may have felt more pressure to construct an identity that gained them access to the lay male social hierarchy and the influence implied by such membership so that they could accomplish their preaching and evangelical goals among the laity. This combination of religious and secular traditions of masculine behavior thus provide a solid methodological platform from which to discuss Dominic as a masculine saintly model.

Although many of these hagiographic texts are called \textit{vita Dominici}, some of them are, in fact, \textit{vitae} of the Order’s development and include stories about many figures other than Dominic. The first of these collections, the \textit{Libellus de Principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum} by Jordan of Saxony, set this precedent of discussing many important early Dominicans rather than just Dominic since it was the founding document of the Order’s historical writing and a point of reference for all subsequent medieval Dominican hagiographic texts. The main body of the text was written between December 25, 1231 (when Bishop Fulk of Toulouse

\footnote{Several studies have indicated the extensive involvement of priests in the secular masculine world around them, including Neal, \textit{Masculine Self}, 89-122; Thibodeaux, "Man of the Church," 380-99; Mark D. Meyerson, “Clerical Violence”; and Kathryn Gravdal, \textit{Ravishing Maidens: Writing Rape in Medieval French Literature and Law} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 134.}\n
\footnote{See Jordan of Saxony’s descriptions of early new recruits, for example, in \textit{Beati Iordani de Saxonia Epistulae}, ed. Angelus Walz (Rome: Institutum historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum 1951), XX: 24 (1223); XXI: 24-5 (1223); XXXII: 37-8 (1226); VIII: 10 (1227); XIV: 16-17 (1229); IV: 7-8 (1231); XXVI: 30-1 (1231); L: 58 (1232); and XLII: 47-9 (1234).}\n
died) and Dominic’s canonization on July 3, 1234 and includes the account of Dominic’s translation, which was probably written after Dominic’s canonization and before Jordan’s death in late 1236. This collection focused on the Order’s foundation and early members rather than specifically on Dominic, but also included many discussions about Dominic, often in traditional hagiographic form. Perhaps because of its inclusive nature, the Libellus was soon replaced by a different vita Dominici composed by the Spaniard Peter Ferrando sometime before 1239 and is a more concise version of Jordan of Saxony’s text along with some additional miracles. This text was officially approved for liturgical use throughout the Order and was thus influential in communicating ideals of Dominican behavior to the brothers. Peter Ferrando’s text remained in use until it was replaced by Constantine of Orvieto’s Legenda Sancti Dominici in 1246, which was commissioned by the General Chapter as part of the liturgical reform of 1245 and was intended to include new miracles collected about Dominic in response to the Chapter’s request. Of all of the vitae discussed here, Constantine of Orvieto’s is the most disparate, not only including a large set of previously unwritten miracles, but also altering events and details from Jordan of Saxony and Peter Ferrando’s texts. Constantine himself seemed more overtly aware of the role that his life would play in solidifying Dominic’s saintly status and image, commenting in the introduction that very few of the stories related in Peter’s edition functioned to amplify Dominic’s sanctity and that the reader could judge whether his own version was more successful in this matter. Despite his audacious words, Constantine borrowed heavily from both Jordan and Peter. His Legenda was penned between 1246-7 and inserted into the Dominican choir books after the Order approved it in 1248. Constantine’s was not, however, to be the last vita Dominici to be commissioned and put into use

27 Francis Lehner, ed., Saint Dominic: Biographical Documents (Washington D.C.: The Thomist Press, 1964). There is also a debate among scholars as to whether this section was written in the form of an encyclical letter to the entire Order or not. See Scheeban, introduction to JoS, 5 and Giulia Barone, “Il Libellus de initio Ordinis fratrum Predicatorum e lo sviluppo dell’Ordine nel primo cinquantennio,” in Centro italiano, Domenico di Caleruega, 432-5.


30 ACG 1 (1245), 33.

31 “Audacter namque profiteor, quod in comparatione eorum, que de novo sunt addita, pausa simul et parva censenda sunt, que prior editio continebat, cum etiam ea, que maioris estimationis videntur, discussa diligentius et inspecta, proot ibi sunt posita, inventantur propert defectum in rebus gestis plenarie veritatis non multum ad itulum beati Dominic pertine, nonnulla vero notam potius et minorationem important. In omnibus autem et singulis, quantum ex hac compilatione laudi eius acceverit, ipsius diligens examinatio poterit indicare, si tamen pium et fidelem habuerit inspectorem.” CoO 3, 287.

by the Order. While Constantine of Orvieto’s text was approved, many of the other liturgical revisions planned as part of a larger reform were stalled and eventually passed to the next master general of the Order, the influential Humbert of Romans. Under his guidance the revised liturgy was completed in 1256 and papally approved in 1267. As part of this final version, Humbert of Romans composed yet another life of Dominic, again titled Legenda Sancti Dominici, that was a compilation of Peter Ferrando and Constantine of Orvieto’s text and was meant to supersede all previous lives within the Dominican liturgy, while precluding any future revisions.33

This succession of lives thus provides a window into the evolution of Dominic’s image as it was gradually reshaped during the Order’s nascent years by successive writers, who borrowed and altered material from the previous lives to suit the demands of the Order, the wider church, and society in general. The final product of these revisions, Humbert of Romans’ Legenda, was, in a sense, the most influential of all the lives in crafting Dominican identity since it replaced previous vitae, theoretically precluded any future texts, became the standard version depicting the founding father, and was read in all Dominican convents. Indeed, this legenda was even circulated within the Order as a separate text outside of the liturgy, as the Lombard Provincial Chapter’s 1293 directive that all convents should have a copy of Dominic’s legend under penalty of fasting suggests.34 However, despite the prominence of Humbert’s Legenda, not all of the previous vitae Dominici were destroyed and many continued to circulate among the brothers in some form.35 In this sense, all of these lives continued to be influential in determining and solidifying Dominican identity, including a specifically masculine one, through their representation of Dominic.36

The following discussion will look at changes in Dominic’s legacy through the successive lives arranged according to the important themes developed throughout the texts and in relation to secular and religious traditions of male behavior. In addition to facilitating discussion, this arrangement also reflects the

35 Angelus Walz, Einfuehrung zu HoR, Legenda, 360. For example, some manuscripts containing Constantine of Orvieto’s Vita still exist that were copied in the 14th or 15th centuries and one existing manuscript from Prouille contains all of Dominic’s vitae except for Humbert’s. See H.-C. Scheeren, Einfuehrung zu CoO; SOP I: 293; and R. J. Loenertz, "Archives de Prouille" AJP 24 (1954): 5-49.
internal structure of the *vitae* themselves, which generally proceed chronologically through Dominic’s life, but also tend to emphasize certain themes during particular periods of the saint’s activities. The first section will discuss Dominic’s pious practices, which formed the foundational layer on which his sanctity was constructed and included physical mortification, chastity, and prayer. The second part will turn to the most common aspects of the *cura animarum* advocated by the Order’s leaders and, not coincidentally, central to Dominic’s vocational development: study and preaching. The third section will look at the activity most characteristic of Dominic’s saintly identity and institutional legacy, his interactions with the “enemies of the faith”, that is, heretics. This thematic arrangement also reflects the presentation of Dominic in his feast day liturgy and Gregory IX’s Bull of Canonization, foundational texts in the construction of the saintly Dominic to which the discussion will also refer.

**Conquering the Body: Asceticism, Physical Mortification, Chastity, and Prayer**

Every August as the warmth of summer began to fade, late medieval Dominicans throughout Europe would have gathered in the evening to begin their liturgical celebration of Dominic’s feast day by singing the following First Vespers hymn:

“Rejoice, Mother Church, giving happy recollection that you sent the joys of the new offspring to the heavenly curia. Dominic, leader and father of the Order of Preachers, now shines to the ends of the world after being made a heavenly citizen. Free from the flesh’s prison, he reached Heaven’s glory; because of poverty’s belt he was given a royal stole. The fragrant odor from his tomb with the frequency of virtue proclaims the Highest Father’s mighty works through Christ’s servant. Praise, honor, strength, and glory to God, both three and one, who leads us to heavenly joys through Dominic’s prayers.”

The liturgical placement of this hymn at the beginning of Dominic’s feast day underscores the foundational and introductory nature of the material contained within the office, as it was the brothers’ first extended encounter with Dominic’s legacy for the feast and the thematic canvas on which the rest of the celebration was built. The text of the hymn, which contained the bulk of the information about Dominic related during Vespers, would suggest that the foundation of Dominic’s sanctity, divine priestly authority, and intercessory role for his sons was his practice of bodily transcendence, poverty, and personal virtue. Dominic’s

---

37 Gaude mater ecclesia letam agens memoriam que nove proliis gaudia mittis ad celi curiam./Predicatorum ordinis dux et pater Dominicus mundi iam fulget terminis civis effectus celicus/Carnis liber ergastulo celi potitur gloria pro pauperitatis cingulo stola dotatur regia./Fragrans odor de tumulo cum virtutum frequentia clamat pro Christi famulo summi regis magnalia./Trino deo et simplici laus, honor, virtus, gloria qui nos prece Dominici ducat ad celi gaudia.” Tugwell, Simon, ed. “OfPice for the Feast of St. Dominic,” in O’Carroll, “Cult,” 604-9.
hagiographers, whose work both influenced and was influenced by Dominic’s liturgy, likewise followed this general emphasis, designating ascetic practices such as physical discipline, chastity, and prayer as the foundation for Dominic’s spiritual authority and pastoral work, rather than as spiritual ends in themselves. In discussing their founder’s personal ascetic practices, Dominic’s hagiographers incorporated descriptions characteristic of masculine sanctity from the hagiographic tradition as well as basic medieval ideas about male bodies and identity.

Although the Vesper hymn’s reference to Dominic as someone “freed from the flesh’s prison” both referenced his actual death and implied that his entrance to heaven was made possible by his ability to transcend the physical body, references to his use of physical mortification as a method of achieving this bodily transcendence were relatively few in his vitae. This scarcity of references indicates that bodily mortification was not a central marker of sanctity in Dominic’s vitae and aligns him with medieval representations of male saints in which physical mortification likewise played a secondary role. This pious practice figured more centrally in hagiographic representations of late medieval women, who sought to literally imitate Christ’s humanity and suffering through their own bodies. The ascetic regimen of bodily mortification described by Dominic’s hagiographers was also relatively moderate when compared to those engaged in by many early medieval saints. Jordan of Saxony, for example, only mentioned Dominic’s ascetic practices once near the very end of his account of the Order’s beginnings and largely focused on his sleeping and eating habits. According to Jordan, Dominic often maintained nightly vigils in which he stayed awake as much as possible, only sleeping for a short time when necessary and lying down wherever he happened to be at the time. A short while later, Jordan stated that Dominic wore cheap clothing, “consumed a most moderate amount of food and drink, possessing firm control over his flesh, and drank wine with fanatical

---

38 O’Maura posits that Dominic’s office, including the Vespers hymn was composed in the first decade after Dominic’s canonization, during which period the first three vitae Dominici were being composed in “Cult,” 583-4. See also Heribert Christian Scheeben, “Petrus Ferrandi,” AFP 2 (1932): 329-347.
39 Humbert’s final Legenda contained only six references within sixty chapters.
41 JoS, chap. 106, 75.
temperance so that, satisfying his bodily needs, he never weakened his fine and subtle spirit." The placement of these descriptions near the end of Jordan's narrative also indicates that they were peripheral to his overall saintly identity. Although Peter Ferrand changed the order of several of the events in the rest of the text, his description of Dominic's personal ascetic practices, which he took directly from Jordan, remains the last description prior to the saint's death, translation, and miracles. However, Peter did add one description of Dominic's ascetic practices early in his *Legenda* where he described the saint's preference for sleeping on the floor rather than in bed as a child, a common hagiographic trope used to demonstrate a saint's early holy behavior. Constantine of Orvieto also kept all of the references to Dominic's ascetic practices contained in the first two lives despite his significant organizational and textual deviations elsewhere in the *vita*. In fact, he added three additional references to the saint's practices of bodily mortification, perhaps taken from the stories about the saint submitted to the General Chapter, depicting fasting, intentional sleep deprivation, and the only reference to bodily mortification contained in the texts as a whole. In one added anecdote, Constantine's Dominic ate only bread and water and avoided sleeping in a bed for the entirety of Lent, but still appeared stronger and more attractive by the time Easter arrived. Likewise, Constantine claimed that the saint had stayed up all night in prayer, as was his custom, wearing the wet traveling clothes he had on, while his companions proved to be more susceptible to the enticements of a good night's rest and warm fire. Finally, Constantine amplified Jordan and Peter's description of Dominic's nightly vigils to claim that Dominic "struck himself nightly with an iron chain three times, once on behalf of himself, once on behalf of the sinners who lived in the world, and a third time on behalf of those who were suffering in purgatory." Humbert of

---

42 "Verus erat paupertatis amor, vilibus utens indumentis. Et in cibo simul ac potu modum temperatissimum observabat, delicata vitans et libenter simplici pulimento contentus, habens firmum sue carnis imperium, et utens vino sic temperate limphato, ut necessitati satisfaciens corporali numquam subtilem eius ac tenuem spiritum hebetaret.” JoS, chap. 108, 76.
43 PF, chap. 45, 243-4.
45 CoO, chap. 61, 329; chap. 45, 317; and chap. 7, 290.
46 CoO, chap. 56, 325.
47 CoO, chap. 42, 315.
48 "Tres singulis noctibus recipiebat manu propria de quadam catena ferrea disciplinas, unam videlicet pro se, alteram pro peccatoribus qui versantur in mundo, tertiam vero pro iis, qui in purgatorio cruciantur.” CoO, chap. 61, 329.
Romans evidently agreed with Constantine’s portrayal of Dominic’s holy asceticism because his final version of Dominic’s life contained all of these examples copied word for word from either Peter or Constantine.49

The moderate nature of Dominic’s ascetic activities becomes evident when compared to those found in the Lives of the Desert Fathers, whose extreme practices were referred to as “heroic asceticism” and included rigorous self-mortification (wrapping thorns around the limbs and torso and regularly tightening them until their skin rotted, for example), extremely restricted food intake (eating every third day or existing on the eucharist alone), and voluntarily limiting sleep to a few hours per circadian cycle.50 This ideal of ascetic behavior, gendered as masculine, was often held in opposition to the more moderate regimen of fasting, mortifying the body, and manual labor promoted by the Benedictine rule, practices gendered as feminine in the early and high Middle Ages.51 While women also engaged in such heroic ascetic practices, they were often gendered as masculine when they did so.52 Benedict of Aniane, for instance, is depicted as having practiced such heroic asceticism, despite the attempts of his abbot to discourage him, because he considered the Benedictine Rule to be “for novices and weak people,” in essence, for those individuals who were not mature men and thus occupied a lower tier of the masculine hierarchy.53 Likewise, knights who became monks were especially likely to practice extreme forms of bodily mortification, fighting a battle against devil and sin through their own bodies and the devil, which hagiographers described using masculinized military terminology and imagery.54

51 Leyser, “Masculinity in Flux,” 113 and Cooper and Leyser, “Gender of Grace.”
52 Pelagia actually dressed as a monk while living as an ascetic in the desert and was not discovered to be female until some monks undressed her body for burial and people considered Radegund to be a monk rather than a queen because of her rigorous practice of bodily mortification, which mirrored those of Simeon the Elder, and important early Christian ascetic. Perkins, Suffering, 210-211 and Kitchen, Saints, 102-3 and 117-119.
53 Coon, Dark Age, 56-7 and Kroll and Bachrach, Mystic Mind, 52.
54 Giles Constable, “Moderation and Restraint in Ascetic Practices in the Middle Ages,” in From Athens to Chartres: Neoplatonism and Medieval Thought, ed. Haijo Jan Westra (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 322 and Murray, "Masculinizing." Meri Heinonen suggests that the male ideal was one that involved harsh physical trials and control of sexual desire, which led to persecutions by his peers and community. Women were forbidden from physical chastisement and protected from persecution by the wider community. See "Henry Suso and the Divine Knighthood," in Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages, eds. P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).
A current of thought advocating more moderate ascetic practices, however, existed throughout the Middle Ages and gained strength from the 11th century onwards. Writers such as Basil and Gregory the Great challenged the idea that holiness was made manifest through visual bodily suffering and advocated moderate ascetic regimes so as to maintain the bodily health necessary to complete the Divine Office and other acts of holy obligation. Even the hot-headed Benedict of Aniane eventually came to embrace the moderate asceticism and communal life of the Benedictine Rule, at least in the pages of hagiography. 

Writers such as Basil and Gregory the Great challenged the idea that holiness was made manifest through visual bodily suffering and advocated moderate ascetic regimes so as to maintain the bodily health necessary to complete the Divine Office and other acts of holy obligation. Even the hot-headed Benedict of Aniane eventually came to embrace the moderate asceticism and communal life of the Benedictine Rule, at least in the pages of hagiography.55 Bernard of Clairvaux, Ailred of Rievaulx, and Peter the Venerable emphasized internal spirituality over conspicuous signs of holiness and discretion as the mother of all virtues. These men also attacked hypocritical asceticism in which individuals appeared to live a holy life—mortifying their flesh, fasting, praying loudly and continually, wearing rough clothing, and constantly criticizing the clergy and laity—but were, in fact, internally impure. Thus, the masculine ideal of the male saint who was committed to the practice of asceticism as a demonstration of his holiness gradually gave way to the saint who showed restrained and unostentatious behavior, while claiming sanctity based primarily on the qualities of his heart and spirit.56 In fact, although heroic asceticism was practiced to some extent by both men and women, extreme ascetic practices and bodily mortification more often became the primary focus of female sanctity in the later medieval period while masculine ideals tended toward moderation and followed a more diversified path toward holiness, especially among the mendicant orders.57 Asceticism thus lost prominence within hagiographic texts as masculine governance of the body itself became governed. Dominic’s moderate ascetic practice, as described by his hagiographers, which allowed him to subjugate the body to the spirit without destroying either—that is, to satisfy his bodily needs without weakening the spirit—was therefore consistent with late medieval hagiographic traditions of masculine saintly behavior.58

In addition, Jordan’s reference to Dominic’s “firm control” over his body, which allowed him to temperately meet his physical needs without damaging the spirit, mirrored fundamental secular

55 Coon, Dark Age, 56-7.
56 For a complete discussion of this trend, see Constable, “Moderation.”
58 See above, 102.
understandings of masculine physical governance as the basis for authority to govern others. More specifically, the Roman ideal of the *vita militaris* had emphasized the ideal of masculine *firmitas* or steadfastness, an ideal incorporated into early Christian martyrdom ideology, which gendered firmness in the face of death masculine for both men and women, and medieval hagiographic traditions depicting monks steadfastly defending Church prerogatives against secular encroachment, violent or otherwise. Medieval literature, including *The Song of Roland*, also used similar terminology to idealize and heroicize knights who gripped their swords firmly, steadfastly obeyed their oaths to their Lord, and persevered in battle despite fear of death, as well as kings who ruled firmly and established firm peace. Medieval medical theory associated men’s warm, dry bodies with firmer muscles and physical vigor, while women’s cool, moist bodies made them soft, weak, and relatively sedentary, and medieval theologians expanded upon this basic medical understanding of the masculinized body to assign gendered spiritual traits. The Dominican Albertus Magnus, for example, wrote that “woman’s complexion is more humid than man’s...The humid is readily mobile, and thus women are inconstant and always seeking something new.” In addition, medical understandings of gendered sexuality led to the theological construct that woman is to man as matter is to spirit. Monastic tradition starting with Jerome held that men were considered stronger, less vulnerable to physical sin, more rational, and more capable of spiritual understanding by their very physical nature than their female counterparts and were thus expected to spend less time subduing the body or cleansing it of innate sinfulness and more time focused on activities of the spirit. In portraying Dominic as firmly in control of his body, therefore, Jordan and subsequent hagiographers aligned him with fundamental medieval understandings of the male body as well as various militaristic, literary, and theological interpretations of this gendered body.

In addition, Dominic’s hagiographers linked firm bodily control with successful fulfillment of the *cura animarum*, depicting the saint fasting, mortifying his own body, and forgoing sleep as a way of supporting his

---

59 See above, 102 and introduction, 14-15.
60 Kuefler, *Manly Eunuch*, 110; Coon, *Dark Age*, 75; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 294; and Thomas, “Shame.”
other pious ends. In a story introduced by Peter Ferrand and kept by both later hagiographers, for example, Dominic gave up wine to enhance his capacity for study for a period of ten years, still only drinking a little bit when compelled to do so by his superior for the sake of his health. Constantine expanded the anecdote a bit, writing that when the saint started drinking again he drank so little that “scarcely a trace of the taste lingered in his mouth,” a reference kept in Humbert of Romans’ final Legenda. Both hagiographers were clear that he did this, at least initially, in the service of his studies. In a more extensive description of Dominic’s ascetic practices again introduced by Peter, Dominic and an unnamed companion underwent an ascetic routine for the entirety of Lent during which time they ate only bread and water, prayed all night, and slept on an unadorned table. Peter also mentioned how Dominic asked the landlady to procure a hair shirt for him and his companions in secret, but did not mention whether or not he actually wore this shirt. Dominic persisted in these activities, however, “not so that he would acquire the reward of human praise, but so that he would entice the minds of the infidels toward a love of the catholic faith and call them back from the error of heretical superstition.” Following this anecdote, Peter included an entire chapter in which he assured the reader that Dominic’s actions were not hypocritical since the outward displays of goodness, despite being used in conscious imitation of the actions used by the heretics to “deceive,” were consistent with his interior holiness. Although no other hagiographer felt the need to include a similar section, Peter’s concern with hypocritical displays of asceticism was consistent with later medieval preferences for internal spirituality over external signs of holiness. The focus of these depictions was thus the active cura animarum, higher
education and preaching to heretics, two largely male prerogatives, rather than bodily discipline in itself.  

Thus, Dominic acted consistently with medieval hagiographic representations of masculine sanctity, which showed physical asceticism as an aspect of holy behavior secondary to the central saintly identity, and with fundamental secular ideals of male behavior that emphasized bodily control as the basis for influencing others.

Finally, Dominic’s hagiographers also used references to his ascetic practices, particularly to poverty, as a way of addressing contemporary concerns in the Order’s vocational development. In reference to poverty, Jordan of Saxony mentioned that Dominic was a “lover of poverty” who wore cheap clothing, that the brothers who first went to Bologna suffered great poverty, and that the brothers adopted apostolic poverty excluding some types of income along with the Augustinian rule. However, later lives portrayed all of the early brothers suffering great poverty, excised any exceptions to the absolute poverty adopted with the Augustinian rule, and made poverty the central theme of Dominic’s living “will,” although Jordan had made no such claims. This increasing concern in the lives of Dominic matches the progressive movement toward absolute poverty within the Order. Dominic’s ascetic practices were thus not portrayed as having value in

---

70 Although the late medieval period provided more opportunity for women to preach, particularly within heretical sects, male preachers by and large dominated the field within the Catholic Church. The Dominicans themselves clearly designated preaching as a male prerogative as did Humbert of Romans in his influential Liber de eruditione praedicatorum, while hagiographic depictions of preaching were largely limited to male saints. HoR, Liber, 2.12, 406; Claire M. Waters, Angels and Earthly Creatures: Preaching, Performance, and Gender in the Later Middle Ages (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 3-4 and 174 ff. 22; Jean Longère, La Prédication Médiévale (Paris: Études Augusiniennes, 1983), 16; Weinstein and Bell, Saints, 227-9. For a discussion on masculinity in university culture and preaching see Karras, From Boys, 67-108 and “Sharing Wine.” On the relationship between university culture and the preaching vocation, see David d’Avray, The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons diffused from Paris before 1300 (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1985), 180-203.

71 JoS, chap. 108, 76; chap. 55, 51; and chap. 42, 46.

72 On Dominic’s poverty see PF, chap. 45, 244; CoO, chap. 62, 330; HoR, Legenda, chap. 60, 417. On the plight of the early brothers see PF, chap. 32, 233; CoO, chaps. 26, 305; and HoR, Legenda, chap. 34, 393. On the acceptance of the Augustinian rule see PF, chap. 28, 230 CoO, chap. 22, 302-3; and HoR, Legenda, chap. 31, 391. It is Constantine who clarified that the brothers were not allowed to keep any incomes and Humbert also adopted this stance. In terms of Dominic’s “will”, Jordan’s Dominic only admonishes the brothers to stay away from women on his death bed, while Peter’s Dominic is more verbose and emphasizes possession of charity, humility, and poverty. Both Constantine of Orvieto and Humbert of Romans adopt Constantine of Orvieto’s stance. See JoS, chap. 92; PF, chap. 50, CoO, chap. 63; and HoR, Legenda, chap. 63

themselves, but were used to augment his other spiritual and vocational goals as well as those of the Order.74 The depiction of these practices is also consistent with late medieval hagiographic traditions surrounding male ascetic practices, including poverty, which emphasized the secondary, foundational, and functionalist nature of asceticism as well as moderation of practice, and with secular ideals of masculine self control, which also emphasized this moderate control over the body as a demonstration of prominence within the social hierarchy of men.75

Of all the ascetic practices depicted in the vitae, it is perhaps chastity that underwent the most marked transformation in the early lives of Dominic, moving away from traditional depictions of chaste monks struggling to maintain their purity and toward a less central and more functional depiction. In Jordan’s Libellus, Dominic’s chaste behavior remained consistent with traditional hagiographic depictions of monastic virtue. In one of Jordan’s early stories, for example, some enemies of a certain friar named Dominic sent a prostitute to him in order to “confess” so that she might tempt him into straying from his vows. He accepted her invitation and told her to meet him at a secret place for the completion of the deed. However, when she arrived to meet him, she found him standing in the middle of a circle of fire requesting that she join him and fled out of fear, but Dominic himself remained unharmed.76 Such stories in which a clever holy man used miraculous interactions with actual fire to combat the metaphorical fires of lust abound in the hagiographic corpus, and such heroic defense of virtue was a common characteristic of male hagiographic representations.77 William of Montevergine, for example, allegedly used his bare hands to part coals in the hearth before lying down in their midst when faced with a prostitute’s solicitations. His feat seems to have been even more impressive than Dominic’s since the prostitute in this case repented from her profession entirely and became a nun.78 In another particularly interesting example, Christina of Markyate’s hagiographer related how she resisted the repeated solicitations of a certain cleric, which included naked appearances and pleading, despite her own “miserable passion” by pretending not to reciprocate his

74 Lappin argues similarly about early Dominican poverty, that it was an ingenuous response to the attempt to convert Cathar sects in southern France rather than forming a central part of the Order’s identity. See Lappin, “From Osma,” especially 56-7.
75 See above introduction, 14-15.
76 JoS, chap. 50, 49.
78 Related in Weinstein and Bell, 82.
inclinations, "whence the cleric sometimes said she was more like a man than a woman, when she, a virago gifted with manly strength [\textit{virtute virili}], might justifiable have called him effeminate."\textsuperscript{79} Thus, heroic defense of chastity from an outside source was labeled as masculine in high medieval hagiographic texts. Jordan also ascribed a common type of monastic chastity to his beloved friend Henry, whose "virginal integrity," lack of contact with women, and "cleanliness of heart" earned him a shining divine jewel which he displayed to a messenger in a posthumous appearance.\textsuperscript{80} Dominic likewise avoided the enticements of the secular world in university, and "conserved the distinction of his virginity intact for the Lord, the lover of incorruptibility, until the end."\textsuperscript{81} In a far more significant scene, however, Dominic gathered twelve of the brothers around his death bed and, as a last admonishment, bid them to "avoid the suspect company of women, and especially of young women, since this unhealthy group is too great and effective at ensnaring souls not yet purified."\textsuperscript{82} Jordan’s Dominic, despite having avoided fleshly corruption, was not perfect, however, since the saint admitted that he "had not avoided imperfection, rather that the conversation of young ladies affected his heart more than that of elderly women."\textsuperscript{83} Jordan’s overall presentation of chastity is thus consistent with monastic hagiographic representations of male saintly behavior in which the holy man ardently defended his own virtue against the advances of beautiful women sent to entrap him and is rewarded in the afterlife for his efforts. In addition, Jordan’s presentation overall adhered to hagiographic traditions in which the male saint struggled against an external force threatening chaste behavior, which opposed the ideal of female saints struggling against their own sinful bodies, a dichotomy based upon medieval understandings of the gendered body.\textsuperscript{84} However, the Dominican founder cuts a slightly more ambiguous and human figure in Jordan’s text, one who, although he


\textsuperscript{80} JoS, chap. 78, 63 and chap. 83, 65.

\textsuperscript{81} JoS, chap. 8, 30.

\textsuperscript{82} “admonens feminarum maxime iuvencularum suspecta vitare consortia, quoniam hoc genus illecebrosum est nims et efficax illakeandis animabus nondum ad purum excoxit.” JoS, chap. 92, 69.

\textsuperscript{83} “‘En,’ inquit, ‘usque ad hanc horam in carnis incorruptione misericordia me divina servavit; nec tamen hanc me imperfectionem evasisse confiteor, quin magis cor meum afficiat iuvencularum colloquia, quam vetularum affatus.’” JoS, chap. 92, 69

has fulfilled the requirements of physical chastity, nevertheless admitted his struggle to achieve the apathy toward young women allegedly exhibited by other saints.

The later hagiographers, however, significantly altered both Dominic’s legacy as well as the prominence and the form that chaste behavior took in the lives of the early brothers. This is largely due to the fact that they also removed the stories about the other Dominic and Henry—the individuals on whom Jordan had largely focused his discussions of continence—and thus needed to create new anecdotes or embellish existing figures in order to address the issue. To clarify Dominic’s relationship to the virtue of chastity, all of the later hagiographers omitted any reference to Dominic’s sexuality in university, evidently feeling that it did not play a significant role in supporting Dominic’s sanctity. However, they all seemed to have struggled over Dominic’s final legacy to the brothers—an extremely important scene from the perspective of the Order’s identity construction—writing and re-writing his death bed scene with each successive life. Peter expanded Dominic’s message substantially, borrowing the initial warning word for word, but added that these dangerous conversations with young ladies should be avoided since “they both greatly weaken and lower manly souls.” Peter thus made it clear that feminine contact was not merely a threat to souls not yet perfected, but specifically functioned to sully and degrade men, a stance consistent with the hagiographic and ecclesiastical tradition.\textsuperscript{85} This thematic material also reflects Jerome’s writing on the subject where he condemns a woman’s love, which “enervates a man’s mind” and “engrosses all thought except for the passion which it feeds.”\textsuperscript{86} Thus, according to Peter’s Dominic, women, through their physicality, removed men from the rational world of the spirit through which they fundamentally expressed their masculinity, a world made accessible through chaste behavior, and made them less effective and less manly.\textsuperscript{87} Peter’s Dominic also added that the brothers should strive toward the canonical observance of religion and constancy of virtue, leaving a special testament which advocated charity, humility, and poverty. The second biographer also omitted Dominic’s admission of his susceptibility to younger women, as do all later hagiographers, since the General Chapter of 1242, evidently feeling that this did not reflect well on his overall image, ordered that this

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{85} “Admonuit quoque cavenda esse feminarum et maxime iuvencularum suspecta consortia, que illecebrosa admodum viriles etiam animos aut emoliunt aut inclinant.” PF, chap. 46, 245 & HoR, \textit{Legenda}, chap. 62, 418.
\textsuperscript{86} Related in Salisbury, \textit{Church}, 23.
\textsuperscript{87} Salisbury, \textit{Church}, 23
\end{flushleft}
reference be permanently omitted from Dominic’s legacy.\textsuperscript{88} Constantine of Orvieto dropped the references to chastity, observance of canonical religion, and constancy of virtue entirely, but Humbert of Romans copied Peter’s extended death scene word for word in his authoritative version.\textsuperscript{89} The theme of chastity, while initially more central to Dominic’s final legacy, thus became subsumed within a barrage of instructions to the brothers meant to bolster the Order’s foundation within the larger Church.

Chastity was not, however, entirely lost from the later texts and appeared in three new stories added to Jordan’s \textit{Libellus} and kept in Humbert’s final \textit{Legenda}. The first of these, in which Constantine attributed the delicious smell that emitted from Dominic’s tomb during the translation of his remains to his physical chastity, links chastity with spiritual reward, a common hagiographical trope.\textsuperscript{90} The other two stories, however, suggest a different ideal of chastity: that the friars should never experience bodily lust so that they would not be impeded from performing their spiritual duties among the laity. One of these references occurred in the course of Reginald of Orleans’ brief, but highly influential, sojourn in the Order. In Jordan’s story, Reginald experienced a vision that convinced him to join the Dominican Order. In this vision, the Virgin Mary appeared to him, anointed his feet in preparation for his evangelical path, and showed him the Dominican habit that he was to don.\textsuperscript{91} In Peter Ferrand’s story, however, Mary anointed his eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, kidneys, and feet. Although she allegedly articulated the benefit to each body part, Peter only quoted Mary’s words in two cases, the first of which occurred while she anointed his feet in preparation for the evangelical path, a detail taken directly from Jordan. The second part of the body was his kidneys, considered to be the origin of male sexual energy and the pathway for semen emission in medieval medical theory, which Mary “restricted with the belt of chastity,” so well, in fact, that Reginald never felt lust again.\textsuperscript{92} This version received the unanimous approval of both Constantine and Humbert, who included it in later versions. Unlike Jordan’s Dominic, who never achieved true apathy toward women, Reginald was miraculously relieved of this fleshly burden through Mary’s intervention. This depiction was consistent with

\textsuperscript{88} PF, chap. 50, 248; CoO, chap. 63, 331-2; and HoR, \textit{Legenda}, chap. 65, 420. For the General Chapter’s command see \textit{ACG} I (1242), 24. Vauchez attributes this change to the fact that after 1270 no saint fell into the traditional hagiographic category of repentent sinner and the \textit{vitae} of both Francis and Dominic underwent revision to eliminate any sign of imperfection in this area in \textit{Sainthood}, 515.


\textsuperscript{91} JoS, chap. 57, 52

\textsuperscript{92} PF chap. 35, 235 & 36, 236; Brown, \textit{Body and Society}, 232; and Cadden, \textit{Meanings}, 15 & 180.
the apex of hagiographic ideals of heroic chastity, gendered particularly masculine in Weinstein and Bell, in which divine intervention resulted in the complete subjugation of bodily lust after a period of struggle. The *virago* Christina of Markyate, for example, after “manfully” resisting her own lust through bodily mortification and harsh asceticism received perpetual chastity from Christ as a reward for her labors. In addition, Reginald’s dramatic inception into the Order at Mary’s hands is reminiscent of the highly symbolic ceremonies initiating a secular knight into the chivalric community, such as the one described by Ramon Llull in his *Llibre de L’Orde de Cavalleria*, in which the squire is to “kneel before the altar and lift his bodily and spiritual eyes to God.” The officiant, a knight, was then to place the sword around the squire’s waist “as an indication of chastity and justice, to kiss the squire as a sign of charity, and to give him a “symbolic slap through which he will remember what he promised, the great path to which he is obliged, and the great honor which he has taken through the Order of Knighthood.” Thus, Reginald’s initiation to the Dominican Order paralleled the ceremony undergone by secular young men, who were being initiated into the masculine hierarchy of knighthood, and implied that the Dominican vocation itself was a sort of knighthood. In addition, Mary’s actions specifically emphasized the two fundamental things necessary for a man to fulfill the Dominican mission: mobility and bodily control in the form of chastity. Thus, chastity in Reginald’s life formed the bedrock of his later achievements in the Order rather than the primary marker of his exemplary behavior, a theme further emphasized in the second reference to chastity added by Constantine, which took the form of a miracle performed by Dominic at the request of a certain deacon. This deacon complained to Dominic that he was unable to contain his lustful urgings to such an extent that, despairing, he had to refrain from accomplishing good works among the general population. Dominic then cured him of all lustful thoughts, saying, “Go among the rest, go manfully, and do not despair about God’s mercy. I will ask him to give fleshly continence to you.” This example is especially important because it is the only time, in all four lives, that any

93 For numerous examples of saints whose battles with sexual urges ended in the complete eradication of these desires, see Weinstein and Bell, 81-66.
95 “L’escuder davant l’autar se deu agenollar, e que lleu sos ulls a Déu corporals e espirituals, e ses mans a Déu. E lo cavaller li deu cenvyr l’espasa, a significar castetat e justicia. E en significanç de caritat deu besar s’escuder e donar-li queixada, per ço que sia membrant de ço que promet, e del gran càrrec a què s’obliga, e de la gran honor que pren per l’orde de cavalleria.” Ramon Llull, *Llibre de L’Orde de Cavalleria*, ed. Albert Soler i Llopart (Barcelona: Editorial Barcino, 1988), Book IV,11, 200.
sort of behavior is qualified with the adverb viriliter; taken as it was from the psalm in which David commands himself to go manfully among his enemies, unafraid and hopeful of the Lord’s salvation. To Constantine, the deacon’s manliness was defined by his ability to actively face his enemy—sexual temptation—in order to fulfill his pastoral obligations.

The definition of manly ascetic behavior in these hagiographic texts, which emphasized the ability to appropriately demonstrate one’s masculine social and professional identity in the public sphere, rather than active expression of sexual maleness, has continuities with the expectation placed on laymen during the same period. While many historical and anthropological studies of masculine roles have labeled sexual performance, virility, and procreation as the primary method of expressing masculinity in the medieval period, without which a man could hardly call himself a man, more recent scholarship indicates that late medieval views of lay male sexuality and its appropriate expression were complex. We have already seen, for example, how medieval theologians ascribed physicality and sexual expression to the female body. Although church theology and canon law were clear about which expressions of sexuality were licit, late medieval communities tolerated, condoned, or actively supported forms of sexual expression condemned by the Church as long as these activities were conducted within particular parameters. Frequent sexual expression, for example, was a behavioral norm for youths—a category also including grown men who had not achieved the status of mature masculinity for economic reasons, such as knights and journeymen—, while married men regularly engaged in forms of extra-marital sexuality and enjoyed a certain level of societal toleration for this behavior.

On the other hand, medieval sources indicate that these forms of extra-marital sexual expression were only tolerated, rather than whole-heartedly approved, and had to exist within certain boundaries in
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97 Psalm 26.11-14.
98 See above introduction, 12-15.
99 See above introduction, 3-4; Gilmore, Manhood, 30-55; Brandes, Metaphors, 183-4; Pitt-Rivers, Fate of Shechem, 20-3 and Karras, “Thomas Aquinas’s.”
100 See above 34-6.
101 Otis, Prostitution, 5.
order to avoid negative social and legal consequences. Inappropriate or excessive indulgence in these activities, for example, could be considered as a sign of bad character which, when formalized into a charge of malafama, could have serious legal and judicial consequences. Although toward the end of the medieval period this condemnation was based more and more upon Christian ideas of sin, the mainstay of criticism of extra-marital sexuality, consensual or otherwise, was the disruption of the social order and challenge to personal honor it caused when it involved with other men’s wives and daughters. Sexual misbehavior, including adultery, was often equated with disreputability, property mismanagement, and immature masculinity, while disciplined sexuality could greatly enhance masculine identity, especially the masculine identities of mature adult men. Indeed, marriage and legitimate fatherhood, a form of disciplined and directed sexuality, marked the solidification of a man’s social identity as a mature, governed individual at the apex of the masculine hierarchy, although as we have seen, a limited amount of adulterous liaisons was socially sanctioned. This patriarchal responsibility also placed a man in charge of the sexual behaviors of his household and thus made him a sexually governing figure. Thus, secular ideals of masculine sexual expression were undergirded by a basic concept that such expression should be appropriately directed, consistent with an individual’s social status, age, and position on the masculine hierarchy.

Perhaps nowhere is the complexity of medieval understandings of sexual expression and masculinity more apparent than in chivalric romance and courtly culture, which was immensely popular among

103 In cases where legal and social authorities actively encouraged forms of extra-marital sexuality, this behavior was almost always seen as the lesser of two evils with brothels functioning to keep men from injuring the community’s “respectable” women rather than an endorsement of extra-marital sexuality in and of itself. See Rossiaud, Medieval Prostitution, 42.
104 Nirenberg, Communities, 142; Bowman, “Infamy and Proof,” 104-5; and Ruggiero, Boundaries, 45-69.
105 Thus, for example, charges of “cuckhold” litter the pages of medieval legal records and legal codes strictly forbade use of the term, while those associated with frigidity or homosexuality are very rare in Maria Àngels Dieguez Seguí, Clams i Crims en la València Medieval segons el Llibre de Cort de Justícia (1279-1321) (Alacant: Universitat d’Alacant, 2002), 257-8; Germà Colón, ed. Pars de València (Barcelona: Editorial Barcino, 1994), IX,V, 46; and Shannon McSheffrey, Marriage, Sex, and Civic Culture in Late Medieval London (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 142; Otis, Prostitution, 108; Karras, Sexuality, 123-4; McSheffrey, “Men and Masculinity” and Ruggiero, Boundaries, 16-44 and 92; Guido Ruggiero, ”Sexual Criminality,” 31.
106 McSheffrey, ”Men and Masculinity”, 260 and Neal, The Masculine Self, 69.
individuals from different social levels during this period.107 On the one hand, just as courtly men were taught to demonstrate self-restraint and consistently elegant manners in their interactions with others, so were they expected to exhibit the same sort of self-discipline in their pursuit of the opposite sex, at least within literary and lyric models.108 This kind of self-discipline meant treating the love object with an extreme amount of respect, spiritual and quasi-religious contemplation of the beloved, and obedience to certain rituals of courtship including love songs, casting oneself in the role of “love slave”, and sexual restraint. In return for properly executed love service, in essence, for a knowledge of courtly convention, the man earned social distinction.109 Although the capacity to love and to demonstrate this love through self-disciplined courtly ritual was traditionally ascribed to the nobility, while the rest of society was linked with pure eroticism aimed at reproduction, recent scholarship has demonstrated the extent to which courtly love ideals also permeated through all levels of late medieval culture.110 Taken to the extreme, this treatment of the lady love could remain non-sexual in actuality depending on class relationships, ideals of vassalage and queenship, vocational quests, and the individual knight.111 Indeed, in the section of his Art of Courtly Love in which a nobleman speaks to a noblewoman about love, Andreas Cappellanus wrote that the lover should keep himself chaste for the beloved and Gawain, in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, declined the amorous attentions of a woman in order to pursue his quest with the Green Knight.112 Andreas’ text also makes it clear that the ability of a man

109 Karras, From Boys, 49-51; Schultz, Courtly Love, xxi, 162-3, and 166; Lourie “Cultic Dancing,” 171; and Keen, Nobles, Knights, 21-2.
111 Karras, From Boys, 42-3 and 50-51.
to express himself sexually was completely dependent upon his own social class and the class differential between him and his lady love.113

On the other side of this idealized rhetoric, however, was the literary representation—and historical reality—of knights engaging in consensual and nonconsensual sexual relations, committing adultery, and otherwise proving themselves as sexually active in response to courtly expectations that sexual expression defined masculine behavior.114 The woman attempting to seduce Gawain above, for example, argued that if he were really renowned for his courteous manners and speech, he would translate that courtesy into erotic action.115 Although Gawain declined this particular invite, he did decide to have sex with a woman in another text with whom he was sharing a bed, despite the threat of a magical sword that would attack him if he tried, because he “realized that it could not be concealed, that everyone could not be prevented from knowing, that he would have lain with her, all alone and naked in her bed, and had refrained from taking his pleasure just because of what she said and he would rather die in honor than live a long time in shame.”116 A scene from The Story of Merlin perhaps best sums up this complex understanding of masculine sexual expression in chivalric literature and courtly culture, which balanced the ideals of spiritualized, chaste love with the ideals of masculine sexual assertion. In this story, three brothers answer the question of what they would do with a beautiful woman if they had her alone in the forest with them. Agravain answered that he would “make love to her immediately” if he felt like it, Gaheriet said that he would take her to safety, while Guerrehet answered that he would make her his “lady love, if she liked, and...not do anything to her by force.” When called to judge, their eldest brother, Gawain, acknowledged Gaheriet’s position as the best since it “can have come to him only from love and courtliness,” but says that he himself would take Guerrehet’s path, who had “spoken like a worthy gentleman.”117 Thus, although sexual expression played an important role in defining a man as a man in late medieval society, the choice of when to engage in such acts was governed by a variety of religious ideals, courtly convention, social class, and practical situations. It was not so much the body itself as the

113 Andreas specifies the protocol for love, sexual or otherwise, between individuals of all different social levels in De Amore, 74-263.
116 From in Le Chevalier à l’épée and quoted in Gaunt, Gender and Genre, 116.
concept of appropriate male behavior that governed how, when, and with whom a man engaged in this expression.

Although Reginald, Dominic, and the deacon were certainly much more restricted in their avenues of appropriate sexual expression than their secular peers, the focus of these stories on subduing the body in favor of other spiritual goals resonated with medieval society’s most basic understanding of appropriately expressed sexuality and control of the sexual body as masculine. In choosing pastoral responsibilities over the sexual body, Dominic and the deacon displayed a choice not too dissimilar from Gawain, who chose to pursue his quest with the Green Knight rather than engage in the sexual activity expected of him. In addition, Dominic, in regulating the deacon’s social expression of sexuality also functioned as a patriarchal figure akin to the wealthy burgher whose elevated social gave him control over the sexual activities of his familiars. Rather than argue that chastity was in fact “more manly” than sexual expression because it required manly struggle against temptation, as early Christian ascetics had done, Dominic’s hagiographers instead focused on eradicating this desire through divine intervention, the final result of the heroic struggle with chastity within the hagiographic tradition, and thus allowed the saint to pursue the central tasks of his vocation. However, the eradication of physical desire was not, as it was in the vitae of early ascetics, an end in itself, but was a means by which the friar could successfully perform his other pastoral duties in the secular world. Thus, in its supportive functionality, chastity is treated in much the same way as the other ascetic practices by the early hagiographers and drew upon medieval understandings of the masculine saint. Thus, while Dominican men were called by their saintly model to avoid the sexual performance associated with secular masculinity, the hagiographic presentation of physicality relied upon hagiographic, theological, and even some literary models that rendered it particularly masculine in certain ways.

Finally, the role of prayer in Dominic’s legacy changed substantially in the progression of the four early lives, becoming more and more overshadowed by the friars’ other vocational callings and placed within the background of personal spiritual practice.118 While Jordan of Saxony emphasized Dominic’s monastic

---

118 Although prayer had been a central component of the monastic opus dei, it is grouped here with ascetic practices because it is not represented as part of the opus dei of the Dominican order in the hagiographic texts, but is rather presented as part of the founding saint’s personal pious practices meant to support his other activities. For a brief overview of the role of prayer as part of the monastic opus dei see F. Petit and O. Praem, “Asceticism in the Middle Ages,” in Christian Asceticism and Modern Man, trans. Walter Mitchell and the Carisbrooke Dominicans (London: Blackfriars Publications, 1955), 33-4.
dedication to prayer as a canon regular, where he impressed his fellow canons by wearing out the church floor night and day, praying continuously, closing himself up at night to pray, and emitting groans and shouts intermingled with prayer, this particular reference to Dominic’s prayerful demeanor was slowly whittled away through the succession of lives until it was eventually omitted entirely from Humbert of Romans’ *Legenda.*

This final omission is especially noteworthy in light of the fact that Humbert of Romans copied nearly all of Peter Ferrand and Constantine of Orvieto, word for word in his text, leaving out very few sections. By the time Humbert of Romans took his turn in crafting an ideal Dominic, the traditional monastic depictions of the incessantly praying saints seems to have lost social currency in the realm of Dominican hagiography.

Unlike the heroic prayer life of the 13th-century St. Peter of Morrone, for example, who allegedly recited the entire Psalter, the canonical hours, and made five hundred genuflections daily, Dominic’s prayer, even at its initial monastic intensity remained relatively moderate. Indeed, it was female saints from the thirteenth century onward who were more likely to display such diligent attention to liturgical life and personal prayer — engaging in repeated genuflections until their body gave out, holding their arms up in extended prayer, and remaining dedicated to the Office — as did, for example, the Dominican affiliates, Margaret of Ypres and Christina the Astonishing, whose lives were both composed by the Dominican Thomas of Cantimpré.

In later texts, references to Dominic’s prayer life were only expressed within the context of miracle stories in which prayer provided the backdrop to the main action. In one such story, introduced by Constantine of Orvieto and copied by Humbert of Romans, Dominic’s clothes got soaking wet when traveling with some companions. Despite this discomfort, however, Dominic would pray in church all night, “as was his custom,” while his companions would spread their clothes by the fire and sleep. Miraculously, it was Dominic’s clothes that were always dried by morning. Here it is Dominic’s dedication to his spiritual development, which surpasses that of his companions, that produced a miracle. Although Constantine was careful to mention that this type of nocturnal prayer was customary for Dominic, the description is far less
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119 *JoS,* chaps. 12 & 13, 32; *PF,* chap. 12, 217-18; *CoO,* chap. 11, 292-3; and *HoR,* *Legenda,* chap. 8, 375-6.
120 On Cistercian hagiographic emphasis on prayer, among both male and female saints, see *Roisin,* *L’Hagiographie,* 108.
122 Thomas of Cantimpré, *De S. Christina Mirabili Virgine,* in *AASS* Julius 24, vol. 5 (1868), II.16 and *ToC,* *Vita Margarete,* chap. 18-21 and 115-117.
123 “...vir Dei Dominicus, Sancti Spiritus igne fervens suo statim ecclesiam ad orandum, immo in oratione potius pernoctandum sic cum vestibus quantumcumque videlicet madefactis intrabat.” *CoO,* chap. 42, 315, and *HoR,* *Legenda,* chap. 46, 405.
central and elaborate than Peter’s depiction of the zealous young canon performing the opus Dei through prayer. Two more references to Dominic’s accustomed practice of prayer, described as his refuge and usually taking place in a church, occurred in the later lives of Dominic, but are even less central to the miraculous nature of the story.  

They do, however, function as an infrequent reminder that the saint, despite the predominance of his other worldly activities, still attempted to maintain the private life of prayer so central to the idea of worldly renunciation, yet so difficult for the active friars to achieve. Such a balance between active pastoral responsibility and the traditionally monastic virtue of prayer also marked medieval hagiographic models of the bishop-saint, a typology of sainthood especially common for male saints in the High Middle Ages and defined by the synthesis between the ecclesiastical leader, who ruled firmly over his Church by fighting evil in various forms and the man of religion engaged in prayer, fasting, and ascetic practices.

Indeed the decentralization of prayer in Dominic’s vitae to some extent reflects the Order’s own transition from the more liturgically centered Augustinian Rule of the canons initially adopted by the Order toward the more specialized Dominican Constitutions in which the liturgical office was to be performed “briefly and succinctly so that the friars did not set aside devotion and especially so that their study was not impeded.” In his commentary on the Constitutions, Humbert explained that this devotion [devotio] referred to both devoutly reciting the office and to “other things that the friars did after the office, time to be devoted to meditations or secret prayers.” Humbert’s portrayal of Dominic’s prayer life, conducted in secret during spare moments after his pastoral responsibilities in the world, thus reflects this Dominican extra-liturgical understanding of prayer and increasing emphasis on study. The emphasis on moderation in ascetic practices,

124 For example, “..post predicationem more solito in ecclesia ad orandum remansit” in CoO, chap. 48, 319 and HoR, Legenda, chap. 52, 409-10 or “..sed compassione permutus, continuo ad consuetum orationis refugium se convertit…” in CoO, chap. 48, 319; and HoR, Legenda, chap. 52, 409.
125 John Coakley, “Friars, Sanctity,” 99. Kieckhefer makes the similar point that men’s lives tend to emphasize their outward, public conduct over their inner piety and often depict male piety as serving pedagogical ends in “Holiness,” 303-5.
126 Vauchez, Sainthood, 288.
128 “Circa devotionem, notandum quod est…alia cui solent vacare fratres post officium, tempus meditationibus aut secretis orationibus impendendo” Humbert of Romans, Expositio super Constitutiones, in Opera, vol. 2, 86.
including bodily mortification and prayer, in Dominic’s vitae likewise reflected the papacy’s increasingly suspicious stance toward the excessive austerity and solitary life at the heart of the saintly ideal of heroic asceticism as well as the Church’s frequent support for saints who demonstrated religious experience in a communal context, dedication to pastoral responsibility, and engagement with sacramental and liturgical life, especially among men.129 This contrasted sharply with the growing trend in feminine pious expression toward extreme ascetic and mystical practices, which encompassed the majority of female saints from the period and gained momentum as the thirteenth century progressed.130 Even the heroic ideal of male chastity lost the topos of manly struggle so central to earlier monastic lives in Dominic’s Legendae as leading Dominican figures received freedom from lust, with comparatively little struggle, through a divine intervention meant to allow the friar to pursue other spiritual goals. Thus, it was not the heroic struggle with the flesh that defined the vocational paths of the early Dominican friars, but the fulfillment of their larger missions in the world, their newly transfigured opus Dei, which moderate ascetic practice and divinely granted physical governance made possible. The transition away from asceticism, bodily mortification, prayer, and chastity as the focus of saintly identity and toward active pastoral responsibility reflected both transitioning hagiographic ideals of male sanctity and secular ideals of masculine active and public performance, masculine self-governance, and patriarchal authority.

The cura animarum: Study and Preaching

If the focus of the Vespers hymn sung by the friars at the beginning of Dominic’s mass was the saint’s virtue, poverty, and ability to overcome the flesh, the focus of the later offices was on the activities that these practices enabled the saint to perform. The hymn sung at Matins, for example, had the following text,

“May Dominic be praised as God’s new athlete, who, made an evangelical man, conformed action to the name. Conserving virginity’s lily without stain he burned like a torch with an ardent love for those who are perishing. Trampling the world under his feet he put his hand to bold things, naked and running into

129 Vauchez, Sainthood, 332-5
battle, suffused with Christ’s grace. He fought with his word, with miracles, and through the brothers, who had been sent throughout the world, attaching constant tears to sedulous prayers.”

The text of this hymn causally linked Dominic’s virginity to his love for souls, his disdain for the physical world to his ability to battle for Christ, and his prayer to his ability to fight to save souls. The progression of antiphons and responses sung during the three nocturns in between the psalms and the readings from Humbert’s *legenda Dominici* also reflect this hierarchical relationship between personal piety and vocational impetus. The first Nocturn, for example, began by praising Dominic’s poverty and shame, then discussed his education in the arts and the “study of the highest truth,” and finished by extolling Dominic as a divine messenger through whose writing, “error is conquered and faith is extolled.” The next two nocturns followed a similar progression from personal pious practice toward an externalized piety that transformed the world through holy doctrine. The *vitae Dominici* likewise abounded with examples of various friars, led by their founder, persisting in the particular activities at the heart of the Dominican vocation: study and preaching. Indeed, the writers of the Dominican Constitutions note that the Order was “specially founded for preaching and the care of souls” and that “study should principally and ardently strive toward this with the greatest effort” in order to be “useful to the souls of our neighbors.” Since these activities were largely only socially accessible to men, performance of them was inherently masculine and provided an important ideological foundation for masculine identity formation within Dominic’s *vitae*. In discussing their founder’s education and evangelical efforts, his hagiographers also positioned Dominic within the larger masculine cultures inhabited by university masters, orators, and lawyers.

Just as the Constitutions had shortened Dominican liturgical practice in favor of study, Dominic’s *vitae* emphasized diligent study in place of the extensive prayer in the monastic *opus Dei* from the High Middle
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131 “Novus athleta domini collaudetur Dominicus, qui rem conformat nomini vir factus evangelicus/Conservans sine macula virginitatis lilium ardebat quasi facula pro zelo pereuntium/Mundum calcans sub pedibus manum misit ad fortia, nudus occurrente hostibus Christi suffultus gratia/Pugnat verbo, miraculis, missis per orbem fratribus, credem adungen sedulis fletus orationibus/Trino deo et simplici laus, honor, virtus, gloria qui nos prece Dominici ducat ad cel i gaudia” Tugwell, “Office,” 606.


134 “…cum ordo noster specialiter ob predicationem et animarum salutem ab initio noscatur institutus fuisse, et studium nostrum ad hoc principaliter ardenterque summo oopere debeat intendere, ut prosimorum animabus possimus utiles esse.” *Constitutiones Antique*, prologue, 311.

135 See above, 36, ff. 70.
Ages. Indeed, the Constitutions also labelled such activities as sleeping instead of studying, reading forbidden books, and disturbing those reading or listening as faults to be corrected in the daily chapter, and charged special visitatores to report on each friar’s dedication to study, zeal for preaching, and personal habits. Given the fundamental centrality of study to the Dominican vocation, it is perhaps not surprising that Dominic’s hagiographers were relatively consistent in their portrayal of the saint’s diligent study habits at university and as a canon regular. Beginning with Jordan of Saxony, Dominic’s hagiographers claimed that Dominic worked so diligently as an adolescent at university that he hardly ever slept, a depiction common to traditional hagiographic representations of young male saints in grammar school. Peter of Ferrand and subsequently Humbert of Romans also described this diligent study in terms of maturity, writing that “the blessed Dominic, a youth of holy character, did not work half-heartedly, but strove diligently for knowledge and, putting aside all of the frivolous things with which a younger age was accustomed to overflow, to occupy himself in more mature studies” while achieving a liberal arts degree in Palencia. Thus, Dominic’s hagiographers portrayed diligent study as a marker of maturity, a characteristic occupying a more elevated position within the competitive masculine hierarchy that determined relative maleness along the youth/maturity continuum. Indeed, while pursuing his education, and particularly his university training, the Dominic of hagiographic legend acted with a maturity more often associated with adult men than with university adolescents, who typically engaged in drinking, brawling, and illicit sexual liaisons in most university towns. Constantine of Orvieto further asserted that Dominic “sweat diligently” over his studies, a description that placed study in the category of manual labor prescribed by the Benedictine rule.

136 See above, 48-9. For a brief look at the relative role of prayer in the development of high medieval monasticism see Petit and Praem, "Aseticism," 33-4 & 43.
137 Constitutiones Ante, dist. 1, cap. 21, 331-3 and dist. 2, cap. 19, 354-5. See discussion in Mulchahey, "First the Bow;"
138 JoS, chap. 7, 28; PF, chap. 8, 213; and HoR, Legenda, 6, 374.
139 “Cepit autem sancte puer indolis beatus Dominicus non segniter agere, eruditioni, cuius gratia missus erat, diligenter intendere, omissisque frivolis, quibus adolescentior solet etas effluere naturaliter, maturioribus sese studiis occupare.” PF, chap. 7, 212-3 and HoR, Legenda, chap. 5, 373. It is Humbert of Romans who adds the adjective maturioribus. The average age for young men starting their degree in liberal arts was between 14 and 16. See John Lowrie Daly, The Medieval University, 1200-1400 (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), 130.
140 See above introduction, 12-14.
142 CoO, chap. 8, 290.
Anthropologists have indicated the importance of performing manual labor suitable to a man's social class as a marker of masculinity since patriarchal understandings of maleness required a man to economically support his dependents. This association between work and male honor was reflected in the Valencian legal trope often describing an honorable man as one "going about his work honestly," while juxtaposing illegal and socially disruptive behavior with working "simply and honestly" in municipal proclamations. Although study was by its very nature a male activity, Dominic's hagiographers also reinforced this inherent association with masculine identity by depicting it as an aspect of relative maturity and by associating it with the work required of men in a deeply patriarchal society.

Dominic's hagiographers not only depicted the saint diligently studying during his university career, but also emphasized his intellectual achievements. According to the vitae, Dominic's understanding of the liberal arts surpassed that of his contemporaries in a short amount of time and "he not only drank the milk of the easier doctrines, but also tasted the more solid substance of food with amazing ease, having been taught to unravel the perplexities of difficult questions and to penetrate the innermost details of profound mysteries." Thus, Dominic's hagiographers emphasized Dominic's intellectual prowess in the milieu of intellectual male competition that was the university life. This likely required him to prove his intellectual and rhetorical achievements by engaging in public debates with other noted scholars since this was a customary pedagogical tool in universities during Dominic's education and the education of his
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143 Gilmore, Manhood, 30-55 and Neal, Masculine Self, 42-5. According to the Furs in late medieval Valencia, the husband sustained the ‘burden of marriage’ (carregà matrimoni) by providing food, clothing, and shelter for his dependents and thus required the funds to do so, in Lightfoot, “Negotiating Agency,” 41.

144 Rafael Vizcaíno Narbona notes that municipal proclamations were constantly dictating that “tots menestral de qualsevol ley o condició [...] nos mesclen o façen part en alcuna de les bandositats, ne isquen a alguna brega que sia d’aquelles, ans estiguen simplament e honest faent lurs faenes” in "Marrades un Partit Patrici,” in L’univers dels prohoms: perfils locals als temps medievals, ed. Eliseu Climent (València: Perèz Bayer, 1995), 30 and 39.

145 On Dominic’s performance compared to his contemporaries, see PF, chap. 7, 213 and HoR, Legenda, chap. 5, 373. “Effudit proinde largius intellectum fons sapiencie super latitudinem cordis eius, ut non tantum facilioris doctrine lac sugeret, sed et solidiorem cibi substantiam mira facilitate glutiret doctus utique questionum difficilium perplexa dissolvere et profundum mysteriorum intima penetrare.” PF, chap. 8, page. 214 and a similar description in JoS, chap. 7, 29. Later authors mentioned the fact that his skill surpassed that of his contemporaries.
had repeatedly made a special petition, “that God should deign to grant him the true charity capable of caring vocational goal: the salvation of souls through effective preaching. All of Dominic’s hagiographers were also in agreement about the nature of Dominic’s primary vocational goal: the salvation of souls through effective preaching. While an Augustinian canon, Dominic had repeatedly made a special petition, “that God should deign to grant him the true charity capable of caring
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146 The pedagogical style of intellectual communities underwent an extensive overhaul in the High Middle Ages, transitioning from small groups of scholars surrounding a beloved master toward a more combative system of education in which teachers were regularly challenged by their students in an atmosphere of severe competition often idealized in the language of military combat. This change began to be felt in the 12th century and was solidified through the scholastic method, with its regular disputations, in the universities of the late medieval period and within the Dominican educational system itself. As a student in Iberia, Dominic would surely have taken part in this new type of development during the late 12th century as the Iberian schools were heavily influenced by developments at the university of Bologna, a renowned institution and one of the leaders in university pedagogy. Regardless, Dominic’s hagiographers, writing in the early 13th century, would certainly have gained their university educations—as well as their educations in Dominican convents, for that matter—within a system emphasizing the public debate. For an overview of this process see Stephen Jaeger, The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999). For a discussion of the increasing association between mastership and male identity as well as the agonistic nature of this process, see Solterer; Master and Minerva, 26. For the state of Iberian schools, see Santiago Aguadé Nieto, “Las universidades y la formación intelectual del clero castellano en la Edad Media,” in Universidad, Cultura y Sociedad en la Edad Media, ed. Santiago Aguadé Nieto (Alcala de Henares: Universidad de Alcala de Henares, c. 1997). For the role of university debates in masculine identity formation, see Karras, From Boys, 91. For a discussion of the Dominican educational system through which Dominic’s hagiographers were educated, see Mulchahey, “First the Bow,” 130-218.

147 JoS, chap. 13, 33; PF, chap. 10, 216; CoO, chap. 11, 292; and HoR, Legenda, chap. 9, 376.

148 See the directives in the Constitutions’ prologue above, 32.
for and administering to the salvation of men, judging that then he would truly be a member of Christ, since he would devote his entire self with all of his might to the souls that were to be gained, just as the savior of all, the Lord Jesus, offered his entire self for the sake of our salvation.”

Although prayers of this type were common in the hagiographic depiction of sainthood for both men and women, Dominic’s expression of the cura animarum is also consistent with his gender since the adult male saint expressed this care of souls mainly through persistence in preaching. Likewise, while late medieval holy women increasingly identified themselves with Christ’s humanity evidenced through redemptive physical suffering, holy men identified with Christ’s divinity and sought the imitatio Christi through preaching, interactive and public care of souls, and martyrdom—the literal vita apostolica. As was suitable for an order of preachers, the hagiographers regularly depicted the early friars “persisting” in preaching, despite the lack of dedication displayed by their companions and the difficulty of the situation. Bishop Diego of Osma, Dominic’s early mentor and initiator of the preaching crusade against the Cathars, returned to Spain with the intention of seeking out “men suitable for preaching, whose task was to constantly crush the errors of the heretics and to guard the true faith continuously.” Once Diego had died, the unwearying Dominic remained in Toulouse with only a handful of followers “constantly announcing the word of God” after all of the other preachers, including the Cistercian abbots and papal legate, had abandoned the task. He also persisted “with all of his strength and with the most fervent zeal” in attempting to win whatever souls he could for Christ, despite the threats, traps, and abuse aimed at him by the heretics of the region. In addition, the only activity that the early hagiographers attributed to the illustrious canon lawyer Reginald of Orleans, during his very brief stint in the Order, was

149 “Puit autem ei frequens et specialis quedam ad deum petitio, ut ei largiri dignaretur veram caritatem curande et procurande saluti hominum efficacem, arbitrans sese tunc primum fore veraciter membrum Christi, cum se totum pro viribus lucrificiendis animabus impenderet, sicut salvator omnium dominus Iesus totum se nostram obtulit in salutem.” JoS, chap. 13, 32. A version of this petition also exists in PF, chap. 10, 216; CoO, chap. 11, 293; HoR, Legenda, chap. 9, 376.

150 Bynum, Holy Feast, 245-69 and Kieckhefer, “Holiness”; and André Vauchez, The Spirituality of the Medieval West: from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1993), 82-84. For the relationship between the mendicant call to mission and the tradition of the vita apostolica see Müller, Bettelmönche, 82-114.

151 “... viros ad predicandum idoneos, quorum esset officii hereticorum errores semper elidere et tuende veritati fidei non deesse.” JoS, chap. 28, 39; PF, chap. 17, 221; and HoR 20, 383.

152 “...in predicationis indefessa continuatione permansit, contra hereticos maxime constanter annuntians verbum Dei.” CoO, chap. 16, 297 and HoR, Legenda, chap. 21, 383 use this exact wording, while JoS, chap. 34, 42 and PF, chap. 20, 224 contain very similar stories.

153 “Ipse vero totis viribus et zelo ferventissimo satagebat animas, quas posset, lucrificare Christo; et inerat cordi eius mira et pene incredibilis salutis omnium emulatio.” JoS, chap. 34, 42 and PF, chap. 20, 224.
dedicated and ardent preaching. Thus, all three of the major players in the early Dominican vitae demonstrate a commitment to the predominantly masculine profession of preaching, persisting in their edifying and conversionary mission in the face of persecution and the defection of their companions. They were also mature men, seasoned in their vocations, either as members of the ecclesiastical structure or products of the university system, and thus lent a certain patriarchal gravitas, which was often ascribed to politically and socially dominant men, to their preaching activities. Such repeated emphasis on preaching was, of course, consistent with the Order’s fundamental vocational goal of saving souls through preaching, but this emphasis simultaneously placed the Dominican vocational ideal for the brothers closer in line with hagiographic and secular traditions of specifically male behaviors, at the apex of which stood the preachers general, the celebrity figures of the Order.

The hagiographic texts make clear, however, that these Dominican preachers used more than just persistence to conduct their public cura animarum emphasizing the lived embodiment of preaching, the masculine use of language itself, and effective persuasion as a marker of heroic saintly status. The ideal of preaching as an embodied vocation, as an obligation to be achieved through both persuasive words and actions, permeates the descriptions of the major figures of all four early hagiographic texts. Early in his Libellus, for example, Jordan wrote that Bishop Diego of Osma drew those people whose natural desires led them toward secular pleasures to a more religious and praiseworthy life by persuading with words and inviting by example. Diego used the same approach when he was called to counsel the Cistercian abbots appointed to convert the Cathars in southern France, recommending that they not only preach with their lips, but also demonstrate a holy life with their hands and their actions so that, as Constantine phrased it, “the merit of their life should confirm what their speech promised.” The Cistercians responded positively to this...
advice, sent away their stately revenues, and began to preach the faith of Christ in both “word and deed.”

The early hagiographers also claimed that Dominic demonstrated this two-pronged approach to his conversionary efforts, claiming that he “everywhere showed himself to be an evangelical man through words and works” including among the heretics. Reginald also allegedly preached in both word and example in Bologna and Paris before his untimely death.

The Latin phrase *docere verbo et exemplo* was often used by the Augustinian canons, as Caroline Walker Bynum has shown, to distinguish the canons’ sense of personal responsibility for the edification of their fellow men as an extension of holy study from the earlier monastic emphasis on study of the Word for personal edification only. In other words, these writers stated that Biblical study should lead the canon to edify his fellows through his own holy speech and personal example within cloister, thus de-emphasizing, the traditional connotations of preaching as only something external to conventual life.

This debate between the externalized *cura animarum*, especially in the form of preaching, and the personal pursuit of prayer in the monastery also had gendered connotations. While medieval monastic authors had long depicted the active vocation as masculine, rather than defining active service as personal ascetic discipline as early medieval writers had done, writers such as Anselm of Havelberg, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Joachim of Flora increasingly favored preaching as the masculine active role, even for monks. Many male saints had, of course, exhibited the trait of fiery preaching throughout the Middle Ages, but the gendered rhetoric surrounding preaching gradually entered the monastic milieu and assumed the form of the *docere*

---


verbo et exemplo among the Augustinian canons.\footnote{164} Dominic’s hagiographers, however, further equated the active vocation specifically with public edification, by changing the language that they use to discuss the Order’s \textit{modus operandi} from the formula \textit{docere verbo et exemplo} to \textit{praedicare verbo et opere} and using the phrase in reference to Dominic’s public preaching.\footnote{165} In other words, if holy study compelled the canon to edify his brethren, such study compelled the Dominic of early hagiographic memory to preach to and convert the laity, a fundamentally masculine prerogative in hagiographic and theological traditions.\footnote{166} In expanding the Augustinian ideal of obligatory edification of others beyond the cloister to the laity through preaching, Dominic’s hagiographers thus simultaneously masculinized the Dominican mission.

The phrase \textit{praedicare verbo et opere} also promoted an ideology of linguistic and rhetorical embodiment for Dominic and his preachers, an embodiment that had gendered implications in literary, rhetorical, and medieval traditions. As Jill Ross has shown, the poet of the \textit{Poema de mio Cid}, for example, presented the Cid as the heroic emblem of masculine warrior society where a man’s “thoughts, words, and actions signify in an immediate, straightforward manner” in contrast to the villainized and feminized \textit{Infantes}, whose words do not match their intentions.\footnote{167} Likewise, legal records from late medieval England indicate that masculine social identity was defined by the concept of the “true man,” that is, one who dealt openly and honestly with those around him, who avoided excessive subtlety, cunning, or duplicity, a characterization likewise highlighted in anthropological literature regarding maleness.\footnote{168} Medieval society, on the other hand, considered “untrue” men to be false, sneaky, and unmanly and Andreas Capellanus wrote of women that “everything they say is spoken with duplicity in their hearts, since they always carry another thing in their
heart than what they say with their mouth.”¹⁶⁹ Augustine discussed a similar concept in his *De doctrina christiana* with specific reference to preaching, writing that a man who lived a bad life, but spoke the edifying and truthful words written by another was a thief, since he stole God’s words, while living according to his own plan.¹⁷⁰ Dominic’s hagiographers spoke to this tradition when they related how Dominic’s “sermons and preaching were not based on words of human wisdom, but on the demonstration of virtue,” while he “everywhere showed himself to be an evangelical man in word and deed.”¹⁷¹ Like the Cid, whose thoughts, words, and actions communicated the same message and the “true man” whose words matched his deeds, Dominic is depicted as a transparently open man who valued action reinforcing speech, rather than skill with words by itself. Thus, the emphasis in Dominic’s *vitae* on preaching in both word and deed renders Dominic as the idealized “true man” by late medieval standards at the same time that it served the functional purpose of attempting to convert heretics.

In addition to presenting Dominic as a man whose preaching matched his actions, Dominic’s hagiographers also sought the constancy and depth of his conversation in general. All the hagiographers, with the exception of Constantine of Orvieto, claim that Dominic “preserved so much constancy of heart regarding those things which he had rationally conceived of doing according to God, that with appropriate deliberation he hardly ever agreed to change a single thing that he had said.”¹⁷² Likewise, the saint’s habitual conversation allegedly only touched upon weighty and important matters, since “his heart was itself suspended on high and words never fell from his mouth in vain.”¹⁷³ The constancy and deliberation of Dominic’s speech coincided with the type of speech expected of medieval men in general which directly

---

¹⁶⁹ “Sed mulieres omnes cuncta quae dicunt in cordis scimus duplicitatem narrare, quia semper alia corde gerunt quam ore loquantur” in *Capellanus, De Amore*, 400. Andreas also labels women as liars in *ibid.*, 404. Such perceptions of honorable male behavior help account for the ubiquitous charges of falseness, lying, and thievery hurled as insults among late medieval men, who were in essence calling each other lesser men or women, while Valencian men and women favored the related charge of treason. See Neal, *Masculine*, 31-42 and Lesnick, “Insults,” 76-8; and Dieguez Seguí, *Clams i Crims*, 202, 206, 244, and 252.


¹⁷¹ “Ubique virum evangelicium verbo se exhibebat et opere” JoS 104, 75; CoO 60, 329; HoR 60, 416 and “Sermo eius et predicatio eius non in humane sapiencie verbis et sed in ostensione virtutum.” PF, chap. 8, 214 and HoR, *Legenda*, chap. 6, 374.


contrasted with "women's speech," considered to be excessive, frivolous, scolding, and gossipy. Andreas Capellanus, for example, wrote, that "every woman is also loud-mouthed, since not one of them can curb her tongue from abuses or from complaining loudly all day, barking like a dog, because she lost a single egg, and disturbing the entire neighborhood over a small matter...and her tongue or spirit would never be fatigued by speaking." Likewise, the hagiographers’ emphasis on Dominic’s deliberation before speaking reflected medieval ideals of kingship in which the lord, responsible for justice, never decided on a course of action without taking worthy counsel. Charlemagne was described in the Song of Roland, as “a man not hasty in reply, but wont to speak only when well advised.” Although the monastic tradition of holy speaking, expressed clearly in the Benedictine Rule, advocated limited and restrained speech for both men and women, prevailing ideas associating women with loose speech often determined the more extensive efforts at repression aimed at holy women’s speech in the Christian tradition. In addition, while hagiographers regularly portrayed female mendicant saints speaking spiritedly and often about their internal spiritual process, mediated though this discourse may have been, male mendicant saints are markedly mute about their own internal lives and "speak" far less to and through the hagiographer. Thus, Dominic’s moderate, holy, and governed speech provided yet another aspect of a young friar’s template for appropriate male behavior within the Order.

The early Dominican hagiographic texts also portray heroic preachers who were successful and, sometimes literally, fiery preachers. The legendae demonstrate Dominic’s general preaching skills from the very beginning of his life through the prophetic vision shown to Dominic’s pregnant mother in which Dominic was seen as a barking dog holding onto a burning torch with which he set the world on fire. All of the hagiographers interpreted this vision to mean that Dominic would be an exceptional preacher who would

---

175 “Est et omnis femina virlingosa, quia nulla est quae suam noverit a maledictis compescere linguam, et quae pro unius ovi amissione die tota velut canis latrando non clamaret et totam pro re modica viciniam non turbaret...nec unquam posset sua lingua vel spiritus fatigari loquendo.” Capellanus, De Amore, 404.
177 Sayers, Song of Roland, 10, 56.
178 Salisbury, Church Fathers, 36 and McNamara, “Need,” 212.
180 As Christine Caldwell Ames has demonstrated, this vision was foundational to the construction of Dominic’s identity in general and particularly for his identity as an inquisitor. See Righteous Persecution, 94-134.
light the world on fire with love for God and whose preaching or “bark” would drive the “wolves” or heretics away from the flock of Christ.\textsuperscript{181} Other, less illustrious members of the Order also demonstrated skilled and pleasing speech. For example, Henry’s "lively and efficacious speech penetrated the hearts of his audience most violently."\textsuperscript{182} Much like the noble knight on a battlefield motivating his troops, Diego’s rousing speech in the \textit{legendae} convinced twelve seasoned Cistercian abbots and a papal legate, very important men, to send home their retinues and travel through southern France on foot preaching.\textsuperscript{183} Reginald placed all of Bologna in an uproar through his eloquent and ardent preaching, winning many souls for Christ and brothers for the Order.\textsuperscript{184} Dominic, likewise, converted four heretical noble ladies, who sought Dominic out because of his preaching, and, after seeing a vision of a thoroughly repulsive black cat that represented the devil and head of the Cathar sect, were converted. Constantine makes it clear that both the terrible vision as well as the “persuasion of Dominic’s words” were responsible for this remarkable conversion.\textsuperscript{185} In this sense, Dominici’s hagiographers placed the Order’s early preachers within the masculine saintly typology of the passionate preacher, who fiercely cut out vices and turned his audience toward a more correct practice of living through verbal skill and personal charisma.\textsuperscript{186}

However, in attributing the success of these early preachers to their violent potential to evoke change in their audiences, that is, to draw the flock back to true love of Christ and protect it from sin and heresy, also reflected deeply rooted medieval traditions of the violent potential contained within men’s speech in general and mark these Dominican preachers as particularly virile orators. Rhetoricians beginning with Cicero and including Quintilian and Augustine described rhetorical skill as a sword with deadly penetrative force, which,

\textsuperscript{182} “...cuius sermo vivus et efficax audientium corda violentissime penetrabat” JoS, chap. 77, 62. Also, see references to a man named Thomas who joined the Order early on and was known for his preaching in JoS, chap. 38, 44; PF, chap. 26, 220; and HoR, \textit{Legenda}, chap. 29, 389.
\textsuperscript{183} Jordan of Saxony includes and extended version of Diego’s speech in the first person, while the later hagiographers settle for a summarized version of his words and their results. See JoS, chap. 20, 36; PF, chap. 13 & 114, 218; CoO, chap. 14, 295; and HoR, \textit{Legenda}, chap. 15, 379.
\textsuperscript{184} JoS, chap. 58, 53; PF, chap. 36, 236-7; CoO, chap. 33, 310; and HoR, \textit{Legenda}, chap. 35, 396.
\textsuperscript{185} “hoc tamen adiciens, quod mentes feminas, tanto tempore in errore fraudatas, facilius reducere potuit tam terribilis visio ipsius oculus foris exhibita, quam sola verborum quantalibet persuasio per aures infusa.” CoO 49, 321. See also, HoR, \textit{Legenda}, chap. 52, 409.
\textsuperscript{186} Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 300; Weinstein and Bell, 227 & 237; and Beth Crachiolo, “Seeing the Gendering of Violence: Female and Male Martyrs in the \textit{South English Legendary},” in Meyerson, Thiery, and Falk, \textit{A Great Effusion}, 154-6.
when wielded skillfully, could “wound, kill, crush, overcome, or destroy” an opponent. This ability of the word to penetrate the listener fundamentally gendered the speaker as masculine and his audience as feminine, since the ability to avoid physical penetration or to penetrate others was a fundamental marker of male behavior throughout the period in question. Thus, oratorical skill that allowed the speaker to “penetrate,” harm or persuade the audience was a special marker of masculinity in the later Roman period and this tradition continued into the medieval period in the form of courtly ideals of aristocratic behavior, the scholastic disputation, and literary representations. As Stephen Jaeger has shown, the characteristics ascribed to the ideal male courtier of the High Middle Ages, including skill in debate, irony, verbal composure, and diplomacy often overcame the uncontrolled or violent outbursts of more overtly violent figures at court to gain a courtier or cleric who possessed them a higher social standing and a secure masculine identity.

Men’s speech also had violent potential on the streets of late medieval Europe where insults played a prominent role in late medieval confrontations, functioning as actions and being actionable in return. It was the violent potential of speech that caused many late medieval cities such as Valencia to legislate firmly against “spoken injuries...since hatreds and ill will follow from the injuries of words and from there, wounds and death,” even levying higher fines against those hurling insults than against those threatening or enacting actual violence. Thus, the violently penetrative, smoothly persuasive, and efficacious nature of early Dominican preaching in the vita Dominici, provided a model for rhetorically virile preaching within the Order.

Given the specific constitutional emphasis on study, preaching, and the care of souls as the fundamental aspects of the Dominican vocation, it is perhaps not surprising that the early vita Dominici

---


188 David Frederick, “Mapping Penetrability in the Late Republic and Early Imperial Rome,” in The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body, ed. David Frederick (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 2002); Rocke, Forbidden Friendships, 89-111; and Coon, Dark Age, 70.


191 See above introduction, 17.

192 The Furs of Valencia, for example, state “Fem fur nou, car per injúries de paraules se segueixen e naxen odis e males volentats e d’aquèn nafres e morts. E car als perills, qui per venir són, deja hom acórrer que aquelles injúries que seran dites de paraula, oltra aquelles que són escrites en lo primer fur de injúries, sien punides a arbitre de la cort e dels pròmens” and punish this more harshly than drawing a knife on someone in Colón, Furs, vol. 7, Book IX, rubric V5, 48 and Book IX, rubric IV.1, 45-6 and VII.1, 54-5. Italian authorities acted similarly Muir, Mad Blood, 52 and 71-2.
likewise highlighted dedication to study and, particularly, preaching as central to the activities of the early Dominicans. As we have seen, this depiction of Dominic as a successful preacher engaged in a public, interactive *cura animarum* and drawing individuals toward a good life was inherently consistent with several different hagiographic traditions of masculine sainthood, the thirteenth-century emphasis on the masculine *vita apostolica*, and theological understandings of male piety. The early Dominican hagiographers, however, also elaborated on Dominic’s saintly activities in a way that placed him within rhetorical, literary, courtly, and pedagogical understandings of male behavior outside of the religious traditions. In their depiction of Dominic’s saintly practice, his hagiographers reflected the hierarchical nature of the friar’s vocational progression denoted in the Constitutions, which made study a necessary prerequisite for preaching and the salvation of souls, rather than an end in itself. This vocational hierarchy corresponded to the gendered nature of the activities within the texts, since the hagiographers depicted study as a youthful stage in Dominic’s development, much as they had emphasized physical governance as foundational to both study and preaching. This gendered hierarchy within the vocational ideals of the Order likewise paralleled the various masculine hierarchies along which secular men arranged themselves as a defining point of maleness and likely formed the bedrock of the friars’ understanding of what it meant to be Dominican and male.

**Battling the Enemy: Anti-heretical Activity and Dominican Maleness**

Just as Dominic’s hagiographers consistently emphasized his preaching mission, the means through which he pursued the salvation of souls, as the culmination of his saintly journey, the liturgical culmination of his feast day likewise focused on the saint as a preacher. The final hymn sung during Lauds, which followed Matins on Dominic’s feast day, contained the following lyrics:

“Our choir today utters a hymn of new joy, brought forth in pleasing song, for saint Dominic. When the evening star of the world was fading, a new star was born and a herald of salvation was sent to those enclosed in a prison of error. Spreading evangelical doctrine through the ends of the world, he put flight to the heretical pest, producing a new order. Here is that mid-sized spring, growing into the largest river, which was now miraculous and bestowed the best drink on the world.”

---

193 See above, 50-1.
194 “Ymnum nove letite dulci productum cantico noster depromat hodie corus sancto Dominico./Vergente mundi vespere
novum sydus exortur et clausis culpa carceri preco salutis mittitur./Doctrinam evangelicam spargens per orbis
cardinem pestem fugat hereticam novum producem ordinem./Hic est fons ille modicus crescens in flumen maximum
This early morning hymn thematically reflected the time of day during which it was sung, depicting Dominic as a preacher who created a renewed spiritual world, drawn from error and spiritually enlightened by the evangelical doctrine of the Order’s star. The placement of this mission at the center of the liturgical celebration and as the last office composed specifically for Dominic’s day, also highlights the thematic centrality of the salvation of souls, expressed through public preaching, to Dominic’s saintly vocation, an emphasis which reflected the Order’s Constitutions.\(^\text{195}\) The type of preaching emphasized in this hymn, however, was specifically directed toward heretics, who Dominic “put to flight” through his use of evangelical doctrine.\(^\text{196}\) Dominic’s audience in the *vitae Dominici* is likewise made up mostly of heretics, whom he tries to convert using a variety of methods. In writing these interactions, Dominic’s hagiographers emphasize the antagonistic relationship between saint and heretics and make Dominic into a heroic figure, whose conduct during his campaigns draws upon a variety of religious and secular ideals of masculine behavior.

One of the main forums for interactions between Dominic and his heretical audience in the early *legendae* was the public debate. With the rise of scholasticism in the university contexts, the debate had taken on increasing importance in the education of older students at all levels, providing an important and public method of demonstrating masculine intellectual and rhetorical achievement.\(^\text{197}\) The Dominicans also adopted this educational tool wholeheartedly in all levels of their schools, expending considerable amounts of energy in ensuring the quality of these debates since *schola* disputations, along with university ones, were open to the public.\(^\text{198}\) In the thirteenth century, the ideology of the scholastic academic debate was applied to the new proselytizing impetus of a Christian world that had become more and more motivated to draw non-Christians

---

\(^{195}\) See above, 50-1.

\(^{196}\) Heretical sects were often described as being “in error” in papal bulls. See, for example, *BOP* I: 79 (Aug. 13, 1235) and 85 (March 7, 1236).

\(^{197}\) In the words of Helen Solterer, “It was the scholastic institution of the master (*magister*), developed over the course of the twelfth century, that played a significant part in cultivating the affinities between mastery as intellectual authority and mastery as mode of domination. And it did so by casting the intellectual enterprise agonistically” in *Master*, 26. See also, Karras, *From Boys*, 91.

\(^{198}\) Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow,’ 168. Although some Dominican writers also stressed the intellectual and rhetorical achievement among women, such as was the case with Catherine of Alexandria in the *legenda aurea*, this seems to have been a relatively isolated phenomenon and one that did not apply to *vitae* written about the early Dominican saints including Diana d’Andalo, Margaret of Ypres, and Margaret of Hungary. In addition, although the *legenda aurea* became a medieval bestseller, there is evidence that the Order’s leaders were less than thrilled with it as a representation of the Order’s wider goals. It was also not explicitly composed as a way of establishing Dominican identity and missions, but as a preaching manual. For Dominican intellectual culture see footnote 144 above. For a discussion of ideals of early Dominican feminine sanctity see chapter 3 below. On the *legenda aurea*, see Ames, *Righteous*, 254, ff. 27.

Beyond this religious context, verbal sparring also dominated secular legal culture, where successful argumentation became ideologically masculinized. Medieval commentators considered verbal argumentation to be analogous to physical combat and considered the courtroom to be a belligerent forum that required declamatory training and legal discourse as weapons, while both spheres developed masculinized rhetorical strategies to assert intellectual superiority.\footnote{Ipsa nocte vero, qua in prefata civitate hospitati sunt, suprior ille cum hospite domus hereticus multa disputatione et persuasione fortiter et ferventer aegens, dum non posset hereticus resistere sapientie et spiritui qui loquebatur ad fidem ipsum spiritui de mediate reduxit.” JoS, chap. 15, 33-34.}

Dominic’s hagiographers portrayed their founding father as an active evangelist within this tradition, when discussing his public debates with the Cathars in southern France. Unlike the descriptions of Dominic’s preaching, references to the disputations between Dominic and the heretics changed character and decreased in importance with each successive re-write of his life. As has already been demonstrated, Dominic’s first two hagiographers drew specific attention to Dominic’s skill in debate throughout his schooling and his ability to solve difficult and arcane questions, while the later \textit{vitae} contain far less elaboration of this point.\footnote{See above, 17.} More important than this, however, were his debates in the field. In fact, Dominic’s first encounter with the heretical sect that would change his fate included an informal debate with the heretical proprietors of the inn where he was staying with Bishop Diego on an errand for the Spanish king. While all of the hagiographers agreed that Dominic converted his host through a conversation of some sort, the initially combative character of this conversation mellowed with each rewrite. Jordan of Saxony claimed that Dominic converted his heretical host “by striving boldly and fervently with a lot of debating and persuasion.”\footnote{JoS, chap. 15, 33-34.}

In this version, Dominic’s techniques had a more militaristic tendency in which his aggression and persistence, combined with a combative sort of conversation, achieved his ends. In Peter Ferrand’s version, Dominic “conquers his
host entirely by both affable persuasion and the flawless logic of his reason.” While the verb choice, in which Dominic conquered his opponent entirely, upholds the militaristic ideals of the previous version, the tools that Dominic used to achieve his rout have lost their teeth. Instead of heroically striving toward the conversion of his host, Peter’s Dominic uses charm and reason. While the successful use of reason seems at first to move away from the aggressive masculine ideal presented by Jordan, it in fact responds to the masculine university and rhetorical ideals for the use of reason, a trait by itself gendered as masculine. Dominic’s affability also appealed to the masculine ideal of courtly and clerical behavior, which valued linguistic skill in persuasion, an association made even more clear by Constantine of Orvieto’s version. Constantine’s Dominic “approaches” his heretical host and converts him “with both kindly and evangelical persuasion.” The heroic and militaristic Dominic of the first debate is thus thoroughly replaced by the learned and kindly preacher who used his courtly and clerical manners to change the hearts of non-believers. Humbert of Romans copied Peter’s version of these events word for word in his final text, thus preserving the most complex presentation of Dominic’s rhetorical skill, which drew upon masculine militaristic language, the rhetorical prowess of the medieval university world, and the refinement of courtly manners in his conversionary efforts.

The two other references to debates between Dominic and heretics ultimately fell victim to Humbert’s editorial process, as they are entirely excluded from this last vita despite their presence in earlier lives. The first reference functions as an introduction to the second and consists of a general description of the frequent debates that took place throughout the region between the Catholics and the heretics, which had official judges and drew large and diverse crowds. Humbert of Romans omitted this entirely from this

---

203 “...beatus Dominicus hospitem suum hereticum tam affabili persuasione devincens quam irrefragabili rationum connexione ad fidem catholicam, Dei spiritu cooperante, convertit.” PF, chap. 11, 216-7 and HoR, Legenda, chap. 11, 377.

204 Aristotle, whose work profoundly influenced university culture, wrote that woman “has the power of understanding, but this power is weak, because by the softness of her nature, her reason does not firmly adhere to plans, but quickly is removed from them because of some passions...” while the author of the Book of Anchoresses wrote that “Woman is Reason grown weak when it should be manifold, stalwart, and bold in true faith.” Quoted in Karras, From Boys, 84 and Anonymous, Rule for Anchoresses (Ancrene Riwle), in Woman Defamed and Woman Defended: An Anthology of Medieval Texts, ed. by Alcuin Blamires (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 97.

205 See above, 61.

206 “Quem benigna simul et evangelica persuasione conveniens et ad fidem convertens quasi quendam primiariarum manipulum future messis congregande per ipsum domino presentavit.” CoO, chap. 12, 293.

207 HoR, Legenda, chap. 11, 377.

208 JoS, chapter 23, 37; PF, chap. 155, 219; and CoO, chap. 15, 296.
portion of the vita and made no mention elsewhere of widespread disputations in the region at that time. In
the earlier text, this description of widespread disputations is directly followed by one of the most well known
of Dominic’s miracles: that of the Burning Book. The basic story, in all of the lives, described how one or more
of the heretics came to possess a book written by Dominic in defense of the Catholic faith. Through varying
means it is decided that the book should be thrown in the fire to determine its veracity; if it burned it was
false, but if it remained unharmed it was true. The book was thrown in the fire a total of three times, but leapt
from the flames, unharmed each time.209 The major changes to the story, however, occur in the context and
audience of this miracle. In Jordan and Peter’s version, the miracle was the concluding part of a great debate,
attended by many people, that occurred between Dominic—the author of an edifying treatise chosen as the
most persuasive from among a pool of such books written by other preachers—and a heretic who had written
a similarly selected text in favor of his own religion. When the judges were unable to decide on a winner after
reading the books and listening to the debate, they ordered that the book undergo a trial by fire.210
Constantine’s version, on the other hand omitted the debate portion of this contest, indicating that the judges
merely read the opposing books before deciding on the fire solution.211 The entire competition is relieved of
the direct conflict between the striving spiritual opponents, becoming a more impersonal comparison of
written material. Although university scholars could and did engage in heated and aggressive “debates” in
written form, Constantine’s portrayal of the event removes the lively exchange of propositions and retorts that
defined such debates, depersonalizing the exchange of ideas to such an extent that the event is no longer
directly conflictual, but still highly public.

Humbert of Romans, however, in a completely uncharacteristic editorial move, altered the context of
this miracle entirely. Rather than taking place during public comparison of the faiths, Humbert’s Dominic
gave the book to an individual heretic during his conversionary efforts. This heretic then brought it to a small,
private gathering of Cathars, who did not read the book at all, but immediately subjected it to the trial by fire.
The miracle was only made known when one of the heretics spread the news after he had converted to

209 See JoS, chap. 24, 38; PF, chap. 15, 220; CoO, chap. 15, 296, and HoR, Legenda, chaps. 17 & 18, 380-1.
210 JoS, chap. 24, 38 and PF, chap. 15, 220.
211 CoO, chap. 15, 296.
Catholicism. Thus, Humbert of Romans' version represents the culmination of the downgrading process by which Dominic's public intellectual, literary, and debating skills are converted into a privately performed miracle that was completely detached from any intellectual or literary accomplishment. Indeed, the story of the burning book is one of the few places where Dominic as a historical figure interfered with the construction of his saintly legacy, since Humbert's version of these events came from Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernai's *Historia albigenensis* in which Cernai claims to have heard his version of events from the saint's own mouth. Simon Tugwell posits that this text was late in reaching Dominican circles since its author was Cistercian and that Humbert came across it after the previous *legendae* had been written. Regardless of the final outcome, Dominic's first three hagiographers—and perhaps Humbert, if left to his own devices—had all emphasized their founder's skill in debate, the efficacy of his words in confounding and converting heretics, thus placing the miracle in the context of societal expectations of masculine rhetorical performance, especially expectations for the scholastic disputation. In addition, despite Humbert's alteration and the subsequent prominence of this version in the Dominican liturgy, the confrontational and public nature of the event as depicted in the early *vitae* remained alive in Dominican art. The depiction of the burning book on the front of the Dominic's tomb, for example, features a group of heretics, several monks, and Dominic himself surrounding the book and fire, while the fourteenth century altarpiece at Santa Caterina in Pisa also shows Dominic, with arms outstretched standing with a companion on the other side of the book and fire from a group of heretics. Thus, the oppositional, public quality of the original *Legendae* was not entirely removed from Dominic's legacy or his characterization as a rhetorically virile preacher. Indeed, all versions of the story emphasize the miraculous virility of Dominic's written word against the Cathars, an emphasis immediately evident in the book's centralized location in both artistic representations. In the legend of the burning book it is Dominic's words, embodied in the book, that are sanctified, withstand violent action at the hands of heretics, and ultimately have the power to enact conversion.

---

214 Tugwell, *Humberti*, 75.
Not all of Dominic’s encounters with heretics in the *legenda*, however, were limited to exchanging words, however powerful and masculine, and demonstrating orthodox sanctity. According to hagiographic representations, the heretics he encountered also threatened him, laid ambushes for him, and committed *injurias* against him, a term that referred to insults as well as injuries and was often used by medieval vassals hoping to instigate their Lord to enact justice on their behalf.\(^{216}\) In crafting Dominic’s response to such threatening actions, his hagiographers fit him into specifically masculine martyrdom tropes: the masculinized and militarized saint who scorned pain and adversity and played an active role in his own suffering through a passionate declaration of faith despite or because of the consequences.\(^{217}\) Despite the many threats and disgraces hurled at him by those to whom he was preaching, Jordan of Saxony’s “fearless” Dominic continues on his mission, scorning their traps and responding, “I am not worthy of the glory of martyrdom, I have not yet earned this death.”\(^{218}\) Peter Ferrand increased the extent of Dominic’s persecutions, while maintaining his manly stoicism. Rather than just the general injuries and insults discussed by Jordan, the heretics in Peter’s text mock him, throw mud and other disgusting objects at him, prepare ambushes in order to kill him, and hurl dire threats in his direction. Dominic himself also takes on more heroic proportions in his response, becoming a “soldier of Christ, scorning all of these things and saying to those threatening him with death, ‘I am not worthy of the glory of martyrdom.’”\(^{219}\) This extended version is incorporated in Constantine of Orvieto’s text and copied word for word in Humbert of Romans’ final *Legenda*. Dominic’s enemies are far more menacing in this version, constantly threatening Dominic’s life, which not only make his assertion regarding martyrdom more contextually appropriate, but also cast Dominic as the heroic male saint who is scornful of bodily harm and possible death.


\(^{218}\) “Quantas in illis diebus pertulit ab inquis injurias, sprevit et insidias! Denique dum aliquando ei minarentur interitum, imperterritus respondebat: ‘Non ego martyrii dignus sum gloria, nondum merui mortem istam’” JoS, chap. 34, 42.

In another powerful incident, contained in a similar form in all four lives, a happy and singing Dominic entered into an area “where he strongly suspected that traps had been placed for him.” The heretics, amazed at his unperturbed demeanor, said to him, “Aren’t you afraid of death? What would you do if we had apprehended you?” To which Dominic responded that he would have asked them to draw out his death for as long as they could, even specifying the exact bloody physical dismemberments that they should perform, “through which he would be worthy of a greater martyr’s crown.”220 His words so amazed his enemies that they did not cause him any physical harm and stopped setting traps for him entirely.221 Such a verbal exchange between persecutor and Christian victim served to emphasize the heroic nature of the martyr in early hagiographic texts, who declared his or her faith openly and bravely disputed with the judge, but also called upon the masculinized rhetorical tradition in which rhetorically virile words had the power to stop his opponents.222 Although both men and women suffered martyrdom in the Christian hagiographic tradition, hagiographers emphasized the virile nature of the martyr who demonstrated courage in the face of death using militaristic imagery, regardless of the saint’s gender.223 Through his stoic endurance of torture and martyrdom, the hagiographers placed the male saint in the context of the heroic epic tradition, in which the knight courageously, and even enthusiastically faced imminent death.224 In addition, medieval male hagiographic texts tended to emphasize the rhetorical skill of the saint, such as preaching and singing, and show the him playing an active role in procuring his own martyrdom. Women’s lives on the other hand, when not utilizing the masculinized virago trope, more often emphasize the saint’s virginity, nakedness, physical

---

220 “Postmodum autem locum preteriens, in quo positas sibi forte suspicabatur insidias, cantans et alacer incedebat. Quod cum insinuatum fuisset hereticis, mirantes tam inconcussam eius constantiam dixerunt ei: <<<Numquid non horres mortem? Quid acturus fuisses, si comprehendissemus te?>> At ille: <<<Rogassem vos>>, inquit, <<<ne repentinis me subito perimeres vulneribus, sed successiva mutilatione membrorum prostraretis martyrum. Dehinc autem ostensis ante meos oculos detruncatis membrorum particulis, et erutis postmodum oculis truncum reliquum vel relinueretis in hunc modum suo sanguine volubantem, vel extingueretis omnino; quo maiores coronam martyrii protractione mererer>>. JoS, chap. 34, 42. See also PF, chap. 20, 223; COO, chap. 16, 298; and HoR, Legenda, chap. 24, 385.

221 JoS, chap. 34, 42; PF, chap. 20, 224; and HoR, Legenda, chap. 24, 385.


223 Boyarin, Dying, 74-81.

224 Kuebler, Manly Eunuch, 111-117; Elliot, Roads, 22-41; and above, 15.
vulnerability, and physicality, portraying her endurance of torture as the vehicle through which she gained the purification from physical sin necessary for her own salvation.  

Thus, although Dominic was never martyred, his hagiographers placed his encounter with potentially violent heretics within the hagiographic tradition of male martyrdom, perhaps in response to renewed interest in martyrdom as an aspect of the masculine *vita apostolica* in the thirteenth century.  

Dominic’s interactions with the Cathars in this scene also drew upon ideals of rhetorical masculine prowess in place of physical defense, since the saint used his powerful words to stop his opponents from causing him physical harm, not through persuasion, but through bold speech inviting martyrdom.  

Dominic’s willingness to enter the forest despite knowledge of physical threat also mirrors the conduct of heroes in literary texts, who courageously engaged in battle despite the fear of death.  

Indeed, Dominic’s speech to his would-be murderers has much in common with a scene from the *Song of Roland*. When faced with an overwhelming number of opponents, Roland quieted his companion’s desire to call for aid by declaring that Charlemagne had chosen them to serve him since “well he know not one would flinch and flee. Men must endure much hardship for their liege, and bear for him great cold and burning heat, suffer sharp wounds and let their bodies bleed. Smite with your lance and I with my good steel, my Durendal [sword] the Emperor gave to me: And if I die, who gets it may agree that he who bore it, a right good knight was he.”  

Both heroes thus bravely faced seemingly imminent death out of sense of devotion to their respective Lords, viewing their own physical demise as the event that would make them worthy of their specific vocation. Dominic’s hagiographers, of course, did not depict the saint engaging in physical battle with his opponents, rather relying upon hagiographic and religious traditions of martyrdom and rhetorical weapons, but the underlying idea of death as a part of masculine vocational performance drew upon established literary traditions of masculine knightly performance.
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225 Boyarin, Dying, 74-81 and Crachiolo, “Seeing,” 156-61; and Elizabeth Robertson, “The Corporeality of Female Sanctity in The life of Saint Margaret,” in Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Szell, Images. In the late medieval period, this desire was expressed as bodily mortification in imitation of Christ’s human suffering, to which women especially related since they were generally associated with the body. Men in the later medieval period, however, were called to identify with Christ’s divinity, his preaching, and the salvation of souls epitomized by the Christian knight. Bynum, Holy Feast, 256-9.

226 See above, 127.

227 See above, 133-5

228 See above, 107-8.

Although the Constitutions had not specified preaching to heretics as the central Dominican vocation, the *vitae Dominici* certainly emphasized anti-heretical activity as the central activity of their founding saint. Indeed, in his commentary on the Constitutions’ prologue, whose composition was overseen by Jordan of Saxony, Humbert of Romans wrote that the “special cause” for which the Order had been instituted seemed to be the “defense of the faith rather than preaching, just as is contained in the *Legenda of St. Dominic*” [my emphasis]. Humbert, at least, considered anti-heretical activity to be the defining element of Dominic’s hagiographic legacy, which he himself had helped to compose, even if the historical documentation of the saint’s activities conflicted with the nascent hagiographic tradition. Given the violently oppositional nature of the relationship between the Cathars and the Catholics sent to convert them, it is not surprising that the hagiographic representation of Dominic’s interactions with them took on heroic and masculinized proportions. In depicting Dominic’s anti-heretical activities through the lens of antagonistic debates, physical threats, and potential martyrdom the early hagiographers placed their saintly founder within hagiographic and religious traditions of male martyrdom. Dominic’s altercations with these heretics also thematically paralleled the knight in a heroic epic, even while the saint relied upon words rather than a sword and the ideal of Christian knighthood rather than military knighthood, producing a masculine figure by both religious and secular standards.

**Conclusion**

Through their successive re-writings of the Order’s founding father, the early Dominican hagiographers provided a glimpse into the hagiographic construction of Dominic’s identity, an identity that would form part of the normative body of materials defining Dominican vocational goals, behavioral ideals, and corporate identity as a whole. The end product of this hagiographic crafting was a physically self-governed man whose moderate practice of personal piety and dedication to study formed the foundation of his primary vocation—preaching and pursuing the salvation of souls, particularly those belonging to heretics. In this sense, Dominic as a saint was the embodied and personalized manifestation of the vocational heart of

---

the Constitutions, providing an accessible and personal point of identification for the friars themselves as well as a palatable corporate figurehead for exportation of Dominican identity. In essence, the early Dominican authors provided an extended hagiographic version of Gregory IX’s description of Dominic in the Bull of Canonization, in which the pope wrote,

“Like a vigorous athlete guarding the roads of justice and paths of the saints, not forsaking the tabernacle of the Lord, the ministry and instruction of the militant church, for a moment, subjecting flesh to spirit and sensibility to reason, and made one with God in spirit, he strove toward Him with his whole being through the excesses of the mind and did not recede from love of his neighbor in his studies of sober compassion. When he had shot arrows at the delights of the flesh and enlightened the stony minds of the impious, all heretical sects trembled, and the entire church of the faithful rejoiced. And getting older he grew in grace, since, receiving inexplicable joy from the zeal for souls, he gave his soul to God’s eloquence and, creating many children through Christ’s gospel, he deserved to obtain on earth the name and work of his betters in the conversion of so vigorous a multitude that professes the office of evangelical dignity.”

The vitae Dominici, then, clarified and explained the fundamental aspects of Dominic’s sanctity expressed in his bull of canonization and embedded the Dominican vocation embodied by the founder saint into the literary and liturgical lives of the brothers. But perhaps the collection of vocational and behavioral ideals expressed by the founder saint was most succinctly and clearly expressed in the liturgical setting. At the conclusion of Lauds, following extended readings from Humbert’s Legenda Dominici, the brothers sang the following words during the Magnificat while the prior ritually spread incense in front of the Sacrament and altar: “O, light of the church, doctor of truth, rose of patience, ivory of chastity, you gave water of pleasing wisdom, preacher of grace, join us to the blessed.”

As this chapter has discussed, the behavioral model presented by Dominic’s hagiographers in his evolving vitae was also a particularly masculine one. Although studying, preaching, and combatting heresy in the field were fundamentally masculine activities socially and theologically restricted to men, Dominic’s hagiographers also portrayed the saint’s method of performing them as particularly masculine by drawing upon a myriad socially accepted models of medieval masculinity—medical, hagiographic, theological,
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231 “…justitiae semita, s et sanctorum vias strenuus Athleta custodiens, et velut ad momentum de tabernaculo Domini de militantis Ecclesie magisterio ac ministerio non discedens, carnem spiritui et sensualitatem subiecens rationi et factus unus cum Deo spiritus, totus in eum per excessum mentis pergere studuit et sobre compassionis studdiis a caritate proximi non recessit. Quo sagittante delicias carnium et fulgurante mentes lapideose impiorum, omnis hereticorum secta contremuit, omnis Ecclesia fidelium excultavit. Aetate crescente crevit et gratia, quandoquidem inexplicable gaudium de zelo consciens animarum, ad eloquia Dei dedit animum, et per Evangelium Christi multos generans, in conversione tam strenueae multitudinis Evangelicae dignitatis officium profitentis, nomen et opus in terra meruit obtinere maiorum.” BOP I: 68 (July 3, 1234) and Tugwell, Humberti de Romanis, 572-4.

rhetorical, literary, courtly, militaristic, and even legal—in their descriptions of him. While the specific behaviors endorsed by the *vita* sometimes differed in dramatic ways from secular ideals of masculine behavior, the foundational nature of Dominic’s sanctity in fact had much in common with core medieval understandings of mature masculinity in that both endorsed self control, governance of others, active performance of masculinity in the public sphere, positioning along a masculine hierarchy, loyal service to a Lord, courage in the face of death, and honorable resistance to an enemy group. Thus, evidence from the four early *vita Dominici* suggests that the Dominican hagiographers functioned simultaneously in the overlapping yet conflicting spheres of secular and religious ideals of male behavior when constructing Dominic as a masculine ideal.
Chapter 2. Growing Pains: Normative Sources for Masculine Self-Fashioning Among the Early Dominicans

As the successive re-writings of Dominic’s *vita* show, the first generation of Dominican friars expended a great deal of energy on the preservation of their origin story, slowly shaping the identity, mission, and behavioral ideals of their Order through evolving hagiographic representations of their founder saint. Although Humbert of Romans designated his *vita* as the last official one for the Order’s founder, the dedication to self-definition exhibited in Dominic’s hagiographic legend continued through the production of other important Dominican texts aimed at solidifying a cohesive Dominic identity. Although self-definition is a crucial part of any nascent institution, this process became especially important for the mid-thirteenth century Dominicans who faced challenges to their unique mandate on several fronts and struggled to establish a permanent role in the changing landscape of late medieval society. Given his seminal role in firmly establishing the Order in late medieval life and standardizing the Dominican liturgy, it is perhaps no surprise that the celebrated Humbert of Romans, the fifth Dominican master general, also played a pivotal role in the creation of a coherent Dominican identity, as instigator, editor, or writer of two important texts: the *Vitae fratrum* and the *De eruditione praedicatorum*. Each of these texts articulated a specific vision for different aspects of Dominican life, together providing evidence of Dominican self-fashioning and vocational ideology during pivotal years in the Order’s existence.

The General Chapter presided over by the newly elected Humbert of Romans in 1255 commanded that “any miracle, vision, or edifying occurrence worthy of memory that had happened in the Order since its inception” be sent to the newly elected master general so that he could diligently “put them in writing for the use of future brothers” and, in the following year, the priors were asked to write down the collected stories and send them to Humbert for codification.¹ The task of compiling these stories fell to Gerard of Frachet, then provincial prior of Provence, who completed the first version of the text around 1260 for distribution among the Dominican houses, just a few years after the master general had finished standardizing the Dominican
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¹ “Quicumque frater scit vel audivit auditu digno fide aliquod miraculum seu visionem seu aliquod factum edificatorium dignum memoria in ordine contigisse aut occasione ordinis ab inicio scribat magistro illud ut per eius diligenciam huius modi in scriptis redigantur ad utilitatem futurorum” *ACG* I: 77 (1255) and 83 (1256).
litrugy along with its definitive version of Dominic's *vita.* Such close proximity to the standardization of the liturgy suggests that Humbert's aim in soliciting, distributing, and possibly editing a text such as the *Vitae fratum* was at least partially standardization, this time of a Dominican historical identity. \(^3\) In a letter that circulated with the text, Humbert expressed his hope that it would make the friars aware of "how much care Divine Providence had for the Order" and would thus "confirm them in their love for the Order of Preachers." \(^4\) He also specified that the text was not to be circulated outside of the Order and explicitly placed it within the tradition of exemplary *vitae* used to shape the inner consciousness of various religious, citing Eusebius, Cassian, the Desert Fathers, Gregory's *Dialogues,* and Peter the Venerable's *Liber de miraculis* concerning Cluny. \(^5\) This focus on internal spiritual formation and distribution indicates that the text would have been particularly useful for introducing novices to a specifically Dominican religious identity and practice and it was, indeed, read in this context for much of the later medieval period. \(^6\) However, the text's composition and distribution also occurred during a time of particularly hostile opposition to the Order on the part of certain masters of theology in Paris and their clerical allies as well as a momentarily oppositional papacy from 1255-56. \(^7\) Thus, the *Vitae fratum* provided a focal point for self-identification, unification, and pride for the entire Order in the face of external hostility and the over fifty extant manuscripts attest to the text's popularity and likely presence in most medieval Dominican houses. \(^8\) In addition, Gerard of Frachet specified in his introduction that the text was meant as a supplement to Dominic's *vita* and it effectively replaced Jordan

\(^2\) Gerard continued editing the text until 1271. Benedictus Maria Reichert, introduction to GoF, *Vitae,* xvi and Lynne Alexandra Griffin, "Ex Exemplis Illustribus: The Influence of Gender on the *Vitae Fratrum* and the *Vitae Sororum,*" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2003), 18-20. That the liturgy had been completed and distributed from the General Chapter of this year is made clear by Humbert's encyclical letter from 1256 in which he commanded the brothers to adopt and copy this liturgy, understanding that there had been no way to satisfy everyone's desires for the new liturgy. *Letterae encyclicae,* V, 42 (1256). The General Chapter of that year also sent money to the prior in Paris "ad facienda communia exemplaria ordini pro divino officio..." in *AGC I*:81 (1256).

\(^3\) For evidence that Humbert of Romans likely edited Gerard's text, see Tugwell, "Petrus," 107.

\(^4\) "Vos ergo, carissimi, predicta legentes, advertite quanta cura fuerit providencie superne de ordine, et hoc audententes confirmamin magis ac magis in eius amore." GoF, *Vitae,* prologue, 5.

\(^5\) GoF, *Vitae,* prologue, 3-5.

\(^6\) Mulchahey, *First,* 103 and Van Engen, "Dominic", 14-16.


\(^8\) For a list of existing manuscripts see Reichert, introduction, xv and *SOP* II: 35-37. For evidence concerning the presence of the text in late medieval Dominican libraries, see Fabio Vigili, *Fabio Vigili et les bibliothèques de Bologne au début du 16e siècle, d'après le MS. Barb. 1at. 3185,* ed. M.H. Laurent (Città del Vaticano Biblioteca apostolica vaticana 1943), 228; KW. Humphreys, *The Book Provisions of the Medieval Friars 1215-1400* (Amsterdam: Erasmus Booksellers, 1964), 97; and Boureau, "Vitae," 82.
of Saxony’s *Libellus*, on which it was based, as the story of the Order’s beginnings.\(^9\) Thus, this collection represented the fruit of the Order’s early efforts to create a centralized account of the historical and hagiographic memory of the Order’s inception.\(^10\)

In doing so, the *Vitae fratrum* thus emphasized a collective Dominican identity, built on the *exempla* of the Order’s great leaders contained within the text—Dominic, Jordan of Saxony, and Peter Martyr—as well as the experiences and stories of countless other friars, rather than of a particular saint.\(^11\) Gerard depicted Dominic as the fulfillment of the Augustinian rule and, just as the structure of the Canons allowed for the interaction and collective decision-making of companion priests, the *Vitae fratrum* represents a collective process of hagiographic and historical institutionalization sharpened by external criticism of the Order.\(^12\) Such collective identity is supported by the structure of the text, which begins with a description of the spiritual predictions and divine intervention surrounding the Order’s foundation, then looks at both Dominic and Jordan of Saxony individually. The final two sections deal with the development of the Order and the miraculous events surrounding the death of the brothers, both sections of which are based on stories about various, often nameless, friars. The presence of the great saints are then literally and figuratively placed within the wider context of the Order’s collective ideal. Thus, unlike Dominic’s *vita* and those of the later Dominican saints, the behavioral ideals portrayed in Gerard’s text represent a process of self-definition for the Order’s internal life and one directed at the *frater communis*, largely living out his vocation through conventual life, or the novice beginning his absorption of Dominican praxis.\(^13\)

If the focus of the *Vitae fratrum* was largely the internalized conventual life of the brother, Humbert of Roman’s *Liber de eruditione praedicatorum* looked at a much more externalized and central aspect of Dominican identity: preaching. A product of the fifth master general’s retirement from 1263 to 1277, this text

---


\(^12\) Canetti, *L’invenzione*, 487-92.

\(^13\) The term *frater communis* first came to designate the friar, who was not sent on for further education but rather engaged in the daily work of pastoral care, hearing confessions, and preaching, in Dominican literature in the early 14th century. See Leonard E. Boyle, “Notes on the Education of the *Frateres communes* in the Dominican Order in the Thirteenth Century,” in *Xenia mediæ aevi historiam illustrantia oblata Thomae Kaeppeli, O.P.*, ed. R. Creytens and P. Künzle, I (Rome, 1978); repr. in *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200-1400* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981), 253-4.
originally consisted of two parts, the first dedicated to an extended description of the preacher’s task, the qualities necessary for the position, and guidelines for fulfilling this vocation, and the second consisting of model sermons and distributed separately under the title *De modo prompte cudendi sermones*. Although the former received only limited distribution with four surviving manuscripts, it nonetheless clearly articulated the highly influential Dominican master’s understanding of the Order’s primary and unique mission.

According to Simon Tugwell, it was the very novelty of this orientation that accounted for the text’s more limited distribution, since it provided a vocation so focused on preaching that it was foreign to other religious orders, who found more benefit from Humbert’s much more widely circulated sermon collection. Indeed, Humbert’s text was unlike the standard *artes praedicandi* circulating at this time, which focused more on the technicalities of sermon construction, theories of preaching, and rhetoric, than on the practice of preaching.

The Dominicans themselves produced or circulated very few *artes praedicandi* simply because they were thoroughly inculcated in sermon production throughout their education at a much deeper level than any *artes praedicandi* could provide and in fact often spearheaded these new techniques at the universities and from the pulpits. If an individual friar already well versed in sermon composition were to consult an *ars praedicandi* it would likely have been out of a special interest in rhetorical theory rather than a need for its technical advice, and he was far more likely to carry a collection of model sermons with him as he traveled than a rhetorical treatise.

Humbert’s purpose in composing his text was therefore quite different from that of a rhetorician’s in approaching a typical *ars praedicandi*, a purpose he articulated in the prologue to his text. The fifth master general opened his *Liber de eruditione* with a reference to Colossians, writing, “see that you fulfill the ministry

---


15 Simon Tugwell notes only four remaining manuscripts containing the first portion of Humbert’s text, while the sermon material provided in the second portion had “far more” manuscripts among which Tugwell lists six. Only a single manuscript contains both sections. See Simon Tugwell, ed. *Early Dominicans: Selected Writings* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1982), 181 and 477-8.

16 Although Charland classifies Humbert’s text as an *ars praedicandi*, Mulchahey’s assertion of its singularity more accurately reflects the text’s focus on shaping Dominican praxis and identity noted by Simon Tugwell. See Charland, *Artes Praedicandi*, 199; Mulchahey, ‘First,’ 474; and Tugwell, *Early*, 181.

that you have accepted in the Lord,” a ministry clearly defined as preaching by the title and topic of the treatise. For a Dominican audience, however, the centrality of preaching to their vocation would have been immediately apparent, since the brothers had extensive familiarity with the Order’s Constitutions, which the General Chapter had ordered be read to them regularly at times when no other religious or secular clergy were present since these latter were not supposed to hear it. Likewise, the second item listed on Humbert’s study list for novices was the Constitutions, likely since the regulations dictated in the text formed the backbone of Dominican praxis. The convent was also to keep a constantly updated copy of this seminal text, which was to be checked and updated by visiting provincials and master-generals. As we have already seen, the preamble to the Constitutions of 1220 contained a clear articulation of the Order’s vocation, stating “our Order is known to have been especially instituted from the beginning for preaching and the salvation of souls.” In his commentary on this passage, written sometime between 1260 and 1263, Humbert of Romans clarified that although preaching was firmly subsumed under the Order’s main goal—the salvation of all souls—it was nonetheless the Order’s end and the activity from which it drew its name. Likewise, he wrote, it was preaching in general for which the Order had been established, not just the defense of the faith that had been central to Dominic’s Legenda, since the Order’s vocation had expanded beyond the anti-Cathar impetus of the early years. Thus, the opening lines from the Liber de eruditione praedicatorum would have called to mind the centrality of preaching to the Dominican vocation, a vocation that was appointed by God. Humbert further stated his purpose in composing the text, writing that one could not fulfill a vocation that one did not

---

18 The first line of the text is, in fact, this Biblical quotation, which Paul directed at an archbishop, “Vide ministerium quod accepisti in Domino, ut illud impleas” in HoR, Liber, 373 taken from Colossians 4:17.
19 The General Chapter of 1260 wrote, “Constituciones aliquando legantur in mensa maxime cum fratres sint ibi melius congregati proviso quod alie religioso persone vel seculares non assint nec audire possint” in ACG I: 104 (1260).
20 Humbert of Romans, Libellus seu tractatus de instructione novitiorum secundum modum vivendi in ordine fratrum praedicatorum compilatus et ordinatus in conventu pariensi, in Opera 2:4, 529.
21 The Provincial Chapter of the Roman Province ordered that the Constitutions be updated in 1251 and Humbert of Romans specified that the master-general was to carry an updated copy of the Constitutions on his person specifically for this person as he travelled between convents. See HoR, De officiis, 182 and ACPPR, 11.
22 “Ad hæc tamen in conventu suo prelatus dispensandi cum fratribus habeat potestatem, cum sibi aliquando videbitur expedire, in his precipe, que studium vel predicationem vel animarum fructum videbuntur impedire, cum ordo noster specialiter ob predicationem et animarum salutem ab initio noscatur institutus fuisse, et studium nostrum ad hoc principaliter ardenterque summo opere debet intendere, ut proximorum animabus possimus utiles esse.” Constitutiones antique, prologue, 311 and quoted in Mulchahey, ‘First,’ 3. See also above chapter 1, 32.
23 Humbert of Romans, Expositio, col. 12, 39. The General Chapter of 1256, in fact, ordered that the brothers were to be known only as fratres praedicatorum in ACG, I: 81 (1256). For the dating of this text, see Brett, Humbert, 197-8.
24 Humbert of Romans, Expositio super constitutiones, col. 12, 38.
understand and that it was therefore “any preacher’s lot to pay attention to and consider what the office of preaching was and what pertains to that office.” Humbert’s goal with his Liber de eruditione, then, was to provide a mission statement for the Order’s main activity, in the process clearly articulating the Order’s identity, behavioral ideals, and vocation specifically as it pertained to preaching. The Liber de eruditione, then, was not an ars praedicandi in the typical sense, but was rather an articulation of a novel preaching identity specific to the Order of Preachers. It is this very specificity as well as the importance of the author himself that make the first section of this text useful for a study of self-definition in the Order.

These two texts, then, worked together to articulate and centralize two important areas of Dominican life for the brothers in the Order—convivial habitus and preaching identity. Through this process of constructing a cohesive identity for the Order, these writers created an ideal that was specifically and inherently masculine, that is, directed toward men, drawing upon societal expectations for masculine behavior, and providing an avenue of expression for a specifically male identity for the brothers as they lived out their vocation. In fact, both texts were specifically directed at the male members of the Order since the Vitae fratrums only contained stories submitted by and depicting the Order’s male members and the preaching office depicted in Humbert’s Liber de eruditione was limited to men. Just as Dominic lacked an equivalent female saint with whom he could be compared, the nuns of the Order did not compile their own version of Gerard’s text until around 1320 when Katherina of Unterlinden composed a similar collection for women. This text, however, was not solicited by the Order’s hierarchy, was largely composed for the nuns of Unterlinden themselves not as an exemplar for the nuns of the whole Order, and reflected the gendered expressions of sanctity from a different period. One point of comparison, albeit imperfect, for the more hagiographic elements of the Vitae fratrums, is the life of Margaret of Ypres (d. 1232), a lay woman under the direction of the influential Dominican preacher Siger of Lille and whose brief life was recorded by another influential Dominican preacher, administrator, and writer, Thomas of Cantimpré from 1240-44. Although she was only embraced wholeheartedly by the Order as a model of female sanctity in the late fourteenth century

---

25 “Ex quo relinquitur argumentum quod praedicatoris cujuslibet est diligenter attendere et videre quod sit officium praedicatoris et quae ad ipsum officium pertinent” in HoR, Liber, 373.
26 HoR, Liber, in Opera, II, 2.XII, 406.
and was not necessarily recognized by the ecclesiastical hierarchy, Margaret was to some extent attached to the Order, was sufficiently interesting to the friars to warrant the composition of her *vita* by a prominent Dominican, and popular enough that her *vita* achieved some circulation in the later medieval period. The comparison is limited, however, in that Margaret was firmly entrenched in the flourishing Beguine movement of the thirteenth century and her *vita* was essentially a glorification of a new form of lay spirituality developing under Dominican auspices, making it nearly impossible to label behaviors as particularly Dominican in her *vita.* Her *vita* nevertheless provides an example of feminine piety in a Dominican context, known in Dominican circles, and functioning as a point of reference for the Order’s hagiographers. Since scholars have devoted much more attention to female sanctity in general and have already produced detailed studies of Margaret’s *vita,* this chapter will not look at her life individually, but will intersperse pertinent examples from it into the discussion of the *Vitae fratum.* Humbert of Romans’ text, however, lacks a significant female point of comparison in this genre and will hence stand on its own.

The Common Friar: Religiosity and the *cura animarum* in the *Vitae fratum*

In the section of the Constitutions outlining the requirements for the novice master, the Order’s early leaders greatly expanded upon their templates to compile a rather formidable list of Dominican *praxis* to be taught to every new novice. As a general guideline, the Constitutions began by instructing the master to teach

---


the novices about the Order, encourage their love of the church, and correct their faults. They then moved on to list more specific points of the master’s responsibilities to his young charges: he was to teach them to practice humility of heart and body, to form them in virtue, to encourage them to confess frequently, to live without private property, to abandon their will to their superiors, how to behave everywhere at all times, how to keep to their own place, the appropriate demeanor, how to pray and do penance, when to talk, how to make a *venia* whenever rebuked, to endure discipline frequently, not talk ill of people, how to hold their drink, and to be careful with books and clothes. Finally, the chapter admonished the master to teach the novices “how they should be intent in study, so that they should read or meditate on something by day, by night, in the house, or while traveling, and that they should strive to retain whatever they can in their hearts and how zealous they should be to preach at the opportune time.” Thus, the majority of the young friar’s education was to consist of training for conventual living, interacting with other friars, and the process of accumulating personal virtue. Once these foundational practices had been achieved, the master was then to encourage the novices toward internalizing their studies and striving to preach what they had learned.

Gerard of Frachet, in constructing a text that, if not directly aimed at novices, was certainly read by them, followed a similar overall formula in constructing his idealized Dominican practice for the friars, which largely involved moderate ascetic practices and a commitment to a *cura animarum* defined by preaching. Gerard’s extended description of the early brothers demonstrates this bipartite idea of Dominican religiosity, found also in Dominic’s *vitae*, as these legendary men were depicted as having such great zeal that they could be seen constantly praying in the Church, lamenting their own sins by weeping, guarding themselves through prayer, correcting themselves through hard ascetic practice, engaging in holy debate, devoting themselves to the Virgin Mary, practicing charity with each other, being joyful, refusing to eat their full portions of food, preaching zealously, attempting to learn foreign languages, and eagerly seeking to be sent to the Holy Land or among the Tartars despite the imminent threat of death. The order of Gerard’s description suggests the

---

31 “Prior novitiis magistrum diligentem in instructione eorum preponat, qui eos de ordine doceat, in ecclesia excitet et, ubicumque negligenter se habuerint, verbo vel signo, quantum poterit, eos studeat emendare,” *Constitutiones antique*, I.13, pgs. 322-3.

32 “qualiter intenti esse debeant in studio, ut de die, de nocte, in domo, in itinere legant aliquid vel meditentur, et quicquid poterunt, retinere cordetenus nitantur; quam ferventes esse debeant in predicacione tempore opportuno,” *Constitutiones antique*, I.13, 323.

foundational nature of ascetic and personal religious practice in Dominican life, since all of these ascetic practices led to or, as the following examples make clear, culminated in preaching and conversionary mission to non-Christians. These practices, however, existed on a hierarchy wherein the daily practices of the less renowned friars, dominated by ascetic practices and prayer, serve as the basis for both their own more active service and for the Order’s more famous preachers, who were portrayed as the summit of the masculine Dominican ideal.

**Personal Piety: Masculine Asceticism and Prayer**

The common friars portrayed in the *Vitae fratrum*, whose stories dominate Gerard’s text, exhibit a commitment to various moderate ascetic practices—including physical mortification, chastity, and poverty—as well as a more extensive dedication to prayer. As seen in the lives of Dominic, these behaviors, when practiced regularly and in the context of other, more active pursuits, fell within the category of behavior described as masculine by the hagiographic tradition and secular ideals. Accordingly these behaviors usually only formed one element of the friars’ daily lives and references to friars who pursued or excelled in ascetic practices as an end in itself are extremely rare in the text. In addition, there is also a loose hierarchy of ascetic practices within the text based on the quantity and intensity of ascetic practices. At the base of this pyramid sat the friars within the context of their communal life who exhibit various levels of dedication to moderate ascetic behavior including physical mortification, chastity and poverty. Gerard depicted the majority of the friars in this level struggling to maintain this commitment and ultimately recommitting to the Order’s ideals, a theme especially suitable to novices. Above this base level fell more established, often older friars, who still remained involved in moderate ascetic practices, but also engaged in the more active aspects of their vocation. Finally, the Order’s “heroes”—Dominic, Jordan, and Peter—demonstrated more rigorous ascetic practices, in addition to a more determined and saintly dedication to preaching and defending the faith. Thus, they serve as more extreme, and hence more saintly, exemplars of the masculine Dominican religiosity. Gerard’s text, then, portrayed an ideal of male sanctity that involved moderate ascetic practice, but also established a male hierarchy through which the brothers could assess their own behaviors and aspire to better things.

---

34 See above chapter 1, 48-9 and G. Meerseeman, “Prêcheurs,” 71-80.
As with Dominic’s vitae, the brothers’ practiced moderate asceticism and rarely pursued it as a main activity. Physical mortification and bodily deprivation, ascetic practices that were central to the life of contemporary Margaret of Ypres, played a relatively minor role in the lives of the friars depicted in Gerard’s text. Margaret’s hagiographer, for example, made bodily mortification the central theme of Margaret’s life, describing how she placed thorns against her flesh, regularly beat herself bloody, and starved herself to such an extreme that she ultimately died in her early twenties. Such intensive focus on physical discipline as the means of personal salvation and the imitatio Christi, which was based upon theological perceptions of the female body as innately sinful and emerged among beguines and laywomen such as Margaret, became the cornerstone of female sanctity in the late medieval period, particularly among the mendicant orders.

The few examples of bodily mortification offered in the Vitae fratrum, on the other hand, were moderate or served as disciplinary measures to which the brothers willingly subjected themselves. When introducing a story told by Brother Rao Romanus, for example, Gerard lends credibility to his source by describing him as “a man of exemplary sanctity in abstiences, vigils and prayers, a particular zealot for souls and famous in the city.” Rao Romanus’ ascetic practices then functioned as only one of the elements used to establish his reputation and credibility as a source for the miracle that he reported. Its placement at the beginning of the list reflects Gerard’s customary ordering of holy behavior and indicates the foundational nature of the practices in the accomplishments of more prestigious tasks: the cura animarum and fame within the city. The story that Rao Romanus related was also a lesson on the bodily discomfort to be embraced by the friars. According to Rao, an unnamed brother, while maintaining a late night vigil in his cell, saw Mary pass by the cell of a certain brother while in the process blessing all of the other brothers individually. As later investigation uncovered, she had failed to bless this particular brother because he had removed his boots and loosened his arm bands while sleeping in response to the heat in a self-indulgent manner. The offense of this brother was avoidance of bodily discomfort, which was a regular albeit relatively moderate part of the convent’s daily ascetic

---

36 See above chapter 1, 33-4, and 69-70.
37 “Frater Rao Romanus, vir eximie sanctitatis in abstinentiis et vigiliis et oracionibus animarum zelator precipuus et in urbe famousus” GoF, Vitae, 1.6.VII, 44.
38 “...in sero propter estum nimium traxerat sibi caligas, et laxans cingulum nunc unum humerum, nunc alium extrahebat. Fuerat quidem in seculo nimium.” GoF, Vitae, 1.6.VII, 44.
practices. This fear of the relative hardship of Dominican life when compared to secular life--including the simple food, minimal rations, hard beds, uncomfortable clothes, and excessive walking--was a common theme among the novices in Gerard’s text as was their struggle to overcome this self-indulgence.\(^{39}\) The daily life of the brothers was depicted as an ascetic practice, devoid of the luxuries afforded to the secular world and, thus, a key point of identification for the Order’s members against the outer world. This asceticism was, however, relatively moderate, especially by hagiographic standards and those established for late medieval holy women such as Margaret. Indeed, Gerard openly discouraged excessive bodily discipline among novices at one point by telling the story of a brother who had weakened his body so much during his novitiate through fasts, vigils, and other labors that he was unable to physically sustain them. In response, he prayed to God, saying “Lord, I know and I confess that I have erred because, against the counsel of the Brothers, I have vexed myself too much, but since I strive to please you alone, hear me and have mercy on me so that I am able to do those things which are characteristic of the Order along with my brothers.” He was afterwards immediately returned to health and served the Lord for many years.\(^{40}\) As this example makes clear, while a certain amount of ascetic practice was required of all Dominicans, this asceticism should be of a moderate type, especially among the Order’s novices.

Examples of more intensive ascetic practice were even more rare and either accompanied accounts of individuals working outside of the convent or those who were presented as exemplars of behavior for the other brothers. The first of these references occurred in a story about a brother who resisted the sexual advances of a lady (\textit{domina}) by telling her he would have to return for the intended tryst the next day after he had removed his hair shirt and iron girdle.\(^{41}\) This friar’s obvious involvement in some sort of pastoral responsibility in which he interacts with a lady placed him at a more mature level within the Order, certainly

\(^{39}\) See for example, GoF, \textit{Vitae}, 4.13.X for a deacon who was afraid to join the Order because of the poor food and excessive walking and 4.17.I. the novice who became deeply unhappy with the hard beds and ragged clothes present in the cloister. Section 4.18 tells stories of brothers who are tempted by delicate foods, which they lacked in the convent, while in section 4.16.III a devil punishes a friar for drinking alcohol unlawfully. In 4.12.II a certain scholar is convinced by a subprior to join the Order after overcoming his attachment to fine things.

\(^{40}\) “Cum frater quidam in noviciatu suo corpus suum ieiuniis et vigiliis et ceteris laboribus debilitasset adeo, quod se ipsum sustinere non posset, prostrerns se in oracione cum multis lacrimis exclamativit: ‘Domine, tu scis et ego confiteor, quod erravi, quia contra fratum consilium nimium me vexavi; sed quia tibi soli placere studui, respice in me et miserere mei, ut ea, que ordinis sunt, cum fratribus meis facere possim.’ GoF, \textit{Vitae}, 4.24.XI, 217.

beyond the novitiate stage, that Gerard associated with more extensive practices of bodily mortification that accompanied, in this case literally, the friar’s increased responsibilities. Another reference to the use of hair shirts occurred in a story about Dominic not found in his *vitae* in which he leaves a garment made of hair cloth, which he had been wearing in lieu of a regular hair shirt, with a certain holy woman in Segovia since he had found a harsher hair shirt that was punitive enough to meet his standards. Gerard not only depicted Dominic, a holy exemplar, as regularly wearing a hair shirt during his pastoral missions, but also demonstrated the saint’s commitment to the harshest version of this ascetic practice. The second reference to a harsher ascetic regime occurred in Gerard’s enthusiastic description of the fervor and dedication of the early brothers, which he described as being so great that no one could adequately describe it. Part of this fervor included regular self-mortification and abstinence from food interwoven among the brothers dedicated liturgical practice, devotions to Mary, zealous study, holy debate, preaching, and missions to non-Christians. Gerard describes brothers who “subject themselves to harsh disciplines” as part of their visits to various altars, “discipline themselves strongly, sometimes with whips and sometimes with knotty cords” in reparation for their various sins or drink only once a day for 50 days. All the brothers, according to Gerard, at the very least abstained from part of the food offered to them on a daily basis. The concise nature of these descriptions contrasts with Thomas’ more graphic descriptions of Margaret, who repeatedly “entered into the forest alone, undressed until she was naked, and struck herself with thorns until there was a great effusion of blood...in remembrance of Christ’s wounds,” a description paralleling feminine actual and spiritual martyrdom in hagiographic texts. While Gerard’s adjectives emphasized the strength and almost military discipline of the early male saints, Thomas’s description highlighted Margaret’s vulnerability and corporeality, as she stood alone, naked, and bleeding in the woods, a spectacle of physical suffering visible only to divine eyes. While the

42 “In civitate Segobina fuit quedam mulier Deo devota, apud quam aliquando sanctus Dei Dominicus hospitatus saccineam tunicam, qua loco cilici ad tempus usus fuerat, deposit, invento asperrimo cilicio et iuxta voluntatem suam admodum pugitivo.” GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 2.9, 73.

43 “Temporibus primitis tantus fuit fervor in ordine, quod nullus sufficit enarrare.” GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 4.1, 149.

44 “se disciplinis duris subiiecbant” and “disciplinabant se fortiter; aliqui virgis, aliqui nodosis corrigis.” GoF, *Vitae*, chapter 4.1, 149-50.

45 GoF, *Vitae*, 4.1, 150

brothers were collectively disciplining their own bodies in preparation for their work, Margaret struggled to experience the pain of Christ’s suffering through her own open, receptive, and feminized body.\textsuperscript{47} The goals of these practices, however similar their behavioral manifestations, were thus very different. Gerard followed this discussion of the habits of the early brothers with a laudation of their extremely skilled and zealous preaching “to which the Order had been assigned from the beginning,” using words drawn from the Constitutions.\textsuperscript{48} Thus, while the primary goal for these early brothers was preaching, this mission was intricately intertwined with ascetic practices that were harsher than those practiced by the other brothers in Gerard’s text. While physical mortification or deprivation formed a part of the religious practice among Dominican friars, it was only one aspect of their experience, often forming the background to or accompanying their other activities. In addition, the extent and harshness of these practices was directly related to the level of extremity that the friar exercised in other areas of their religiosity. The average friar, either in the process of adjusting to convent life or engaged in “normal” pastoral activities, was encouraged to engage in moderate physical deprivation, while the Order’s exemplars were depicted undergoing more severe physical asceticism in addition to their more extensive preaching and pastoral activities. Such a correlation would suggest that Dominican masculine asceticism was used as training for a more strenuous vocation, a means to an end, while Dominican female asceticism was a spiritual end in itself.

A similar discrepancy between the behavioral expectations for the “average” brother and his more saintly brethren also occurred in the area of chastity, but instead of increasing the extremity of the friars’ struggle with chastity in the more saintly lives, as the hagiographic models of heroic asceticism had done, Gerard’s text instead sidelined it in favor of their other activities.\textsuperscript{49} In the lives of the average brothers, on the other hand, the few references to chastity align more closely with the ideals of the monastic hagiography in which the male saint defended his virtue from a threatening external source of some sort, particularly in the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\item \textsuperscript{47} Caroline Walker Bynum and André Vauchez have noted the prevalence of this motivation for ascetic practices, that is, \textit{imitatio Christi}, among late medieval holy women in “Women Mystics and Eucharistic Devotion in the Thirteenth Century.” \textit{Women’s Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal} 11:1-2 (1984), 189 and Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 443.
\item \textsuperscript{48} “In praecando autem verbum Dei, ad quod ordo a principio deputatus est...” GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.1, 150.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Placido di Rosi, for example, struggled with sexual temptation for his entire life, according to his hagiographer, going to such extremes as living on a mountain, never sleeping lying down, and drinking very little for fear of provoking his own libido, while Thomas of Cantilupe would not allow his own sisters to kiss him or remain under his roof. Related in Weinstein and Bell, \textit{Saints}, 85. For a survey of chastity in medieval saints’ lives, see ibid., 73-99.
\end{footnotesize}
\end{thebibliography}
form of the devil’s temptations or the unwanted advances of lewd women.\textsuperscript{50} One example of this comes from the story of the brother who used his hair shirt as an excuse to avoid unwanted solicitations mentioned above, while another anecdote related the tale of a simple and innocent friar, who was lured into a bedroom, unaware, by a woman who wanted to seduce him,—a common hagiographic trope—but ran away once he realized her designs.\textsuperscript{51} After having survived this ordeal, Gerard described the latter friar as one “who has existed in the fire but not been burned.”\textsuperscript{52} Gerard thus placed both of these friars in the position of actively avoiding sexual temptation that is externally placed upon them while not appearing to struggle with any internal temptation at all. These depictions are thus consistent with hagiographic representations of masculine chastity and defense of virtue, although certainly lacking the “heroic” element—encountering real fire, bodily mutilations, etc.—that would have lent such avoidance of sin an aura of sanctity.\textsuperscript{53} They also contrast markedly with Thomas of Cantimpré’s description of Margaret, who, after a very saintly childhood dedicated to Christ, fell in love with a boy at the age of eighteen. She did not however experience the “dregs of desire” for him, since “Christ, the lover of chastity, pleased her above all else and she loved him from her youth and sought to take him as her husband and was made into a lover of his form.”\textsuperscript{54} She was so horrified at the idea of marrying the earthly man she loved, that she took the Dominican friar Siger’s suggestion that she devote herself to Christ.\textsuperscript{55} Margaret’s expression of chastity was thus connected to her loyal devotion to Christ, a relationship which replaced her attachment to an earthly man.

Gerard makes it clear that the maintenance of chastity exhibited by these brothers was related to, but not nearly as heroic as more saintly models, by grouping the chaste behaviors in the same section as a story from Dominic’s \textit{vitae} in which the saint repelled a would-be seductress by standing in a literal fire and remaining unharmed.\textsuperscript{56} These three stories make up the entirety of the section dealing with the virtue of

---

\textsuperscript{50} Weinstein and Bell, \textit{Saints}, 81, 87 & 236; Salisbury, “Gendered,” 86; and Karras, “Thomas,” 57.


\textsuperscript{52} “...qui in igne extitit nec fuit combustus.” GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.4.I, 159.


\textsuperscript{54} “Iuvenem enim quemandam, forma egregium, incuncte conspiciens, amore ferventissimo, sine fece tamen concupiscencie, per tempus aliquod adamavit...Castitatis enim amator Christus super omnia placebat ei, et hunc amavit iuventute sua et quesivit eum sponsum assumere et amator factus est forme illius.” ToC, \textit{Vita Maragete}, chap. 5, 108-9.

\textsuperscript{55} ToC, \textit{Vita Maragete}, chap. 6, 109.

\textsuperscript{56} For the \textit{exemplum} involving Dominic see GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.4.II, 159-60.
continence and occurred in book four of the *Vitae fratrum*, not the second book, which contained further stories to supplement Dominic’s *vitae*. The description of the second friar as having symbolically withstood fire unharmed, clearly linked him to Dominic, who had literally accomplished this as a mark of his sanctity. That Gerard did not place this story in his relation of Dominic’s *vita* earlier in the text indicates that Gerard did not necessarily consider this story to be central to Dominic’s overall identity, but thought it more useful as a way of demonstrating how the experience of the average friar could theoretically reflect Dominic’s saintly ideal. While these stories idealize active defense of chastity along a continuum from average to heroic, the role that chastity plays in the *vitae* of the Order’s other great leaders is entirely different. As with Dominic’s *vitae* discussed above, maintenance of chastity was a foundational practice for the friar’s sanctity, but was not central to their more glorified accomplishments.\(^{57}\) This is demonstrated by the fact that Gerard only briefly mentioned chastity at the very beginning of Jordan and Peter Martyr’s *vitae*, saying that Jordan was chaste in mind and body and that Peter entered the Order as a virgin.\(^{58}\) The ideal of heroic defense of chastity is completely eradicated in favor of other saintly ideals within these lives, a pattern that is consistent with the shifting hagiographic trends of the late medieval period in which physical defense of chastity even unto death is largely attributed to female saints.\(^{59}\) In addition, at the very beginning of his extensive and idealized description of the Order’s early members, Gerard mentioned that the early brothers maintained their chastity through “great insistence of prayer and practice of religion.”\(^{60}\) Again, chastity, concisely described at the very beginning of the list of holy accomplishments, functioned as the initial base on which more extensive holy feats were built, a sort of training ground in which the brothers learned a type of discipline that would prepare them to extend themselves in pursuit of more vigorous spiritual goals.

As with Dominic’s *vitae*, Gerard’s portrayal of male chastity aligned itself with hagiographic traditions in that he delegated the idea of defense of virtue to the everyday friars as a point of struggle, while presenting chastity as the assumed state of holiness that allowed a more advanced friar to perform his pastoral duties in

\(^{57}\) See above chapter 1, 56-61.
\(^{58}\) GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 3.1, 101 and chap. 5.1.III, 236-7.
\(^{59}\) As Caroline Walker Bynum has pointed out in “The Female Body,” 203-4, this was the case with the Dominican hagiographic collection, the *legenda aurea*.
\(^{60}\) “magna oracionis instancia et religionis custodia, quibus ipsa castitas maxime custoditur.” Gerard of Frachet, *Vitae*, chap. 4.1., 148.
the world and the saint to demonstrate his sanctity without blemish.61 This contrasted with Margaret’s *vita*, where maintenance of chastity was expressed through her attachment and dedication to a male protector, Christ as a surrogate spouse, a relationship that formed the foundation of her holiness. Gerard’s hierarchical approach to Dominican sexuality, which emphasized governance of the sexual nature according to the ideological age of the friar in question, in which “younger” friars struggled more with their sexuality than “mature” and saintly friars, who had gained control of their physical natures, parallels secular understandings of youthful masculine sexual expression and mature masculine sexual governance.62 While the starting point for youthful sexuality was markedly different between laymen and the friars, both were thus founded on the same basic cultural understandings of masculine sexuality, maturity, and governance. The gendered distinction in Gerard’s portrayal of female saintly chastity here also reflected popular lay notions of gendered behavior, in which a woman’s chastity, maintained through formalized attachments to male guardians, was foundational to her honor and that of her family, while men were expected protect the chastity of their female dependents.63 Such a perspective of female sexuality accounts for the prevalence of insults about sexual impropriety lobbed at women in late medieval court records.64 Indeed, Gerard’s presentation of a Dominican friar directing Margaret toward a formalized spiritual union with the male godhead as a way of directing her romantic inclinations, further emphasized social norms surrounding masculine patriarchal identities, foundational to late medieval society, in which men as fathers, siblings, and husbands protected the chastity of their womenfolk, the symbolic repositories of male honor, through formalized relationships. Thus, Gerard’s portrayal of chastity as central to female sanctity and peripheral to male sanctity in many ways reflected lay ideals of gendered chastity, masculine governance, and maturity. On the other hand, chastity was in practice the most obvious distinguishing feature between religious and laymen, one undoubtedly stressful for the friar

---

61 See above chapter 1, 56-61.
62 On lay expectations for male sexual expression, see above chapter 1, 61-5.
64 See, for example, the charges of *bagassa, puta,* and *alcavota* directed at woman in Valencian legal records in Diéguez Seguí, *Clams*, 203, 220-1, 239, 246, 251, 257-8, and 261-2 and Lesnick, “Insults,” 76-8. In addition, women were often physically attacked within the home with the implication that a sexual violation could have occurred as a way of insulting a man. Diéguez Seguí, *Clams*, 262-3. See a complete discussion in Meyerson, “Assaulting,” 10-15.
engaged in active pastoral responsibility, and it is perhaps to mitigate this disparity that Gerard did not emphasize this behavior, particularly in relation to the *fratres communes*.

Of all ascetic practices, prayer is by far the most present within the text of the *Vitae fratrum*, a prominence reflecting a traditional feature of hagiographic literature. The form and function of this prayer within Dominican life took on particularly masculine overtones as defined by the hagiographic tradition and well as secular ideals of male courtly love roles, while the intensity and purpose of prayer also differed between the average brother and their more saintly models. For the common brother, prayer functioned most often as a way for the friar to honor and serve Mary, who was presented as the special patroness of the Order in Gerard’s text, and as the vehicle through which the friar worked miracles. The *Vitae fratrum* takes special care to emphasize the unique role that Mary played in the life of the Order. The first section of the text, for example, was dedicated entirely to Mary’s role in establishing the Order, while the end of that chapter emphasized how special the Dominicans were to Mary and her role in their religious practice. Within the pages of Gerard’s text, Mary protected the friars from sinning, helped with their preaching, visited them in the convent to bless them, attended to them in sickness and death, and showed up to their liturgical services and processions. In return, the friars were expected to “love the blessed Mary above all else” and, in Mary's own words, “do for her what they would do for a beloved” that is to love, praise and honor her. This type of relationship with Mary is consistent with hagiographic representations of male saints who have a special relationship with Mary that is often characterized by respectful tenderness, courtesy, or filial affection. The language is also reflective of literary courtly love ideology in which the lover theoretically treated the beloved with an extreme amount of respect, obeyed certain rituals of courtship, and cast himself in the role of “love

---

66 For Mary’s role in establishing the Order see GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 1.1, 6-11. On Mary’s affection for the Order and her presence in their lives, see, generally, chaps. 1.6-1.7, pgs. 38-65.
67 GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 1.6.IV, 41; chap. 1.6.VII, pgs. 43-44; chap. 1.6.XIII, 50; 1.6.XXXII, 55-6; and chap. 1.7.II-VIII, pgs. 59-63
slave,” while honoring and serving her. The knight Tirant lo Blanc, for example, responded to his beloved princess’ desire to give him advice early in their courtship by saying, “How will I be able to serve your majesty, a lady of such esteem, I, who have received such great grace from your highness without preceding merit? ...

...And so that you do not consider me to be ungrateful for the good which you do me, I accept your offer as from a lady whom I love above all others in the world and I kiss your feet and hands and oblige myself to follow everything that your highness will command of me. Because it is a thing worthy of great praise and glory, when a gift is given without any demand or merit, and it is an act of great generosity, and in this your excellence shows herself to be more angelic than human.” Andreas Capellanus, likewise, instructed a middle class lover to initiate a flirtatious conversation with a woman of the high nobility by offering to serve her. In casting the friar as a masculine courtly lover in relation to Mary, Gerard thus placed his chaste behavior within the context of chivalric romance, an area of lay culture in which male chastity played a respectable role, however theoretical, in the idealized relationship.

Serving Mary was most closely linked to prayer for the Dominican friar, both liturgical and private, and this was especially the case for the novices in the text. Gerard related several stories of novices who were about to leave the Order, but decided to stay after praying to Mary and miraculously receiving her aid. Mary was also seen reciting prayers with a novice, causing him great joy. This relationship sometimes took on more overt gendered overtones, as it did in one story, where an elderly friar saw Mary appear among the brothers while they were reciting the Matins of the Blessed Mary and say, “Strongly, brave men,” an

---

70 Schultz, Courtly Love, xxi, 162-3, and 166; Keen, Nobles, Knights, 22; and Lourie “Celtic Dancing,” 171. For a survey of the range of behaviors toward women present in chivalric literature, see Richard W. Kaeuper, Chivalry, 209-30. Simon Gaunt, among others, has argued that this posturing was a only a veneer for misogyny and that the idealized woman acted as a symbol of exchange for male homosocial desire in Gender, 135-47 and 113-121.

71 “¿Quan poré jo servir a la majestat vostra, senyora de tanta estima, que sens mèrits precedents, tanta gràcia de l’altesa vostra haja aconseguida?...E perqué no em tingau per ingrat del bé que em feu, jo accepte l’oferta com de senyora qui sobre totes les del món val, e us ne bese peus e mans, e m’oblige de seguir tot lo que per l’altesa vostra me serà manat. Car cosa és digna de gran llaur e glòria, com lo do és donat sens demanar ni sens alguns mèrit, e és acte de gran liberalitat, e en açò se mostra la vostra excelsa condició ésser més angèlica que humana.” Joan Martorell and Martí Joan de Galba, Tirant lo Blanc, ed. Martí de Riquer, vol. 1 (Barcelona: Editorial Seix Barral, 1970), 396-7.

72 Andreas Capellanus, De Amore, 1.6, 108.

73 See above chapter 1, 63-5.

74 On the expansion of supplication to Mary in the Dominican liturgy, especially during times of trouble, see Bonniwell, History, 224-8.


76 GoF, Vitae, chap. 1.6.XXIIb, 57-9.
admonition which the friar interpreted to mean that the brothers needed to love her more and to say her office more devotedly. In depicting Mary offering aid in the Dominican conventual vocation, Gerard mirrored literary representations of her in which she brought a devoted knight some forgotten weaponry on the battlefield or even jousts on behalf of a knight devoted to her. Mary also frequently played the role of a powerful background presence in late medieval literature, a presiding aristocratic lady, who has the inspiration or even the final goal of a quest in literary representations, a role she also played for the friars in Gerard's text. Tirant’s beloved princess, for example, the aristocratic beloved in the text, rewarded his devotion, virtues, and knighthood with counsel, money, and eventually a title. It is clear in Gerard’s text that prayer was vehicle through which the Dominican friars, particularly those new to the Order, demonstrated their love and honor for Mary as the special patroness of the Order, a relationship which cast the friar in a gendered role appropriate to hagiographic representations of male saintly devotion to the Queen of Heaven as well as to the male role of the courtly lover to a great lady. The centrality of Mary for the friars is clearly demonstrated by a comparison to Margaret of Ypres, whose devotional life instead emphasized affective bonds to Jesus. For example, according to her hagiographer, Margaret’s meditations were so dominated by thoughts of Jesus that Mary appeared to her on the feast of the Annunciation and asked the young girl to think only of her. Margaret does so, but tells the Virgin that she will return to thinking of Christ the next day. The Virgin replies that both she and her Son will return to Margaret on the next day and give her whatever she wants in Paradise. Thomas concluded from this story that great reward, that is, both Mother and Son, come from meditating about Christ. While Christ was central to the prayer-life of the young laywoman, it is Mary who played a central role in the prayer of the Dominican friars.

78 Kaeuper, Chivalry, 49-50.
80 Martorell and de Galba, Tirant lo Blanc, 1: 396.
81 Roisin, L’Hagiographie, 116-121.
82 TC, Vita Margerete de Ypris, chap. 31, 121.
In addition to the friars’ interactions with Mary, prayer, as in the lives of Dominic, also functioned as the basis of their thaumaturgical power. Using prayer individual brothers, whatever their status within the Order put out house fires, stopped the rain, achieved the admittance of new members, learned to speak foreign languages, cured the sick, and performed many other miracles. Some brothers performed miraculous feats through dedicated prayer. For example, the “humble, devout, and merciful” Brother Walter, a prior and lector, was often seen levitating during prayer and, through this prayer, cured another friar of a fever, predicted that a nun would break her vows, drove a demon out of another sister, and freed a dead person from Purgatory. Through his specific prayers in each situation, Walter worked miracles in his community while still acting in administrative and educational capacities. The brothers could also use collective prayer to achieve various miraculous ends, such as obtaining papal favor for the Order in the face of attacks by the Parisian masters or driving out demons from the convent. The depiction of the Order’s more distinguished figures, including Dominic and Jordan of Saxony, often associated the saint’s prayer with the production of various miracles. The vast majority of these miraculous activities by all of the friars occurred outside of the convent and in the course of the friars’ normal pastoral work. The accounts also do not include extended descriptions of the type of prayer engaged in by the brothers, but only mention that the friar prayed regarding the issue and achieved the desired miraculous event through this prayer. It is not the prayer itself that was the focus, but the friar’s resulting thaumaturgical abilities.

Although Gerard provided a few examples of friars who attempted to devote themselves entirely to prayer or to having mystical experiences, these expressions of piety either occurred within the context of the friars’ other activities or were discouraged in favor of the more active cura animarum. Among the list of miraculous events initiated and exhibited by Brother Walter, the prior and lector discussed above who

83 GoF, Vitae, chap. 1.6.VIII, 44-5; chap. 2.10, 74-5; chap. 4.5.III, 161; chap. 4.5.VI, 163-4; chap. 4.25.IV, 244.
84 “Frater Gualterus quondam prior et lector fratrvm in Argentina Theutonie humilis, devotus, misericors...” GoF, Vitae, chap. 4.3.5.II, 222-3.
85 GoF, Vitae, chap. 1.6.VIII, 44-5 and chap. 1.7.1, 59.
86 See for example, GoF, Vitae, chap. 2.8, 72-3; chap. 2.10, 78-9; chap. 2.11, 75-6; chap. 2.12; pg. 76; chap. 3.9, 107; chap. 3.13, 109-110; and chap. 3.21, 117-118.
87 There is one exception to this provided in the appendix of the text where a friar has a well-described mystical experience independent of any other known activity on his part, but this example was added to Gerard’s text after its initial compilation and is so reflective of later developments in ideas of Dominican sanctity. This story is the only of its kind in the later additions, which are largely dominated by stories of the friars’ missions in the east. See GoF, Vitae, appendix VI, 312-3.
enacted many miracles through prayer, Gerard mentioned that Walter experienced the pain of Christ’s wounds in his own body and, at another time, felt as if he had been pierced by a sword when he desired to know how Mary had felt at the death of her son. Though mystical in nature, these experiences were included as part of a list of this friar’s pastoral duties and were seen as evidence of his holiness rather than as a central component of his identity. Another brother dreamt that he was allowed to kiss the feet of the baby Jesus “as a reward” for thirty years of preaching. In this case, it is preaching rather than prayer that afforded the friar a type of mystical vision. Whereas, as Bynum has pointed out, holy women attempted to imitate Christ by trying to fuse themselves with Christ’s body through prayer, asceticism, or eroticism, the mystical experiences of these friars was presented as merely one aspect of their activities, subordinate to their pastoral imitatio Christi. This is supported by the limited role that prayer played in the lives of the Order’s saintly heroes, Dominic and Jordan, functioning mainly as a brief episode in their overall lives. For example, Gerard stated that Jordan did not neglect his prayers despite his other duties and often prayed for a long time and in such strange body positions that his ability to walk was impaired. This is followed in the same section by a discussion of his meditative practices while on the road and even-tempered nature. The majority of his vita, however, was dedicated to his care for the brothers, preaching, and miracles that he performed. The vita of Margaret of Ypres, on the other hand, is dominated by asceticism, prayer, and meditation, which are not channeled outward in the service of Christian society, while prayer and mystical experiences make up only a small portion of masculine Dominican sanctity presented in Gerard’s text.

Gerard himself made it clear that it was active service, not contemplation, that was the core of male Dominican religiosity. For example, Gerard immediately followed the story of a young novice who experienced the entire Passion in his body on Good Friday with another anecdote in which some friars told a new novice, who was insufficient in knowledge but very devout, that he would be kicked out of the Order of

---

90 See for example, Gerard’s additions to Dominic’s life in which Dominic is shown praying despite attempts by the Devil to dissuade him and praying all night long over the sleeping brothers. GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 2.14, 77 and chap. 2.18, 79.
92 ToC, *Vita Margarete*, chap. 2, 107-8; chap. 3, 108; chap. 4, 108; chap. 5, pg.108-9; chap. 10, 110-11; chap. 11, 111; chap. 13, 112-3; chap. 16, 114; chap. 18, 115; chap. 19, 116; chap. 20, 116-7; chap. 21, 117; chap. 22, 117; chap. 23, 117-8; chap. 24, 118-9; chap. 26; pg. 119; and chap. 28, 120.
Preachers because of this lack of learning. According to this story, it was learning and its resulting pastoral service, not contemplation, that defined a brother as suitable for the Order. In another more overt example, Christ appeared to a certain brother of “great life and reputation,” and allowed him to suckle a “miraculous sweetness” from his wounds, since this friar had been accustomed to hold Christ’s passion and his wounds in high esteem. This uncharacteristically descriptive mystical experience was, however, immediately followed by a story about the same brother that clearly articulates Gerard’s perception of appropriate male behavior in the Order and is thus worth relating in its entirety. In Gerard’s words:

Likewise, the brother was accustomed to venerate the blessed Virgin—the heart with which she had believed in Christ and loved him, the womb in which she had carried him, the breasts at which she had nursed him, the beautifully formed hands that had served him, and the chest on which he had reposed, especially venerating her as the repository of all virtues, frequently seeking grace individually for each virtue with as many Ave Marias, while adopting for himself the virtues through which she had deserved to be the mother of God—namely faith, humility, charity, chastity, kindness, and patience—and he asked her to seek these virtues from God on his behalf. Moreover, the Blessed Virgin appeared to him on a certain Saturday (Sabbato) and endowed him with each of the virtues for which he had had veneration and on account of which he had prayed, pouring them over his senses. Therefore the brother, having discarded his studies, became idle and continuously enjoyed the miraculous sweetness of prayer. Made aware of this, the brothers frequently accused him of making himself useless to the Order by not studying. The brother then asked the Lord to change this portion of sweetness into learning with which he would be made useful to souls for God’s honor (ad eius honorem). Therefore the Lord heard him and poured knowledge over him, which he had not previously known and he then preached graciously in German and Latin, and also exerted power through great counsel.

In this story, Gerard drew a clear distinction between female Dominican piety, epitomized by Mary and expressed primarily through continuous prayer as well as affective devotion to divine figures, and male Dominican piety, bestowed by Jesus and expressed through the active services of study, preaching, and exerting power through counsel. Although gender is not explicitly evoked here, the type of meditation described at the beginning, in which the friar venerated the Virgin’s body parts and their individual roles in

---

93 GoF, Vitae, chap. 4.24.IX-X, 216.
94 GoF, Vitae, chap. 4.5.I, 160.
95 “Idem frater consueverat venerari beatam virginem, cor eius quo in Christum credidit et ipsum amavit, uterum quo eum portavit, ubera quibus eum lactavit, manus eius tornatiles quibus ei servivit, et pectus eius in quo recubuit, virtutum omnium apotecam specialiter venerans, ad singula faciens frequenter singulas venias cum totidem ave Maria, adaptando illi virtutes, caritatem, castitatem, benignitatem et pacienciam, et rogabat eam, ut eam sibi a domino impetraret. Huic autem apparuit beata virgo in sabbato quodam et de singulis, quas in veneracione habebat, propinabat ei virtutes, pro quibus oraverat, sensibiliter infundens. Frater igitur postposito studio vacans oraciones mira dulcedine continue fruebatur. Quod advententes fratres accusabant eum frequenter, quod se inutilem ordinem reddebat, non studens. Tunc frater rogavit eum, quod partem illius dulcedinis in scienciam commutaret, qua ad eius honorem utilis fieret animabus. Exaudivit igitur illum dominus et infudit ei scienciam, quam prius non noverat, et modo Teotonice et Latine predicat gracioso, magno eciam consilio pol lens.” GoF, Vitae, chap. 4.5.II, 160-61.
Christ’s life is highly reminiscent of the affective piety toward which women were directed in spiritual treatises, guides to prayer, and even pictorial representations in manuscripts as a result of their allegedly weak intellect, corporeality, and strong passions.⁹⁶ Extended descriptions of a woman’s individual body parts was also a characteristic of chivalric romance, lyric poetry, and hagiographic texts, and the inclusion of the description of Mary further associated the friars’ veneration for Mary with lay literary models of courtly love in which the courtly lover, in this case the friar, described the beloved’s appearance from head to foot in detail.⁹⁷ Mary’s response, in providing the friar with a gift of virtues in return for his veneration, likewise parallels the literary courtly love rituals in which the beloved is compelled to reward an appropriately courtly suitor with various love tokens. In Tirant lo Blanc, for example, the princess awards Tirant with a title in response to his love service, while Diafebus argued that Estefania owed him her love, or a token of it, in response to his own love, which she ultimately gifts through marriage and property.⁹⁸ While the nature of love service and relationship differ substantially between Gerard’s text and Tirant lo Blanc, the basic gendered themes certainly lend Gerard’s friar the external trappings of the male courtly lover. According to Gerard, however, the extensive adoration of Mary displayed by the brother was not the suitable end goal for the Dominican friar, who should instead devote himself to the cura animarum through which he brought honor to himself and the Lord, much as literary knights ultimately had to prove their fundamental chivalric identity through battle and were shamed for desiring to remain with their beloveds rather than engage in military exercises.⁹⁹ A similar theme occurred in a story earlier in Gerard’s text in which the Devil, disguised as Mary, led a brother away from his studies and toward inner contemplation.¹⁰⁰ The idea of the ideal brother as someone who was useful to the Order also appeared as the brothers faced the deaths of their colleagues as

---


⁹⁸ Martorell and de Galba, Tirant, 3: 96-106.

⁹⁹ Diefebux promises a lady in love with Tirant’s page that the page “will have all the honor of knighthood” in the first battle that Dieubus fights “lo us promet’, dix Diafebus, ’que en la primera batalla que io em trobe, ell haurà tota la honor de cavalleria,” in Martorell i de Galba, Tirant lo Blanc, ed. Capdevila and de Balanzó, 3: 98. On the centrality of battle to knighthood identity, see Kaeuper, Chivalry, 135-49 and 220.

¹⁰⁰ GoF, Vitae, chap. 4.23.II, 212-3.
was the case at the death of a certain Brother William, whose “usefulness” to the Order made him both missed by his companions and assured of a place in Heaven, and Everard, the loss of whose “utility” to the Order Jordan also lamented. Thus, while prayer as an ascetic practice certainly played a role in the Dominican friar’s life—particularly as an expression of devotion to Mary or as the means through which the friar worked miracles—more extreme forms of prayer, especially those that resulted in mystical experiences, or overtly affective piety were actively discouraged as they were thought to render the friar “useless” to an Order of male scholars and preachers. Indeed, Gerard’s description of the young friar gendered such overtly or overly affective and “useless” piety as feminine and the active preaching life as a marker masculine performance and utility to the Order.

As was the case with Dominic’s *vitae*, ascetic practices such as bodily mortification, chastity, and prayer form the foundational layer in the *Vitae fratum* on which the more masculine behavior of the Order’s active *cura animarum* was built. Although moderate ascetic practice and maintenance of chastity helped to establish the religiosity at the root of Dominican life and placed the brothers comfortably within the hagiographic structures of late medieval masculine sainthood, it was not these practices that formed the true mission and identity of the Order of Preachers. In the few instances in the text where a friar demonstrated a preference and affinity for the contemplative life, he was actively encouraged to devote himself to the study and preaching that was the heart of the Dominican masculine ideal. For the average Dominican friar moderation of pious practice was encouraged as well as the integration of such practices into his pastoral responsibilities. Even in areas such as bodily mortification and extended prayer where the Order’s most distinguished members demonstrated more intensive and “heroic” practices, these practices still made up a relatively minor portion of their overall sanctity and formed the backdrop to their other activities. This portrayal of relatively moderate asceticism, physical mortification, chastity, and prayer that forms a single component in a figure’s overall sanctity is consistent with hagiographic norms established for men, who were primarily devoted to their active pastoral duties. In constructing the pious practice of the early brothers as masculine, Gerard also related them to several important lay understandings of male behavior.

---

101 GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 5.2.II, 249 ("quia tam bonum socium et tam utilem ordinii amittebam") and chap. 5.2.VII, 252 ("Cum autem fratres flerent, utpote quia erat valde utilis et reverenda persona in ordine...\).
"Age viriliter": Protecting Christendom through Preaching

As with Dominic’s vitae and the Dominican Constitutions, the Vitae fratrum glorified preaching, both to the Christian faithful and to the enemies of the faith, as the main goal for the male members of the aptly named Order of Preachers. Gerard established the ideological foundation for this mission early in the first book where he developed the image of the Order as the protectors of Christ and His church through the interpretation of several different Biblical passages. The Dominicans were compared to the knights who cared for Solomon’s goods, the lions who decorated Solomon’s throne, soldiers who “place the shield of faith against the powerful in the world,” the royal guards who protect Christ from schismatics and heretics, ironworkers who make spiritual arms, and guards who save souls from perdition. Later in the chapter, Gerard demonstrated that a Dominican’s task could be dangerous and in need of manly courage through the story of a friar who was greatly troubled by the danger inherent in an unspecified task entrusted to him until he prayed to Mary and was told to “go manfully.” This is a reference to the same psalm that Dominic used to encourage a different troubled brother to complete his pastoral duties in the world despite the temptations to his chastity. Just as David in this psalm tells himself to “go manfully” among his enemies hopeful in the Lord, Mary encouraged the friar and all Dominicans, to complete their tasks, however dangerous, with manly courage. Among the many different tasks performed by the friars in Gerard’s text, it was their preaching skills that were most often referenced. Over and over again, a friar was designated as a worthy source for a particular story or as an important member of the Order because he was a gracious, dedicated, or useful preacher.

Although the Constitutions indicated that study was the foundation of good preaching, study appeared far more infrequently in the Vitae fratrum than in Dominic’s vitae, perhaps as a reflection of

---

102 “Christus enim bellum agit, cum predicaturum ordo contra mundi potentes scutum fidei opponit” GoF, Vitae, chap. 1.3.III, 15. See also chap. 1.3.II-II, pgs. 14-15; chaps. 1.3.IV-VIII, pgs. 15-16; and chap. 1.3.XI, pgs. 16-17.
103 “Age viriliter” GoF, Vitae, chap. 1.6.II, 39.
104 Psalm 26:11-14. For the reference in Dominic’s vitae, see above introduction, 1.
105 See, for example, GoF, Vitae, chap. 3.12, 109; chap. 3.18, 200; chap. 4.11.II, 177; chap. 4.13.IV, 183; chap. 4.17.II, 200; chap. 4.25.IX, 227; chap. 5.2.III, 249; chap. 5.2.VI, 251; chap. 5.2.XIV, 259; chap. 5.3.V, 259; chap. 5.3.IX, 265; chap. 5.4.III, 279; chap. 5.5.XI, 282; chap. 5.6.IV; chap. 5.7.VI, 290; chap. 5.7.VII, 290; chap. 5.8.XI, 294; and chap. 5.9.XV, 304.
Gerard’s well-known personal reticence about the increasing emphasis on philosophical study in Dominican life.\textsuperscript{106} Indeed, the few stories dealing with study in the \textit{Vitae fratrum} extensively are contained in a short chapter called “about the temptations of philosophical curiosities” and describe the dangers of becoming a philosopher rather than a friar, which largely involved eternal damnation.\textsuperscript{107} One Italian friar, for example, decided to study theology rather than philosophy after a dream revealed to him a list of dead philosophers who suffered the greatest torture in the afterlife.\textsuperscript{108} Gerard’s text does contain plenty of references to friars who performed the more academic roles of the Order—as lectors, masters, or doctors—or administrative duties, either as one aspect of their duties or for the entirety of their service to the Order, but these references are passing in nature and are not accompanied by the same extended descriptions and praise describing the Order’s preachers.\textsuperscript{109} Gerard’s rejection of philosophical study, however, did not extend to personal reading and holy debate between friars, which he presented as one of the activities performed by the heroic early brothers.\textsuperscript{110} In addition to this pious learning as the foundation of preaching, Gerard also emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit, “which through interior anointing supplied what the preachers lacked in acquired knowledge; for they converted many to penitence with only the text of the seven canons, which, along with Matthew’s gospel, St. Dominic had frequently assigned to the brothers.”\textsuperscript{111} Thus, Gerard’s description fundamentally minimized the role of academic and particularly philosophical study in the friars’ formation, designating prayer, minimal reading, and the intervention of the Holy Spirit as the basis for solid preaching.


\textsuperscript{107} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.20, 208–9.

\textsuperscript{108} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.20.II, 208.

\textsuperscript{109} For some references to lectors, see GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 3.4, 102; chap. 3.12, 109; chap. 3.18, 115; chap. 4.17.II, 200; chap. 5.2.III, 249; and chap. 5.2.IX, 252. For some references to theologians, see GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.17.III, 201; chap. 4.24.VIII, 216; 5.3.VI.a, 259–60; and chap. 5.8.XI, 294. For some references to the friars in administrative capacities, see chap. 5.2.I, 248; chap. 5.2.IV, 250; chap. 5.2.VII, 251; chap. 5.2.XIII, 255; chap. 5.3.XI, 266; chap. 5.4.VIII, 272; chap. 5.4.XI, 273; and chap. 5.5.VI, 279.

\textsuperscript{110} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.1, 150.

\textsuperscript{111} “In praedicando autem verbum Dei...Deus super eos effunderat fervorem...in quibus spiritus sanctus supplebat ex interiori unccione, quod eis extra dearet ex scientia acquisita; nam multi multos converteratorunt ad penitenciam solum cum textu septem canoniarum, quas cum evangelio beati Matthei beatus Dominicus frequenter fratribus iponebat.” GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.1, 150–51.
Gerard’s minimization of study and its role in preaching, however, reflected several rhetorical and literary presentations of male behavior. In highlighting academic simplicity and reliance on the Holy Spirit as characteristics of Dominican preaching, Gerard thus characterized it as a type of powerful, fervent action, which clearly expressed the Christian truth that had been internalized through prayer and granted by the holy spirit. In this presentation, Gerard reflects Augustine’s description of the grand style of oration, which was to be employed in order to persuade the audience and to be preceded by prayer so that the Holy Spirit would speak through the preacher. Augustine further described this method of preaching as:

“not so much dressed with verbal ornaments as made violent by the mind’s passions. For it seizes nearly all of those ornaments, but if it doesn’t have them, it does not require them...For it is sufficient for what drives it that proper words are not selected by the mouth’s industry, but follow the chest’s ardor. For if a strong man most intent on battle is armed with a golden and bejeweled sword, he does with those arms what he does not because they are precious, but because they are weapons; the same man is nevertheless the same and prevails the most even when anger makes a weapon for the one searching for it.”

The unadorned fervor with which Gerard’s early friars preached thus had the potential to inflict masculinized rhetorical violence on the listener and to succeed, by channeling the Holy Spirit and engaging in basic study, in converting audience members. The martial imagery used to describe the type of rhetorical strategy exhibited by the early preachers also links the fervor for souls that these early preachers showed to the battle fury exhibited by heroic epic’s great heroes, who regularly felt rage, exhibited boiling blood, lost their minds, and acted as fierce lions at challenges to their honor or during the heat of battle. Gerard described the single-minded purpose of the early friars dedicated to preaching in similar terms, writing that “God poured such a great zeal for preaching the word of God onto them, by which activity the Order had been defined from the beginning, that many of them did not dare to eat in good conscience on any given day unless they had preached to one or to several people.” Thus, by downplaying study and advocating a highly focused martial,

112 See above chapter 1, 60-2 and especially, Ross, “Dazzling,” 157-163.
113 Augustine, De doctrina, 4.20, 143.
114 “Grande autem dicendi genus hoc maxime distat ab isto genere temperato, quod non tam verborum ornatibus comtur est, quam violentum animi affectibus. Nam capi etiam illa ornamenta paene omnia; sed ea si non habuerit, non requirit...Satis enim est ei propter quod agitur; ut verba congruentia non oris eligantur industria, sed pectoris sequantur ardorem. nam si aurato gemmateque ferro vir fortis armetur; intentissimus pugnae, agit quidem illis armis quod agit, non quia pretiosa, sed quia arma sunt; idem ipse est tamen, et valet plurimum, etiam quum ‘rigmanti telum ira facit.’” Augustine, De doctrina, 4.20, 147 and partially quoted in Ross, “Dazzling,” 161.
115 Kauper, Chivalry, 144 and Sayers, Song of Roland, chap. 88, 95.
116 “In predicando autem verbum Dei, ad quod ordo a principio deputatus est, Deus super eos effunderat fervorem, ita quod multi eorum non cum tuta consciencia comedere ulla die audebant, nisi uni vel pluribus predicassent...” GoF, Vitae, chap. 4.1, 150.
rather than an academic, mentality for the Order’s preachers, Gerard placed the Order’s central mission within the context of literary and rhetorical ideals of militaristic masculinity.

Gerard also left little doubt as to whether or not the Order’s early friars were successful in their preaching ventures by emphasizing their ability to attract new recruits, a process often portrayed as “stealing” them with rhetorical skill from their literal or social families. Jordan of Saxony’s eloquence, for example, converted so many scholars in Paris that “there was a great flood of tears, for the brothers wept with joy on the one hand, while the scholars wept with grief from the loss or separation of their own.”117 In addition, the friars did not have enough habits to clothe all of the new recruits and so resorted to removing one article of their own habits for use in clothing the new brothers.118 In this instance, it is Jordan’s preaching skill that caused men to break with their previous homosocial and affective associations in favor of new ones. The sermon’s power could also be so strong that it caused men to fear the preacher as it did in another anecdote in which a notable scholar of the liberal arts in Bologna “began to fear very much that he would be seized during the sermon” of Reginald of Orleans, since so many other great clerics and masters had been drawn to the Order by his preaching.119 This scholar was eventually converted by one of Reginald’s sermons, more specifically by the *verbum Dei* as expressed through the sermon, and drew many other scholars into the Order after his profession.120 In the context of the battles at the University of Paris over the position of Dominican teachers at the university, which included forbidding students from attending Dominican lectures at one point, the preachers’ success in winning novitiates for the Order must have taken on a more immediate and literal sense of victory for the Order.121 This Parisian conflict was also heavily imbued with masculine martial imagery in Humbert of Romans’ annual encyclical letter.122 The seizure of these scholars, the commodity over which the secular and mendicant masters fought, speaks to fundamental lay understandings of military

117 “Unde semel in festo purificacionis recepit ad ordinem predictus magister XXI scolares Parisius, ubi fuit maxima effusio lacrimarum; nam frater ex una parte fletant pre gudio, et scolares pre dolore de amisione seu separacione suorum.” GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 3.12, 109.
120 Hinnebusch, *History*, vol. 2, 71-82.
121 Humbert’s letters are discussed at length in below chapter 4, 13-35.
victory and reciprocally violent exchanges that flooded late medieval streets and defined the lives of many laymen.\textsuperscript{123} In addition, this victory was achieved, according to Gerard, by an aptly worded sermon, which was composed by both the preacher and by God himself and allowed God’s power to flow through the intermediary, making the preacher’s rhetorical abilities and the sermon itself, according to Gerard, a source of power worthy of fear.\textsuperscript{124} This use of rhetorical skill to persuade the audience has some resonance with secular university culture which prized rhetorical ability and competition as a marker of mature manhood, while the “bare-bones” nature of this rhetorical skill aligned itself more closely with a rhetorical tradition of masculine persuasive oration depicted by Augustine.\textsuperscript{125}

Gerard also personified the sermon in this depiction, which functioned as the vehicle for the transmission of God’s word, as something that could “seize” a man with its rhetorical and divine power, causing him to abandon his previous allegiances and goals. The term “seize” in its various vernacular permutations littered the pages of medieval chivalric texts and described various situations in which the masculinized victor seized the object of his desire: armies seized cities, the vanquished, and goods, while knights and noblemen seized women that they desired and often raped them.\textsuperscript{126} Outside of literature, however, legal codes condemned this sort of extra-military seizure, that is, theft, labeling it as illegal and unmanly, instead focusing on verbal, physical, and legal assaults on opponents as the height of male assertion.\textsuperscript{127} Perhaps in response to the Order’s recruitment rhetoric, late medieval men even attempted to portray this seizure of their sons by Dominicans as homosexual in nature, likely drawing upon Roman ideas of \textit{raptus} as the seizure and rape of young women.\textsuperscript{128} Regardless, seizing another man’s property was a fundamental method of inflicting damage to that man’s reputation, and thus acting as a violating, powerful

\textsuperscript{123} See above introduction, 15-16.

\textsuperscript{124} On the preacher and his sermon as an intermediary between God and audience, see Beverly Mayne Kienzle, introduction to \textit{The Sermon}, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 154. On medieval perceptions of God and the preacher as “co-authors” of the sermon, see Carlo Delcorno, “Medieval Preaching in Italy (1200-1500),” in \textit{The Sermon}, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 448-560.

\textsuperscript{125} See above chapter 1, 60-2 and above pg. 100.

\textsuperscript{126} See examples in Sayers, \textit{Song of Roland}, chap. 8, 54; Martorell and Galba, \textit{Tirant lo Blanc}, 310 (in English); Kaeuper, \textit{Chivalry}, 177-8, 184, 245, and 250 ff. 83; and Gravdal, \textit{Ravishing}, 4-6, 36, and 172; and Ross, \textit{Figuring}, 138.


\textsuperscript{128} Gravdal, \textit{Ravishing}, 4-6 and Neal, \textit{Masculine}, 114-18.
man. Thus, the ability of the friars’ sermons to seize young men for the Order granted their preaching a particularly masculine power to inflict injury on other men, the ability to feminize the audience by rhetorically seizing them against their will, and to act as a conduit for divine power.

Within such a fraught linguistic milieu, it is hardly surprising that this “seizure” of young men in Gerard’s text sometimes resulted in more than tears as the families of these young men became involved. The friends of a certain Bolognese convert, for example, threatened to violently remove him from the Order by marching on the convent where he was staying, but eventually retreated after they saw twenty angels circling the convent, which Dominic assured the brothers had been sent to protect them. In another instance, the father of a young nobleman who had entered the Order because of Jordan’s very insistent preaching, rode toward the monastery where his only son was in residence with a small army intending either to “reclaim his son or to kill Jordan.” When Jordan—in Gerard’s words—very bravely did not hide his identity from the man and his army, the father was humbled and abandoned his purpose. In these instances, the friars successfully defended themselves from the violent retribution incurred by gaining new members with supernatural means or demonstration of individual courage, means reminiscent of the rhetorical and ideological traditions established in the early Middle Ages when religious non-violent men attempted to defend themselves and their property from secular men armed with more tangible weapons. When rowdy royal festivities in Llandaff in 1070 led to the death of the Bishop’s nephew, for example, the Bishop ordered

130 GoF, Vitae, chap. 2.21, 81. Interestingly, the friars in the story begged Dominic to send for their “soldier patrons” to defend them, but Dominic refused since he saw the angels outside.
that all crosses and relics be placed on the floor, bells turned over, and church doors closed and barricaded with thorns so that no services be held. King Cadwgon of Morgannwg, anxious to have this anathema and separation from the faith placed on his family removed, brought the culprit to justice.\(^\text{133}\)

Rather than the rituals and ecclesiastical sanctions utilized by these churchmen and other monks in the early and high Middle Ages to combat their violent lay enemies, however, Gerard instead emphasized the inherent virtue, rhetorical power, and personal courage of the individual friars, which inspired divine protection or inspired a perpetrator’s change of heart. This portrayal of preaching as a mode of masculine expression in these examples—that is, relying on oral skills, personal display of courage, and divine justice rather than physical violence to inflict damage on other men and respond to threats—was thus somewhat analogous to laymen resorting to courts of law instead of private vengeance, an increasingly common practice in the late medieval period. Although both systems of private vengeance and legal measures continued to coexist throughout the period, the fact that increasing numbers of men resorted to legal avenues as an honorable alternative meant that there was a cultural milieu in which the Dominicans’ particular form of masculinity, as virtuous, rhetorically effective preachers, would have been more widely understandable and accepted.\(^\text{134}\)

Although Gerard’s text tells us very little about the way in which the public viewed the friars, one interesting story suggests that Gerard, at least, was overtly connected the Order’s recruitment with secular ideas of feuding and legal rhetoric in which gaining novices was seen as a form of actively inflicting injury.\(^\text{135}\)

As Gerard relates:

“A certain noble lord from Germany, the lord of a master’s mother, stole a cow from her; the same master also drew a certain young son of the noble’s to the Order. When certain ones therefore complained a lot to the friar on the noble’s behalf that he had snatched the same son from that lord, he, with the intent of appeasing them toward a certain solace, responded ‘You all know that, according to the customs of Germany, if someone does injury (iniuriam) to another’s mother and the son took vengeance against him, no one in Germany ought to consider this an evil. Therefore, since your Lord did injury (iniuriam) to my

\(^{133}\) Related in Little, *Benedictine*, 126-7.

\(^{134}\) See above introduction, 17-18.

\(^{135}\) On the norms of vendetta culture, see introduction, 16.
mother by stealing her cow from her, why should you or he consider it to be an evil if I stole a little calf from him, that is, his son?\textsuperscript{136}

The Dominican master in this story thus walked the line between his role in the Order and his obligations to his natal family. While Gerard never said that the master drew the lord’s son to the Order as a purposeful form of vengeance—thus leaving the master ideologically free from direct involvement in secular affairs—the master in this story does demonstrate his connection to and knowledge of his mother and lay culture even while functioning as an active Dominican, suggesting that the ties between the Order and the secular world were stronger than other stories from the text indicate. In addition, both the lord and the master understood this son’s conversion as a form of injury against the lord’s family on par with the stealing of property. Indeed, the term \textit{iniuria} can be translated as insult and was often used in a feuding context by vassals trying to motivate their lords to take vengeance, since an action had slighted both of them.\textsuperscript{137} In this way, the “seizure” of sons represents a conflicted transitional space in Gerard’s text where the Order both operates within secular feuding culture and outside of it in the way that it represents itself. While the true views of secular men toward the friars is not particularly accessible in this text, the friars in these examples managed to successfully defend their “acquisitions” non-violently, through a combination of humility, divine intervention, spiritual arms, and rhetorical prowess, and so successfully demonstrated their unique brand of masculine prowess. This masculine prowess also reflects the transition from private vendetta to legal recourse as a method of protecting personal honor since traditional methods of violating others (stealing of possessions) were effectively countered by legal customs (acceptable retribution in kind, demonstration of virtue, and divine protection), against which the layman had no recourse within the story.\textsuperscript{138}

Besides acting as a way of recruiting young men for the Order, effective preaching also lent the preacher worldly fame and thaumaturgical powers according to the stories in the \textit{Vitae fratrum}. While

\textsuperscript{136}“Quidam nobilis de Teotonia dominus secundum mundum matris magistri eiusdem abstulit vaccam; ipse autem magister quendam filium eiusdem nobilis iuvem traxit ad ordinem. Cum ergo quidam ex parte predicti nobilis multum conquererentur ipsi magistro, quod filium istum abstulisset domino illi, respondit in quodam solacio ad placandum eos in hunc modum: ‘Vos scitis, inquit, secundum consuetudinem Teotonie, quod si quis fecisset iniuriam matrici allicius, et filius vindicaret in eum, nullus in Teotonia deberet habere hoc pro malo. Cum ergo dominus vester et meus fecerit iniuriam matris mee auferendo sibi vaccam, quomodo debetis iniuriam matric mee auferendo sibi vaccam, quomodo debetis vos vel ipse habere pro malo, si ego abstuli sibivilum id est filium?’ GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 3.44.XV, 143-4.


\textsuperscript{138}See above introduction, 17-18.
Jordan’s preaching drew large crowds, even the less saintly members of the Order were in high demand.\textsuperscript{139} For example, Gerard indicated that two papal nuncios came to the General Chapter meeting in Bologna to request that the Dominican preacher John Vincent be required to remain in Bologna since his preaching there had been so successful, but were turned down in their request since it was incompatible with the itinerant preaching mission of the Order.\textsuperscript{140} Dominican preachers in Gerard’s text were given the ability to make those individuals who disturbed their sermons become mentally disturbed, make their denouncers physically ill, or even to resurrect a rooster after the friar himself had killed the unfortunate bird for interrupting his sermon writing.\textsuperscript{141} Perhaps nowhere is the connection between preaching and spiritual power articulated more clearly than in a story about an unnamed brother who was cured of a lifelong illness by bathing in the dirty water left over from some brothers who had just returned from preaching to wash off the “sweat of their labors.” While bathing, the sick brother prayed in the following way: “O omnipotent God, faithful remunerator of all good labors, on behalf of the sweat of your servants, whom you have regarded with grateful eyes, now look at me and make me a participant in and partner of their labors.”\textsuperscript{142} According to this story, the act of preaching itself, as a good labor performed by any member of the Order, imbued the preacher’s body and even the grime that covered it with spiritual power. Much as was the case with saintly bodies, relics, and the water associated with them, the preacher himself, even the most anonymous of preachers could be the conduit of God’s power.\textsuperscript{143}

As conduits of God’s power, it is perhaps no surprise that one of the Order’s most illustrious preachers would arouse the Devil’s jealousy. It is because of his successful preaching that Jordan of Saxony found himself the target of several of the Devil’s attacks. Appearing as a trickster, the Devil tried to get Jordan

\textsuperscript{139} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 3.11, 108; chap. 3.13, 109-10; chap. 3.28, 123; and chap. 3.30, 124
\textsuperscript{140} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.4.III, pgs. 138-9.
\textsuperscript{141} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.25.III, 223-4; chap. 4.25.V, 224-5; and chap. 4.25.X, 229.
\textsuperscript{142} “O Deus omnipotens, bonorum laborum pius remunerator, per servorum tuorum sudores, quos gratis oculis intueris, respice nunc ad me et fac laborum ipsorum participem et consortem.” GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.25.XI, 229-30.
\textsuperscript{143} Pilgrims often attached great importance to the earth, even the dust, collected from the area where a saintly body had been buried. In addition, they venerated the liquid used to wash the saint’s bones, which was extremely valuable, or made do with drinking water that they themselves poured over the saintly tomb. See Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 429-30. Dyan Elliot also discusses the increasing tendency of Late Medieval people to sanctify the body of living holy women, even attempting to secure a part of their dead body contractually before they had died, and this appears to be the case here. Elliot, \textit{Proving}, 70-2. For another Dominican example of the miraculous healing power of water that had come into contact with Margaret of Hungary’s hair; albeit after her death, in GoG, \textit{Vita}, chap. 56, 521.
to agree not to preach anymore in exchange for which the Devil would stop tempting Jordan’s brothers.\textsuperscript{144} Although this must have been a tempting offer, given the Devil’s formidable presence in the rest of the text where he is seen attempting to draw the brothers away from their holy responsibilities, Jordan nonetheless rejects the idea of making a pact with the Prince of Darkness.\textsuperscript{145} In another anecdote, the evil “shapeshifter” appeared in the guise of a respected friar and convinced Jordan not to eat meat in order to recover from an illness so that he would be an example of ascetic practice to the brothers. Thankfully for Jordan, the truth of the trick was revealed to him before he had wasted away entirely.\textsuperscript{146} Although not explicitly stated anywhere in Gerard’s text, the combination of the divine powers granted to the brothers through prayer and the labor of preaching as well as the Devil’s regular attempts to distract the friars from their duties strongly suggests the idea of a spiritual war in which the preachers act on the front lines on God’s behalf, drawing souls toward heaven and the Order. As in Cistercian hagiographic texts, the Devil was a primary enemy for the brothers in Gerard’s text and they devoted much of their time combatting his pernicious influence both inside the convent through practices of personal piety and outside of it through preaching and the \textit{cura animarum}.\textsuperscript{147} Such polarized antagonism also fits the paradigm for masculine behavior in vendetta culture—in which the world was divided into feuding groups and the honorable man struggled to maintain his position among his friends while combatting his enemies in public and private arenas—and the older hagiographic trope of monastic struggle against the Devil particularly common in Cistercian saints’ lives.\textsuperscript{148}

The Dominicans in Gerard’s texts, however, also faced enemies outside of the convent in the form of heretics and non-Christians. Engagement with these two groups formed an important component of the brother’s active service, especially with the death and canonization of Peter of Verona, which occurred while Gerard was collecting his stories for the \textit{Vitae fratum}.\textsuperscript{149} Although Gerard’s \textit{Vita Petri} was the first

\textsuperscript{144} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 3.30, 124.
\textsuperscript{145} For numerous examples of the Devil tormenting various members of the Order while they go about their daily life in the convent, see GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 1.7.1, 58-9; chap. 2.14, 77; chap. 2.15, 77-8; chap. 2.16, 78; chap. 3.13, 109-110; chap. 3.31, 125; chap. 4.15.1V, 195-6; chap. 4.16.I, 198; and chap. 4.16.II, 198.
\textsuperscript{146} “versipellis,” GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 3.28, 122-3.
\textsuperscript{147} Roisin, “L’Hagiographie,” 104; Weinstein and Bell, \textit{Saints}, 247-8; and Caroline Walker Bynum, introduction to \textit{Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).
\textsuperscript{148} For a discussion of vendetta culture and honor groups on the streets of late medieval Europe, see above introduction, 16.
hagiographic account of the newly-minted saint, it was not written to promote the inquisitor’s canonization, which took place without any official vita beyond what was written in the bull of canonization, but was rather written for purposes of internal edification and Order identity formation, the goal of the Vitae fratrum in general.\(^\text{150}\) Although, as we will see, Peter became the frontman for anti-heretical activity in Gerard’s text, he was not entirely without company among the Order’s brethren. The Order’s role in responding to the heretical challenges of late medieval Europe, as depicted in the text, evolved from a relatively infrequent and non-violent engagement based upon the model presented in Dominic’s vitae to interactions defined by more confrontational debates and even martyrdom. Gerard made the presence of heretics in the Order’s identity clear in the first chapter of the Vitae, which dealt with the Order’s beginnings, by relating the conversion of two heretics who transferred their religious affiliations simply in response to premonitions of the Order’s arrival.\(^\text{151}\) While Gerard depicted these heretics as rather benign, potential converts, who converted without any real effort on the part of the Order, Gerard also gave one of the most damning descriptions of heretics found in the entire Vitae fratrum in this chapter, saying that they, “bearing the venom of malice in their hearts, plot against the truth and steal it from believers, and they kill Christ, that is, the faith of Christ among the faithful themselves,” but the Order of Preachers, like Mardocheus in the Book of Esther, makes these heretics known to Christ, “so that the innocent will be saved and they will be punished with just retribution.”\(^\text{152}\) Gerard thus depicted the Order as a group of men protecting the faithful from the violent seizure of their faith at the hands of the devious heretics, by discerning the heretic from among the good—a common trope describing inquisitorial responsibilities—and reporting them to Christ, the final judge.\(^\text{153}\) In addition, the term malice had legal significance in late medieval culture and was regularly used to describe the ill intentions of one individual toward another, as a contrast to just or truthful actions, or to designate a state of mutually held


\(^{151}\) GoF, Vitae, chap. 1.4.VI, 22 and chap. 1.4.VII, 22-3.

\(^{152}\) “Duo eunuchi regis, qui ianitores erant, in palacii primo limine residebant, voluerunt regem interficere, quod Mardocheum non latuit.” Interlinearis super Mardocheum: id est ordinem predicatorem; et glosa marginalis: Possunt in duobus eunuchis scismatici et hertici notari, qui fraudis et malicie venenum corde gestantes contra veritatem consolation, et eam credentibus auferant, et Christum id est fidem Christi in ipsis fidelibus interficiant. Sed eorum iniquitatem sancti doctores manifestant, ut innocentes salventur et illi iusta ulcione punitantur.” GoF, Vitae, chap. 3.4, 15.

\(^{153}\) Elliot, Proving, 233-263 and Ames, Righteous, 53-6.
antagonism between individuals that had important legal consequences. In 1321, for example the Valencian fabric dyer Nadal Tamarit argued that since his accuser, Jacme Roïç, "proposing the said denunciation maliciously and against the truth had defamed and injured him," Jacme should be convicted under the city’s laws. The term malice and its derivatives was also associated with the legal implications of a wider understanding of the "enmity" in late medieval Europe as a public, highly antagonistic, ritualized concept that divided the world into enemies and friends for most people and resulted in structured and socially understood legal and violent conflict between oppositional groups. Gerard thus clearly defined the general category of heretics as the Order’s enemies, intending to inflict harm upon the friars and all Christians, in terms readily applicable to lay understandings of oppositional groups involved in varying levels of reciprocal conflict. In encouraging the brothers to stand against this enemy, Gerard instructed the brothers to convert them in person through unspecified methods or, if this should fail, to report them to Christ for just punishment. Thus, in describing the Order as a group which reported its enemies to a system of divine justice for retribution, Gerard likewise reflects lay norms of vendetta culture that increasingly relied upon legal systems as a form of enacting revenge on enemies. Gerard also established the inquisitorial element of the Dominicans’ task as an important part of his ideological presentation of the Order’s role in salvation history and linked it to lay understandings of honorable masculine conduct in vendetta culture.

But how did this relatively peaceable and legalistic inquisitorial model play out in the rest of Gerard’s text? Throughout the first four books of the *Vitae fratum*, Gerard presented opposition to heretics as a relatively infrequent part of the Dominican mission and the confrontations between the friars and heretics in a vague and theoretical way. For example, Gerard included a story in which Dominic returned from disputing with some heretics so late at night that the door to the church had been locked. After the saint prostrated himself and prayed, however, he miraculously found himself on the other side of the closed doors.
Although the disputation is very much in the background of this story, Gerard seems to imply that it was the day’s labor, combined with prayer, that made God favorable to enacting such a miracle. As with preaching, reference to combatting heretics also occurred in the text as a way of designating a friar’s status within the Order. Gerard found it difficult to express, for example, how much Moneta of Cremona, a Dominican inquisitor in Milan during the 1230s, “accomplished toward the confutation of heretics in word and doctrine” and lauded another Dominican’s “longtime defense of the faith, through manfully disputing, preaching, and exposing heretics, as well as confirming catholics.”\(^{159}\) The latter Dominican was a reformed heretic, who had converted to the faith after reading the Bible and was thus not the product of any successful evangelizing on the part of the Order. In fact, it is not conversion that is the focus of these stories, but rather the laudably performed struggle against this enemy group. While successful anti-heretical activity certainly earned these friars Gerard’s accolades, they were part of a very small group of Dominicans associated with inquisitorial behavior in the text and stand in contrast the large number of friars distinguished by their successful preaching. The only other times that heretics appeared they function as the object of a miracle. Brother Isnard, for example, responded to the mocking of heretics by performing miracles on two occasions, the first of which involved exorcising a certain Martin and the second involved causing a large vase to fly across the street and break a snide heretic’s legs.\(^{160}\) Although the heretics in these stories promised to believe in Isnard’s power if he performed these feats, we are never told if they in fact do convert, as it seems it is the miraculous power of the Dominican and his bravery in response to taunting, not his ability to actually achieve conversion, that is the focus of these events. Even the one martyrdom at the hands of heretics recorded in the first books of Gerard’s text merits only a passing reference at the beginning of a different story, in which a friar dispels a visual trick produced by another heretic by brandishing the Eucharist, and essentially functions as a temporal marker: “In the year 1230, when Master Conrad was preaching among the heretics in Germany and


\(^{160}\) GoF, Vitae, chap. 4.25.IX, 228. For a similar story, in which a brother dispels a fictitious image of the Virgin Mary placed by a heretic, see chap. 4.23.I, 211-12.
was faithfully martyred by them...

Thus, in the first four books of Gerard’s texts, anti-heretical activity remains in the background of the Dominican *cura animarum* and was reserved for the activities of more well-known friars, while the text chiefly focused on the general way that a Dominican should conduct himself, that is, by fervent preaching to general audiences, which could include heretics, but did not necessarily do so.

Chapter five, which discusses the various ways in which Dominicans had died, portrayed Dominican anti-heretical activity in an entirely different manner. Gerard began the first section of this chapter with a clear description of the danger involved in anti-heretical activity and the Dominicans’ specialized role in this task:

> Since the Order of Preachers was founded in Toulouse by the blessed Dominic specifically against heresies and errors, and for almost 40 years brothers from those parts in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness and in many tribulations have battled against them and the tyrants who defend heretics, finally, inquisition against the said heretics and their supporters was entrusted by Pope Gregory IX to the brothers throughout Provence on account of which the brothers exposed themselves to many dangers.¹⁶²

Here Gerard further specified the focus of the Constitutions’ preamble, which had emphasized the salvation of souls and preaching in general as the basis for the Order’s foundation, and Humbert of Romans’ chronologically later assertion that the Order’s mission expanded to focus on general preaching rather than the *defensio fidei,* to specifically emphasize the centrality of fighting heresy to Dominican identity.¹⁶³

Following the organization of the fourth chapter on the Order’s progress and the work as a whole, which was organized hierarchically from the most impressive examples to the more commonplace ones, Gerard’s placement of the Dominican victims of heretical opposition at the beginning of this section emphasized their position at the apex of the Dominican ideal. Indeed, martyrdom had been closely associated with sainthood from the earliest days of Christianity and was increasingly rare at the close of the Middle Ages.¹⁶⁴ As discussed above, it was also one of the spiritual goals of the mendicants, whose interpretation of the *vita*

---

¹⁶¹ "Anno ab incarnacione domini MCCXXX predicante magistro Chunrado in Teutonia contra hereticos, et ab ipsis fideliter martirizato..." GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 4.23.1, 211.

¹⁶² "Cum ordo predatorum a beato Dominico contra hereses et errores specialiter fuerit institutus Tolose, et fere XL annis frates de partibus illis in fame et siti, in frigore et nuditate et in tribulacionibus multis certaverint contra illas et contra tirannos, qui hereticos defendebant, tandem a beate memorie papa Gregorio nono inquisicio contra dictos hereticos et eorum fautores fratibus per Provenciam est commissa, propter quam frates multis periculis sese exposuerunt," GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 5.1.1 pg. 231.


apostolica focused on martyrdom and preaching as masculine characteristics, and Gerard’s description emphasizes the heroic physical endurance and danger that defined the Dominican mission among the heretics.\textsuperscript{165} Although the Franciscans seem to have sought martyrdom more frequently than Dominicans in actuality, Gerard’s placement of the material here suggests his familiarity with trends in masculine piety.\textsuperscript{166} Gerard likewise followed this introduction with a description of the various tribulations endured by the Dominicans in these parts at the hands of the rulers and other heretics, including the murder of three Dominican inquisitors in 1262, who “were killed by heretics on account of the faith in Christ and obedience to Rome while singing the \textit{Te Deum laudamus}.”\textsuperscript{167}

The shining star of this fifth chapter discussing dying, however, is the short \textit{vita} devoted to the newly canonized Peter Martyr, whose individual hagiographic text we will discuss in more detail in the next chapter, but whose central presence in Gerard’s text makes it important to a discussion of the \textit{Vitae fratrum} as a whole. By focusing on Peter’s desire for martyrdom, debates with heretics, inquisitorial activity, and eventual martyrdom Gerard presented a saint whose characteristics combine all of the elements associated with anti-heretical activity found earlier in the text and lent his actions a certain heroic value. The main events of Gerard’s \textit{vita} describe an orthodox Catholic youth who successfully defeated his heretical uncle of undefined denomination in a debate over the meaning of the Creed as a demonstration of “how he would be while defending the truth in the future” and then entered the Order of Preachers where he distinguished himself with a career of successful disputation with heretics and proto-inquisitorial activity.\textsuperscript{168} He was then murdered by a group heretics near Milan, whose particular sect was again unspecified in the text, but which historians have identified as Cathars living in Lombardy.\textsuperscript{169} Gerard’s presentation of Peter’s saintly progression clearly emphasized the more active aspects of Peter’s ministry. Gerard even left out the extended

\textsuperscript{165} See above chapter 1, 54, ff. 150.
\textsuperscript{167} “...ab hereticis pro fide Christi et obedientia Romane ecclesie interfeci sunt cantando \textit{Te Deum laudamus},” GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 5.1.I, 232.
\textsuperscript{168} “...per quod manifeste dabatur intelligi, qualis futurus erat pro defendenda veritate” GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 4.1.III, 236.
\textsuperscript{169} GoF, \textit{Vitae}, chap. 5.1.III, 236-9. Peter’s bull of canonization likewise fails to identify the specific heretical sect responsible for Peter’s death in \textit{BOP} I: 228-9 (March 24, 1253) also edited by Ambrogio Taegio as Innocent IV, “Magnis et Crebris [March 24, 1253], in TAoL, \textit{Vita}, 708-710. For historical evidence, see Prudlo, \textit{Martyred}, 57-8.
prayer as the vehicle of divine power through which Peter enacted divine will rather than as a method by form of revenge rather than taking private, violent action. In addition, Gerard's story portrayed the saint's than acting with physical violence, Gerard's Peter acts as a layman who reported his enemies to the courts as a divine vengeance. By dispensing divine justice, Peter deliberated with worthy counsel, that is, God through prayer, before delivering himself enacted by completely silencing the ringleader. Like a good king, who was also responsible for dispensing divine justice, Peter deliberated with worthy counsel, that is, God through prayer, before delivering divine vengeance. In pursuing legalistic channels in response to an openly challenging confrontation rather than acting with physical violence, Gerard’s Peter acts as a layman who reported his enemies to the courts as a form of revenge rather than taking private, violent action. In addition, Gerard’s story portrayed the saint’s prayer as the vehicle of divine power through which Peter enacted divine will rather than as a method by

170 BOP l: 228-9 and GoF, Vitae, chap. 5.1.III, 237.
171 “Unde cum die assignata venisset hereticus cum multitudine horticorum et stetisset in medio et ad modum Golie vocaret ad singulare disputaciones certamen...” GoF, Vitae, chap. 5.1.III, 237.
172 ...et cum proposuisset hereticus acute et subtiliter errores suos et dicaret: ‘Respondete michi, si potestis et scitis’, petivit deliberacionem ad respondendum. Qua habita divertit parumper ab eis...et prosternens se coram altari cum multis lacrimis rogavit dominum, ut causam suum defenderet, et ut aut illi lumen vere fidei infunderet aut quaelu privaret, qua ita contra Deum abutetatur” GoF, Vitae, chap. 5.1.III, 237.
173 In 1378, for example, Garcia Doso accused a group of men of attacking him on the road “in order to kill him,” a charge that appeared to be true given that the men had just come from the home of a relative, who was recovering from a wound inflicted on by Garcia, with the intent of seeking vengeance. For Garcia’s case, see Narbona Vizcaíno, Malhechores, docs. 3 and 4, pgs. 185-200 as well as other examples in doc. 7, 204-5; doc. 9, 213-14; doc. 11, 217-18; doc. 13, 223-27; doc. 17, 239-255 and in Meyerson, “Assaulting” 11-15
174 See above introduction, 40.
which he created an affective relationship with the divine, and was thus fundamentally masculine in goal and function according to the hagiographic tradition.¹⁷⁵

The contrast in preaching styles between Peter and the heretics is also foundational to Gerard’s presentation of the incident, in which language itself functions as the point of exchange, the weapons of engagement, between opposing groups. In describing the heretic’s argumentation as erroneous, subtle, and skillful, Gerard highlights medieval anxieties over the moral danger and feminizing potential inherent in the use of rhetoric. This was based on writers such as Tertullian, Augustine, and Jerome, who emphasized the potential for skilled rhetoricians to convince an audience of falsities through the allurement of their language, associating this potential to rhetorically attract with physical lust, carnality, and, consequently, the feminine.¹⁷⁶ Such a worry over adorning falsity with the alluring cosmetics of rhetoric found natural parallels in Dominican understandings of heretics, who were said to be “wolves in sheep’s clothing” by writers such as the Dominican Moneta of Cremona, that is, those who persuaded others by their outward appearance and words, while inwardly holding to a false religion inspired by the Devil and desiring to seize souls.¹⁷⁷ Bernard of Fontcaude, an anti-Waldensian polemicist, argued that “heretics seduce woman and men not by striving manfully, but in a womanly fashion,” while Alan of Lille argued that they “preach false things with true things,” like “our innkeepers who mix water and wine.”¹⁷⁸ Indeed, some Cathar preachers were, in fact, women.¹⁷⁹ Late classical and medieval thinkers faltered, however, in presenting a cogent, consistent image of manly rhetoric, that is, finding an oratorical method of allowing the virile truth of the preacher’s message to shine through without the distortion of words, presenting views which range from attempting to masculinize rhetoric itself to eschewing its usage altogether.¹⁸⁰ Alan of Lille, however, whose late twelfth-century De arte

¹⁷⁵ See above chapter 1, 47.
¹⁷⁶ Ross, “‘Dazzling,’” 153-60 and Waters, Angels, 74-84.
¹⁷⁷ Ross, “‘Dazzling,’” 161-3; Waters, Angels, 77-8; Ames, Righteous, 32-6.
¹⁸⁰ See a survey of this process in Ross, “‘Dazzling’”; Waters, Angels, 78-83; and above chapter 1, 41-3.
*praedicatoria* was the chronological and thematic predecessor of the early Dominican texts, placed false heretical preaching in direct opposition to the preacher who “has in his work, what he proposes with his voice,” since “a preacher ought to be faithful in word an deed...lest he mix falsities with truth,” a stance echoed in Dominic’s *vitae.*181 Gerard’s Peter, however, avoids this complicated gendered balancing of the word and rhetorical skill altogether, since he literally silenced the heretic’s feminizing rhetoric by acting as a conduit for divine justice, thus miraculously demonstrating the divine truth without using rhetoric of any kind. He is, in a sense, the ultimate “true man” who could communicate his inner self and divine truth without uttering a word.182

Gerard also placed the preacher as a conduit of divine power in opposition to elevated rhetoric and complicated argumentation in a couple of other anecdotes. In another story, Peter, “considering certain disputations and serious conflicts with heretics, began to be battered in his mind afterwards regarding certain articles” until he prayed to Mary that she “should remove that temptation from him out of her goodness” and he was freed from uncertainty.183 While this story was left out of the official *vita Petri,* perhaps because it implies that Peter has some doctrinal uncertainty, it is consistent with the overall message of the *Vitae fratrum* and Dominic’s *vitae* seen above, which depicted prayer and a special relationship with Mary as the means by which the friar could overcome his personal spiritual struggles and successfully complete his pastoral work. It also demonstrates another instance in which direct divine intervention overcame intricate heretical argumentation. Gerard likewise depicted Peter examining and miraculously confounding a heretical bishop in front of a large crowd of citizens, bishops, and religious people—the only reference to official inquisitorial activity in the text.184 In none of these disputations with heretics did Peter demonstrate extensive skill at disputation, like the type demonstrated in late medieval universities, but instead utilized a miraculous type of “preaching” in which he functioned a conduit of divine justice. Gerard’s Peter was thus

---

181 “…predicador debet habere in opere quod proponit in voce” and “Fidelis enim debet esse praedicator, in verbo et in facto; fidelis in verbo, ne veris falsa misceat…” The section on false preachers and heretics follows immediately after this in Alan of Lille, *Summa,* ch. 38, col. 183.

182 See above chapter 1, 47-8.

183 “Insistente eo semel quibusdam disputacionibus et gravibus hereticorum conflictacionibus, cepit mens eius postea de aliquibus articulis propulsari. Sed ubi ille compert suggestionem esse maligni, ad oracionem recurrit, et prostratus coram altari beate Marie virginis, cepit ipsam devotissime invocare per filium, ut temptacionem illam sibi sua pietate auferret.” GoF, *Vitae,* chap. 5.1.1, 238-9.

184 GoF, *Vitae,* chap. 4.1.III, 238.
presented as a rhetorically virile embodiment of Christian truth and divine justice, which was a simultaneous rejection of heresy and, fundamentally, a methodological rejection of university culture.

The other major aspect of Gerard’s Peter was his active desire for the martyrdom, a desire that would ultimately be fulfilled. At the beginning of his preaching career, Peter told a young friar who regularly attended his sermons that every time the host was elevated during mass, he would pray that he would “die in no other way than for the faith of Christ.” Although Peter’s actual martyrdom would play a central role in the development of his cult, Gerard’s description of his death is very brief, saying the following:

When the blessed Peter was preaching in Milan on Palm Sunday, where approximately ten thousand people had gathered, he said publicly and in a loud voice, ‘I am certainly aware that heretics are discussing my death and have put money down for my death, but let them do whatever they want because I will do more harm to them dead than alive.’ He was killed by them a month later and his word was verified and is verified daily.

Despite the brevity of the account, Peter demonstrated some of the heroic and masculinized aspects of hagiographic martyrdom, such as the inquisitor’s unflinching acceptance of his imminent death and his open desire for martyrdom even as a youth. Such a public proclamation of faith despite the known risk of mortal consequences played an important role in the heroic martyrdom tradition, which paralleled the epic literary tradition, in which good and evil are diametrically opposed and the hero demonstrated heroic indifference to potential pain. In addition, his combative and even taunting speech to his enemies is reminiscent of the fearless posturing and insult common in late medieval vendetta culture as well as heroic epic. Peter’s preaching functioned as a verbal offensive against his heretical opponents, one intended to damage their reputations, humiliate them, and even threaten them in the same way that laymen employed public insults in the course of reciprocally violent relationships. Given the conflation between blows and insults in late medieval culture, Peter’s words would have had a virile, almost physical presence. Finally, that the focus of

185 “…rogo dominum ut numquam permittat, me aliter mori quam pro fide Christi, et istam oracionem semper feci” GoF, Vitae, chap. 5.1.I, 237.

186 “Cum in ramis palmarum predicaret beatus Petrus Mediolani, ubi erant congregata fere X milia personarum, dixit publice alta voce: ‘Ego scio pro certo, quod heretici tractant mortem meam, et pro morte mea pecunia est deposita; sed faciant, quod volunt, quia deterior faciam eis mortuos quam vivus’ Qui infra mensem occisus est ab eis; et verificatum est verbum eius et cotidie magis verificatur.” GoF, Vitae, chap. 5.1. III, 239.

187 On Peter’s youthful prayers for martyrdom, see GoF, Vitae, 3.1. III, 237. For these hagiographic tropes surrounding martyrdom see KuePler, Manly Eunuchs; Weinstein and Bell; Ross, Figuring; Elliot, Roads;


189 See above introduction, 17 and chapter 1, 61.
Gerard’s story was Peter’s public speech rather than his actual martyrdom aligns him with other late medieval descriptions of male martyrdoms, which tend to emphasize the saint’s preaching and verbal speech acts rather than focusing on the physicality of his death. Peter’s vita then functions as the culmination of the developing anti-heretical identity of the Order within the Vitae fratrum, developing from a relatively specialized form of the cura animarum in the first four chapters of the text into a heroicized ideal increasingly at the center of Dominican life, in the form of Peter Martyr. This image of the masculinized inquisitor-martyr, as we will see below, was even further developed in Peter’s official vita.

Aside from anti-heretical activity, Gerard also depicted the friars engaging in dangerous missions to peoples at the edge of Christendom in a few stories. One terrified brother gets assigned to preach to the Cumans, but is consoled by a vision from a holy man promising Mary’s aid, while another accompanied a group of brothers to Africa for the purpose of preaching the faith at the pope’s command and died in Morocco, “with his travel having been happily completed.” These references indicate that interactions with non-Christians were a possible avenue of the Dominican evangelizing effort, but not experienced by the majority of brothers, if the scarcity of references in the text as a whole are any indication of their actual activities. If we take Humbert of Romans at his word and believe that there were more friars volunteering to preach among non-Christians by 1256 than were needed, then Gerard’s taciturnity on their experiences as central to the Dominican ideal becomes even more pronounced. Indeed, the longest story regarding interactions between a friar and a non-Christian, in this case a Muslim, is rather unusual. In this story, Brother Peter of Sézanne traveled to Constantinople as a papal representative to the Emperor, where he encountered a “Muslim monk,” with whom he was very impressed, that is, until the man blasphemed Christ. In a display of witticism, Peter told the Muslim that he should behead him, if Peter were to follow Islamic law that beheaded Christian preachers, but instead Peter has the thoroughly silenced man incarcerated for three days instead. While in prison, the Muslim holy man has a vision which convinces him to abandon Islam and convert to Christianity. Such an encounter bears little resemblance to contemporary hagiographic models for

192 Litterae encyclicae VIIIb: 42 (1256).
Christian-Islamic encounters, especially those associated with Francis of Assisi and the Franciscan martyrs at Teruel, in which the brave friar entered Muslim lands, flouted repeated threats or actualization of violent retribution and valiantly professed the faith, ostensibly hoping to convert Muslims, but primarily seeking martyrdom as the ultimate expression of the *imitatio Christi*. Two Italian Franciscans, for example, had entered the region of Valencia in 1228 while it was still a Muslim region in order to court martyrdom by publicly preaching the Christian faith and denouncing Islam, achieving conversion of the Muslim ruler, Abu Zayd, but only after he had executed them. In fact, Peter's encounter with the Muslim in Christian lands more closely resembles the idealized process by which heretics were brought back to the orthodox flock: clever disputation first stumped the opponent, while merciful imprisonment by the secular authorities then achieved the desired spiritual transformation. Peter's ultimate reliance on the legal system as a form of enacting spiritual justice again parallels the increasing use of the court system in lay culture as a step in the process of reciprocal violence. While not quite demonstrating the traditional heroic characteristics assigned to martyrs in foreign lands, Peter's rhetorical skill and ecclesiastical position still place him high on the masculine hierarchy within the Order and the Dominican ideal in general. This approach is very much indicative of ideological Dominican approaches to missionizing among Muslims found elsewhere in Dominican literature and which would be further developed throughout the later middle ages. While certainly not central to Dominican identity in the *Vitae fratrum*, mission to Muslims still played a peripheral role in the masculine *cura animarum*.

The individual stories about friars engaged in all areas of Dominican life in Gerard's text provided a composite portrait of the ideal male Dominican in which moderate ascetic practice and personal prayer

---


195 For an overview of the Dominican approach to converting Muslims compared to the Franciscan approach see Tolan, *Saracens*, 214-55 and Müller, *Bettelmönche*. 
formed the foundational layer for both the individual friar and the Order as a whole supporting the friar’s true vocation: the *cura animarum* based on preaching and combatting heresy. While the overwhelming majority of Gerard’s text focused on the pious practice of novices and the common brother, largely defined by conventual life and personal spiritual development, Gerard’s heroicization of certain established or saintly brothers make it clear that the active vocations of preaching and anti-heretical activity were the heart of Dominican identity and mission, one to which every mature member of the Order should aspire. The attributes of the two major saints provided an overview of these ideals. Gerard’s Jordan of Saxony both provided a clear model of pastoral care within the Order—as he is often depicted caring for the brothers as well as providing important spiritual guidance—and also represented the ideal preacher whose zealous preaching brought the Christian faithful closer to God. Gerard’s Peter of Verona, however, shifted the Dominican ideal firmly away from monastic traditions and toward a distinctly mendicant praxis by emphasizing the preaching ideal in general and expanding upon the saintly inquisitorial ideal introduced in Dominic’s *vitae*. As we will see in the following chapter, Peter’s official *vita* further developed and solidified this ideal. In terms of the *Vitae fratrum*, however, it is perhaps Gerard’s glowing epithet for Bernard of Caux, a Dominican inquisitor in southern France and one of the only figures in chapter five to have merited a reference his anti-heretical activities, that best describes the multifaceted masculine ideal to which any young male Dominican should aspire: “It was Bernard of Caux, venerable in his mode of living, of miraculous fervor in preaching, a hammer of heretics, and consoler of the faithful, through whom, while he was alive, God worked many miracles and led many souls to faith as well as true charity.” While all of the later male Dominican *vitae* tended to focus on a particular aspect of this ideal, as we will see in the following chapter, they nonetheless maintained some aspect of its multiplicity.

The Preacher’s Mentality: Humbert of Romans on the Dominican Vocation

While Gerard of Frachet worked to provide an overall sense of Dominican identity based upon anecdotes about real individuals living out a multi-faceted vocation, Humbert of Romans created a vocational

---

196 “Fuit frater Bernardus de Cauicio, vite venerabilis et miri in predicacione fervoris, malleus hereticorum et consolator fidelium, per quem adhuc viventem dominus multa miracula fecit et per eum multas animas ad fudem et veram caritatem.” GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 5.9.VII, 300. On Bernard’s inquisitorial activities, see Ames, Righteous, 65.
model in the form of practical instructions about one particular aspect of Dominican practice considered to be the apogee of Dominican life: preaching. Written after the Constitutions, the vitae Dominici, and Gerard’s text, it is perhaps not surprising that Humbert’s text thematically reflects the earlier Dominican texts studied here, solidifying rather than adding extensively to the Dominican masculine behavioral ideals presented by them. After clearly indicating that the preaching office was by nature a masculine prerogative, Humbert emphasized four major themes that should ideologically undergird the preacher’s activities and which had been gendered male in earlier texts. Drawing from the Order’s Constitutions, which specified that the preachers themselves should demonstrate “the grace of preaching which God conferred on them, education, religion, fervor of charity, and proposed intention,” Humbert’s text specifies that the preacher was to be a conduit for the divine word, engage in academic study as a foundational aspect of successful preaching, be a personal example of virtue, and have a zeal for the salvation of souls as his motivation for preaching. Although the more focused functionality of Humbert’s text does not always allow him to elaborate on the gendered implications of his instructions, his discussion of these themes would undoubtedly have led the friar reading it to make connections between Humbert’s preaching manual and the other major Dominican texts used to define and inculcate Dominican masculine praxis, particularly the Constitutions, Dominic’s vitae, and the Vitae fratrum. Thus, reading the Liber de eruditione praedicatorum in light of the other normative texts studied here will provide a fuller reading of the gendered implications of Humbert’s words that would have been readily apparent to a Dominican audience.

Humbert made it clear that he considered the ability to preach to be an exclusively male prerogative, stating specifically that the preacher “ought to be of the masculine sex” in accordance with St. Paul’s admonition to Timothy that women should not be allowed to teach. His reason for this was four-fold: women had less understanding than men, they possessed a natural inferiority to men at odds with the preacher’s “distinguished position”, their appearance would provoke lust in the audience, and Eve’s first

---

197 “Quibus omnibus diligenter seorsum examinatis ab idoneis personis ob hoc et ob alias capituli questiones institutis, et fratribus, cum quibus conversati sunt, studiose inquisitis de gratia predicationis, quam eis Deus contuelerit, et studio et religione et caritatis fervore, proposito ac intentione...” in Constitutiones antique, II.20, 356.

198 Humbert writes, “Circa personam est notandum quod debet esse sexus virilis. 1 Tim. 2: Mulierem docere non permitto” in Liber, 2.XII, 406. This is based on 1 Timothy 2: 11-12 in which Paul writes “Mulier in silentio discat cum omni subjectione. Docere autem mulierem non permitto, neque dominari in virum: sed esse in silentio.”
attempt to teach had been a disaster. In emphasizing women's innate inferiority and the status accorded to
the preaching office, Humbert made it clear that the preaching office was intrinsically gendered masculine,
requiring an authority only associated with the male body in late medieval society for its successful
enactment and thus providing a venue for specific performance of masculine identity. Not only was this
office available only to men, Humbert also considered it an obligatory task for male Dominicans. For example,
in the first section of the fourth book dealing with the execution of the preaching office, the fifth master
general condemned those friars who drew back “from an active life of preaching out of fear of certain sins
which are inevitably contracted by it.” He justified this idea with a passage from Ecclesiasticus denoted by the
quote “Man’s iniquity is better than a woman giving blessing,” in which man’s iniquity was “that certain
iniquity of living which is connected to preaching” while “the woman giving blessing is the cleanness of a soul
reposing in the contemplative life.” Humbert further stated that the former was better than the latter,
“since it is sometimes better that men should work, although they pick up dust while working, than that they
should always stay in the home in all cleanliness.” Thus, while Humbert acknowledged that the friar placed
himself in danger of contracting sin in the course of his duties, he also made it clear that it was the friar’s duty
not only as a Dominican, but specifically as a man, to persist in preaching despite that danger so that he could
be more useful to others. Thus, Humbert’s text departed from traditional monastic ideals of the
contemplative ascent toward God as the vocational path, essentially labeling this vocational path as feminine
due to its association with the Order’s “home.” This type of rhetoric denoting the external world as a
dangerous yet profitable masculine space and the home as a feminine sphere of purity and safety resonated

---

199 HoR, Liber, 2.XII, 406.
200 This is a medieval example of the theories on masculinity, authority, and gendered performativity discussed by many
theorists, including Connell, Gender; Brittan, Masculinity; Butler, Gender; and Bourdieu, Masculine. For application of
these theories to the preaching office, see Waters, Angels, 19.
201 “Alii sunt qui timore peccatorum quorumdam, quae inevitabiliter contraeantur, ab activa praedicationis retrahuntur.
Sed contra hos est quod dicitur, Eccl. 42: Melior est iniquitas viri quam mulier beneficiens” in HoR, Liber, 4.XVII, 418
Ecclesiasticus 42:14.
202 “Quod exponens Bernardus, vocat iniquitatem viri quamdam iniquitatem vitae quae annexa est praedicationi;
mulierem veo beneficiantem vocat munditiam animae quiescentis in vita contemplativa. Et bene hoc illo melius dicitur,
ides utilius. Nonnullum quae melius ut homines laborent, licet in labore puluerem contrahant, quam quod
semper domi cum omni munditia resideant” in HoR, Liber, IV. XVII, 418.
203 Humbert also acknowledged the spiritual danger present to the preacher in his section on appropriate conversation,
writing “Difficile enim est inter sordes ambulare, et immaculatum se custodire” in HoR, Liber, 7.XXXVII, 459.
Middle Ages (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 44.
with secular ideals of gendered space, while Humbert's association of the active vocation with male
Dominican achievement echoes Gerard's perspective in the *Vitae fratrum*.205

In addition to simply being male, Humbert also specified that the ideal preacher was to have a sound body with no physical deformities and the bodily strength to endure the “vigils while studying, shouting while preaching, labors while traveling, poverty while not having necessities, and many other things of this nature.”206 He was also to be of a “competent age,” which the Constitutions specified as over 25, so as to avoid causing scandal, and occupy a position of authority over others “either in office, in literature, in religion, or in a similar manner,” which certainly excluded the laity.207 Finally, he was not to be a contemptible person whose appearance would cause the condemnation of his preaching.208 Thus, Humbert specified that Dominican preachers were to be physically strong, competent, mature, and authoritative men, whose physical body granted them the authority to occupy the preaching office and to be taken seriously by an audience. In addition to the purely functional nature of such admonitions, Humbert's conception of the preacher's body reflected late medieval ideas about the gendered male body as the location of personal honor, the physical means by which a man's honor could be injured.209 This is demonstrated by the lay practice of dismembering and desecrating the dead bodies of their male enemies as a form of extreme humiliation.210 However, not all

---


208 HoR, *Liber*, 2.XII, 407


male bodies necessarily had inherent honor, but only those born into certain families, thus chivalric ideals thus emphasized name, lineage, and blood, while legal codes prevented specific types of corporeal punishment in the case of nobles whose behavior had besmirched their honorable name. In Valencia, for example, a nobleman’s body could not be corporeally punished for criminal behavior since, although he had dishonored his name, his body retained its inherent honor. Likewise, Charlemagne ordered three of his knights to guard the bodies of fallen French soldiers to protect them from any desecration before burial, and surveyed the dead, “red with the blood of all our chivalry.” Secular ideas of mature masculinity also linked authoritative manhood, visible in the body’s sex and appearance, to performance of patriarchy, demonstration of personal decorum, and governance of self and others. Therefore, through his focus on the male body in his Liber de eruditione, Humbert advocated that the Order’s preachers at the very least achieve the standards of mature masculinity prescribed by secular norms so that they possessed the personal authority necessary to command other men and women and fulfill the masculinized preaching office.

In addition to defining the body of the preacher as masculine and endowing it with qualities considered to be masculine in late medieval society, Humbert also emphasized key behavioral ideals for the friars that would allow them to exercise their office in ways considered masculine by lay society and by other Dominican authors. The first of this was emphasis on the preacher as the conduit of divine power, which had played an important role in Gerard’s depiction of the masculinized preacher. As did the Constitutions, Humbert opened the part on of his treatise about “the Conditions of the Office,” by depicting preaching as a divine gift bestowed upon the friars. According to Humbert, the office of preaching was apostolic, since the Apostles had been selected for that purpose, angelic, since preachers were sent for salvation of men just as Angels who were sent on behalf of the heirs of salvation, and divine because God became human in order to preach. Not only was the task of preaching central to God’s life and plan for salvation, it was also directly

212 Puchades i Battaller, 80.
213 Sayers, Song of Roland, ch. 178, 144 and ch. 205, 161.
215 See above pgs., 47-8 and 61-2.
216 HoR, Liber, 1.II, 374.
inspired by Him. In his section describing why the task is difficult, for example, Humbert argued that preaching was more difficult to learn than other arts since, unlike the others which are acquired through frequent repetition, “the grace of preaching is possessed through a special gift of God” and “it is because of God’s gift that man has powerful preaching.” Three chapters later, Humbert reiterated this point at the end of a section about the preacher’s speech in which he stated that a preacher should have a pleasing voice without speech impediments, articulate clearly, and use simple speech directed toward the listener’s utility, writing “all of these are of little use without the grace of the lip” and “above all the grace of preaching, which flavors everything, is necessary in speaking according to what was said about the greatest preacher in Psalm 44, ‘grace is distributed on your lips.’” Thus Humbert reiterated the message in the Constitutions that the ability to preach was fundamentally a gift from God, not solely the product of individual study, that a man either had or did not have. Such a prerequisite implicitly underlined the hierarchical distinction in the Order between the common friar, lacking the special gift of preaching, and the skilled preacher whose divine gifts gave him entrance to a more exclusive and masculinized position within the Order.

Not only did Humbert emphasize the divinely endowed nature of successful preaching ability, he also focused on the preacher’s role as the disseminator of the divine message and conduit for divine will that this gift entailed. For example, he introduced chapter six of the first part, which deals with the utility of preaching to men, by saying, “it ought to be noted that although [preaching] is necessary to the entire world, as was said above, it is nevertheless useful to all men and in as many ways as the word of God, which is related through holy preaching, is found to be useful to men.” Humbert then followed this introduction with a long list of reasons why God’s word disseminated through the preachers’ efforts benefitted mankind, including reviving dead souls, providing spiritual medicine, and rekindling charity. Humbert’s portrayal of the relationship between divine word and preaching in this section placed the preacher in the privileged role of God’s conduit

---

217 “Gratia vero praedicandi ex dono Dei speciali habetur...Quod ideo dicitur quia ex dono Dei est quod homo habeat potestativam praedicationem” in HoR, Liber, 1.VI, 393.

218 “Item, quia omnia ista parum sunt quum sine gratia laboriorum, iuxta illud Eccl. 20: Homo acharis quasi fabula vana, super omnia necessaria est gratia praedicatori in loquendo, quae omnia condit, iuxta illud quod dicitur de summo praedicatori, in Ps. 44: Diffusa est gratia in labis tuis” in HoR, Liber 2.X, 404.

219 “Circa quod notandum est quod quamvis sit toti mundo necessarium, ut supra dictum est, tamen specialiter est utile omnibus hominibus, et tot modis quot modis ipsum verbum Dei, quod per praedicationem sanctam proponitur, utile hominibus reperitur” in HoR, Liber 1.VI, 390.

220 HoR, Liber, 1.VI, 390-2.
in disseminating his life-giving message to such an extent that the two—God’s word and the preacher’s sermon—become conflated in his description of their utility. Through the grace of preaching, then, the preacher’s word was the vehicle for God’s power. Humbert also expressed such an intermediary role for the preachers in the final section of part two, which was dedicated to the necessities for preaching, describing various images associated with preachers. Among the many metaphors provided, Humbert noted that preachers are called the feet, mouth, or face of God and should thus take care “that nothing should proceed from their mouth that does not befit God’s mouth and that nothing should appear in them that does not befit the divine face so that they walk in whatever way conveys God, just as feet convey their owners.”

Humbert makes the preacher, in both his words and aspect, a channel for divine presence in the world, a sort of body through which God spoke and became present. Humbert used similar language in his presentation of several other metaphors in this section, comparing the preachers to snow falling from the heavens since “the sublime hearts of saints descend toward the humble words of preaching because of fraternal charity,” as mountains “which first receive heaven’s blessings and then send them below,” and as servers at God’s house who “labor in distributing and speaking so that it is abundant at the Lord’s table where the faithful are nourished.” Thus, according to Humbert, the preacher functioned to redistribute God’s blessings among the people through his speech. Another very common image employed in Humbert’s text to describe this sort of conductivity depicted preachers as fountains who emanate the waters of knowledge and doctrine. Humbert’s basic idea was that God’s grace inspired the preacher to pour out the sacred word while speaking in a celestial tongue, whose efforts transferred that word along with knowledge and doctrine to those hearing him speak. Gerard’s text had also emphasized the masculine rhetorical power of the preacher as God’s conduit, which allowed the friars to “seize” souls, gain new members for the Order, and triumph over their lay

---

221 “Cum ergo praedicatores dicuntur os Domini, et vultus Domini, et pedes Domini, valde cavendum est eis ne ex ore eorum procedat aliquid quod non debeat os Domini, et ne aliquid in eis appareat quod non debeat vultum divinum, et ut quocumque iverint deferant Deum, sicut pedes deferunt illud cuius sunt” in HoR, Liber, 2.XIII, 408.

222 “Cum sublimia corda sanctorum…pro fraterna charitate ad humilia praedicationis verba descendunt”; “Dicuntur etiam montes, quia sunt montes beneficia coeli, quae primo recipiunt, deinde mittunt ad inferiora”; “…ordo paredicatorum distribuendo et loquendo laborat, ut in mensa Domini abundet unde nutriantur fideles” in HoR, Liber, 2.XIII, pgs. 409-10.


224 For the idea of the preacher speaking in a celestial rather than an earthly tongue, see HoR, Liber, 7.XXXIX, 465, and of God inspiring the preacher’s words, Ibid., 6.XXXIX, 444.
enemies. As in Gerard’s text, Humbert’s preacher embodied God’s power, acting as spokesperson for the Almighty on earth and through such a linkage gained authority and status within the Dominican Order and presumably within wider Christian society. While God’s authority and word, as Humbert also made clear, could only find expression through the male body which already possessed an innate social authority necessary for the dissemination of the divine message, this male body also experienced an increase of that masculine authority through the process of divinely inspired preaching.

Like the Constitutions, Humbert also emphasized the necessity for augmenting that gift for preaching, and the masculine authority associated with it, through careful preparation, writing “although the grace of preaching is specially possessed through God’s gift, nonetheless, the wise preacher should do what is in him by diligently studying how to preach so that he does it laudably.” According to Humbert, the preacher must first educate himself before educating others, since he would have little success as a preacher in saving souls through preaching or hearing confession if he did not have this knowledge. Part of what made preaching such a difficult calling in Humbert’s eyes was the breadth of material that the preacher had to study. Materials for study included Scriptures, natural philosophy, histories, Church mandates, Church rites, knowledge of testing souls, discernment, appropriate timing, sermon structure, and knowledge of the Holy Spirit. Of these, it was Sacred Scripture that played a central role in legitimizing a preacher’s words, an idea Humbert quoted from Pope Gregory I, writing “it is necessary the he who is preparing himself for the words of true preaching take the origins of his arguments (causae) from the sacred pages, so that what he talks about harkens back to the foundation of divine authority and the foundation of his speech rests solidly upon it.” In an earlier chapter, the fifth master general similarly wrote that the “prudent preacher should study the

---

225 See above pgs. 46-8.
226 “Circa primum notandum est quod licet praedicationis gratia specialiter habeatur ex dono Dei, tamen sapiens praedicator debet facere quod in se est, diligenter studendo circa praelectionem faciendum, ut laudabiliter fiat” in HoR, Liber, 1.VII, p. 394.
227 HoR, Liber, 2.IX, 400; and 6.XXVII, 443; and 7.XLIV, 480.
228 HoR, Liber, 1.VII, 395.
229 HoR, Liber, 2.IX, 400-402.
230 “Item, confirmtatio omnium quae dicuntur per sacram Scripturam. Gregorius: Qui ad verae praedicationis verba se praeeparat, necesse est ut causarum origines a sacris paginis sumat, ut quod loquitur a divinae auctoritatis fundamento revocet, atque in eo fundamentum suae locutionis firmet” in HoR, Liber, 4.XIX, 426.
Thus, unlike Gerard, Humbert saw study as an important method of augmenting the divine gift of preaching since it formed a foundation consisting of the divine word already written down so that the preacher could better distribute this knowledge to his audience. Indeed, the prime distinguishing factor that Humbert used to determine whether or not some texts were to be studied was their relative utility to the listener. Thus, he encouraged the preachers to study “whatever they found useful for edification among secular sciences...so that what they [the ancient pagans] uselessly possessed, the faith might usefully take hold of for the salvation of souls.”

As with the various authors of Dominic’s vitae, including Humbert himself, and Gerard of Frachet, the fifth master general condemned those scholars who studied “subtleties” or excessive rhetorical flourishes, often gendered feminine, instead emphasizing simple preaching aimed at edifying the listener with the virile Christian truth. As in Dominic’s life, the focus of the friar’s study was always the listener’s edification and the salvation of souls achieved through personal incorporation of the divine knowledge. Humbert also made it clear that study was to be considered active preparation for preaching when he told the friars not to sit in idle quiet, but to constantly engage in reading, study, and meditation, “which afterwards they aimed at preaching.”

They were not, however, to dedicate themselves entirely to study, asking, “if they do not direct study of this type toward the doctrine of preaching, what utility is there in it?” As in the Constitutions, Dominic’s vitae, and Gerard’s text, study was simply a means to an end to be engaged in by all friars as necessary preparation for their primary vocation—utility to others expressed through preaching. This emphasis on an externally directed vocation contrasted, as we have seen, with models of female pious practice that centered around the achievement of personal salvation as an end in and of itself. That Humbert spent relatively little time emphasizing study in his book on preaching also indicated that he considered it a

---

231 “...debet prudens praedicator circa aliorum dicta studere in Sacris Scripturis plus Sanctorum expositionibus quam suis ininiti, et in his dicendi plus sententias bonas quam verba amare” in HoR, Liber, 1.VII, 398.
232 “Item, collectio omnium quae in scientis saecularibus inveniuntur utilia ad aediPicationem...ut quod illi inutiliter possederunt, fideles utiliter ad salutem animarum possideant” in HoR, Liber, 4.XIX, 426.
234 HoR, Liber, 4.XIX, 427.
235 “Alii sunt qui libenter vacant lectionibus sacris: sed si hujusmodi studium non dirigatur ad doctrinam praedications, quae utilitas in illo” in HoR, Liber, 4.XXI, 432.
236 See above chapter 1, 29-40 and above, 93-6.
stepping stone toward the creation of the Dominican preaching ideal, thus implicitly reinforcing the hierarchy within the Order emphasized in Dominic’s vitae and Gerard’s text between those friars engaged in study and those who had moved up to preaching, a hierarchy that was inherently masculine since women were restricted from both activities.

More central to Humbert’s conception of the preaching task than these relatively brief references to study, however, was the idea of the preacher as a personal exemplar whose virtuous behavior reinforced his sermon’s message, an idea based upon the Constitutions’ concern with a preacher’s adherence to the religious rite. Humbert repeatedly underlined the importance of congruence between a preacher’s message and his actions in the Liber de eruditione, writing, for example, that the preacher’s reward for fulfilling his task is diminished “when a preacher does not practice what he preaches so that his action does not agree with his voice” or “when the signs of penitence do not precede a preacher...for if we are in the Apostle’s place, let us not only imitate them in their sermon, but also both their conversation and abstinence.”

According to Humbert, successful preaching presented the preacher a sort of holy package, where the listener could be saved through both the preaching method and the example of virtue presented by the friar. Indeed the first section of Humbert’s chapter about those things necessary for preaching emphasized the preacher’s life as an example and, after adding a holy conscience, irreproachable life, austere practices, excellence, and a life emanating light, Humbert concluded by encouraging the preacher to display concord between action and word as well as to emit a “pleasant smelling reputation so that he, along with Christ’s Apostle, is a good odor drawing others after him.” In another chapter, Humbert compared the audience’s perception of a preacher: just as someone both looks at the figure on a coin and weighs it to determine its authenticity, so too does the audience assess both the preacher’s doctrinal teaching and method of living. Thus, the preacher was to embody divine authority. Humbert’s main reason in encouraging demonstration of a virtuous life in the text

---


238 “Aluid est, quando praedicator non facit quod dicit, ut concordet opus cum voce...” in HoR, Liber, 2.XI, 404 and “Aluid est quando praedicatorem non praeecedent signa poenitentiae...Si in Apostolorum loco sumus, non solum sermonem eorum imitemur, sed et conversationem quoque et abstinentiam” in HoR, Liber, 2.XI, 406. See also 2.XIX, 428.

239 “Aluid est fama odorifera, ut sit cum Apostolo Christi bonus odor attrahens alios” in HoR, Liber, 1.VIII, 400.

240 HoR, Liber, 1.VII, 398.
was as a way to augment the success of the preacher’s mission, not as an end in itself as it was for female members of the Order, a distinction he made perfectly clear by condemning those friars who refused to preach out of love for the quiet of contemplation. In addition, this idea of the preacher whose words reflected his inner goals and personal behavior reflected the ideal of the “true man” whose actions reflected his motives in contrast to feminine deception and heresy.241

Indeed, the fifth master general’s understanding of virtuous behavior revolved around active service in saving souls rather than any purposeful ascetic regime. For example, in a chapter about conducting the office of preaching freely, Humbert wrote about the hardships faced daily by preachers on the road who sustained poverty, anxiety, want, and various afflictions, likening their trials to the pain experienced by a woman giving birth. According to Humbert, a friar who had transferred to the Dominican Order from the Cistercians “said that he had sustained more of evil during the few days which he had been on the path than in all the days in which he had been in his first order.” Therefore, wrote Humbert, “the exercise of preaching is to be given preference to fasts and other exercises of bodily affliction, since it has these and heavy afflictions with it and beyond this much fruit for his neighbors.”242 Thus, the preacher’s way of life was intrinsically so full of want and hardship that it surpassed the self-imposed physical austerities of the monks and did not require further ascetic behaviors—that is, of course, assuming that the brothers followed all of the rules for travel laid out by Humbert later in the Libellus de eruditione, the Constitutions, and by Dominic’s example.243 In this way, purposeful ascetic practice was replaced by the incidental physical hardship endured in pursuit of the active vita apostolica. Thus, Humbert firmly sidelined the purposeful pursuit of physical discipline so central to Margaret of Ypres’ holiness, in favor of the prioritized and innately punishing preaching mission. Indeed Humbert most commonly associated this idea of preacher as personal exemplar not with bodily asceticism, but rather with the example of personal action to edify the Christian faithful. At several points in the chapter about why displaying a good example to men is necessary for the preacher, Humbert espoused

241 See above chapter 1, 47-8.
242 “Dixit quidam, qui de ordine Cisterciensi transierat ad Fratres Praedicatorum, quod plus mali sustinuerat quibusdam paucis diebus quibus fuerat in via, quam omnibus diebus quibus in ordine primo fuerat. Praeferendum est ideo praedicationis exercitium jejunis et alis afflictionis corporalis excitationibus, cum haec et afflictiones graves secum habeat, et ultra haec ad proximos fructum multum” in HoR, Liber, 4.XXI, 431.
243 HoR, Liber, 7.XLI, 468; Constitutiones angiue, II.34, 364-5; and, for Dominic’s vitae see chapter 1, 10-31.
the idea that the preacher “should live so that God is glorified not only in words but also in his examples” and act as a personal exemplar, like a picture, to reinforce his conversation. In addition, Humbert defined example as effective based upon the preacher’s goodness before God and then in front of others, so that the friar rendered himself so pleasing to his audience in virtue that his companion would be moved to conversion. The primary goal of such an example of holy behavior was the salvation of souls, since “it concerns preachers to example than through the word.” Thus, the preacher was to be a model of sanctity in his manner of conducting himself so as to leave behind a good reputation that itself would draw people toward God’s word, reflecting lay concerns with proper masculine public performance so as to maintain personal honor and the benefits accrued from it. Such a focus on teaching as an embodied practice as well as actual sermon stemmed from the traditions of the Augustinian canons in Dominic’s vita, which viewed the male religious as a constant vessel for divine example edifying his neighbors. The friar’s practice of virtue and piety was thus externalized for the benefit of his neighbors in an imitatio Christi, or imitation of the Apostles as Humbert saw it, not so that he could experience Christ’s suffering or develop a more affective relationship with the divine as was the goal in Margaret of Ypres’ pious practices and, as we will see, for other Dominican women. Thus, not only did Humbert’s vision of the preacher inherently define the Dominicans as men, appropriate performance of this office also gave the Dominicans status over non-preaching monks whose monastic calling did not include active efforts to save souls in the world, thus favorably placing them within a wider masculine hierarchy.

As we have seen the idea that a preacher’s main responsibility was the salvation of all Christian souls was fundamental to Humbert’s discussion of the preacher as a personal exemplar. Just as the Constitutions had encouraged Dominican regulators to assess a potential preaching candidate for his fervor of charity and

244 “Circa primum notandum est quod ad praedicatorum pertinet ut sic vivat quod non solum in verbis, sed etiam in exemplis ejus glorificetur Deus...” in HoR, Liber, 7.XXXV, 455 and 7.XXXVI, 458.


246 “Item, praedicatorum interest procurare salutem alliorum modis quibus possunt. Quandoque vero melius procuratur per bonam conversationem quam per verbum” in HoR, Liber, 7.XXXV, 455-6.

247 HoR, Liber, 7.XLI, 469 and above introduction, 11-14.


249 See pg. 58-9 above and below chapters 3 and 4.
proposed intention in seeking the office, Humbert also emphasized a zeal for souls as the primary motivation for preaching in his Liber eruditione. In the fourth section of the text, Humbert wrote that preaching was considered acceptable to God, since “preaching specifically proceeds from a zeal for souls” than which “no sacrificial offering is greater.” Likewise, Humbert compared preachers to hunters, “who hunt souls wild from every state of sin” so that “God can eat game of this type” and to starving dogs “who should wander here and there so that they can swallow souls into the Church’s body.” The preachers in both of these metaphors exhibit an aggressive, violent prowess in pursuing their vocational goal that included, as Humbert stated elsewhere, seeking spiritual goods rather than temporal ones, traveling around seeking souls, and procuring them through conversation and confession. The language of hunting, related to the literary traditions of “seizing,” was also utilized to portray a type of predatory masculinity in which a male lover hunts and captures a desired woman, often raping her, in medieval literature. Andreas Capellanus, for example, advised a man desiring a peasant woman not “to delay in taking what he seeks and capture her with a violent embrace” as soon as he found a suitable spot, while Méléagant in Chevalier de la Charette aggressively pursued Guenevere by using courtly language, challenging her protectors, and even abducting her. In addition, hunting itself was an important component of male courtly behavior that allowed the aristocratic male to demonstrate and hone his skill in the martial arts, to display his wealth, and to exercise his aristocratic largesse by hosting hunting parties for his peers and subordinates. Humbrt thus places the Dominican preacher’s preaching in the context of courtly masculine display. In fulfilling these duties, Humbert speculated that the very “charity that caused him to labor not only for himself but for others, would

---

250 “Item, praedicatio proprio procedit ex zelo animarum; unde praedicator egregius dicit, 2 ad Cor. 11: Aemulor vos Dei aemulatione, idest sancto zelo. Dicit Augustinus quod nullum est majus sacrificium Deo quam zelus animarum” in HoR, Liber, I,IV, 381.

251 “Quod ideo dicitur, secundum expositores Morales, quia praedicatorum de omni statu peccatorum venantur animas ferinas. Sicut autem nobiles libenter venationibus, ita Dominus hujusmodi feris” in Humbert of Romans, I,IV, 381 and “Praedicator igitur dicitur canis, et ideo sicut canis femelicus debet circuire huc et illuc, ut animas transglutiat in corpus Ecclesiae...” in Ibid., 2,XXI, 410.

252 HoR, Liber, 2.XI, 405; 7.XXXII, 452; 7.XXXIII, 454-5; 7.XXXV, 455-56;


254 Vale, The Princely Court, 183; Thibodeaux, “Man of the Church,” 393; and Vizcaino, Poder, 94.
increase more and more in him because of this.” In addition, successful preaching also resulted in the fruit of souls, a gift that “God loves beyond all others.” Thus, Humbert presented an ideal preacher who was compelled by a desire to convert his neighbors’ souls through an active, itinerant, and externalized ministry, through which the preacher made himself more useful to and thus beloved to God. This ministry directed at saving others contrasts sharply with the spiritual goal underlying Margaret of Ypres’ sanctity. While Margaret’s goal was achieving her own salvation through metaphorical imitatio Christi, an affective bond with Christ, and exculpation of sin—she was repeatedly depicted bitterly lamenting her own sins despite her near perfection and seeking to remove all trace of imperfection from her own body through physical asceticism, continual prayer, and other forms of penance—, the male ideal presented in Humbert’s text emphasized the friar’s primary responsibility in achieving the salvation of other people’s souls.

Indeed, Humbert repeatedly called attention to the way in which a friar’s personal salvation was intimately intertwined with the process of leading the souls of those around him toward God, telling the brothers that they would receive personal absolution from sin, many gifts of virtues, and an increased chance for personal salvation through the task of preaching. For example, he defined the Dominican way of life as superior to the Cistercian one in the example quoted above, based on the fact that the friar saved the souls of others and not just his own through his self-depriving ministry. Similarly, in a somewhat strange analogy borrowed from the Glossa Ordinaria, Humbert compared the preacher to a crow who flew into a hen’s nest and begged for food. On account of this discernment, God gave a larger amount to this crow with the justification that “he gained a greater share not only for his sake, but also on account of those whom he nourished.” Thus, in language familiar to descriptions of mature masculine status throughout late medieval society, Humbert presented the preacher as a type of patriarch who had to earn divine blessings and

---

255 “Probabile enim est quod charitas quae facit eum non solum circa se, sed circa alios laborare, ex hoc plus et plus augeatur in eo. Illa autem augmentata, necesse est praemium substantiale augeri” in HoR, Liber, 1.V, 388.

256 “Item, qui volunt placere magnatis, solent facere eis encaenia de rebus quas multum diligunt, sicut de primis fructibus, vel piscibus nobilibus, et similibus. Illud autem quod summe diligit Dominus sunt animae” in HoR, Liber, 1.IV, 382.

257 See, for example, Margaret’s excessive worry over her own sin and her attempts to compensate in ToC, Vita Margarete, chap. 4, 108; chap. 11, 111; chap. 19, 116; and chap. 20, 116-117.


259 Corvus est praedicator, a quo vagientes in nido pulli aperto ore cibum expectant. Pro hac discretione largior copia ipsi corvo a Deo datur: non solum enim pro se, sed etiam pro eis quos nutrit, maiora percipit” in HoR, Liber, 2.XIII, 409.
knowledge rather than money in order to support those dependent upon him, a group that theoretically encompassed all Christians. In Humbert’s vision, the preacher’s efforts for his own salvation, through extirpating personal sin and successfully competing for God’s grace, were only the first step in his vocation, the basis on which he successfully constructed his mission for saving the souls of others through preaching, not an end in itself. A friar has not entirely fulfilled his mission, Humbert’s text implied, unless he has worked for the benefit of his neighbor through preaching.

Also inherent in this bipartite process is the idea of the preacher working in the world outside of the convent on God’s behalf, a task that Humbert often described using militaristic images in which the Dominican friar battled the Devil in God’s service. For example, he labeled the preachers as Christ’s soldiers, beloved by their king, “who fight the enemy, subjugate the people to him and obey him in all things” as well as soldiers spreading penitence while traveling the world. Furthermore, Humbert gave the preachers a defined enemy to battle, the Devil, whose perniciousness and trickery was causing Hell to fill up with ignorant souls, preventing preaching from taking place, and making efforts to preach fruitless. Fighting like Michael’s angels against “the ancient serpent,” these heroized and active preachers keep the Devil from invading God’s house like an eagle, seize his prey from his teeth, and put the diabolical army to flight.

Articulating this vision most concisely in a section about the necessity of preaching, Humbert wrote, “demons have expended great effort for a long time into subjugating the entire world for themselves and they have subjugated a large part and they would have subjugated more if the preachers had not stood against them by

---

260 See above introduction, 14-15.
261 “Glossa: Hic equi nomine sanctus praedicator accipitur. Nam praedicator ante fortitudinem accipit vitia in se extinguendo; et pro audiendiis alis ad vocem praedicationis venit” in HoR, Liber, 2.XIII, 410.
262 “Isti etiam sicut fideles milites ad imperium ejus vadunt et veniunt, ei per omnia obedientes, sicut milites centurionis ad jussum ejus vadunt et veniunt…Vere amabiles et amandi a rege suo sunt milites tales, qui hostes debellant, populos sibi subjugant, et ei per omnia obedienti” in HoR, Liber, 1.IV, 380-1 and 7.XXXI, 451.
263 HoR, Liber, 1.II, 377; 5.XXII, 434-5; and 6.XXV, 439.
264 HoR, Liber, 1.V, 389; 5.XXIV, 437; and 6.XXVIII, 444-5.
means of the virtue divinely given to them.”

Thus, by using references scattered throughout the Liber de eruditione, Humbert created an eschatological vision for the Order’s preachers that gave them an imperative role in protecting the Christian faithful from the Devil’s onslaught, lending the vision a particularly masculinized and heroic flavor through the regular use of militaristic imagery. While related to the vision in the Vitae fratrum where Mary convinced Jesus to send the Dominicans and Franciscans for one last attempt at converting the world before the final destruction, this vision nonetheless gave the Dominican preacher, not his praying or studying brethren, a pivotal and masculine mission.

Humbert’s text on preaching made it abundantly clear that he considered this activity to be the ultimate expression of the Dominican vocation, superior to the callings of other, non-preaching religious orders and the aim of all of the friar’s other activities. Despite their individual preferences and levels of divine endowment, all friars were actively discouraged from extensive dedication to any contemplation or study that was not directly in the service of their preaching, incidentally the vocational option—along with its prerequisite study—exclusively available to men. In addition to the inherent gender exclusivity of the office, Humbert’s discussion also encouraged the brothers to adopt appearances and behaviors that would augment their masculine authority and contribute to the successful performance of this role by appealing to late medieval ideals of patriarchal behavior, governance, and performance in the public sphere, literary representations of male aggression, militaristic analogies, as well as the concept of the “true man.” The entirety of the preacher’s identity in Humbert’s text, defined by the goal of defending the world from demonic influences, nourishing Christian souls, and confirming their loyalty to God, in fact placed the preacher in an ideological position of patriarchal authority over his audience, thus endowing him with the personal authority necessary for the successful exercise of his vocation. Humbert’s understanding of the preaching mission thus invested the office with masculinized social currency that paralleled more secular norms of illustrious men.

---

265 “Item, daemones apposuerunt magnam diligentiam a longo tempore ad subjugandum sibi mundum totum, et multam partem illius subjugaverunt; et plus subjugassent, nisi praedicatores eis restitissent virtute divinitus sibi data.” HoR, Liber, 1.3, 377.

266 GoF, Vitae, 1.II, 6-7.
Conclusion: Self-Definition and Hierarchy in the *Vitae Fratrum* and *Liber de eruditione praedicatorum*

The collective vision for the Dominican vocation portrayed by Gerard of Frachet and Humbert of Romans in the *Vitae fratrum* and *Liber de eruditione praedicatorum* contained a clearly delineated hierarchy within the Order, one that was masculine in nature, along which these seminal Dominican writers encouraged the brothers to progress. At the foundational level was the brethren's conventual religious practice instilled into the Order’s novices at the command of the Constitutions and largely consisting of self-discipline, obedience, humility, and prayer. Although such behaviors had traditionally appeared in the *vitae* of both male and female saints, Gerard masculinized them by emphasizing moderation in the cultivation of personal virtue and the functionality of these practices in relation to the brothers’ higher mission. Whereas Gerard’s text hinted at the relationship between the cultivation of personal virtue and the Order’s ultimate vocation, Humbert of Romans explicitly expanded upon this link by repeatedly emphasizing the fundamental importance of virtuous conduct to successful preaching and thus created a “practice what you preach” mantra for the Order’s members. While these behaviors had formed the bedrock of Margaret of Ypres’ sanctity by allowing her to form a highly affective relationship with the divine, two of the Order’s early prescriptive texts firmly harnessed them to the preaching mission. Both Humbert and Gerard placed academic study, including meditation on this information, within the second level of the Order’s hierarchy seeing it as more intrinsically masculine since it excluded women entirely. In addition to this inherently gendered perspective, both texts discussed basic study as foundational to the preaching mission, forbidding the brothers to forgo study in favor of personal religious practice, to study things not directly useful for preaching, and to fail to utilize this knowledge by preaching. Although the association made between personal piety and study on the one hand and preaching on the other lacks an immediately apparent association with maleness, the discussion of the preaching mission in both texts makes the gendered implications of such an association clear. This is because both Humbert and Gerard present the preaching mission as the apex of the Order’s hierarchy that was based on secular ideals of masculinity, required personal authority restricted to the male body, and involved masculine performance in the public realm. It was toward this ideal that all of the friars were to aspire as they waded through the preparatory work of the preceding levels and slowly accumulated the level of masculine authority necessary to fulfill the Order’s mission.
Thus, the Dominican hierarchy outlined in these two seminal texts was a fundamentally masculine one which reflected secular ideals of male behavior and provided an arena for gendered competition and achievement between the friars.\textsuperscript{267} While all of the friars theoretically worked to achieve the salvation of all souls—itself a masculinized goal absent from the \textit{vita Margaretae}—the achievement of this goal was a fundamentally masculine competition in which some brothers were more successful than others. Even the preaching office itself consisted of a hierarchy, with two levels of official preachers. At the first level were the \textit{predicatores communes}, who had to have a year of theological training and pass an assessment by their superiors before being allowed to preach within a limited geographic range surrounding the convent.\textsuperscript{268} More specialized than the \textit{predicator communis} was the \textit{predicator generalis}, who received permission to travel “everywhere,” was required to attend the provincial chapter and other important legislative assemblies, worked to enforce provincial regulations in the province, carried a special seal, and often gained personal renown.\textsuperscript{269} The Constitutions required a friar to have three years of theological training before being licensed as a \textit{predicator generalis}, and the General Chapter of 1246 further specified that they were to be “mature and discreet in going about the Order’s business in the chapters.”\textsuperscript{270} Thus, appointment as a preacher general required the friar to have been inculcated in Dominican \textit{praxis} and theological understanding for a longer period of time.\textsuperscript{271} Thus, at a very fundamental level successful preaching abilities meant actual and ideological power within the Order, a power specifically gendered masculine, and earned by advancement in study. Given this authority and the confluence of the Dominican preaching ideal with secular ideals of masculine behavior, it is perhaps no surprise that many medieval Dominicans sought to preach outside of their jurisdictions or without license from the proper channels. The General and Provincial chapters repeatedly attempted to address the problem of too many or unsuitable preachers.\textsuperscript{272} In 1255, for example,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{267} On the importance of masculine performance within a hierarchy see Brittan, \textit{Masculinity and Karras, From Boys}; and above introduction, 11-14.
\item \textsuperscript{268} \textit{Constitutiones antiques}, II.31, 363.
\item \textsuperscript{270} “Statuimus ut nullus fiat predicator generalis antequam theologiam audierit per tres annos addatur et nisi sit maturus et discretus ad negotia ordinis in capitulis pertractanda,” in \textit{ACG} I (1249), 46
\item \textsuperscript{271} \textit{Constitutiones antiques}, II.31, 363 and Mulchahey, ‘First,’ 46
\item \textsuperscript{272} \textit{ACGI}:15 (1240); 19 (1241); 51 (1250); 57 (1251); 187 (1276); 309-10 (1301); \textit{ACGI}: 169-70 (1327); 245 (1337); and 349 (1353); as well as \textit{ACPPR} 5 (1246).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
the General Chapter forbade the provincial priors and diffinitors of the provincial chapter from appointing
more preacher generals where there were more of them than convents or centers, while the Roman Provincial
Chapter ordered that “brothers were not to be licensed for solemn preaching as in Rome, Florence, Pisa, and
in other places, until it has been otherwise ordered by the master and diffinitors of the general chapter.273
Thus, the hierarchical arrangement for male study and preaching over conventual life depicted in Gerard and
Humbert’s writing reflected the Order’s actual structure of educational and preaching specialization and
provided an actual and ideological method of expressing masculine performance as a friar.

273 “Inhibemus prioribus provincialibus et diffinitoribus capitulorum provincialium ne in provinciis ubi tot sunt
predicatores generales, quot conventus, et medietas amplius plures ad dictum officium assumant, donec per magistrum
et diffinitores capituli generalis vel aliiu fuerit dispensatum vel ordinatum” in ACG I: 77 (1255) and “volumus quod ad
predicationes solemnes, sicut Rome, Florentie, Pisis et in alis locis, nec passim licentientur fratres nisi famosi et probati
predicatores, de quorum predicationibus scandalum non timeatur et qui libenter a populo audiantur” in ACPPR 11
(1251).
Chapter 3. The Dominican 007s: Saintly Models of Dominican Masculinity

If the Dominican hagiographic, normative, and prescriptive texts studied thus far focused on developing a coherent and internalized sense of identity for the Order’s members, the hagiographic representations of the Order’s second and third canonized saints provided a more multifaceted source of information about the Order’s identity and mission. As with other saints, Peter Martyr and Thomas Aquinas were spiritual ideals for the entire Church, occupying an elite caste of intercessory figures toward which the Christian faithful could direct their prayers and whom a few hardy souls could strive to imitate. Thus their particular brand of holiness reflected a myriad of expectations for saintliness that included an evolving papal, cultic, and more general lay expectations. However, the hagiographic representations solidifying the legacies of these saints were also deeply rooted in specifically Dominican understandings of idealized behavior as presented in Dominic’s *vitae*, the *Vitae fratrum*, Dominican Constitution, and Humbert’s treatise on preaching, that had been internally developed from the Order’s beginnings and eventually influenced the wider Church. Indeed, the canonization of these saints and the subsequent promotion of their cult as officially presented in their hagiographic image essentially functioned as an official publication of this internally developed Dominican ideal throughout Christendom. Thus, despite the theoretically universal nature of the saintly ideals presented in the *vitae* of Peter Martyr and Thomas Aquinas, these hagiographic representations also provided a more specialized call to emulation for the Dominican friars themselves as examples of those brothers who had reached the apex of the Order’s hierarchy. Indeed, the later general masters regularly held up these saints as exemplars for the Order’s friars in their yearly encyclical letters, encouraging the brothers to imitate their holy predecessors, as did Pope Benedict XI, formerly a Dominican master general, who encouraged the brothers gathered at the General Chapter of 1304 to “be faithful imitators” and “not degenerate sons” of their saintly predecessors.1 Benedict also gave money toward the development of Peter’s tomb in his short tenure as pope.2 In addition, both Peter and Thomas played a prominent role in Dominican liturgical, historiographic, and artistic life, and thus in the friars’ fundamental sense of self.3 The regularity

---

1 *Litterae encyclicae*, XL (1289), 141 & XCIII (1350), 288-90 and *BOP II*:93 (March 10, 1304). See also *Litterae encyclicae* VII (1255), 19-20; VIII (1256), 38; XI (1290), 145-6; and LXXVI (1324), 238-9
3 See below pgs. 141-2 and 170-1.
with which the annual general chapters called for liturgical remodelings of the saints’ offices “since the
examples of our holy fathers provoke us toward better things” and for the collection of additional information
about them, which “provokes and inflames the brothers reading them toward a fervor of devotion”
demonstrates that the Order’s leaders intended these saints to function as a focus for admiration and
imitation in the Order. Thus, while the texts studied in previous chapters reflected a process of largely
internalized self-definition and establishment of normative practice, the figures of Peter Martyr and Thomas
Aquinas represented both the pinnacle of this process and the distillation of the themes introduced in earlier
texts as well as the achievement of external approval for this sanctified Dominican identity and its wholesale
dissemination.

While their very status as canonized saints made them models for all the faithful and their Dominican
roots made them a specifically Dominican model, the *vitae* of Peter Martyr and Thomas Aquinas also provided
particularly masculine models for emulation by the Order’s friars. In the first place, their primary pillars of
sanctity—anti-heretical activity, preaching, and academic achievement—were all activities encouraged for the
friars in other normative Dominican texts and whose literal emulation was a fundamentally male prerogative.
In addition to these inherently masculine activities, the hagiographers of these saints also built upon
behavioral ideals gendered male by earlier Dominican writers, both distilling and developing these themes in
their hagiographic models, as well as making use of common hagiographic tropes and secular ideals of
masculinity in the creation of their saintly models, as we will see below. As with Gerard’s text, however, a
comparison to a Dominican female hagiographic text will throw the masculinized nature of Peter and Thomas’
lives into sharp relief. The closest female equivalents to the official hagiographic texts provided for Peter and
Thomas are Margaret of Ypres, also discussed in chapter two, and the Dominican nun Margaret of Hungary (d.
1271), a Hungarian princess who was widely venerated as a saint in both Hungary and Italy immediately
following her death.

---

4 “Cum exempla sanctorum patrum nostrorum ad meliorem nos provocet, volumus et ordinamus, quod hoc anno in singulis
provinciarum capitulis priores provinciarum cum suis diffinitoribus frates ad hoc ydoneos de suis provinciis deputent,
qui miracula sanctorum patrum nostrorum, videlicet beatorum Dominici confessoris patris nostri, Petri martyris et
Thome confessoris in suis provinciis facte et non habite communiter in ordine, necnon et vitas et miracula ceterorum
fratrum nostri ordinis, qui nunc clarent et ab olim miraulis claruerunt, diligenter perquirant et conscribant et mittant ad
sequens capitulum generale, ut de talibus conscribant valorant liberi, qui ad fervorem devocionis frates in ea legentes
provocet et inflammet” *AGC* II: 223-4 (1334).

5 On Margaret of Ypres’ life and *vita* see above chapter 2, 6-7.
and fourteenth centuries, Margaret of Hungary was nonetheless a popular figure, the object of two separate canonization proceedings which formed the basis of her subsequent *vita*, and was promoted among the Dominicans, especially in Italy. That she was highly venerated by the entire Dominican Order is demonstrated by the most widely dispersed Latin version of her *vita*, the so-called *Legenda Maior* that was based upon the findings of both canonization proceedings and composed by Garin de Gy-L’Éveque before he became master-general in 1340, perhaps in response to the call made by the General Chapter of 1334 for collection of further information on the Order’s male saints. Although Margaret of Hungary was not officially a saint in the later medieval period, Garin Gy-L’Éveque’s *vita* about her was prepared from texts aimed at achieving canonization and thus also reflected the priorities and expectations of both Peter and Thomas’ hagiographers. That Margaret of Hungary’s *vita* was composed after the Dominican male hagiographic texts provides a unique window into Guy’s approach to shaping a particularly feminine piety for the Dominican nuns within the context of a relatively established Dominican masculine hagiographic tradition. Although it would be impossible to label either Margaret’s *vita* as specifically Dominican, both nonetheless provide feminine foils for the Dominican ideal of male sanctity, the main focus of Dominican identity formation, as articulated in the Order’s male hagiographic texts. However, since scholars have devoted much more attention to female sanctity in general and have produced detailed studies about the *vita* of both Margarets, this chapter will not look at either life individually, but will intersperse pertinent examples from them into the discussion of the Order’s holy men, the focus of the present study. Thus, the life of Margaret of Ypres will

---


7 *ACG*, II: 223-4 (1334). On the connection between this command and Margaret’s *vita* as well as a description of the four remaining manuscripts, see Deák, “Birth,” 92-100.

serve as a point of comparison for the *vita Petri Martyris*, while that of Margaret of Hungary will serve the same role for the life of Thomas Aquinas.

**Peter Martyr: “Fighter for the Faith”**

Although we have already met Peter Martyr in Gerard of Frachet’s text, where he dominated the portion of the fifth chapter dealing with martyrdom, Peter’s immense importance in shaping the identity, mission, and reputation of the Order both internally and externally make him a figure worth revisiting.\(^9\) The historical Peter of Verona was the son of Patarine heretics in Italy who grew up to become a charismatic Dominican preacher in the area surrounding Milan. Pope Innocent IV, who responded to Frederick II’s death and subsequent upheaval in Italy by promoting inquisitorial proceedings and papal authority in the region, appointed Peter as inquisitor in Cremona in 1251, in which position he was assassinated less than a year later as a result of a plot by some local heretical nobles. Peter was such a beloved preacher that a popular uproar followed the news of his death and when the pope heard of the many miracles performed by the saint, both during his life and after his death, he responded by canonizing the new martyr only eleven months after he had died.\(^10\) As the Order’s second and most popular saint, he played a central role in firmly rooting inquisitorial activity as a cornerstone of Dominican identity in the eyes of contemporaries, eventually becoming the patron saint of inquisitors.\(^11\) His importance to the internal identity formation and edification of the Order is apparent in the zeal with which the Dominicans embraced his cult, quickly placing him on par with Dominic in their devotional lives. In Humbert of Romans’ standardized liturgy, Peter received the privileged status of *totum duplex* and the General Chapter twice commanded, in both 1254 and 1256, that the “priors and other brothers take diligent care that the names of the blessed Dominic and Peter Martyr be inscribed in the calendars and litanies and that depictions of them be executed in the churches and that their

---

\(^9\) See above, 112-117.

\(^10\) For a complete summary of Peter’s life, death, and canonization, see Prudlo, *Martyred*, 13-96 and Caldwell, “Peter,” 139-41. For the bull appointing Peter to this position, see *Misericors et miserator* in BOP I: 192 (July 13, 1251).

\(^11\) Caldwell, “Peter,” 147.
feasts be celebrated.”12 In addition, the office composed for Peter was a special rhythmic office, whose parts were metrical, rhythmic, or rhymed, a distinction reserved for only four of the Dominican offices and perhaps designed to help aid the friars in remembering the liturgical lesson.13 Indeed, the General Chapters continued to make changes to Peter’s office—forbidding the brothers from working on his feast day, adding daily commemoration of the saint twice daily, and requiring a Solemn Mass twice a month—and continued to solicit further miracles about the saint well into the 14th century.14 Outside of the liturgy, the brothers would have encountered Peter in Gerard of Frachet’s Vitae fratrum as novices, in depictions of the saint in the Order’s convents, and perhaps would have visited the martyr’s elaborate and well-maintained tomb in Milan.15 The saint also functioned as an important rallying point for the brothers during a period in which the Order faced challenges from the papacy, including Innocent IV himself, as well as the Parisian masters.16 In two of his encyclical letters to the Order, for example, Humbert of Romans exhorted the brothers to remember how the Lord had rewarded them for their suffering, first through Peter’s canonization in response to papal persecution of the Order and then through the great celebration accompanying the translation of his remains to Paris, a “war-torn” city tarnished by the struggle between the secular masters and the Dominicans.17

While Peter’s cameo in the Vitae fratrum represented the Dominicans’ initial attempt to harness the saint’s intense charisma and popularity for the internal edification of an Order still immersed in various struggles with the university and the papacy, it was Thomas Agni of Lentino’s vita Petri written about twenty years after Peter’s death and canonization that became the martyr’s official hagiographic text within the

12 “Priores et alii fratres, curam habeant diligentem quod nomen beati Dominic et beati Petri martiris in calendariis et in litaniiis scribantur et picture fiant in ecclesiis et quod fiant festa eorum” ACG I: 70 (1254). This order was repeated in ACG I: 81 (1256) and Bonniwell, A History, 29, 85, 90, 237-8. See also, Prudlo, Martyred, 91 and Ames, Righteous, 64. Although both men were officially canonized at this point, it wasn’t until the 14th century that strong distinctions were made in vocabulary between “sancti” and “beati”. For Dominicans, the crucial difference was that the “sancti” had their own liturgy. See Vauchez, Sainthood, 85-103. Regarding the totum duplex status of the feast, see ACG I: 71 (1254) and II: 321 (1348).
13 Bonniwell, History, 232, ff. 20.
14 For official liturgical changes to Peter’s office, see ACG I: 124 (1264); 127 and 129 (1265); 32 (1266); 256 (1290); ACG II: 123 (1317); 107 (1318); 114 (1319); and 120 (1320). On the Chapter’s call for more miracles about Peter, see ACG I: 252 (1289); ACG II:72 (1314); and 223-4 (1334). See a limited description of these changes in Bonniwell, History, 249.
15 For evidence of construction on Peter’s tomb, see ACG I: 286 (1297) and ACG II: 233 (1335).
16 Mulchahey, ‘First,’ 103 and Van Engen, “Dominic”, 14-16; and Hinnebusch, History, II: 71-77.
17 In his second encyclical letter as Master General, Humbert commands the brothers to “magnifice gracias agite domino deo nostro, qui secundum magnum misericordiam suam de magnis nuper periculos ordinem liberavit et in curia summii pontificis ipsius ordinis negotia prosperari” and goes on to describe how the Lord worked many miracles in Milan following the death of Peter Martyr; in Litterae encycliae, V, pg. 20. In a letter a year later, Humbert describes the pomp that accompanied Peter Marytr’s remains in Paris where the brothers had been undergoing immense persecution Litterae encycliae, VIIb, pg. 41.
Order. In 1276, the General Chapter ordered all Dominican convents to obtain a copy of *legenda beati Petri martiris* "by the venerable patriarch of Jerusalem completed at the request of the Master of the Order" and that the "provincial priors should be diligent about this" and the twelve remaining manuscript copies from between 1350 and 1400 indicate that this request was carried out. Thomas Agni’s important position in the Order and the General Chapter’s desire to widely disseminate this particular text within the Order make this *vita* is an important source of conscious external and internal Dominican identity formation at a pivotal period of the Order’s development. Thomas Agni also seemed to have a more intimate connection to the saint himself as he was present at the Roman Provincial Chapter in 1253, the year after the saint’s canonization, when the chapter ordered all of the brothers to write Peter and Dominic’s feast days in the calendars of all the areas they visited and was appointed the provincial prior’s companion for the General Chapter of that year. Thomas would thus have personally experienced the impact of Peter’s death on the region as well as its implication for the individual friar and the Order as a whole. Unlike Dominic’s *vitae* or Gerard of Frachet’s text, however, which were largely written for purposes of internal edification, Peter’s prominence outside of the Order made his official *vita* much more structured by canonization proceedings, which increasingly fell under papal jurisdiction and required a written summary of the saint’s life. Thus, while Dominic’s canonization bull contained only a brief and general survey of his saintly virtues, Pope Innocent IV’s canonization bull *Magnis et crebris* contained a more elaborate *vita Petri*, which formed the bedrock on which all subsequent lives were built, including Gerard of Frachet’s and Thomas Agni’s texts, and even the Dominican liturgical office for the saint. Both of these texts thus reflect papal objectives to some

---


19 Thomas Agni’s *vita sancti Petri* exists in printed form as part of a 16th century hagiographic compilation of the various legends of the saint written by the Dominican Ambrose Taegio at the convent in Milan. It is this life that was published by the Bollandists in *ASS* April 29, pg. 679-719. Both Dondaine and Prudlo have include indication of the internal subdivision of Taegio’s text, based upon manuscript study and it is from these designations that I will “remove” Thomas Agni’s text from Taegio’s compilation. See Dondaine, “S. Pierre,” 134 and Prudlo, *Martyred*, appendix B, 200-262. A far more popular *vita* of the saint appeared in Voragine’s *Golden Legend*, one of the bestsellers of the age, but there is evidence that the Order was dissatisfied with this text and, regardless, it was Agni’s text, which borrowed from both the *Vitae fratrum* and the *Legenda aurea*, that became the official hagiographic text within the Order. Ames, 64, ff. 27.

extent, although, as we have seen with Gerard’s portrayal of the saint, the hagiographer was free to present the material in whatever way best suited the purpose of his text. Both Gerard and Thomas expanded greatly upon this foundation in response to a myriad of pious and practical concerns, successively crafting Peter’s image into a figure that the General Council of 1276 deemed appropriate for widespread use within the Order. Finally, the large popular following that Peter’s preaching had attracted also influenced the rapidity of Peter’s canonization and the brand of sanctity that he demonstrated. Since the initial push for Peter’s canonization in fact came from the secular clergy and the laity, popular veneration played an important role in verifying Peter’s thaumaturgical powers as did support from the ruling elite who had relied upon Peter to help them combat the Ghibelline threat by associating it with heresy.

Peter’s life, then, marks a shift in Dominican hagiographic output from texts largely aimed at internal edification and identity formation to vitae that also functioned to establish the Dominican mission within the wider church and general public.

While both Gerard of Frachet’s and Thomas Agni of Lentino’s depictions of Peter Martyr were deeply rooted in the structure provided by Innocent IV’s bull of canonization, both authors elaborated on this outline in specific ways. As we have seen, Gerard presented Peter as the primary model of the masculine Dominican ideal of inquisitorial activity, an ideal that had received only limited attention in the rest of the text as it was indeed a fairly nascent element of Dominican activity at the time of Peter’s death. Thus, while Gerard emphasized Peter as the culmination of the Dominican ideal of masculine anti-heretical activity by elaborating on the stories of the saint’s debates with various heretics, his examination of a heretical bishop, and his

22 Goodich has argued that papal objectives in supporting anti-heretical activity dominated Peter’s canonization process and hence accounted for his sanctity in “The Politics of Canonization in the Thirteenth Century: Lay and Mendicant Saints,” Church History 44.3 (1975): 307. Because of Innocent IV’s repeated letters from the second half of the thirteenth century concerning the proper implementation of Dominican saints in the universal church, Prudlo in Marytred, 85 claims that, “Peter’s cult represents one of the first examples of direct and repeated papal intervention in fostering veneration” as papal canonization was still quite novel. André Vauchez even goes so far as to claim that the Dominicans had practically no interest in their cult of saints until the Holy See pushed for the acceptance of Dominic and Peter’s cults throughout Europe in Sainthood, 119-120. After Gerard’s initial hagiographic representation of the saint, Jacob of Voragine included Peter in his extremely popular Legenda aurea and these two texts, along with the bull of canonization, were the sources for Thomas’ life. However, the Dominicans in general were dissatisfied with this text and, regardless, accepted Thomas’ vita for official purposes. For that reason, I will be excluding a close study of Voragine’s text. See Dondaine, “S. Pierre,” 119-21 and Ames, Righteous, 64 ff. 27.

23 On Peter’s following see Prudlo, Martyred, 77-9 and Daniel Lesnick, Preaching in Medieval Florence: The Social World of Franciscan and Dominican Spirituality (London: University of Georgia Press, 1989), 84. This lay involvement in a canonization process supports Kleinberg’s assessment that canonization involved papal approval or denial of a claim of sanctity that already existed, through the report of a person’s fama, and that this fama was necessary for a successful claim to sanctity since a pope could only suggest that an individual deserved veneration, but not create it where the faithful were in disagreement. See Aviad Kleinberg, “Proving Sanctity: Problems and Solutions in the Later Middle Ages,” Viator 20 (1989):192.
expectation of martyrdom, he was limited in the extent to which he did so by the very originality of Peter’s calling—most friars were not inquisitors, but rather focused on preaching, teaching, and pastoral care—and some hesitation in the Order regarding implementation of such a controversial, dangerous, and papally sponsored mission. The Provincial of Toulouse, for example, wrote to Pope Innocent IV in 1242 asking that the Dominicans in the area be released from inquisitorial responsibilities after the murder of three of its friars by Cathars, while Dominican inquisitors in Burgundy and Lorraine likewise requested papal absolution from this office due to exhaustion and poor funding. Writing nearly 25 years later, Thomas Agni existed in a milieu where inquisitorial activity was an increasingly accepted reality of the Dominican vocation, one which Dominican writers worked to incorporate into the Order’s overall mission to save souls. Perhaps Thomas wanted to contribute to this process by providing an expanded version of Peter’s life in addition to responding to the General Chapter’s general promotion of Peter’s cult within the Order through the late 1260’s.

Regardless of his motives, Thomas Agni’s presentation of the saint strongly emphasized his heroic virilitas, utilizing strong language, employing masculinized imagery, and either downplaying or masculinizing aspects of Peter’s life that did not fit with this militaristic heroic model, such as asceticism and study, firmly subordinating them to Peter’s preaching and anti-heretical activities.

Thomas quickly established his intended presentation of the saint as a heroic fighter focused solely on saving souls by whatever possible method in the second prologue to the legenda beati Petri, where he wrote,

...hearsers and spectators of such virtue will marvel, as in a darkened glass, at the new soldier following the King’s footsteps with triumphant evidence. While thus stained with blood and called both victorious in his bloody clothing and fruitful in the grace of doctrine through which he carried a large cohort of faithful with him to the Lord, like sheaves of his wheat, he either converted those in error to the faith, or transported those in fault toward justice, or led the worldly ones to Religion. These are the triumphant indications of the new fighter, to be admired by all ages and unheard of since ancient times, that is, he ascended crowned with the Triple Crown, namely, the crown of Martyrdom, because of his effusion of blood for Christ’s faith; of Virginity, because of his undiminished cleanliness of mind and body; and of Preachers, because of his dissemination of salvific wisdom through which he converted many to the path of salvation. These are the

24 Ames, Righteous, 5.
25 For the papal bull denying the 1242 request see Innocent IV’s Inter alia in BOP I: 118 (July 10, 1243) and Mortier, Histoire, I:356-71 for a summary of events. Alexander IV granted the Dominicans’ request in 1255, however; in BOP I: 286.
26 For an excellent study of this process, see Ames, Righteous.
indications at which heaven marvels, which the world veneratest, and which the army of infernal demons and heretics fears, just as the various and amazing miracles made known...\textsuperscript{27}

Thomas thus set a militaristic, heroic, and violent tone for his \textit{vita Petri}, emphasizing the saint’s multifaceted approach toward the Order’s mission of saving souls, which included converting those in error or leading heretics to the Lord’s judgement, likely administered by secular authorities, through salvic doctrine and personal bloodshed. The image of a darkened glass comes from 1 Corinthians and was commonly used in hagiographic texts, such as the life of Herman Joseph, to describe the distance between humanity and the divine. While saints such as Herman Joseph saw themselves on the human side of the glass until granted mystical union with God, Thomas Agni placed Peter on the divine side of this darkened glass perhaps as a marker of the saint’s superhuman and heroic position.\textsuperscript{28} Thomas’ description also touts the inquisitorial office by honoring Peter’s ability to convert or punish sinful and heretical Christians and further espouses Dominican propaganda depicting Peter as a super saint who wore the rare “Triple Crown” and thus embodied several heroically masculine ideals.\textsuperscript{29} It is Peter’s blood, however, and his willingness to shed it for his beliefs that most clearly paralleled lay masculine military, literary, and feuding ideals. Whatever their emphasis on the ideology of chivalry, the bloody violence of the knightly vocation remained the heart of the literary heroic ideal, proof of masculine prowess. Writers thus described grass smeared with blood, swords and shields covered in blood, bloody footsteps, and banners soaked in blood as signs of individual prowess and successful battle.\textsuperscript{30} In addition, Peter’s bloody clothing would have functioned as a powerful reminder to his supporters and fellow Dominicans of the blood debt that they owed to the killers, who had deeply dishonored Peter and his cohorts, by the deeply rooted standards of vendetta culture. By holding up the macabre textual specter of

\textsuperscript{27} “…mirentur auditores etspectatores tantaevirtutis, velutper speculum in aenigmatam, novum militem cum triumphalibus indiciisdregistugestia prosequentem; dum sic crure tinctus et victoriosus descriptur in veste sanguinea, sic fructuosus doctrinae gratia, per quam magnam comitivam Fidelium, quasi seminis suis manipulos, secum tulit ad Dominum, sive quos de errore ad fidem convertit, sive de culpa in justitiam transtulit, sive de mundo ad Religionem adduxit. Hae sunt triumphalia indicia novi pugilis, omnibus seculis admiranda et ab antiquis seculis inaudita, ut sic triplici laurea laureatus ascendat, Martyrum videlicet, in effusione sanguinis pro fide Christi; Virginum, in illibata munditia mentis et corporis; et Praedicatorum, in disseminatione sapientiae salutaris, per quam multos convertit in viam salutis. Hae sunt, quae miratur coelum, veneratur mundus, et expavescit infernalis daemonium et haereticorum exercitus, sicut ex variis et mirandis miraculis innotescit...” Taol, \textit{Vita}, prologue 2, pg. 694.


\textsuperscript{29} For a discussion of the promotion of Peter’s Triple Crown status in many different areas of Dominican production see Prudlo, \textit{Martyred}, 109-119. The Dominicans also somewhat controversially presented Peter as the anti-Francis in their sermon material, claiming that Peter’s martyrdom trumped Francis’ stigmata. \textit{Ibid.}, 122-4.

\textsuperscript{30} Kaeuper, \textit{Chivalry}, 147-8 and above chapter 2, 50.
bloody clothing in the prologue to Peter's *vita*, Thomas functioned much in the same way as the Montenegrin mother described by Boehm who repeatedly showed a container of her murdered husband's blood to her young sons to remind them, as they matured, that they had to take the blood owed to their household or forever remain in a state of dishonor.\(^{31}\) Peter's heroic death then, was meant to inspire the brothers toward further inquisitorial activity. The epic quality of Thomas' prologue to Peter's life is especially apparent when compared to the opening reading of the saint's office, adapted from Innocent's canonization bull by Humbert of Romans and acting as a source for Thomas, which read, "Saint Peter, Lombard in origin, from the Order of Brothers Preachers, in that very Order for almost thirty years, supported by a troop of virtues he made such progress in the very defense of the faith for which he was especially eager that, engaging in continual battle against its dire enemies with a fervent spirit, he completed his long lasting battle eventually and happily with victorious martyrdom conquering."\(^{32}\) Thus, Thomas' prologue expanded upon the militaristic imagery of Humbert's office by using language more evocative of militaristic, epic, and vendetta traditions, while still emphasizing the saint's zeal for souls, anti-heretical stance, and eventual martyrdom.

Although it is the more obviously militaristic aspects of Peter's life that appear in the prologue, Thomas Agni's *vita* also reflected the other aspects of Peter's life present in the bull of canonization and Humbert of Romans' office. In fact, many of the stories that Thomas added to Peter's *vita* that were not present in Gerard of Frachet's version revolve around the saint's ascetic practice, both self-mortification and maintenance of chastity. As with the other Dominican authors discussed thus far, Thomas presented Peter's ascetic practice as a transitional phase between the novitiate and the mature Dominican preacher, using it as a way of proving Peter’s "heroic virtue" in consensus with evolving papal canonization requirements within Thomas's text.\(^{33}\) The only story in Thomas' *legenda* dealing with self-mortification occurs in the fourth chapter, when Thomas said that Peter was "inflamed with excessive zeal against the flesh, lest a servant delicately nurtured should seem shameless in front of the Lord, so afflicted himself with fasts and abstinence

---


\(^{32}\) "Beatus Petrus, Lombardus origine, de ordine fratrum predicatorem in ipso ordine triginta fere annorum spacio fultus caterva virtutum sic profecti circa ipsius maxime defensionem fidei pro qua totus ardebat quod contra illius diros hostes ferventi spiritu continuum certamen exercens suum tandem agonem duetinum victrici superante martyrio feliciter consummavit" in Urfels-Capot, *Sanctoral*.

\(^{33}\) Vauchez demonstrates that the idea of "heroic virtue" had begun influencing canonization processes from the end of the thirteenth century, in contrast to scholarship placing it in the Renaissance. Increasing canonization processes required that the saint show virtues that were against nature, exceptional, and, eventually heroic. Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 519-20.
that were too harsh and so weakened himself with intense vigils and prayer that, exceeding the extent of his own fragility, he almost destroyed the city while he sought to destroy the enemy.” Thomas related how he became so weakened by this extensive asceticism, that he eventually acquired lock-jaw and was only cured through miraculous intervention, since God “having compassion for him, or rather for his people, did not allow that blessed mouth to remain fastened.” After this point, Thomas said that Peter, because of this experience of human weakness and out of compassion, moderated his practice somewhat so that “although he remained frugal and austere, he nevertheless was more attentive to the needs of others” and thus “following from afar Him, who came to minister and not to be ministered to.” At the same time that Thomas presented Peter’s ascetic practice as particularly heroic, he censured the saint for pursuing this intensive ascetic practice, since Peter had forgotten that the body was not an enemy, but the means by which he would achieve his ultimate vocation: preaching, ministry to others, and the cura animarum as God’s will for the saint and the mission of the Order in general. Thomas does, however, feel compelled to emphasize that Peter abandoned his traditionally masculinized ascetic regime out of love for his neighbor. This transitional description also reflects hagiographic trends for masculine asceticism, which moved away from heroic asceticism as a marker of male sanctity and instead emphasized moderate asceticism in the later medieval period. Unlike Thomas’ Margaret of Ypres, who did not heed the requests of either nuns or her beloved confessor to cease her extreme asceticism for her own sake, but instead zealously abused her body as a way of performing penance and experiencing Christ’s passion and even continued to exhibit these behaviors after receiving a vision from Mary that she had been cleansed of all sin, Peter firmly subjugated his fervent desire for asceticism to his active preaching mission. Thus, subjugation of the body was not the focus of Peter’s sanctity, as it was for his

34 “In novitiatu suo contra carnem nimio zelo succensus, ne servus delicate nutritus proterviret in dominum sic se jejuniis et abstinentia nimiae austeritas afflxit, sic se vigiliis honestatis in orationibus macerabat, quod mensuram propriae fragililitatis excedens, fere civem perdidit dum perdere quaerit hostem.” TAoL, Vita, 1.4, pg. 696.
35 “Miseratus autem ejus vel potius populi sui Dominus, non passus est os illud beatum diutius obserari...” TAoL, Vita, 1.4, pg. 696.
36 “...licet sibi parcus et austerus permanserit, aliorum tamen necessitatibus indulgentior semper fuerit.” and “sic solitus erat saepius abstinerere, illum sequens a longe, qui venit ministriare et non ministrari.” TAoL, Vita, 1.4, pg. 696.
37 See above chapter 1, 32-4 for a survey of this trend.
38 Thomas of Cantimpré relates how Margaret felt the need to atone for her sins and follow the example of Christ by beating herself, weeping, praying, and fasting, even continuing to exhibit these behaviors as a primary marker of her sanctity after Mary appeared to her in a vision and cleansed her of all sin. ToC, Vita Margarete, chaps. 3-4, pg. 108; chap. 11, pg. 111; chap. 16, pg. 114; and chap. 18, pg. 115.
feminine counterpart, but proper care of the body was necessary for the saint to achieve his larger spiritual mission.  

If the Dominican hagiographic tradition as well as general ideas of male sanctity had so strongly emphasized moderate asceticism, why did Thomas include reference to Peter’s initial overly zealous ascetic regimen at all? Requirements of thirteenth-century sanctity articulated by canonists such as Hostiensis, writing in 1270, increasingly emphasized three aspects as important to sainthood that would influence the development of canonization requirements: intense penitential practices (including fasting, mortification, austerity in dress and conduct, and wearing a hairshirt), pure morals, and performance of courageous acts. Peter’s brief foray into heroic asceticism thus gives his vita a component deemed necessary to official sanctity. In having Peter actively reject excessive asceticism, Thomas may also have been adding his voice, as a former prior, to an increasingly common movement among the brothers of the Order after the 1250s moving toward a relaxation of Order’s strict regimen of ascetic practices and penitential duties. In addition, Thomas may have been responding to the trend toward excessive physical mortification among holy woman during this time, including Clare of Assisi (vita written in 1255 or 1256) and Margaret of Ypres. By including reference to Peter’s ascetic practices, Thomas makes room for this type of sanctity within the Dominican hagiographic tradition but, by having Peter reject it, he clearly distinguished between youthful and perhaps feminine asceticism and the mature, masculine, and more moderate Dominican ideal. Regardless, Thomas eloquently solidified the trope in which pursuit of merit purely through ascetic practice and renunciation was subordinated to active service based on love for one’s neighbor, present in Dominic’s vitae, the Vitae fratrum, and Humbert’s text on preaching in this lone example of Peter Martyr’s youthful ascetic practices, a trope which had increasingly became a cornerstone of male mendicant sanctity.

---

39 Vauchez, Sainthood, 350. Also, see above chapter 2, 83.
40 Related in Vauchez, Sainthood, 516.
43 Vauchez, Sainthood, 340.
Thomas also emphasized Peter’s chastity more than did Gerard of Frachet, likely responding to the emphasis placed on Peter’s Triple Crown status by Dominican writers and preachers. Peter’s struggle with chastity, however, was portrayed as an externalized attack consistent with masculine hagiographic norms and received relatively little attention within the text as a whole, despite its importance to the Triple Crown. After Peter headed to Bologna, Thomas said that “a new type of assault was present, battling to seize the flower of his chastity, customary for a more youthful age,” asking “who would be capable of guarding mental and physical integrity among fleshly enticements, worldly tricks, the snares of the enemy, and the deceitful company of his companions?” Although, as Thomas related, “to live in the flesh while outside of it was angelic and not human, according to Jerome,” Peter nonetheless resisted this temptation, thinking that it was “not safe to live with scorpions” and joined the Order instead. Thus, according to Thomas, the young Peter’s struggle for chastity was performed against an external source of temptation, as was the hagiographic norm for male saints, and he successfully overcame this struggle by entering the Order. Thomas also overtly promoted the idea that the successful maintenance of this chastity in the face of such great worldly temptations was an inhuman, and therefore saintly, characteristic. Once in the Order, Peter, according to Thomas, maintained his mental and bodily purity and was never tainted by a mortal sin. Both references, however, used chastity as a form of early training that became a foundational practice allowing the saint to perform his active duties which, in the case of the first reference, included preaching, fighting heresy, persecuting the sinful, and fighting vices, and, in the case of the second reference, involved demonstrating such saintly virtues as obedience, kindness, patience, charity, and “maturity of manner.” Thus, as with Dominic’s life and the *Vitae fratrum*, physical chastity formed the bedrock of his wider activities and does not appear to be central to his identity as a saint. It seems likely that Thomas added a section on Peter’s adult adherence to a pure mind and

44 “Ubi licet esset ab haereticorum instantia elongatus, non defuere tamen novae impugnationis genera, florem pudicitiae suae subripere decertantia, adolescentioris actatis assueta. Quis enim inter carnis illecebras, mundi fallacias, hostis insidias et lubricos sodalium comitatibus, integritatem mentis et corporis sufficeret custodire? In carne praeter carnum vivere, Angelicum est non humanum, ait Hieronymus...Bonitatem circa se divinia dispensationis agnoscons et stupens, suae puritatis conscis est confessus, quomodo in via tam lubrica lapsum castitatis potuerit evitare. Advertens etiam non esse tutum cum scorpionibus habitare, velut alter Joseph, pallium reliquit in manu Egyptiae suo insipientis pudori; et ad religionis refugium confugiens, mundum cum flore decensit...” Thomas of Lentinia, *Legenda*, 1.3, pg. 696.

45 See above chapter 1, 37-42.


47 TAoL, *Vita*, 1.5, pg. 696.

48 TAoL, *Vita*, 1.3 and 1.5, pg. 696.
body so as to emphasize his status as a virgin for canonization purposes and align this *vita* with St. Dominic's. Thus, even though Thomas added material to his *vita* elaborating on Peter's chastity and bodily mortification, both forms of asceticism are only present in Peter's youth and function as a transitional and preparatory phase that bore fruit in the saint's true vocational callings and are thus in line with accepted masculine hagiographic tropes. In this way, Thomas' understanding of Peter's chastity reflects the type of preparation that a squire would undergo in order to become a knight in which he learned such foundational as caring for a horse, serving a lord, and fighting skills, for in no other way "would he know the nobility of his lordship when he becomes a knight."50

Thomas' presentation of Peter also included a more extended description of Peter's studies prior to his preaching career than was present in Gerard's text. Although intellectual endeavors played a major role in the daily lives of all the friars, a coherent ideal of saintly study had yet to be worked into Dominican male hagiographic identity by the time of Thomas' text.51 As we have seen, the theme of intense study and academic performance along with its overtones of male competition had appeared in Dominic's *vitae*, which emphasized his university career as part of a natural progression toward a religious vocation, a typical hagiographic trope, while the topic was largely absent from Gerard of Frachet's text which instead focused on conventual life and preaching.52 When Gerard did mention academic achievement in the *Vitae fratum*, he portrayed it as a masculine activity pursued within conventual life in opposition to feminized contemplation, but he made no mention of the young Peter Martyr as a student. Humbert of Romans emphasized study as a foundational tool for successful preaching in his *Liber praedicatorum*, but largely focused on the utility to the message to the preaching mission.53 Thomas, charged with the task of solidifying Peter's sanctity at all points of his career, thus faced a lacuna not only in the Dominican hagiographic tradition, but also in the hagiographic tradition in general: sanctifying study as part of the masculine Dominican life, rather than as a precursor to a religious vocation. In order to address this area, Thomas seemed to have drawn on two rather conflicting traditions: the monastic tradition in which study functioned as a method of achieving greater

---

49 See above chapter 1, 37-42.
51 Mulchahey, 'First.'
53 See above chapter 1, 50-3 and chapter 2, 99-100 and 126-8.
understanding of and closer relationship with God and the idea, present in both Dominic’s *vitae* and the *Vitae fratrum*, of study as the foundational layer which, along with asceticism and personal piety, made the friars’ active vocations possible.

Thomas began the section on Peter’s study by discussing the “young saint’s” pursuit of humility through service to others within the convent. This included duties that would play a prominent role in the lives of later medieval female saints, including the Dominican Margaret of Hungary, such as tending the sick, greeting guests, and cheerfully undertaking the lowest and most vile duties in the convent. This ministry made Peter akin to Martha, according to Thomas, but Peter was also comparable to Mary and unlike his female saintly counterparts in that he “does not cease praying or engaging in divine speech either during the day or at night, bearing the Gospel or some sacred text under his arm or against his chest or in his hands, always reading when he was able, or meditating on things read or thinking about what he had heard and committing them to memory.” Peter’s desire to learn divine law was so great that, endowed with divine gifts to help him, “his heart became a storeroom of sacred law and a storage chest of holy Scripture.” The emphasis on the physical bond between Peter and the divine word as well as the ingestion of these words and retention in the memory was perhaps also modeled on Marian tropes which depicted the Virgin as the bearer of the Word, the means by which divine word was embodied and made visual. Unlike Gerard of Frachet, who saw study as oppositional to prayer, Thomas’ text explicitly linked the two, emphasizing study as a meditation on material relevant for his spiritual development and thus following the image of constant book learning presented in the *vitae Dominici*, the Constitutions, and Humbert’s *Liber de eruditione praedicatorum*. In the hierarchy of activities to be performed at the convent, Thomas’ categorization would seem to denigrate study, since association with Mary was often seen as feminine and less important than active masculine vocations. However, in the monastic tradition, contemplation was seen as the higher goal for

---

55 “...et sedens ad pedes Domini cum Maria, non diebus neque noctibus cessabat a coloquis divinis et oratione, Evangelium Christi vel aliquem sacrum codicem sub axilla vel in pectore aut in manibus gerens, semper legens cum poterat, vel lecta meditans, vel audita ruminans et memoriae recommendans.” TAoL, *Vita*, 1.7, pg. 697.
the monk, while ascetic discipline, manual labor, and service, were important daily activities that supported contemplation. Contemplation was also highly valued in Dominican life as a way of cultivating humility, common charity, and the deeper understanding of doctrine necessary for the successful preaching endeavor as Thomas’ placement of study in a chapter dealing with Peter’s service to the other brothers indicates. Thus, in this example, Thomas rooted study within the context of conventual life and the monastic tradition.

However, the sequence of events in Peter’s vita as well as the repeated association of study with youth casts this stage of contemplative study in a supportive role to the friars’ pastoral activities, which are more representative of the mature Dominican male identity presented in earlier Dominican hagiography. For example, Thomas began the chapter immediately following Peter’s study habits in this way: "In this same time of youth, neither forgetful nor oblivious to the taunts of the heretics, the reproachers of God’s Church, [Peter], having been made a zealot, had thus impressed the faith and especially those things which pertained to the defense of the faith and combat of heretics onto his soul just as, like a more ardent defender of the faith, he had transferred his entire self to obedience of the faith and against its enemies." Thomas’ language here also reflects the language used to describe the process of apprenticing squires to become knights, a process which Ramon Llull says is “like how jurists, doctors, and clerics have science and books and hear the lesson and take their office from the doctrine of letters.” Thomas then goes on to briefly discuss Peter’s success in defending the faith and his eventual martyrdom. Although it is not clear where and how Peter learned to defend the faith against heresy, the location in the vita, immediately following the section on study, as well as the designation of the saint as youthful suggest that study likely played some role in preparing Peter for confronting heretics since he would have acquired a deep knowledge of scripture and at least part of his education would have been devoted to the anti-heretical disputational literature of the twelfth and thirteenth

---

60 Mulchahey, ‘First,’ 17.
61 “Per idem tirocinii tempus, haereticorum opprobriorum, Ecclesiae Dei exprobrantium, non immemor neque obliviosus zelator effectus, sic animo suo fidem praecipue et ea quae ad fidei defensionem pertinent et haereticorum impugnationem impresserat, ut quasi fidei propugnator ardentior, totum in illius et contra hostes ejus se mancipaverat obsequium…” *TAoL, Vita*, chap. 1.8, pg. 697.
62 “Enaxí com los juristes e.als metges e.als clergues an sciència e libres, e oen la lissó e aprenen lur ofici per doctrina de letres...que enans seria covinent cosa que hom de l’orde de cavaylaria feés scola, e que fos scència scrita en libres e que fos art mostrada, així con són mostrades les altres scències; e que los infants fylls dels cavaylers, en lo comencament, que apressessen la sciència qui pertany a cavaylaria e, enaprés, que fossen scuders e que enassen per les terres ab los cavaylers” Llull, *Libre de l’Orde*, I.14, pg. 170.
centuries. Thomas, however, also referred in the same section to the entire Order as a *collegium* through which Peter was made even more blessed, which implies that Peter also learned his trade "on the job," a typically monastic view of learning and one associated with knightly training. In the next section, Thomas noted that Peter was made Preacher General, since he “joined celestial virtue to study,” and that, as a busy preacher, confessor, and confounder of heretics, Peter still regularly studied and prayed during “the nightly silence allotted to human quiet,” while sleeping very little. Thus, study at least partially contributed to Peter’s success as a preacher and played a role in his adult life. Dominic’s hagiographers had also established this dichotomy between daily pastoral service and nocturnal private contemplation as a masculine Dominican ideal, and Thomas added study to the list of contemplative activities. Unlike in Dominic’s *vitae*, where study was placed in the university context of male competition, however, Thomas saw study as part of the friars’ contemplative life. As with prayer, however, study in Thomas’ text was portrayed as an important supplement to the friar’s active vocational work, but remained secondary, since Peter and Dominic both sacrificed sleep rather than their daily *cura animarum* for its completion. Thus, while the theme of study within the Dominican context is present at multiple stages in Peter’s *vita*, the overall role of this activity in his sanctity remains unclear, clarification of which theme would wait until the canonization of the great Dominican intellectual giant, Thomas Aquinas.

It is to this active *cura animarum*, Peter’s “day job,” that Thomas devoted an extra amount of attention. Unlike Gerard of Frachet’s depiction, which entirely centered around Peter’s anti-heretical activity, Thomas Agni created a more multi-faceted public identity for Peter, an identity more consistent with Dominican masculine vocational goals established in the previous hagiographic texts. He does this by incorporating stories about Peter’s immense popularity as a preacher in general and brief examples of his pastoral responsibilities, in addition to firmly establishing his inquisitorial identity. Immediately following

---


65 “...et coelesti virtutie studium comitante, praedicator factus est generalis” and “...nocturna silentia, humanae deputata quieti...” TaoL, *Vita*, chap. 1.9, pg. 697.
the discussion of Peter’s adolescent years, Thomas looks at Peter’s preaching career. After being made preacher general, the highest level of preacher in the Order, Peter engaged in a marvelously successful preaching campaign all over Italy during which he roused many towns to devout yells, struck the hearts of many listeners, and became a very well known preacher. Thomas wrote that he was so popular in Milan that he couldn’t enter the city without being crushed by the crowds, alerted to his presence by waving flags and trumpets, so that the city designed a special litter for him to be carried into the city by the citizens. Some of the citizens were so thankful for the “more plentiful grace poured out from his lips” that they gave him lots of presents, often edible, but the saint did not eat any of them for an entire Lent. His ascetic practices here contrast sharply with those of Margaret of Ypres, who, in honor of Lent, did not eat or drink anything for a week straight, while still managing to walk a league to hear her confessor preach. Thus, it was Peter’s incredible success as a preacher among the laity and his skillful preaching that allowed him to achieve the highest status among Dominican preachers and accumulate an extensive fan base, not his ascetic practice. Thomas also emphasized the spiritual gains of Peter’s teachings, saying that he earned plentiful “fruit in the salvation of souls and the wealth of their merits” and that “there were scarcely any men of such stiff necks in a city or camp that Peter did not beneficially overthrow their hearts, if there was the occasion for them to attend to his preaching for a long time.” Thus, Thomas judged preaching as successful in much the same way that Gerard of Frachet and Humbert of Romans: by the preacher’s popularity and his ability to revivify the faith of the laity by encouraging their repentance. In addition to saving the souls of orthodox Catholics, Peter’s charismatic preaching also achieved the conversion of heretics. For example, Thomas described Peter at the beginning of the text as “an exemplary preacher, fighter of heresy, persecutor of sordidness, and most powerful fighter of vices” and, in the chapter dedicated to his preaching said that as a result of Peter’s efforts, “many abjured heresy after having examined the truth of Catholicism, more end their disagreements having

---

66 On the status of the preacher general within the Order’s hierarchy, see above chapter 2, 137. TAoL, Vita, chap. 1.9, pg. 697.
67 TAoL, Vita, chap. 1.9, pg. 697.
68 ToC, vita Margarete, chap. 26, pg. 119.
69 “Quantos autem et quales fructus fecerit in salutem animarum vel in suorum copia meritorum, solus novit qui multitudinem stellarum enumerat, cu nuda sunt omnia et aperta” TAoL, Vita,1.9, pg. 697 and “…vix esse possent ita durae cervicis homines in civitate vel castro, quin eorum corda salubriter subverteret, si tempus adesset praedicationi ejus diutius insistendi.” TAoL, Vita, chap. 1.10, pg. 697.
70 See above, chapter 2, 98-120 and 131-4.
put aside their injuries, and the greatest number rushed to do penance by confessing their sins.\footnote{TAoL, \textit{Vita}, prologue 1, pg. 694; rologue 2, pg. 694; chap. 1.3, pg. 696; chap. 4.30, pg. 703; chap. 4.32, pg. 704; chap. 4.36, pg. 706. This term, \textit{pugil fidei}, was also used in the preface to the mass of Saint Dominic and so evidently had a multifaceted meaning in Dominican life. See Guy Bedouelle, “Saint Pierre de Vérone ou le Poids d’un Héritage,” in \textit{À l’Image de Saint Dominique} (Paris: Cerf, 1995), 45.} This second reference, couched among Thomas’ extended description of Peter’s preaching, established a clear hierarchy of Peter’s successes, ranking heresy last in terms of its presence in the \textit{vita}, despite the large number of heretics in the area where Peter preached, while prioritizing peace-making and inspiring confession.\footnote{“Cum pestis haeretica in Lombardiae provincia pullularet, et multas jam civitates contagione pestifera incesset; summus Pontifex D. Innocentius IV, attendens quantum fieret ovibus luporum periculosa commixtio, ad pestem diabolicam abolendam, diversos Inquisitores de Ordine Praedicatorum (quasi diversos canes qui lupos arcere possent a gregibus) in diversis Lombardiae partibus providentius delegavit.” \textit{TAoL, Vita}, chap. 3.30, pg. 703.} Thus, although anti-heretical activities were, as we will see, very important in Thomas’ construction of the Veronese saint, in his chapter on Peter’s preaching career Thomas is careful to place his inquisitorial labors in the context of a wider male Dominican mission which, as the Constitutions, Gerard of Frachet, and Humbert of Romans indicated, prioritized rejuvenation of the orthodox laity as a sign of successful preaching, even while absorbing the new association with papal inquisition.

However, Thomas’ favored description for Peter Martyr, the \textit{pugil fidei} or “fighter for the faith,” which appears in the \textit{vita}’s introductory stories as well as those stories discussing Peter’s inquisitorial activities and martyrdom, refers specifically to his anti-heretical activities.\footnote{“futurus praedicator eximius, oppognator haeresum, persecutor sordium, et vitiorum potentissimus objurgator” and “Unde multi abjurabant haereses catholica veritate inspecta, plures injurii dimissi finem discordiis imponebant, plurimi sua confitendo peccata ad poenitentiam properabant.” \textit{TAoL, Vita}, chap. 1.3, pg. 696 and chap. 1.9, pg. 697.} It is in these stories that Thomas most overtly heroicized and masculinized the saint. After discussing Peter’s preaching and briefly relating two miracles that highlight Peter’s pastoral role as a confessor and priest, Thomas turned to Peter’s final appointment as Inquisitor in Milan and surrounding areas. Greatly expanding upon Gerard of Frachet’s simple announcement of Peter’s appointment, Thomas says “since the heretical plague had sprouted up in the provinces of Lombardy and many cities had already been infected with pestilential contagion,” the Pope began appointing members of the Dominican Order to posts as Inquisitors, “for the purpose of abolishing this diabolical plague...just as dogs are appointed to keep wolves away from the sheep.”\footnote{“Hunde u[r]m Herrenstuhl zu hängen, oder dergleichen, was der Gegner thun würde, den Herrn Stuhl herabzukehren, erhebt die Freunde zu seinem Ruhm.” \textit{Martyred}, \textit{prologue} 2, pg. 694.} Although the denotation of “dog” was usually an insult in medieval culture, denoting a dishonorable person, Jew, apostate, or a heretic, the dog...
became of symbol of the Dominican approach to Inquisition for a couple of reasons: it was a reference to Dominic’s mother’s vision of Dominic as a dog carrying the burning torch of truth discussed above as well as an intentional pun on the name of the Order itself, that is, *Domini canes.*

The imagery associating Dominicans with dogs thus became very common and in one interesting painting from the Spanish Chapel at Santa Maria Novella, Peter Martyr and Thomas Aquinas are depicted confuting heretics, while black and white “Dominican” dogs attack scraggly brown “heretical” wolves at their feet. Thus, as did Gerard of Frachet in the prologue to the chapter containing the stories about the various ways that friars died, Thomas clearly established the close relationship between papal prerogative, heresy, and the Dominican Order, placing Peter within this historical context. Thomas went on to say that, because the heretics in Milan were large in number, prominent, “talkative with eloquence”, and “full of diabolical knowledge”, the pope, aware that Peter was magnanimous, “not afraid of the great crowd of enemies”, constant in virtue, eloquent “through which he exposed the fallacies of the heretics,” and knowledgeable so that he could “confound the frivolous arguments of the heretics through reason,” appointed him Inquisitor in Milan and surrounding areas, just as “a vigorous fighter of the faith and undefeated warrior for the Lord.”

Thomas used a multifaceted approach in presenting Peter as a particularly masculine saint in this passage. First, he depicted the heretics as particularly dangerous male opponents by emphasizing their large numbers, political power, as well as their intimate association with the Devil. He also employed the strategy used in Dominic’s *vitae* and referenced in

---


76 See Prudlo, *Martyred*, 125.

77 “Sed cum Mediolani haeretici, non solum multi numero, sed etiam magni secundi potencia, acuti fraudentia, eloquentia garrulosi, et diabolica pleni scientia residerent; idem summus Pontifex sciens et intelligens B. Petrum virum esse magnanimem, qui ab hostium multitudine non paveret; advertens quoque suae virtutis constantiam, per quam et adversariorum constantiae nec in medicó cederet; cognoscens etiam eius facundiam, per quam haereticorum fallacias detegereat; non ignorans insuper ipsum mundana sapientia plene eruditum, per quam frivola haereticorum argumenta rationabiliter confutaret; utpote inter haereticos a puero conversatus, et qualiter sensum perverterent Scripturarum, et quibus verbi suam sauciatam conscientiam palliarent, frequentibus puginis divinisque experimentis edoctus: ipsum, tamquam fidel pugilem strenuum et tam indefessum Domini bellatorem, in Mediolano et eius comitatu instituit, et Inquisitorem haereticae pravitatis auctoritate concessa plenaria ordinavit.” TAol, *Vita*, chap. 3.30, pg. 703.
Humbert’s *Liber de eruditione* of feminizing them by emphasizing their “frivolous” and therefore feminine rhetorical subtleties.\(^{78}\) Secondly, Thomas heroicized Peter by describing his reason-based argumentation and his “practical knowledge” since “he had associated with heretics since his childhood and was educated through frequent fights and divine testing in the words that [the heretics] used to disguise their dirty conscience and how they perverted the sense of the Scripture.” Thus, Peter’s practical experience and divine knowledge gave him the type of educated and masculine rational *facundia* needed to combat the excessive, flashy, and diabolical *eloquentia* of the heretics. Gerard also masculinized Peter through the prevalent use of martial imagery, pitting Peter against this large and dangerous foe toward whom he showed no fear and presenting him as an undefeated warrior.\(^{79}\) Thomas continued this masculine imagery in his discussion of Peter’s activities as an Inquisitor saying that Peter “sought out the little foxes of Samson and everywhere scattered them, giving them no rest, but miraculously confounding them all and powerfully expelling them, so much so that they were unable to resist the wisdom and spirit which spoke through him” and that “to this end, the courage for particular fighting was present in the blessed fighter, poured out from divine grace.”\(^{80}\) Again, Peter is presented as a successful bellator of heretics, either physically disbanding and expelling them or converting them as an irresistible medium of divine grace. The image of Peter as a preacher who converted even the most unwilling of individuals, heretics, by acting as God’s conduit echoes the masculinized imagery of the Peter found in the *Vitae fratrum*.\(^{81}\) It is at this point in the text that Thomas related a modified version of Peter’s prayer to Mary found in Gerard of Frachet. While in Gerard’s text Peter prays to Mary because he is troubled by some heretical arguments, Thomas says that he does so because “he was once afraid for a short time about future and uncertain events,” thus avoiding the problem of doctrinal indecision present in Gerard’s text by portraying Peter as a sort of *alter Christus* who could foresee future events and perhaps his own

\(^{78}\) See above chapter 1, 60-2 and chapter 2, 113-6.

\(^{79}\) On the hagiographic trope depicting a religious figure, often in militaristic terms, persisting fearlessly in defending their perspective even in the face of violence, see Thomas “Shame,” 1059-1063.

\(^{80}\) “Ipse igitur injunction sibi officium diligenter exercens, Sampsonis vulpeculas perquirebat dissipatubique, nullam eis requiem tribuenus, sed mirabiliter omnes confundens, et potenter expellens: ita ut non possent resistere sapientiae et spiritui, qui loquebatur per eum. Ad hoc inerat beato pugni specialis certandi fidicia contra hostes, ex divina revelacione infusa” Taol, *Vita*, chap. 3.30, pg. 703. The use of the “little foxes” scriptural reference in relation to heretics was used by the Cistercians in their early anti-heretical activities and was also common among Dominican writers. See Kienzle, *Cistercians*, 109-134 and Ames, *Righteous*, 42-3.

\(^{81}\) See above chapter 2, 113-6.
death. Thomas is also careful to reiterate that this miracle did not conflict with his characterization of Peter as a fearless warrior since it was only a temporary, single occurrence. Thus, Thomas greatly expanded upon Gerard's presentation of Peter to create a saint with more overtly masculine characteristics consistent with the male ideal presented in the earlier hagiographic texts.

Thomas also strengthened the masculine imagery surrounding the saint in his discussion of Peter's actions as inquisitor. The patriarch of Jerusalem relied on the same miracles presented in Gerard's text,--the examination of the heretical bishop and the dispute between Peter and a heretic--but altered the sequence of the miracles in the text and changed the latter miracle in significant ways. Thomas placed the miracle involving the examination of the heretical bishop first in his text and changed the substance of Gerard's text very little. In this miracle Peter caused a cloud to cover the sun so as to shade the crowd from the burning sun at the instigation of the bishop who had offered to convert if Peter could preform this miracle. As with Gerard's text, this miracle served to demonstrate Peter's popularity--since the crowd included "many bishops, religious, and the greater part of the city" who had attended both Peter's preaching as well as this examination--his inquisitorial activity, and thaumaturgical powers. In doing so, Peter's hagiographer placed this overt inquisitorial activity in the context of several hagiographic traditions associated with male saints and thus lent credibility to the controversial portrayal of the inquisitor as an alter Christus, a characterization especially important for developing Dominican identity. Peter's examination of the heretical bishop fell within the older hagiographic model of the holy bishop who practiced public pastoral correctio of every type of abuse, imposing penances on sinners if they repented, while the impressively large audience demonstrated his exceptional charisma and preaching prowess, a theme which was present in earlier Dominican hagiography and became increasingly important as a model of sainthood in the later medieval period. His public thaumaturgical activity is consistent with popular perceptions of sainthood and, more generally, the
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82 "Nam dum semel, aliquantulum ex futuris et incertis eventibus pavidus..." TAoL, Vita, chap. 3.30, pg. 703.
83 "...et adesset fere maior pars civitatis et multi episcopi et religiosi..." GoF, Vitae, 5.1.III, pg. 237 and TAoL, Vita, chap. 3.32, pg. 703.
84 For the ambiguities inherent in this presentation of Inquisitor, see Ames, Righteous, 50-6. Prudlo also discusses the importance of the image of Peter as a alter Christus in Dominican and Franciscan competition see Prudlo, Martyred, 119-24.
85 Vauchez, Sainthood, 300 and 307 and Weinstein and Bell, Saints, 237.
imitatio Christi. Peter as the popular, fiery preacher and challenger of heresy stood as a very clear masculine model of sainthood in Gerard’s text, a model which Thomas adopted in its entirety.

Thomas did, however, significantly alter Gerard’s other miracle, that of his disputation with a heretic who is rendered mute as a result of Peter’s prayer, adding militaristic language, further feminizing the rhetorical strategies of the heretic, and editing the narrative so as to emphasize the saint’s effectiveness, virility, and doctrinal constancy. In the first place, Thomas expanded upon Gerard’s imagery of the dispute as a battle, by clearly defining the oppositional categories. Thomas pitted the “sons of Light,” armed with “weapons of truth” and use of reason, against the “sons of Darkness,” who bear dangerous weapons of loquaciousness, “wicked tricks of speech,” “verbal snares,” and large numbers. Throughout his depiction of this event, Thomas walked the fine line between establishing the masculine militaristic structure of a saint engaged in battle against a dangerous opponent and establishing the saint’s superior approach to this confrontation by associating the rhetorical and spiritual strategies of the heretic with those strategies established as more feminine within medieval rhetorical and hagiographic traditions. In addition, Thomas reworked the storyline of this miracle in such a way as to eliminate any evidence, however subtle, of the saint’s vacillation, cowardice, or need for assistance. While in the Vitae fratum, Peter began disputing with a certain heretic, who possessed “the most acute skill and singular eloquence,” but then, “considering these tricks” rescheduled the dispute so as not to prolong it and with the hope of bringing in reinforcements, Thomas omitted this sequence of events entirely, merely beginning the story by saying that the disputants met on a “day designated for disputing when the brothers who had been summoned delayed in the neighboring convents.” Thomas also described Peter’s opponent as “a barking and talkative man learned in wicked tricks of speech.” These changes downplay the suggestion that Peter was unable to successfully dispute with the heretic by himself. In a second narrative alteration, Thomas clarified Peter’s reasons for retreating in the
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86 Vauchez, Sainthood, 406
87 TAOl, Vita, chap. 3.32, pg. 703-4. Interestingly, Peter himself uses this language to describe heresy in his Summa contra hereticos. Related in Ames, Righteous, 29.
88 See above chapter 1, 60-2 and chapter 2, 113-6.
89 “Cum quadam vice disputaret cum quodam heretico acutissimi ingenii et eloquencie singularis, adtendens hastucias eius, noluit diu protrahere disputacionem...” GoF, Vitae, 5.1.III, pg. 237 and “Altera die similiter ad disputandum cum haereticis constituta...” where the similitur refers to the previous story relating the miracle of the cloud in TAOl, Vita, chap. 3.32, pg. 703.
90 “...vir clamosus garrulusque et malitiosis sermonum versutiis eruditus.” TAOl, Vita, 3.32, pg. 703.
middle of this dispute for prayer. Gerard says that Peter retreated when the heretic demanded a response to his arguments and prayed “that he should defend his cause and that he should either pour the light of the true faith into [the heretic] or that [the heretic] should be deprived of speech,” thus creating the portrait of a man unsure of his abilities.91 Thomas, however, took a less personal approach and de-emphasized Peter’s own doubt. He said that the heretic loudly demanded an immediate answer so that the saint would fall into his verbal traps and that Peter retreated since he felt that “it was not fitting for the servant of God to fight with yells nor useful to pour forth words of truth and sobriety when he was not being heard.”92 He then prayed that “the enemy either should be ashamed as impious ones and their crafty tongues be made mute or that the sun of true knowledge should shine on the them.”93 These changes subtly shift the emphasis away from the idea of Peter as confused by the heretic’s arguments, unsure of his own ability to combat error, and unable to defend the faith appropriately and instead emphasize the heretic’s uncouth behavior, his inability to hear the divine words, and the feminine nature of his rhetorical style defined by deceit and loquaciousness.94 Thomas’ Peter demonstrates a commitment to controlled, rational behavior and the ability to discern whether or not a particular environment was fertile ground for the word of God. Thus, Thomas Agni’s version of the saint as an inquisitor presents him as a more confident, capable, saintly, and masculine fighter of heresy than does the Gerard’s in the Vitae fratrum.

Thomas’ final elaboration to Gerard of Frachet’s depiction of Peter occurs in the section of his vita that discusses the most important element of his sanctity: his martyrdom. As with Gerard of Frachet, Thomas set up the martyrdom scene by emphasizing Peter’s prayerful desire to die for the faith and knowledge of the death plot against him. While Thomas’ description of Peter’s desire for martyrdom remained the same, he did elaborate on the story in which Peter announced his knowledge of the plot to the crowd in Milan with the following introduction:

92 “Quo saepius acclamante, vir Dei attendens, quod servum Dei clamoribus litigare non dect; et ubi non erat auditus, verba veritatis et sobrietatis effundere non prodesset; recordatus misericordiae Domini, totum se ad orationem devote contulit...” TAoL, Vita, chap. 3.32, pg. 704.
93 “…supplicans ut hostes vel juste erubescerent tamquam impii, et muta fient labia dolosa, aut super eos sol verae intelligentiae oriretur.” TAoL, Vita, chap. 3.32, pg. 704
94 Ames, Righteous, 28-46.
But the heretics, seeing and feeling aggrieved that matters of the faith were prospering because of God’s fighter, began to discuss his death with their supporters, deciding that they would be able to live in peace if such a powerful persecutor of them were removed from the earth. But the secret plotting of the enemy was not hidden from the saint due to the reliable reports of many: but he, just as a courageous fighter, neither feared that which he had previously thirsted for with a burning desire, nor delayed in that which he had confidently begun, knowing that he could be killed, but that, having been killed, he would not at all be conquered.95

Thomas then related the story from Gerard’s text in which Peter publicly announced his knowledge of the plot and his belief that he would be more useful dead than alive. Thomas’ extended introduction to the story created a more masculine figure in both secular and hagiographic traditions since it emphasized Peter’s success in the spiritual war against the heretics as the reason for his eventual martyrdom, used militaristic language to describe the saint and his relationship with the Milanese heretics, and reiterated his ardent desire for actual martyrdom as a spiritual requirement for living a true vita Christi.96 In describing Peter as a courageous fighter who persisted in his activities despite knowledge of his own potential death, Thomas demonstrated Peter’s imitatio Christi and associated him with the epic hero, both of whom face death with fortitude and operate within the context of larger war.

Thomas’ real elaboration, however, was in his description of Peter’s death, which largely focused on establishing Peter’s death as an imitatio Christi, placing the saint within hagiographic norms for male martyrs and masculinizing the murderous ritual through the use of militaristic language. As with his introduction to Peter’s pre-death speech, Thomas placed the saint’s martyrdom in the context of a larger spiritual as well as actual battle of the faithful versus heretics, with Peter and his murderer, Carino, representing the diametrically opposing sides. Thomas began by describing how Peter, “the athlete of Christ,” was journeying to Milan, “returning to battle” there, when he was ambushed by Carino, “a heretic and cruel accomplice of

95 “Verum videntes dolentesque haeretici, negotium fidei per Christi pugilem sic vehementius prosperari, de ipsius morte cum suis fatoribus tractare coeperunt, arbitrantes se posse pacifice vivere, si eorum tam validus persecutor de terra tolleretur. Nec latuit Sanctum tractus occultus hostium ex certis plurium relationibus: sed ipsa, veluti pugil intrepidus, nec metuebat quod dum ardentii desiderio sitivenerat, nec in eo, quod confidenter inceperat, retardabat: sciens quod occidi poterat, sed minime vinceretur occisus.” TAoL, Vita, chap. 5.35, pg. 705. For Thomas’ description of Peter’s desire for martyrdom, paraphrased from Gerard’s text, see 1.8, pg. 697.

96 Boyarin emphasizes this shift toward martyrdom as the fulfillment of a spiritual need after the Hasmonean period, while both Vauchez and Daniel look at the revival of this quest for literal martyrdom at the hands of Christian enemies, really only achieved by Dominican men in the later medieval period. See Boyarin, Dying, 114; Vauchez, Spirituality, 82-4; Daniel, “Desire,” 85; Tolan, Saracens, 220. As Chazan points out, such a revival of the martyrdom ideal was only possible as the Christian world became more aware of a perceived threat from non-Christians and thus created expressions of Christianity focused on combatting Christian enemies in Daggers, 25-37. For hagiographic tropes among the early martyrs, see Delehaye, Passions, 155-77 and Elliot, Roads, 20.
heretics,” who “ventured an insult, exercised a plot, and intended to kill the holy man.”

In introducing the narrative in this fashion, Thomas emphasized the antagonistic relationship between Peter and the heretics in general with whom he regularly engaged in an ideological battle, as well as his physically violent relationship with Carino, whose intentions toward the saint were described using terms from feuding culture, including insult, ambush, plot, and murder. The athletic metaphor, common in early martyr stories, used to describe Peter stressed the saint’s active, and hence masculine, role in the ensuing action and signaled a change from ideological to physical action.

Thomas further emphasized the dichotomy between heretics/Carino and the faithful/Peter by describing the two main protagonists through a series of antonyms taken from Peter’s bull of canonization and incorporated in the Dominican liturgy: wolf/lamb, savage/meek, impious/pious, insane/mild, unrestrained/modest, and profane/just. Carino represents the murderous heretics, while a Christ-like Peter is allied with his Dominican companion and “the faithful” who eventually catch the murderer. Once these two protagonists meet, Carino, bearing a “wicked sword,” immediately wounded the saint’s head and then struck him again, until Peter, “not turning away, but facing his enemy and sustaining the savage blows of the murderer with patience,” finally fell down half dead. When Carino then turned to strike Peter’s companion, who had been yelling for help, the saint uttered Christ’s last words and began reciting the Creed with patience,” finally fell down half dead.

Finally, in a reference to the Passion, Carino delivered the death blow to the saint by stabbing him in the side with a small knife.

While at first glance, Peter’s passivity in the face of his own death appears to be at odds with the assertively violent norms of feuding culture, Thomas’ placement and treatment of the martyrdom in fact show
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97 “...athleta Christi de Conventu suo ad pugnam Mediolani rediit...” and “…Carinus, haereticus et crudelis haereticorum satelles, eorum, ut dictum est, inductus precibus, et pretio librarum quadraginta conductus, in Sanctum virum...praesumit insultum, exercet conatum, mortem intentat” TAoL, Vita, chap. 5.38, pg. 706.
98 For a general overview of feuding patterns see Boehm, Blood, 91-120; Meyerson, “Assaulting,” 10-12; and Muir, Mad Blood.
99 Elliot, Roads, 32.
100 BOP I: 228-29 (March 25, 1253) and Urfeles-Capot, Sanctorale, Humbert of Romans, Sanctoral, 226-7.
101 “…non divertentem ab hoste, sed exhibentem se protinus hostiam, et occisoris sustinentem in patientia truces ictus...” TAoL, Vita, chap. 5.38, pg. 706.
102 “…vir sanctus ex parte altera suum Domino commendat spiritum, In manus, inquiens, tuas Domine commendando spiritum meum. A fidei praeconio etiam in hoc articulo non desistens, Symbolum fidei, quod propter blanditias patrui puer deserere noluerat, propter mortis angustias, velut praeco fidei...” TAoL, Vita, chap. 5.38, pg. 706.
103 TAoL, Vita, chap. 5.38, pg. 706.
strong correlations to expectations for manly behavior in chivalric literature and lay feuding culture. In this description, Thomas was careful to emphasize Peter’s Christ-like courage in the face of death, a characteristic shared by the epic heroes. Rather than conceiving of the martyrdom scene itself as a contained battle, however, Thomas specifically described Peter’s death as the final chapter of a long war waged against heresy in which Peter’s conduct during physical defeat conformed to chivalric norms for an honorable masculine death. Although many a knight in chivalric literature choose honorable defeat over death when faced with the the final sword stroke of death, the truly heroic preferred to die without surrendering, as did Blamour, who when defeated by Tristan said that he would rather “dye here with worship than lyve here with shame.” Blamour’s brother agreed, saying that “though sir Trystanes hath beatyn his body, he hath nat beatyn his harse, and thanke God he is nat shame this day.” Rather than invoking the chivalric code as a reason for his death, however, Peter instead employed the *Credo,* not as an admission of manly honor, but instead as his last rhetorical weapon before death. And what an effective weapon this final death scene, the culmination of his war with the Cathars, would have been! First, Peter’s heroic disregard for his externally inflicted physical injuries along with his forceful proclamation of faith despite torture place his martyrdom in line with hagiographic traditions surrounding the early Christian martyrs. Such a detailed description of a saint’s last moments, influenced by the rise of the *artes moriendi*—which took on increasing significance in the later Middle Ages as the clergy sought to demonstrate the saint’s commitment to the very end, his joy at approaching death as a sign of his certainty about his own redemption, as an important sign of sanctity—would thus have helped to solidify Peter’s position as a martyr, a very rare and sought-after distinction in the late medieval period. Christine Caldwell Ames has pointed out the pivotal role that Peter’s death played in solidifying the dividing line between the Orthodox preacher and the heretic, ratifying the idea of the inquisitor as holy and ideologically alienating heresy further from orthodoxy. Second, friars and lay audiences alike would have interpreted the heroic portrayal of this detailed death scene with the recitation of the *Credo* in much the same way as the textual bloody clothing in the *vita’s* prologue. Late medieval men, whether lay or
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104 Ames, *Righteous,* 72, and above chapter 1, pg. 50, ff. 224.
105 Quoted and discussed in Kaeuper, *Chivalry,* 154-5.
106 Vauchez, *Sainthood,* 512-3 and above page
107 See above, 145-7.
religious, would undoubtedly have understood the necessity of avenging the murder of one of their own, especially a valiant knight who had died honorably in defense of shared beliefs, the victim of a cleverly executed ambush. In that sense, Peter’s death scene has much in common with Roland’s in *The Song of Roland*. Roland, having fought valiantly against a large contingent of Muslims while part of the rearguard for Charlemagne’s retreating army and seeing that many of his men had died, decided to sound his war horn, his “Olifant,” so as to call back the king’s army to enact vengeance. The poet described the scene in the following way: “The Count Roland with pain and anguish winds His Olifant, and blows with all his might. Blood from his mouth comes spurring scarlet-bright; He’s burst the veins of his temple outright.” Peter’s dying, bleeding recitation of the *Credo*, spread throughout Christendom through the *vita* would thus have functioned in much the same way as Roland’s horn, calling all Dominicans, Christian men, and God to avenge his death at the hands of the “heretics” and to respond as did Charlemagne to the dying Roland, by yelling “To arms! Let sound your battle-cry to heav’n! Make haste to bring your gallant household help! You hear how Roland makes desperate lament!” Although not a model for knightly physical prowess, Peter nonetheless proves to be rhetorically virile and capable of enacting the machinery of war upon his enemies. Thus, in depicting Peter’s physical death as the culmination of his spiritual battle with heresy and constructing his death scene in ways reminiscent of chivalric literature, Thomas transformed the confrontation between Carino and the martyr from a physical battle in which Peter was defeated, into a spiritual and doctrinal one in which Peter’s unflagging orthodoxy triumphed over his heretical enemies by means of his death since it called all of Christendom to take revenge on heresy.

---

108 As Gaunt discusses at length in *Gender*, 24-35, the decision to sound the horn was, in fact, a key point of tension between the three main knights in the text and it is the Archbishop Turpin, whose decisive words finally enact the horn-blowing. Among his reasons, Turpin cries, “Let the King come; his vengeance will be rude.” Sayers, *Song*, chaps. 128-132, pgs. 117-9.


110 Sullivan argues that the martyrdom story in Thomas’ text transforms the external, physical battle into an internal battle where Peter overcomes the natural desire to live in order to pass into the afterlife. However, that Thomas explicitly equates Peter’s martyrdom and his earliest debate with his uncle via the unifying theme of adherence to the *Credo* indicates to me that the final martyrdom scene was a doctrinal battle between orthodoxy and heresy in which Peter’s stringent adherence to the Catholic interpretation of the Creed gave him victory in both instances. In addition, Thomas did not indicate anywhere that Peter struggled to overcome any desire to live, instead emphasizing his complete adherence to *imitatio Christi*, desire for martyrdom, and doctrinal opposition to heresy. Finally Thomas, unlike Gerard, emphasized Peter’s war against heresy as an external conflict, not an internal debate, throughout his *vita* of which his martyrdom represents the final and most successful battle. This is the meaning of Peter’s promise to be more useful after death, as it was in Dominic’s *vita*: both fighters of heresy achieved more heretical conversions after their deaths, at least according to Dominican hagiography and historiography. See Karen Sullivan, *The Inner Lives of Medieval Inquisitors* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 116-7.
Thomas Agni’s *legenda Petri*, thus presented a saint who both emerged organically from earlier masculine hagiographic traditions within the Dominican order and solidified some aspects of this sanctity that remained nascent in earlier texts. Thomas carefully expanded upon the saint’s *vita* contained in Gerard of Frachet’s text so as to emphasize elements of Peter’s life outside of his inquisitorial activity and, in doing so, more closely linked the saint to existing Dominican hagiography. Thus, Thomas’ Peter demonstrated heroic dedication to ascetic practice as a young man, but moderated and harnessed these practices into the service of his active ministry, as did the Order’s exemplars presented in the *vitae Dominici* and Gerard of Frachet’s text. Thomas also presented the saint as an exceptionally charismatic and beloved preacher whose skillful ministry led many wandering Christians back to the flock, thus creating a Dominican saint who could respond to the intense late medieval desire for effective preaching, fueled by such idolized figures such as Francis of Assisi. Other aspects of male Dominican hagiographic identity, however, saw their flowering in the Veronese saint since Thomas Agni created a saint who responded to a changing late medieval religious landscape in an especially virile and heroic way. Thus, Thomas described a world defined by a spiritual battle between Catholics and heretics, in which heresy was an unequivocal evil over which Peter, the inquisitor-warrior, spectacularly triumphed. Throughout his depiction of Peter’s inquisitorial activities and martyrdom, Thomas used militaristic and hyper-masculine language as well as heroic epic literary and hagiographic martyrdom traditions to create a distinctively masculine saintly ideal. This image of bloody sacrifice in the service of doctrinal orthodoxy also functioned as a call to arms for the other friars and all of Christendom, an image that found its most prevalent and arresting expression in the common late medieval iconographic depictions of Peter’s martyrdom in which the saint laboriously traced the initial letters of the *Credo* on the ground in his own blood as he lay dying.\(^\text{111}\) This conflation of Peter’s blood and text, both the text of his *vita* and the pictoral representation of that text, relates to a long history of martyrdom in which the martyrs’ bodies and blood are textualized, that is, their the holy message contained in their martyred bodies is conflated with the textual or

\(^{111}\) One striking depiction of Peter Martyr’s death is the *La muerte de San Pedro Mártir*, in which the saint struggles to write *Credo* in the sand as his assassin stands above him with a knife, occurred in an altarpiece dedicated to Peter Martyr and painted by the first great Spanish Renaissance painter, Pedro Berruguete, for the convent of Saint Thomas of Avila, constructed by Ferdinand and Isabella in the late 15th century, presently held at the Prado. This image is also present in early 15th century Italian depictions of the saint, including one by Fra Angelico in a antiphonary from around 1430 and one by Gentile da Fabriano from around 1420. See Prudlo, *Martyred*, 129 and 131.
artistic vehicle disseminating their holiness. Peter’s *vita* and his verbalized, textualized faith, would thus call out for vengeance as much as would his actual bloodied clothing or physical relic. The heroic martyr saint would undoubtedly provided a rallying point for the brothers, who regularly heard his *vita* as part of their conventual and liturgical life and were charged with the dangerous task of implementing the newly established and highly controversial papal inquisition, eventually becoming the patron saint of inquisitors.

Thus, Thomas’ depiction of Peter expanded upon important elements of masculine Dominican sainthood introduced in earlier Dominican hagiographic texts.

**Thomas Aquinas: Saintly Mastermind**

One theme of masculine Dominican hagiography that Peter’s brand of sanctity failed to solidify, however, was the theme of saintly study and heroic intellectual achievement, a theme that would find full expression in the *vita* of the Dominican intellectual giant, Thomas Aquinas, to whose life we now turn. This particular type of sanctity in which academic achievement was the primary basis for the designation of sanctity found very little precedent in early and high medieval hagiographic traditions, which largely portrayed it as a period of transition in the male saint’s life between his holy youth and saintly maturity. As was the case in Dominic’s *vitae*, medieval hagiographers often portrayed university as a period of intense academic achievement within a highly competitive and masculinized context that preceded a religious crisis on the part of the saint, who eventually forsook the secular life in favor of a religious vocation, often as a bishop. In stark contrast, monastic traditions emphasized learning by experiencing God in the cloister over the academic wrangling characteristic of formal academic institutions, an inclination reflected in the general lack of attention given to formal book learning in Cistercian hagiographic texts in the 12th and 13th centuries. After the late 12th century, hagiographic texts commonly contrasted the cloister, where all learning beyond a certain level actually separated the soul from God, and the “worldly” institutions of the university which posed a risk to the individual’s soul. Gerard of Frachet’s relative taciturnity on the subject of study hints at this
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112 Ross, *Figuring*, 55-60.
113 Caldwell, “Peter,” 146-7 & 162.
114 Weinstein and Bell, 48-52. On study in Dominic’s *vitae*, see above chapter 1, 50-3.
perspective of the convent as *schola*, while *schola* is expanded to include all of the Order’s activities in Peter’s life. The reality of the Dominican educational system included elements of both cultures since the lower levels of education occurred at the conventual level, while still adopting the structures, content, and pedagogy of the late medieval academy, while the highest levels of Dominican education, the *studium generale*, existed in varying degrees of geographic and institutional proximity to the major secular universities. However, the Order’s hagiographic output, as we have seen above, did not clearly reflect this reality of the Order’s academic system, instead adhering to previous hagiographic models of study as a youthful, transitional stage, while focusing on the saint’s other qualities. Although the late thirteenth century saw a series of holy bishops who demonstrated a high degree of scholarly learning, culminating in the person of St. Thomas Cantilupe (d. 1282), this trend was largely confined to England and instigated by the papacy, while popular piety continued to focus on non-scholarly mendicant saints, especially in the Mediterranean. Thus, the figure of Aquinas, who was above all else a theologian, presented hagiographers with the challenge of creating a relatively unprecedented form of sanctity based almost entirely upon academic achievement as the main expression of the *cura animarum*.

In addition to the problem posed by justifying an atypical brand of sanctity, Aquinas’ hagiographers also had to meet the demands of a papacy that had acquired the sole right of canonization during the tenure of Pope Innocent IV (1243-54) and had developed a rather daunting canonization process that required a substantial *vita* and a stringently investigated report of miracles performed. Canon law from this period emphasized such criteria as penitential practices, purity of morals, courageous acts, humility, and simplicity, while the papacy, beset by the complications of the Avignon papacy and challenges from various heretical sects in the first half of the fourteenth century, increasingly favored candidates demonstrating extensive learning, defense of Catholic doctrine, and orthodoxy even more than active preaching to the infidel or even

116 See chapter 2, 26-7 and above pg. 17, ff. 63.
117 For an in depth study of the relationship between these two institutions, see Mulchahey, *First,* 351-399.
118 Vauchez, *Sainthood,* 399-400.
battling heresy in the field.\textsuperscript{121} Thus, while Peter Martyr and Thomas Aquinas were only canonized fifty years apart and both fit papal objectives, their dominant brands of sanctity look entirely different. If, however, the immensely popular martyr’s \textit{vita} had been influenced to some extent by papal objectives, Aquinas, whose cult was largely limited to a small group of Dominican scholars and nobility, was even more a papal darling. This is especially true if we believe Pierre Gui’s assertion in his commentary on the life of Martin Donadieu of Carcassonne written by his uncle, Bernard, that Aquinas’ canonization was the result of Pope John XXII’s offer to canonize any member of the Dominican Order in 1317 as a mark of his favor to the Order—any member, that is, other than the Dominicans’ first proposed candidate, the Catalan saint Ramon de Peñafort on account of squabbles with the Aragonese king.\textsuperscript{122} Thus, papal objectives shaped Aquinas’ legacy to a far greater extent than they had Dominic’s or and even Peter Martyr’s.

Finally, Aquinas’ hagiographers faced the challenge of appropriately gendering a saint who did not overtly exhibit the characteristics ascribed to mature Dominican masculinity in earlier hagiographic texts. While the depiction of Dominic, the brothers in the \textit{Vitae fratrum}, and Peter Martyr emphasized their active pastoral ministry, preaching, and anti-heretical confrontations, the saintly Aquinas instead demonstrated a commitment to contemplation and study, activities previously portrayed as either feminine or, at the very least, immature by Dominican hagiographers.\textsuperscript{123} On the surface, Aquinas hardly made for an overtly masculine model of sanctity. However, Aquinas’ hagiographers, and particularly the \textit{vita} by Bernard Gui on which this section will focus, made use of several hagiographic, secular, and Dominican male traditions in order to situate Aquinas within the Dominican masculine ideal of sainthood. He does this by incorporating language from the hagiographic representations of the bishop-saint and the ideal of male heroic asceticism, secular university ideals of masculine competition, as well as Dominican rhetoric about preaching and emphasis on professional utility in order to gender the aspects of Aquinas’ life that had been depicted in previous lives as feminine in a particularly masculine way. In doing so, Bernard supplied the order with a

\textsuperscript{121} The papacy had, in fact, increasingly encouraged scholarly learning among the clergy since the late 13th century, but this trend did not find substantial expression in the hagiographic output from the period. Vauchez, \textit{Sainthood}, 397-407. On the virtues favored by the canonists and, hence, papacy from this period, see \textit{Ibid.}, 516.


\textsuperscript{123} See above chapter 1, 50-3; chapter 2, 99-100 and 126-8; and chapter 3, 151-4.
masculine saint who elevated study and an academic career, a model of Dominican male identity previously only partially developed in the Dominican hagiographic tradition, to a legitimate model of holy masculine achievement for the friars.

The doctrinal importance of Thomas Aquinas to the Dominican Order cannot be overstated and perhaps needs very little introduction. Even prior to his canonization the Dominican General Chapter repeatedly commanded that no one was to speak “irreverently or indecently” about the scholar or his works even if they thought differently, that they should work hard to understand, promote, and defend his doctrine, and that they should never assert anything “contrary to what was commonly believed about the doctor’s opinion.” These admonishments were, of course, in response to some fairly robust internal and external opposition to Aquinas’ teachings, but the General Chapter continued to back his teachings prior to canonization, officially adopting Thomistic theology as an Order in 1286. The Dominicans also adopted Aquinas’ Corpus Christi liturgical office, _Sacerdos in aeternum_ in 1322, a year before his canonization, around the time when the Order began officially promoting the feast.

Given the centrality of Thomistic theology for the Dominican Order, it is perhaps no surprise that there were several _vitae_ written of the saint during and immediately following his canonization, the most important of which are those written by William of Tocco, Peter Calo, and Bernard Gui. After extensive scholarly debate about the relationship of these texts to one another, due to their similarity in content and chronological proximity, historians have determined that William of Tocco’s _vita_, which was composed for
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124 “...nec sit aliquantenus tolerandum, quod de ipso vel scriptis eius aliqui irreverenter et indecenter loquantur, etiam aliter sencientes...” _AGI_ I: 204 (1279); “Districtius iniungimus et mandamus, ut frates omnes et singuli, prout sciant et possunt, efficacem dent operam ad doctrinam venerabilis magistri fratris Thome de Aquino recolende memorie promovendam et saltem ut est opinio defendendam...” _Ibid_. 235 (1286); and “...inhibemus districte, quod nullus frater legendo, determinando, respondendo audeat assertive tenere contrarium eius, quod communiter creditur de opinione doctoris predicti...” _Ibid_. II: 64 (1313).

125 _AGII_ I: 235 (1286). The General Chapter also made repeated rulings making Thomist teachings central to Dominican education and defending the doctrine from outside challenges, _AGII_ II: 191 (1329) and 297 (1344). For a summary of the rise of Thomism within the order see Hinnebusch, _History_, II, 149-171.

126 The General Chapter began officially enforcing practice of the Corpus Christi feast in 1318, leaving the job of providing an office to the Master General. In the Chapter Acts from 1322-24, the Order officially adopted and promoted Aquinas’ liturgy. Bonniwell, _History_, 223-5 and the _AGII_ I: 109 (1318); 138 (1322): 144 (1323); and 151 (1324).
Aquinas’ canonization by the commissioner of the committee, was the template for the other lives. Historians have also followed the conclusion reached by the Bollandists that the later *vitae* were of little historical value since they closely followed William of Tocco’s text. Alarcón even claimed that these later *vitae* “add almost nothing of importance to Tocco, if we consider the last revision of his biography.” While it is certainly true that William of Tocco’s life is extremely important as a historical source regarding Aquinas’ canonization and that the later lives add very little in terms of original content, the rhetorical, organizational, and editorial choices of the hagiographer nonetheless provide valuable insight into the shaping of Aquinas’ saintly image. This is especially true in the case of Bernard Gui’s *vita*, written between 1322 and 1324, on which this section will focus. While Peter Calo often copied William of Tocco’s stories word for word and kept much of the original chronology, Bernard Gui rewrote much of William of Tocco’s prose, reorganized portions of the text, and omitted certain sections, thus providing hints as to Bernard’s goals in presenting the newly canonized saint. Peter Calo’s life was also extremely short as it was inserted into his larger *Legendary*, which itself had limited circulation, while Bernard’s stand alone *Legenda* achieved a wider circulation than both Peter Calo’s life and William of Tocco’s combined, with sixteen remaining manuscripts.

---


129 Bernard held the position of Procurator General of the order, acting as the Order’s liason with the pope in all matters, during Aquinas’ canonization and this is likely where he encountered William of Tocco’s *vita* as well as other documents pertaining to the saint. Mandonnet, “Canonisation,” 27-8.

In addition, Bernard’s prominence within the Order as an administrative leader, inquisitor, and historian made his depiction of Aquinas extremely influential for the Order’s internal identity formation.\textsuperscript{131} That Dominican writers considered Bernard’s text to be an important addition to their hagiographic and historic self-representation can be seen in the list of texts included with this \textit{Legenda Thomae} among the remaining manuscripts, which include the \textit{vita Dominici}, \textit{Vitae fratrum}, \textit{vita Raymundi de Pennaforte}, and the life of the Blessed Dalmatius Moner (a Catalan Dominican), as well as Aquinas’ bull of canonization, the letters by Stephen Tempier, bishop of Paris, against some of Aquinas’ teachings and one granting him indulgences, the indulgences granted by Pope Clement IV to Thomas, and Bernard Gui’s \textit{chronica brevis} of Thomas’ life.\textsuperscript{132} In addition, one of the remaining manuscripts was copied specifically for use at a Dominican convent. Thus, while William of Tocco’s life was the official document associated with the canonization proceedings, it is evident that late medieval Dominican compilers considered Bernard’s text to be important in terms of their own hagiographic and historical records. In addition, since Bernard’s \textit{vita} was not directly tied to the canonization proceedings, his \textit{vita} was not influenced as much by papal objectives and canonization requirements, allowing him more freedom in the creation of Aquinas’ legacy. Thus, Bernard Gui’s \textit{Legenda}, written by one of the Order’s most eminent historians, widely distributed, and further removed from papal requirements than William of Tocco’s text, provides a useful window into the creation of Aquinas’ hagiographic image within a broader Dominican identity. Finally, while Bernard kept the main content of William’s text, he removed many of his rhetorical flourishes, producing a succinct and relatively unadorned narrative.\textsuperscript{133} Because Bernard pared down William’s text so thoroughly, it would be impossible and unnecessary for the present discussion to account for all of the nuances of this editing process here. The following analysis, then, will instead focus primarily on the gendered depiction of Aquinas found in Bernard Gui’s text, while referencing any major omissions of material from William’s \textit{vita} relating to the saint’s

\textsuperscript{131} According to Hinnebusch, Bernard was the “greatest historian that the Order produced in the Middle Ages” and his works played and important role in Dominican hagiography until the modern period. That there are over 230 extant manuscripts containing works by Bernard Gui attests to his popularity as does the flurry of copyist activity immediately following his death. See Hinnebusch, \textit{History}, II, pgs. 411-420; Bernard Montagnes, “Bernard Gui dans L’Historiographie Dominicaine,” in \textit{Bernard Gui et sa monde: Ouvrage Publié avec le concours du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique} (Toulouse: E. Privat, c. 1981), 183-203; Dellise, \textit{Notice}; and Vernet, “Diffusion,” 226 & 232.


\textsuperscript{133} For a comparison of the hagiographers’ differing rhetorical styles, see Endres, “Studien,” 545-5 and Janssen, “Premiers,” 331-352.
gendered identity and accounting for the origins of relevant passages of Bernard’s text so as to determine whether Bernard added his own “masculinizing” imagery.

Let us now turn to the representation of Aquinas in Bernard Gui’s *Legenda Sancti Thomae Aquinatis*. Like Dominic’s hagiographers, Bernard used prenatal prophecy and a key childhood event to introduce the core identity of his saintly subject at the beginning of his text. In the first chapter of the *Legenda*, Bernard related Thomas’ noble ancestry, considered an important aspect of sainthood in the hagiographic tradition, and told how a certain holy man, well known around Naples, approached Thomas’s mother while she was pregnant with him and bid her to rejoice since her child “was going to be distinguished throughout the world, in knowledge and in manner of living.” Thus, Bernard’s introductory material on the saint established his innate claim to sanctity through his aristocratic heritage as well as the two major pillars of that sanctity that would be developed in the rest of the text: learning and holy lifestyle. Bernard’s presentation of the next anecdote, pertaining to an event in Thomas’s childhood, further clarified the future saint’s academic bent. In this story, the young Thomas grabbed a mysterious object with his hand, refusing to surrender it throughout his bath, until his mother finally pried open his fist and found a piece of parchment bearing the Angelic Salutation inside. Bernard, taking William of Tocco’s words, said that this event pointed to the boy’s future as a master when, “having been made a man he would be destined to pour forth salutiferous doctrine.” In addition to emphasizing the saint’s future as a great scholar, this commentary also pointed to the utility of this doctrine, a theme which was, as we have seen, central to the male saintly ideal of the previous Dominican hagiographic text and one that Bernard substantiated throughout the rest of his *Legenda*. Thus, the initial two chapters of Bernard’s text first emphasized Thomas’ future as a great scholar and second as a man of holy life.

An initial glance at the chapter headings of the *legenda Thomae* seems to indicate that the Angelic Doctor’s sanctity rested primarily on his personal virtues, piety, and dedication to contemplation within the convent, all characteristics central to female hagiographic texts in the late medieval period. A closer look at the rhetorical presentation and content of the text, however, shows that these characteristics were either

---

inexorably linked to Thomas’ scholarly achievement, fulfilled canonization requirements, or drew upon various other models of masculine behavior. The resulting hagiographic text thus reflects masculine saintly ideals more often than feminine ones, even when the qualities themselves are the same. This characteristic of Bernard’s rhetorical strategy is apparent in his depiction of the three “feminine” characteristics most emphasized in the text—chastity, humility, and divine contemplation. When discussing these virtues, Bernard placed them within the hagiographic traditions of militaristic battle against vice, as is particularly the case with chastity. In addition, Bernard often masculinized these ambiguously gendered traits by simultaneously praising the saint’s “more masculine” traits in his discussion of them, such as his academic achievement or his overall utility to the Order, a theme presented in earlier Dominican hagiography as masculine.

The first of these characteristics emphasized in Bernard’s text is chastity. As with the Dominican hagiographic texts discussed above, chastity in Thomas’ *vita* functioned as a foundational aspect of his sanctity earned through youthful struggle, but was not central to the male saintly claims. As with Dominic and Peter’s *vitae*, Bernard depicted Thomas heroically defending his virtue in the face of an attack from an external source during a period of youthful temptation, a traditional trope from male saints’ lives. In a well-known event from Thomas’ youth, first recorded by Gerard of Frachet in the *Vitae fratrum* during Thomas’ lifetime, his mother, with the assistance of his brothers and the King of Sicily, locked the young Thomas in a tower for a year and used various tactics to persuade him not to join the Dominican Order. Bernard relates one tactic with an uncharacteristically florid rhetorical style, describing how Thomas’s mother and brothers, enemies in the spirit, turned to the weapons and tricks of the Devil and sought to overturn the soul of innocence through the aspect of a woman. ‘For,’ they said, ‘will this one be more cautious than Adam, stronger than Samson, more just than Loth, more devout than David, and wiser than Solomon?' Therefore, let a beautiful girl enter and, through shameless aspect, gesture, and deed, if she is able, let her overthrow this tower which does not fear the siege machines of our threats and injuries nor the missiles of our enticements.”

---

136 Vauchez notes a similar tendency in the inquiry held at Naples during the canonization proceedings in *Sainthood*, 346.

137 See above chapter 1, 38-9, esp. ff. 20

138 GoF, *Vitae*, chap. 4.17.III, 201. Thomas was likely aware of the addition of his story to Gerard’s text since he was present at the General Chapter at Valenciennes in 1259 when the *Vitae fratrum* was put into circulation. It is unclear whether or not Aquinas actually *read* the passages about himself since it is lacking in a certain number of conserved manuscripts. LeBrun-Grouvnic, *Vitoria*, 18.

139 “...hostes spiritu ad dyaboli arma fraudesque se convertunt et per femine speciem subvertere querunt animum innocentis. Numquid, iniquunt, primo parente Adam caucion, sampsone fortior, lot justior; dawid devotion; salomone sapientior erit istic? Ingrediatur igitur puella lasciva et impudico vulu ac pudico vultu et, si prevaeat actu, turrium hanc dejectiat, que minorum, nostrarum injuriarum machinas et blanditiarum missilia non formidat.” BG, *Vita*, chap. VII, 173-4.
By using militaristic language common in hagiographic depictions of heroic defense of chastity especially common in male hagiographic texts from the early medieval period, Bernard linked Thomas’ actions with a long tradition of masculinized sanctity. In addition, this particular dialogue does not appear in William’s text where he instead describes the plan more generally by comparing it to a storm during which “towers are banged together, rocks are softened, and cedars of Lebanon are uprooted by a storm.”

By elaborating on William’s text and describing it in militaristic terms, Bernard presented it as a spiritual battle enacted between the heroic and masculine Thomas and his family, the Devil’s representatives.

Bernard showered the actual confrontation between Thomas and the girl with more descriptive and expansive narrations, which use militaristic language to emphasize the saint’s heroic virtue. According to Bernard,

a girl most beautiful and unchaste, like a serpent with a human face, entered the room in which he was being guarded alone so that she might snare the youth and, if she could, overthrow him from his practice of chastity. She sought to entice the innocent youth, now with snake-like aspect, now with lascivious words and touches, not believing that she fought with an angel, but only with a man. Moreover, so that his strength could be completed through weakness, urges immediately followed in the youthful body, urges which nevertheless his soul, as aged as it was manly, did not delay in immediately overcoming in youth. The young man then introduced virtue to modesty and noble rage. And since a fiery libido was in question, he soon approached the fire which was in the room by chance and, seizing a piece of burning wood in place of a dagger and driving the girl, the suggestor of fiery desire, to the edge of the room, he thrust her away.

After having physically driven her off, Thomas prostrated himself in prayer at the other end of the room and begged Mary for the “gift of perpetual continence and virginity,” a wish that was granted to him in the form of a spiritual “chastity belt [cingulum]” given to him by two angels that could not be loosened for the rest of his life. While translators have sometimes chosen to translate cingulum as girdle, given the use of this word to denote a sword-belt and the highly militaristic language used in the passage as a whole, it seems more appropriate to use belt.

Bernard’s colorful and elaborate portrayal touches upon a wide variety of

---

140 “...cogitaverunt predicti fratres per aliud genus impugnationis evincere, quo turres concuti, saxa molliri et cedri Libani consueuerunt tempestate suffodi.” WoT, Ystoria, chap. XI, 112.
141 “Ingreditur itaque cameram in qua solus sub tali tenebatur custodia puella pulcherrima, impudica, quasi serpens humana facie, ut juvenem illaque et si possit, dejiciat a proposito castitatis. Que nunc vipereo aspectu nunc verbis lascivis et tactibus querit allicere innocentem juvenem non credens se cum angelo, sed cum homine decertare. Ut autem virtus in infirmitate perficciatur; subsequuntur stimuli in juvenili corpore, quos tamen in adolescentem mox tam senilis quam virilis animus non distulit superare. Tunc virtutem pudori ac furori bono adolescens immisit. Et quia de ignita libidine tractabatur, ad ignem qui fortuitu erat in camera mox accessit et tictionem pro pugione arripiens suggestricem ignite libidinis puelead extra cameram ambitum effugans exturbavit.” BG, Vita, chap. VII, 174.
143 In this I concur with Ruth Mazo Karras in “Aquinas”, 62.
hagiographic, religious, and secular ideals of sexuality most often present in male saint’s lives. Bernard’s description almost perfectly embodied the ideal of masculine heroic chastity in the hagiographic tradition in that it depicts sexual temptation as external to the saint and attributes his eventual victory to some sort of divine intervention. It also recalled the early Dominican hagiographic heroes, particularly Dominic’s use of actual fire to deter a seductress and Reginald’s attainment of permanent chastity with Mary’s help. In addition, Bernard emphasized Thomas’s struggle with lust as a youthful stage that, once conquered, did not move into adulthood. This age-specific progression was present in all of the Dominican hagiographic texts discussed above and paralleled secular ideals of male sexuality, which linked uncontrolled sexuality with youth/femininity and controlled sexuality with adulthood/masculinity. Indeed, as with the scene in which Reginald received a chastity belt in Dominic’s *vita*, the bestowal of perpetual chastity also mirrored chivalric knighting ceremonies in which a belt was also bestowed. Finally, this section responded to canonization requirements by emphasizing heroic virtue, a concept first introduced by Boniface VIII in a sermon celebrating St. Louis in 1297 and becoming increasingly important throughout the end of the Middle Ages, in which the saint demonstrated superhuman dedication to a particular virtue. Thus, Bernard’s rhetorical and narrative elaborations to this story emphasized Aquinas’s masculine approach to the defense of chastity based upon hagiographic, Dominican, and even secular ideals.

Margaret of Hungary’s *vita* provides an interesting feminine foil to Bernard’s text, since both saints meet threats to their chastity with distinctly gendered responses. In Garin of Guy-l’Eveque’s account of the Hungarian Dominican nun, the royal princess met her father’s attempts to marry her off and the threats of Tartar invasions with the same defensive strategy: she intended to defend her virginity by mutilating her face or cutting out her eyes, but was never actually required to do so. Although the threat to her chastity is externally inflicted, Margaret of Hungary nonetheless rejected this temptation by proposing to harm her own body, which she saw as the source of temptation for the men around her. Thus, while the actions of these

144 On heroic chastity see Chapter 1, 18-23 above and Ruth Mazo Karras, “Thomas,” 50-68.
145 WoT, Ystoria, chap. XI, 112
146 See above chapter 1, 42-6.
147 See above chapter 1, 40-2.
148 In this sermon Boniface said, “Vita eius non fuit solum vita hominis ed supra hominem.” Related in Vauchez, Sainthood, 519, ff. 67.
saints seemed very different, they both respond to the same logical system that emphasized the female body as the sexual seductress and defined saintly behavior as violent rejection of that female body. In addition Margaret, like Margaret of Ypres and many other female saints, rejected marriage or rape while Aquinas instead rejected youthful sexual desire, much like the other Dominican male saints. Thus, the saintly anecdotes look very different on the surface because the form of the threat to their chastity and their response to this threat followed secular and biological understandings of appropriate or normal expressions of sexuality.

Bernard Gui’s later references to Aquinas’ chastity were far more concise and are mainly concerned with establishing the saint’s lifelong virginity. Much later in the *Legenda*, for example, Bernard related Reginald of Piperno’s public testimony to the saint’s lifelong purity, information that he had received as Thomas’ companion and confessor. The chapter itself is brief, omitting entirely William’s account of Reginald’s grief at his master’s death, while instead focusing on the testimony itself as well as the credibility of the witness providing it. With this omission, the content of the chapter is similar in structure and focus to the account in Peter Martyr’s *vita* about chastity. Bernard’s final reference occurred in the context of a vision in which St. Augustine appeared to Albert of Brescia, who had been praying at Mary’s altar after two of his companions expressed doubt regarding Thomas’s sanctity. The illustrious Bishop of Hippo confirmed the holiness of Aquinas’s doctrine, his presence in heaven, his successful defense of the faith, and literary output. He concluded his endorsement of the saint with the following words, “Thomas is my equal in glory, except that he surpasses me with the halo of virginity, and I surpass him in the dignity of the pontifical order.” While it is Thomas’ knowledge of doctrine and literary output that by and large establish his sanctity, virginity gave him a traditional marker of sanctity and established him in a position of superiority over another important saint. Both Augustine’s endorsement of the utility of Aquinas’s sanctity and the emphasis placed on the traditional marker of sanctity, virginity, functioned in Bernard’s text to directly address concerns about the

---

nature of his holiness expressed by two friars at the beginning of the anecdote. Thus, the images of chastity provided in Bernard's text both placed the saint within established masculine hagiographic tropes, which emphasized the theme of masculine heroic struggle, and Dominican masculine hagiographic constructs, which placed the maintenance of chastity in the background of the mature saint's active ministry. In fact, Bernard de-emphasized the importance of chastity in his construction of Thomas's sanctity by omitting three chapters from William's text further discussing the saint's virginity. In doing so, Bernard more closely aligned the new saint with prior models of masculine sanctity within the Order.

One aspect of ascetic practice referenced far more frequently in Bernard's *Legenda* than chastity and one that played a relatively minor role in earlier Dominican hagiographic texts is humility. Unlike chastity, humility allowed for varying forms of saintly expressions in medieval hagiographic texts that were not so clearly distinguished by gender. Humility appeared in the lives of the bishop saints of the High Middle Ages, demonstrated through their interactions with social inferiors and disdain for personal wealth, as well as the tradition of *mulieres religiosae* who renounced their wealth and the social standing that had accompanied it. This virtue came to the center of hagiographic saintly construction with Cluniac and Cistercian reforms as well as the return to the evangelical virtues in the 12th and 13th centuries. Bernard of Clairvaux defined humility in *De gradibus humilitatis* as putting aside individual pride and denying oneself so as to unite one's will with God's, a concept that fostered late medieval understandings of mystical union with the Godhead prevalent in late medieval saint's lives, and especially in holy women. Humility was a pre-requisite for achieving true mystical connection with the Divine and it also determined how the Cistercian female saints expressed this connection. While female Cistercian saints demonstrated this virtue by avoiding administrative positions, hiding evidence of stigmata, and refusing to reveal their revelations, Cistercian hagiographers emphasized avoidance of honorable office as the primary expression of humility in the male

154 Bernard adds these two doubting friars to William's story as a setup for this miraculous appearance. See WoT, *Ystoria*, chap. XXII, 144-5. Vauchez comments on how many witnesses at the canonization proceedings demonstrated some unease with the novelty of Aquinas' form of sainthood, using this particular story, and specifically Augustine's vote of confidence, as an example in *Sainthood*, 403.
155 WoT, *Ystoria*, chaps. 27, 28, & 32 pgs. 150-4 and 160.
156 Weinstein and Bell, *Saints*, 155. Unlike chastity, the virtue of humility has not been the focus of intense scholarly study let alone studies focused on gendered approaches.
159 Related in Roisin, *L'hagiographie*, 100.
The monastic ideal championed by Bernard, combined with the impetus of the Gregorian reform, also influenced the ideal of the holy bishop who was gradually transformed from a fiery man of action, aggressively defending ecclesiastical prerogatives into a holy bishop who behaved humbly to his inferiors, rejected ostentation and popularity, and was a cultivated man admired for his wisdom. For example, St. Louis of Anjou (d. 1297), bishop of Toulouse, who was also canonized by Pope John XXII, exhibited behaviors such as refusing to ride in a horse or carriage and renouncing an unwanted bishopric out of humility. The Franciscans, drawing on this heritage, linked humility with poverty and late medieval female mendicant saints such as Clare of Assisi, Margaret of Hungary, and Clare of Montefalco attached great importance to the extremes of both virtues, often turning to extensive physical mortification or deprivation for its expression. Thus, while humility as a concept was largely ungendered in late medieval hagiographic texts, the behaviors that hagiographers defined as humble often followed gendered ideals of sanctity. Late medieval female saints, for example, achieved mystical experiences, engaged in voluntary poverty and extensive self-mutilation, avoided leadership positions, and hid evidence of their own sanctity. Margaret of Hungary presented a Dominican example of feminine expression of humility. Garin of Guy-l’Eveque depicted a young princess who declined to wear the clothing given her by her royal family, insisted on ragged clothing, refused special foods, avoided speaking with her family, hid her extensive ascetic practices, performed disgusting tasks around the convent that the other sisters avoided, and took care of the sick.

Although male saints could and did exhibit all of the humble behaviors often ascribed to female saints, twelfth- to fourteenth-century hagiographers more often apply the adjective “humble” to men who treated their social inferiors as equals, avoided the honors of ecclesiastical or administrative office, and despised the wealth that they had. Unlike the earlier Dominican hagiographic texts in which direct references to humility played a relatively minor role, Bernard Gui characterized Aquinas as a humble individual throughout the text. In stark contrast to Margaret of Hungary’s *vita*, however, Thomas’s humility

---

161 Bernard wrote explicitly on this topic in his *De moribus et officiis episcoporum* as did Peter of Blois in his *De institutione episcoporum*. See Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 285-292.
164 GoG, *Vita*, chap. 8, 516; chap. 9, 517; chaps. 11-12, 517; chap. 15, 517; and chaps. 18-22, 518.
165 The path of voluntary poverty was fraught with tension by the early 14th century, a quandary which both Aquinas and the pope who canonized him tried to address. See Vauchez, 394-7.
was almost exclusively associated with his avoidance of academic posts and his patient treatment of his social and intellectual inferiors, two activities typically gendered as male in hagiographic texts. At a couple of points in Thomas’s career, his hagiographers mention that the saint was reluctant to receive a promotion out of humility, but that obedience eventually compelled him to give in. The first incidence of this occurred when Albert Magnus recommended that the young Thomas be sent to Paris for a bachelor’s degree. Bernard, more eloquently restating the content of William’s text, said that Thomas, “always willingly thinking lowly things about himself, since he was the humblest person, would have desired to avoid this office out of humility, if the merit of obedience had not compelled him.”

Bernard included a similar story in the next chapter, when Thomas was studying theology at Paris. The chancellor told the prior of the Dominican convent in Paris to present Thomas so that he could become a master but when the prior informed Thomas of this decision, the saint, “like a truly humble person, began to humbly excuse himself by alleging that he was insufficient in knowledge and age, for he was only about thirty years old. But the power [virtus] of obedience and humility prevailed, while he could not oppose the command, a large amount of merit was acquired out of both.” In both examples Bernard portrayed the young saint avoiding any promotions extended to him because of his humility, but acquiescing out of obedience to his superiors. Bernard, following William’s lead, in some sense legitimized Thomas’ academic career as an appropriate pursuit for a saint by applying rhetoric usually used to discuss ecclesiastical or administrative advancements, signifiers of honorable masculine achievement, to academic advancement. In addition to these academic postings, Bernard significantly altered William’s chapter on the efficacy of Thomas’s prayer so that it included another reference to the saint’s humility. In a rather poignant moment, Thomas sought to console his companion as he lay dying by saying that he had already received the three things for which he had asked God during his life: First, that “no affection for any temporal or worldly thing should corrupt the purity of my mind or weaken my strength”; second, that “God should not allow the dignity of any ruling office to lift me up or transfer me from my humility and that of my

166 “Qui cum humillimus esset de se ipso semper humilia sentiens libenter ex humilitate voluisset officium subterfugere, nisi ipsum obedientie meritum compulisset.” BG, Vita, chap. XI, pg. 178. William says a similar thing in Ystoria, chap. 15, 122.

Order”; and, thirdly, that he should know the state of his dead brother’s soul. The second wish represented one of Bernard’s additions to William’s text, perhaps suggesting that the hagiographer wished to justify Thomas’s lack of promotion within the ecclesiastical or Dominican hierarchy as the result of the saint’s own desire rather than any inadequacy of his character. The second and third desires were Bernard’s additions to William’s original text, which had only indicated Aquinas’s desire to avoid worldly attachment. While this desire for purity could include physical chastity and possibly even referred to Dominic’s final warning to the brothers not to weaken their souls through conversation with young women, it also implied a broader renunciation of all worldly attachment. In that way, Bernard’s specific reference to ecclesiastical office functioned as a further elaboration of this general renunciation.

In addition to demonstrating humility in the form of avoiding or reluctantly accepting honorable positions, Bernard also described Thomas’ behavior as humble when the saint had patience with his social or intellectual inferiors. Bernard told of how the young Thomas, while studying with Albert Magnus, demonstrated great skill in debating with his Master and was thus given more difficult scholastic exercises, “but the youth had cast his heart into the depths of humility, not elevated by these things, he did not change his accustomed manner of simplicity and living.” At this point in the chapter, Bernard removed some details from William’s text that further described the particulars of Thomas’s intellectual brilliance, simply mentioning that the saint was given more difficult scholastic assignments, while ending the entire section with his own addition emphasizing the saint’s humility: “although he prevailed over the others in both knowledge and natural disposition, he did not thoughtlessly hold anyone in contempt or respond haughtily to anyone or, elevating himself above them, consider himself to be something great.” In this description, Bernard, even more so than William, finely balanced the masculine university ideal of aggressive intellectual prowess and success in the highly competitive world of scholastic education with a the ideal of the humble

168 “Primum quod nullius rei temporalis aut carnalis affectio puritatem mentis mee inliceret, vel fortitudinem emolliet. Secundo quod Deus non permitteret, ut a statu humilitatis mee et ordinis alijus prelationis dignitas me extolleret aut transferret.” BG, Vita, 188.
169 WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXXII, 160.
170 See Chapter 1, pg. 20-1.
171 “Juvenis autem in profundo humilitatis cor suum fundaverat, ex his non elatus solite simplicitatis ac vivendi modum minime immutavit, quamvis magister albertus deinceps difficiliores actus scolasticos sibi injungeret.” BG, Vita, chap. X, 178. For the comparable section, see WoT, Ystoria, chap. 13, 118.
172 “Et quamquam supra ceteros tam scientia quam ingenio polleret, nullo tamen vel leviter contempsit vel fastuose ulli respondit, vel se supra se elevans se magnum aliquid reputavit.” BG, Vita, chap. X, 178.
bishop who acted modestly toward his intellectual inferiors. This latter ideal stemmed from monastic ideals of behavior, for both men and women, and thus Bernard’s portrayal of Thomas placed the saint within monastic, particularly Cistercian, ideal of humility as the source of the soul’s ascent toward God, reflecting the Dominican emphasis on education as both conventual, in the monastic sense of spiritual growth, and intellectual as reflected in university practices.

Two anecdotes also depicting the friar acting with humility toward his social or intellectual inferiors occurred much later in the text in a chapter dealing exclusively with the saint’s humility and closely mirrored William of Tocco’s Ystoria. The first example in this chapter, entitled “about the humility of his conversation,” focused more clearly on the traditional interpretation of humility as a virtue. In this story a friar was told to take a companion with him to run an errand in town and, not recognizing the well-known Aquinas, ordered the saint to accompany him at the prior’s command, which Aquinas did, immediately putting aside his doctrinal meditation. Upon reaching the town, with the friar constantly urging the bulky Thomas to walk faster, the citizens, “who recognized him and were amazed that such a doctor had walked with such a lowly friar,” told the poor, ignorant friar whom he had been harassing along the journey. Thomas explained his actions to the reverential crowd by saying that “all religion is accomplished in obedience.” Bernard expressed his amazement that the accolades which Thomas had received as a result of his teaching had not made him too proud to obey his prior’s command.173 This section depicted many of the traditional hagiographic ideals for the humble bishop or monk, who did not let their administrative appointments go to their head, but continued to emphasize service to others, a predominantly masculine ideal. William and consequently Bernard simply altered this paradigm slightly by making the honorable position held by Thomas that of a doctor, master, and scholar rather than of an administrator:

The second anecdote from this section contained a much more ambiguous representation of the saint’s humility, one that was based on the idea of acting with humility toward inferiors, but which largely discussed the saint’s accomplishments in the masculinized academic realm. This elaborate story began during the process of licensing a certain magister, who argued against Aquinas’s own teachings in the saint’s

---

presence. Thomas didn’t argue his own case, however, since he was allegedly oblivious to this insult. His fellow friars, however, made him aware of the threat on the way back to the convent, saying "'Master, we are greatly offended because that master argued thus against your opinion and doctrine. You should not have sustained such an insult [injuriam] in front of all of the Parisian masters.’” Aquinas, “quiet and humble,” responded to this goading by saying, "'It seemed to me, brothers, that the new master should be spared at the beginning [of his career], from being confounded in the sight of all the masters...If, however it seems appropriate to the brothers, tomorrow I will be able to supply what I have omitted for this reason.” By depicting the mere intellectual opposition of Aquinas’s newly minted colleague as an insult and employing such terms as offensi and injuriam, Bernard placed this intellectual conflict within the wider structures of feuding culture in which insults to a man’s honor often resulted in long or short term violent relationships. In Bernard’s narrative, one’s academic reputation was a source of masculine honor, akin to a secular man’s social position, and the university setting functioned as a public arena for defending that honor. In fact, Aquinas’s fellow Dominicans, labeled by William of Tocco as his students, goad Thomas to avenge an offense committed against them by convincing him that it also caused injury to his reputation, using a tactic often employed by secular men for similar reasons. For William and Bernard, Thomas’s humility rested on the fact that he remained unaware of his own standing, acting not for himself but at the instigation of his fellow friars. Indeed, they simultaneously depicted Thomas as a good lord, who protected the reputation of his loyal companions, another trademark of hagiographic representation of bishop-saints. And protect them, he did.

Bernard related how the following day, in front of all the masters and bachelors, Aquinas again met his

---

174 "Magister nos graviter offensi sumus, quia ille magister contra opinionem et doctrinam vestram sic tenuit. Vos autem non debuitis hanc veritatis injuriam coram omnibus magistris parisiensibus sustinere." BG, Vita, chap. XXXI, pg. 197. Also in WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXVI, 149.
175 "Quibus quietus magister et humilis mansuetu respondit: Fratres visum fuit michi novo magistro in suo principio esse parcendum, ne confunderetur in conspectu omnium magistorum...Si tamen fratribus aliiud expediens videatur, crastina die supphere potero, quod omisi ex causa.” BG, Vita, chap. XXXI, 197. Also in WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXVI, 149.
176 Hugh Thomas points to opposition as a source of insult in the context of conflicts between ecclesiastical figures, monks, and aristocrats in Late Medieval England in “Shame,” 1054. Caro Baroja, Boehm, and Muir point out the role of insult, verbal and otherwise, in the initiation of a feuding relationship, while Lesnick reports the prevalence of insults in testimonies of physical violence in the legal records of Todi. See Caro Baroja, “Honour,” 90-1; Boehm, Blood Revenge; Muir, Mad Blood; and Lesnick, “Insults,” 76-8.
177 On the centrality of public competition in the construction of male honor, see above introduction, 11-14.
178 Paul Hyams discusses the importance of the use of the term injuria by late medieval vassals hoping to incite their lords to enact justice on their behalf, namely, by convincing the lord that the wrong committed injured the Lord as well as the vassal in Rancor, 150.
179 Vauchez, Sainthood, 294. Hugh Thomas also discusses the important role that bishops and religious men played in the defense of ecclesiastical rights by utilizing the idioms of honor and shame, in Thomas, “Shame.”
opponent, who continued to state views opposing Thomas’s own, until Aquinas, “with complete self control” politely asked him to change his erroneous view and then, “arguing more forcibly and instigating a debate, compelled him to admit his shame [pudorem] by retracting his error and to humbly seek to know the truth more fully from the holy doctor.”\textsuperscript{180} Bernard thus showed Aquinas to be a scholar and a man fully capable of defending his own honor by shaming an opponent and of functioning effectively in a competitive masculine arena, albeit only when told to do so by others. Thus, an anecdote allegedly meant to depict the saint’s humility, ends up being more a tribute to his intellectual abilities and position within the university hierarchy. Bernard overtly stated this agenda in his concluding sentence, taken from William’s text, in which he said that those present at the debate were amazed at the “tranquillity of mind and words” with which Thomas “argued against his adversary, as if he were teaching a student” and at how he had “proposed such a knowledgable lesson on short notice so that the hidden strength [virtus] of the master’s mind and the his clear veracity should take their rightful place.”\textsuperscript{181} The only hint at the virtue of humility in this otherwise masculinized portrayal of Thomas’s intellectual prowess, was the idea of Thomas treating his opponent as if he were a student, perhaps exemplifying his patience with an intellectual inferior. As with all of these examples of Aquinas’s humility in Bernard’s text, this one exalted his academic reputation or intellectual achievements as much, if not more than, his actual humility by demonstrating his masculine prowess within the competitive university environment.

While the above examples deal with the behavioral manifestations of the saint’s humility, Bernard addressed the root of this virtue in a later chapter. According to the hagiographer, Aquinas, following Christ’s example, said that he had never experienced any vainglory resulting from his academic positions or accomplishments because reason had suppressed any inclination to do so. In addition, Bernard said that Thomas could not be proud because he knew that his wisdom came from a “daily influx of divine truth” given to him by God, not through his own skill. According to Bernard, it was this humility, which mirrored Christ’s in taking on human form, that allowed Thomas to return to the depths [yma] of earth from the divine heights


\textsuperscript{181} “De quo magistri et alii qui aderant mirati sunt universi, de tranquillitate mentis et verbi, qui sic arguebat adversarium, quasi doceret discipulum et qui tante scientie subito proposuisset mirabiliter documentum, ut et suum locum haberet debitum occulta virtus animi et veritas manifesta magistri.” BG, \textit{Vita}, chap. XXXI, 198 and WoT, \textit{Ystoria}, chap. XXVI, 150.
Thus, the virtue of humility both allowed Thomas to act as a conduit for divine revelation and provided the means by which he could imitate Christ, that is, by returning to his humanity after communing with God. Bernard’s concept of Thomas’s humility in this one example, then, seems deeply reflective of monastic and contemporary ideas of mysticism. However, Bernard ended the chapter by indicating that the fruit of this contemplation was "easy conversation and sweet speech" through which Thomas modeled himself on Christ, "whose life Thomas deserved to understand through contemplation and to teach by writing." Thus, unlike Margaret of Hungary’s contemplations which led to trances, levitations, further austerities and, eventually, thaumaturgical powers, Aquinas’s humble contemplations of the divine led him to educate those around him through speech and writing, thus reflecting the Augustinian canon’s idea of docere verbo et exemplo so prevalent in Dominic’s vita. Thus, the masculine requirements of the cura animarum subtly invaded all of Bernard’s discussions of Aquinas’s humility.

A similar focus also invaded Bernard’s discussion of Aquinas’s prayer life. Throughout the Legenda, Bernard emphasized Thomas’ intense and saintly devotion to prayer manifested in such behaviors as bodily levitation, eucharistic devotion, and most frequently divine raptures. Although all of these activities would come to define the prayer lives of important late medieval female mystics, including Margaret of Hungary, they also played a key role in thirteenth and fourteenth century representations of holy bishops, which responded to the same pious trends that found full expression in the female mystics. These holy men impressed their contemporaries with their regular recitation of canonical hours, performance of mass, devotion to the moment of transubstantiation exemplified by weeping, extensive reading, and intense contemplation sometimes resulting in rapture. Bernard placed the Angelic Doctor’s devotion to prayer within this tradition, by always linking these experiences to Thomas’ cura animarum, namely his theological writings, in some way. For example Bernard described an incident taken from William’s text that occurred in the convent at Naples where a certain Dominic of Caserta, who often secretly observed Aquinas’ early morning prayers, saw the saint levitate almost three feet off the ground while praying in front of a crucifix. He then heard a

---

182 BG, Vita, chap. XXX, 196. Bernard takes most of this from WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXV, 147.
183 BG, Vita, chap. XXX, pg. 196. Interestingly, Bernard changes only one word in William’s text, substituting “scribendo” for “praedicando,” and thus more accurately reflecting the reality of Aquinas’s output. WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXV, pg. 147.
184 GoG, Vita, chap. 6, 516; chap. 14, 517; and chaps. 32-3, 519. Bynum, Jesus as Mother, 36-55.
185 Vauchez, Sainthood, 296.
voice from the image of the crucifix say to the holy doctor, “You have written well about me, Thomas, what reward would you like in return for your labor?” Thomas replied by saying that he wanted no reward other than God himself. This anecdote demonstrated the miraculous relationship between Thomas and the divine accessed through prayer and manifested in the bodily levitation, a characteristic also demonstrated by Margaret of Hungary. However, unlike Margaret’s experience, Bernard linked Thomas’s prayer to his scholarship through the dialogue, depicting his writings as a service to God. In a theme that also traverses the entire Legenda, prayer and scholarly output are intimately linked. Indeed, Bernard seemed to find this link important since he omitted a similar anecdote from William’s relation, which framed the saint’s bodily levitation in terms of his bodily purity rather than intellectual endeavors. Thus, while Thomas exhibited a type of devout prayer commonly associated with female mystics, his intense prayer life also reflected the tradition of prayerful bishops and was closely associated with his intellectual labors.

Perhaps one of the markers of piety most reminiscent of mysticism in Aquinas’ vita is his frequent raptures or "abstractions of the mind." However, these experiences were fundamentally different in function, expression, and prominence than in the lives of late medieval holy women in that they were once again linked to his theological output. The first significant reference to an experience of rapture mentioned in Bernard’s text occurs about halfway through his legenda when Bernard related that Aquinas often seemed to have been seized in rapture, “as if he had been separated from men and elevated toward heavenly things or as if he was not where he bodily was, but where he mentally dwelt,” while praying or meditating. Sometimes this would happen in the midst of a conversation and occurred so frequently that Reginald, his companion, took care of him so that he did not commit any bodily harm or error while so distracted. In one very dramatic scene, Aquinas banged on the table and called for his scribe in the midst of a dinner with the king of France, thinking that he was in his cell and needed to record the next portion of his text against the Manichean heresy that he had just figured out. A similar event happened, according to Bernard and William, when the papal legate

186 “Bene scripsisti de me thoma, quam ergo recipies pro tuo labore mercedem.” BG, Vita, chap. XXIII, 189 and WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXXIV, 161-2.
187 GoG, Vita, chap. 33, 519.
188 WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXXIII, 160-1.
189 "...subito rapi et menti abstrahi et quasi ab hominibus separatia et ad celestia elevari quasi non esset ubi corporaliter residerit, sed ubi mentaliter inerret." BG, Vita, chap. XXV, pg. 191.
190 BG, Vita, chap. XLII, 206-7 and WoT, Ystoria, chap. LXIII, 203.
came to see him in Naples: Aquinas found the solution to a problem with his *Summa contra Gentiles* while “abstracted” in his presence.\(^{192}\) In both of these instances, Aquinas’s raptures are so intricately entwined with his writings that he appeared as more of an absentminded professor or holy bishop, completely absorbed in his work, than as a mystic. In addition, the focus was also on his reputation and even social standing, important markers of masculine achievement, since he had attracted attention from such illustrious men, the identities of whom Bernard is careful to include in his version of events.\(^ {193}\) Finally, both of these raptures occurred while he was writing treatises against groups considered enemies of the faith, thus highlighting the relevance of his writings to the overall mission of the Order. Bernard also highlighted the functionality of these raptures in a final story dedicated to the saint’s meditations. According to Bernard, the saint used these mental abstractions by purposefully entering into them to avoid feeling pain during necessary medical procedures.\(^ {194}\) Unlike the female mystics, who sometimes sought physical pain or illness in an attempt to mimic Christ’s suffering by means of the body, the Angelic Doctor’s hagiographer depicted a man who was entirely given over to the intellect and was thus not to be disturbed by physicality in any way.\(^ {195}\) Thus, Aquinas’ raptures in Bernard’s text bear little resemblance to those of the female mystics, although both experience “raptures,” in that the focus of his abstractions was the achievement of a mental connection by means of which the saint could produce texts important to the Church.\(^ {196}\)

Bernard also emphasized the utility of the saint’s personal piety to his academic work, often using existing hagiographic constructions of the bishop saint. Summarizing William of Tocco’s text, Bernard related that Aquinas “was devoted beyond measure to prayer, by means of which he ascended toward God freely with the elevation of the mind.”\(^ {197}\) Bernard’s description emphasized prayer as the means by which Aquinas’ intellect contemplated divine existence, his contribution to the *cura animarum*, rather than as a means of establishing an affective bond with the divine as was the case for many mystics. Bernard also noted that God

\(^{194}\) BG, *Vita*, chap. XXVIII, 194. Also in WoT, *Ystoria*, chap. XLVII, 182. For example, Margaret of Ypres expressed her willingness to suffer any pain for God while in the midst of excruciating pain, while Margaret of Hungary hid various illnesses so as to avoid being forced to eat meat. TC, *Vita Margarete*, chap. 45, 126 and GoG, *Vita*, chap. 16, 517.
\(^{195}\) Bynum, “Women Mystics,” 189.
had granted Aquinas the ability to worship the Eucharist more devoutly than others, "since it had been
granted to him to write more profoundly about it." For Aquinas, this devotion meant saying daily mass and
often becoming so seized with devotion that he wept, characteristics also displayed by late medieval holy
bishops. Bernard also linked Aquinas’ devotion to the Eucharist directly to his academic writing on the topic
rather than the mystical desire to fuse with Christ’s body, the accompanying ideas of fasting, visions of Christ,
or eucharistic ecstasy associated with consumption of the eucharist often central to the lives of late medieval
women. In fact, while William of Tocco followed this description of Aquinas’ Eucharistic zeal with the story
about a rapture induced by the moment of transubstantiation at Easter, Bernard moved it to a later series of
chapters in the text depicting the saint’s various raptures discussed above. This shift in location thus slightly
de-emphasized the role of Eucharistic devotion in this particular rapture and instead emphasized the direct
communication with God as a cornerstone of Aquinas’ piety, regardless of its initiatory stimulus. Bernard’s
text also moves directly to Aquinas’ nighttime habits, which included a short amount of rest, then prayer, "so
that he should deserve to learn what was necessary to write or dictate." Thus, Bernard concluded, after a
brief rest, Aquinas spent the rest of the night praying, reading, meditating, and either writing or dictating
volumes, "so that every moment of his life was filled because it was occupied with holy actions." Bernard
thus placed Aquinas’s prayer life within the format laid out in Dominic and Peter’s vitae, in which it was
largely a nighttime activity, conducted at the expense of sleep, and with the primary function of supporting
the saint’s more active cura animarum. In this example, Bernard did not clearly juxtapose prayer and “holy
actions”, as did Dominic’s hagiographers, Gerard of Frachet, and Thomas Agni of Lentino, but instead implied
that holy actions for Aquinas included prayer as well as meditation and writing. It is thus clear from the
structure of this section and Bernard’s interpretation of William’s text that prayer and Aquinas’ intellectual
output were intimately intertwined in the text.

198 “Erat autem precipue devotus ad sacramentum altaris, de quo quia concessum ei fuerat profundius scribere, donatum
est sibi devotius celebrare.” BG, Vita, chap. XV, 182. Also in WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXIX, 154.
199 Bynum, “Women Mystics,” 179-214. Both Margaret of Ypres and Margaret of Hungary demonstrate these
characteristics. See TC, Vita Maragrete, chap. 2, 107-8; chap. 24, 118-9; chap. 30, 121; and chap. 47, 127 and GoG, Vita,
chap. 5-6, pg. 516.
200 “...ut orando meretur addiscere quo portuisset scribere vel dictare.” BG, Vita, chap. XV, 183. Also in WoT, Ystoria, chap.
XXIX, 155.
201 “…ut nullum vitae tempus esset vacuum quod non esset sacris actionibus occupatum.” BG, Vita, chap. XV, 183. Also
in WoT, Ystoria, chap. XXIX, 155.
Bernard more clearly established prayer, mediation, and intimate conversation with the divine as the source of Aquinas’ intellectual accomplishments in other parts of his *Legenda*. For example, Bernard depicted the young Thomas preparing himself for his first scholastic disputation by “conferring himself to secret prayer and commending his first scholastic act to God,” thus emphasizing the supportive function of prayer in the saint’s academic achievements.\(^{202}\) In the second half of chapter fifteen, Bernard described how the adult Aquinas often prayed before he wished to study, read, write, or dictate or when something was unclear to him, and when he rose from prayer, “he found that what was previously hidden to him was opened, thus having what he should dictate or write immediately as if he had learned it in some book.”\(^{203}\) The same sequence of events led to the composition of his commentary on the letters of Paul and Isaiah, that is, he put aside his writing and prayed when he was unclear on a particular point, after which he knew exactly what to write.\(^{204}\) Aquinas also revealed to his companion in confidence that he did not seek his knowledge as much “by natural disposition or skill, as divinely by the suffrage of prayer and virtue.”\(^{205}\) Thus, Bernard portrayed Aquinas as a sort of conduit for God’s own revelation, much in the same way that earlier Dominican hagiographers conceived of the preacher as a conduit for divine grace.\(^{206}\) This interpretation of saintliness may have come from Thomas’s own writings where he contrasted the human way of behaving based on individual virtue and the superhuman way, which involved making use of the spiritual gifts or the direct impulses of divine grace granted to the individual and thus participating more fully in God’s own actions. Thus, for Thomas, acting under the direct impulse of the Holy Spirit corresponded with a higher degree of perfection than acting in accordance with reason, even reason illuminated by faith.\(^{207}\) Unlike mystical prayer where the focus was on the unification of the human will with the divine, prayer in this instance made Thomas’s writings possible and even divinely inspired much in the same way as it functioned in the preaching of other important friars.\(^{208}\)


\(^{204}\) BG, *Vita*, chap. XVI, 184. An extended version is found in WoT, *Ystoria*, chap. XXXI, 158.

\(^{205}\) “...scientiam suam non tam humano naturali ingenio et studio, quam orationis suffragio et virtute divinitus impetravit” BG, *Vita*, chap. XV, 181.

\(^{206}\) See above chapter 2, 101-3, 115-6, and 93-5.

\(^{207}\) Vauchez, *Sainthood*, pg. 522-3.

\(^{208}\) For examples of this in the *Vitae fratrum* see chapter 2, pg. 20 above.
Thus, while the basic manifestations of Aquinas’s prayer life immediately call to mind the experiences of contemporary female mystics—including his bodily levitations, eucharistic devotion, contemplative raptures, and intense prayer—the focus of these activities was largely intellectual and served the ends of Aquinas’s writings rather than the more affective and imitative ends of his female counterparts. His personal piety was more a reflection of the holy bishop in hagiography, who often exhibited these same characteristics, fused with the Dominican male hagiographic ideal whereby personal piety and asceticism served as the bulwark for the saint’s main focus—performance of the *cura animarum.*

However, the tasks of Dominic’s or Peter’s *cura animarum* find little, if any, place in Aquinas’s distinct form of sanctity, which instead emphasizes Aquinas’s intellectual endeavors as his active contribution to the Order, the fundamental goal of his ascetic and pious practice. Given Aquinas’ prominence as a theologian, it is perhaps no surprise that references to his academic achievements without reference to pious practice litter the text and the centrality of this theme to Bernard’s multifaceted construction of Thomas as a truly masculine and Dominican saint make further discussion of academic achievement relevant here. Bernard, drawing largely on William, depicted Aquinas as a particularly Dominican and specifically masculine saint by discussing the saint’s intellectual prowess, depicting his literary output as preaching, and emphasizing the utility of this work to the Order’s mission. As was indicated by other anecdotes in this text, the scholastic model of education prevalent in various educational systems of the time, including monastic, Dominican, and, university environments, was a highly competitive environment where men fought for status through public demonstration of their intellectual superiority in the form of *disputatio* and written compositions. In addition, the number of spots available at the higher levels of education, especially for monks or friars funded by the Order, was very limited and thus reserved for those especially talented young men who had shown themselves to be more worthy than their peers of such an honor. It was within this highly competitive

---

209 See above chapters 1 and 2.
210 For a discussion of the emergence of this highly competitive model see Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999). For a discussion of the increasing association between academic mastership and male identity as well as the agonistic nature of this process, see Solterer, *Master*, 26. For the role of university debates in masculine identity formation, see Karras, *From Boys*, 91. For the specifically Dominican system of education undergone and further developed by the friars surrounding Dominic’s hagiographers, see Mulchahey, “‘First,’” 130-218.
environment that Bernard, drawing heavily on William's text, placed the young saint. Throughout the early chapters of the *vita*, for example Bernard accounts for the young saint's rapid ascent through the Order's educational hierarchy, of which he himself was a product, with a combination of diligent study and publicly demonstrated intellectual superiority over his peers. Sent at five years old to Montecassino for early education, the young Thomas was described as a serious, quiet, meditative child, who avoided the company and “dissolute talk” of his peers by “fleeing inwardly” and clutching a piece of paper containing his early lessons. In addition to this common hagiographic trope of the mature child, Bernard's Thomas also demonstrated more traditional academic skills in that he “sought God more maturely and wrote about Him more clearly than the others.” According to Bernard, Thomas proved to be equally skilled while studying the liberal arts in Naples, where “he achieved so much in his studies above his contemporaries that he surpassed them all as much in repeating what he heard more profoundly and what he had understood more skillfully as in debating and other acts of the scholarly discipline” and everyone admired him. For this section, Bernard elaborated on William's rather terse discussion of Aquinas's performance in Naples, which only mentioned that he was better at paraphrasing what he had heard from his teachers by emphasizing Thomas's skill in debating and other exercises common to the scholastic discipline. At this point in his career, the young Thomas decided to enter the Order of Preachers, but first had to endure a year long attempt by his family to change his mind before finally taking his vows, during which he steadfastly resisted their pressure, in a display of manly resistance common to representations of the interactions between religious and secular men. After the saint had prevailed over his relatives, Bernard related how Thomas entered the Order and was sent to study in Naples at the *studium generale* with Albert Magnus where he began repeating the Master's lessons to other students as a way of practicing, perfectly recalling the lecture. The main benefactor of this repetition, a fellow student who had himself butchered an attempt at recalling the lesson,

---

reported to the Master of Students, in a dialogue added by Bernard, that he understood the lesson better from Thomas's mouth than from the master himself, thus emphasizing both the young man's superiority over and utility to his fellows. This depiction of Aquinas also demonstrated a marker of intellectual superiority entrenched in the competitive world of scholastic education, that of the student who demonstrates explanatory ability superior to the master. The Master of Students, after hearing Thomas recite, concluded that he demonstrated a greater proficiency than any other student. Once again, the emphasis of these anecdotes is Aquinas's intellectual superiority to his peers in the academic realm, where he outshone them in all areas of scholastic education.

As Aquinas reached adulthood in the *vita*, both Bernard and William emphasized his success in the field of disputations, first within the educational process and, finally, in his position as a master theologian. Both examples, introduced above, were ostensibly included in the life to demonstrate the humility of the intellectual giant, a virtue, as we saw above, that regularly accompanies stories of the saint's achievements. However, Bernard also used these anecdotes as a means of displaying the saint's masculine prowess in displaying his authority over other men in the intellectual realm. The first such dispute occurs while Thomas is a student at the *studium generale* in Naples, when Thomas is called to participate in a disputation as a respondent to a “rather difficult question.” After the saint produced an answer that “sufficiently solved both the question itself and the evidence,” Albert Magnus asked Thomas to determine instead of just responding and “argued more fully and forcefully against him so much so that he thought that he would silence him.” According to his hagiographers, however, Thomas “responded sufficiently to each point” until Albert was forced to admit that “although we call him a dumb ox, he gave such a bellow of doctrine that it would sound throughout the world.” Following such a brilliant display, the young Thomas was entrusted with more difficult questions and disputations. This dispute between master and student plays into the tradition of the brilliant young scholar publicly displaying his intellectual superiority over his own teacher through

---

intellectual debate, a scenario exemplified by the young Peter Abelard, although his hagiographers were careful to couch this encounter in the language of the saint’s humility and therefore distance him from the sin of intellectual pride thought to have infected secular academics.\textsuperscript{220} According to his hagiographers, Aquinas was also able to successfully defend his own ideas against the encroachment of a younger scholar seeking to establish his own place in the intellectual hierarchy by challenging him, through his skill in debating and personal humility.\textsuperscript{221} Both William and Bernard emphasized the regular occurrence of and the centrality of Aquinas’ theology, expressed through public disputation, to his reputation in a miracle involving an extra tooth. In this story, the saintly philosopher was set to determine a question at Paris, which he had previously disputed. When he rose from bed the night before in order to pray, he realized that he had developed an extra tooth that prevented him from speaking clearly. When his companion suggested that he cancel the disputation and get the tooth forcibly removed, Aquinas, “considering the scandal for the university and the danger that could result from extracting the tooth,” opted instead to devote himself to prayer. \textsuperscript{222} His extra tooth became so loose that he pulled it out painlessly and was soon able to speak freely once again.\textsuperscript{223} Although this story most ostensibly demonstrates the efficacy of Aquinas’ prayer, it also highlighted the central role that disputation played in the establishment of the saint’s reputation within the university and the importance of literal and metaphorical verbal lucidity to the performance of his duties.

According to his hagiographers, Aquinas’ scholarly output was not limited to his immensely successful disputation skill, but also included his literary output. Bernard especially emphasized this aspect of Aquinas’ saintliness. While William only mentioned this written output generally or in passing, Bernard, in his only extensive original contribution to the \textit{vita}, included two chapters containing a relatively complete list of the saint’s written output, likely based on the separate catalogue of Thomas’s works that he compiled around 1320.\textsuperscript{224} Bernard also placed these chapters at the very end of the \textit{vita}, right before the catalogue of postmortem miracles, as if highlighting their enduring legacy. But it wasn’t just in the placement of these

\textsuperscript{220} Jaeger, \textit{Envy}, 217-221.
\textsuperscript{221} BG, \textit{Vita}, chap. XXXI, 197. Also in WoT, chap. XXVI, 150. For a more complete description of this event, see above, 191-3.
\textsuperscript{222} “Super quo doctor attente considerans universitatis scandalum, et quod imminere poterat ex dentis evulsione periculum...” BG, \textit{Vita}, chap. XVII, 186.
catalogues that Bernard implied the utility of Aquinas’s work; he also overtly emphasized the utility of the Angelic doctor’s written and oral theology at several other points in the text with wording largely taken from William of Tocco. It is clear from several stories within the text, that both authors did not consider Aquinas’ studies to be an end in and of themselves, but especially esteemed his contribution to scholarship in general and particularly to the fight against the enemies of the faith. In their description of Thomas as a student at Naples and Paris, both hagiographers indicated that Aquinas inspired and enlightened his fellow students, for “God had poured so much grace in doctrine into his lips that he led scholars into a stupor and animated them toward study.”225 In another anecdote, Aquinas is assured in a dream that he should accept the mastership at Paris with a reference to Psalm 103 indicating that he would water and satiate the earth with his works, an image of watering also found in Humbert of Romans’ description of the preaching office.226 Bernard explained this reference by indicating that Thomas’s doctrine rendered the already “educated the more learned and satiated the less educated as with heavenly fodder.”227 Aquinas was compared to Moses, since his doctrine and explanation of useful doctrine illuminated the faithful.228 Thus, both hagiographers emphasized that Aquinas’s learning helped to educate other scholars and was therefore practically useful, thus intellectualizing the concept of docere verbo et exemplo prevalent in discussions of preaching in Dominicus’s vitae and especially in Humbert of Roman’s Liber de eruditione.229

In addition to encouraging learning among others, Aquinas’s hagiographers also emphasize the role of his words, both oral and written, in edifying his lay listeners, using language reserved for preachers in other Dominican texts. In their discussions of the saint’s limitless dedication to writing, meditating, preaching, or reading, William and Bernard mention that the saint was sometimes compelled to speak with the brothers or “other venerable people” and, on these occasions, edified his audience by giving a brief moral or historical lesson before returning to his own endeavors.230 More generally, Aquinas’s conversation was

---

225 “...tantam sibi deus in labiis suis effudit gratiam in doctrina, ut scolares in stuporem adduceret et ad studium animaret...” BG, Vita, chap. XI, 178. William also expresses this idea, albeit in an elongated fashion in chap. XV, 120-22. For Aquinas’s activities in Naples see BG, Vita, chap. IX, 177, which is based on WoT, Ystoria, chap. XIII, 115-117, discussed on above.
226 See above chapter 2, 125-6.
227 “Per ejus siquidem doctrinam doctus quilibet quasi celesti redditur et minus doctus quasi celi pabulo saciatur.” BG, Vita, chap. XII, 180. The main content of the dream was taken from WoT, Ystoria, chap. XVII, 126-128.
229 See above chapter 1, 56-60 and chapter 2, 128-31.
said to be so holy that his listeners were consoled and filled with devotion, thus fulfilling the expectation of teaching *verbo et exemplo*, originating among the Augustinian canons and openly espoused in Dominic’s *vitae*. In the tradition of earlier Dominican preachers, when Bernard and William’s Aquinas preached to the common people, “his speech was not composed in complicated and persuasive words of human knowledge, but in the demonstration of spirit and virtue [*virtutis*],” and “avoiding words which served the curiosity rather than the utility of the listeners, he proposed moral things useful to their salvation in the vernacular...according to the ability of the audience, reserving the subtleties of the questions for the scholastic discipline.”

Thus, Aquinas in these texts demonstrated the utilitarian ideal for preaching found in earlier male Dominican *vitae* as well as Humbert’s treatise on preaching, namely using straightforward language, concepts accessible to the audience, and their own example in order to engage and edify their lay audiences. While reference to Aquinas in this capacity is without a doubt overshadowed by his intellectual achievements, both hagiographers evidently found it important to place his learning in a more standardized ideal of male sanctity that emphasized edification of souls through preaching.

Both hagiographers also depicted the saint encouraging the clergy in their pastoral tasks and combatting the enemies of the faith himself, an important activity in masculine Dominican hagiographic texts. In a chapter dealing with Aquinas’s piety, kindness, and mercy, for example, Bernard inserted a story not found in William of Tocco’s template, describing how the saint, “out of love of justice and the salvation of souls” inspired prelates and courts to rise against faults, “so that, as a result of his counsel, the prelate should become a prosecutor of sin [*crimen*] and liberator of man so that thus the should not fail to subdue sin and man should not perish from sin.” Thus, much like Dominic and earlier male Dominican saints, Aquinas in Bernard’s text inspired others to strive against the sins and crimes of the Catholic laity as a marker of his charity or great love for humanity. In addition, the saint’s hagiographers focus on the utility of Aquinas’s doctrine in combating the Gentiles. In the very first chapter following Aquinas’s academic journey, Bernard

---


233 “…sic pro amore justicie et salute anime proximi judici et prelato consulebat contra culpam insurgere ut prelatus ex suo consilio fieret simul crimini persecutor et hominis liberator; ut sic in subdito crimine deficeret et homo cum crimen non periret.” BG, *Vita*, chap. XXXIII, 200.
generally described the excellence of his doctrine and “the errors which the same doctor of truth had succeeded in tearing out as if with the sharpest sickle of his doctrine,” starting with his *Summa contra gentiles* with which Aquinas, in Bernard’s original description, “prevailed against the error and stupidity of the gentiles with the bow and sword of doctrine.”

Thus, Bernard emphasized Aquinas’s role in combatting non-Christians using militaristic language similar to that found in Peter Martyr’s *vita*. Finally, Bernard, in a story taken from William of Tocco, discussed Aquinas’s role in actively converting a couple of Jews. This occurred when Thomas attended a Christmas gathering at a cardinal’s house where he met two wealthy and learned Jews, who were accustomed to attending this particular event. After disputing with them for a long time, the saint gave them until the next day to respond, and, when they returned with no refutations, the two Jews converted to Christianity. This was due to the attractiveness of his sermons which, as Bernard indicated in an original contribution, “no one was able to resist, while he lived.” In fact, “truth had given him speech and knowledge that no adversary could resist, except one who, condemning the truth, was shameful like a crazy person, or who, blind, walked in the darkness.”

Unlike the earlier Dominican male saints, whose *vitae* did not mention involvement with converting Jews, both William and Bernard relate this particular incident. This likely relates to the fact that Aquinas’ own writings about Jews, which were influential in the later medieval period despite their relative brevity and scarcity within his larger *corpus*, included a section of the the well known *Summa contra Gentiles* that used rational argumentation as a way to persuade Jews and Muslims of the truth of Christianity, and a smaller letter *De Regimine Iudaeorum*, in which he condemned usury. Both authors emphasized the importance of the *Summa contra Gentiles* in their *vitae* as it is one of the few texts that they described in depth, noting its unusual use of “secular knowledge” and philosophy in the service of


his goal. In Bernard’s *vita*, the emphasis is on the influence of Aquinas’s work on Catholic theologians and their efforts in the face of Gentile and Jews, the Biblical enemies.

Perhaps one of Bernard’s most interesting omissions is in the realm of anti-heretical activities. While William of Tocco devoted four whole chapters to Aquinas’ writings against William of St. Amour, the Fratecelli, Greeks and schismatics, and the Averroists, often using militaristic and masculine imagery to heroicize the saint, Bernard omitted these sections entirely, perhaps considering his brief reference to the particular treatises in the catalogue of works to be sufficient. Whatever his reasons, Bernard’s omission made it clear that he at least did not consider anti-heretical activity to be the cornerstone for Aquinas’ identity, even though he himself functioned as an inquisitor in southern France for much of his career. For Bernard, at least, it was enough to battle against non-Christians. From a historical perspective, Bernard’s emphasis, although largely based on the exclusion of certain materials, nonetheless coincided with a rise in a popular, social, and arguably theological push to convert or expel non-Christians, particularly Jews, as has been noted extensively elsewhere. Dominicans such as Ramon Martí, and Ramon de Penyafort wrote treatises meant to be practical guides for successful disputation with Jews and Muslims, based on analysis of Jewish texts, while those like Pablo Christiani brought this theory into the field through public debates with Jews. In order to support such intellectual analysis of Jewish and Muslim texts as well as debates with them, the Order also encouraged the brothers to learn foreign languages as precursors to conversion. Thus, if Dominic’s life and legend introduced the idea of masculine saintly anti-heretical activity and Peter Martyr reflected its apogee, Bernard’s Aquinas emphasized newer missionizing trends. Given the longterm influence of Aquinas’s ideas on usury to the subsequent alteration of Jewish lending rights and social status throughout late medieval

---

western Europe, Bernard’s focus was ultimately more historically accurate than William of Tocco’s and revealed, above all, his unique focus as a lifelong historian.242

Although the hagiographic figure of Aquinas initially seemed to emphasize spiritual practices traditionally depicted as more feminine in earlier Dominican hagiography—including chastity, contemplation, prayer, and even study—, Bernard Gui, altering William of Tocco’s original text, portrayed them as particularly masculine by placing them within hagiographic traditions of male behavior. In addition, Bernard consistently demonstrated how these same characteristics, as they had in earlier Dominican male vitae, contributed to the masculine cura animarum: Aquinas’ intellectual endeavors. Thus, according to his hagiographic representation, Aquinas’ dedication to prayer and contemplation served to unite him with God, not for the purposes of a bodily imitatio Christi, but so that he could become a conduit for intellectual understanding and communication of theological doctrine. In constructing Aquinas as a particularly masculine scholar, Bernard also relied on secular ideals of masculine intellectual prowess and militaristic ideals, while carefully balancing these characteristics with more traditional monastic and hagiographic saintly ideals. Above all, Bernard’s depiction of Aquinas reinforced the Dominican ideal of masculine sanctity present in the earlier lives in which the saint overcame the struggle for chastity in his youth, demonstrated certain saintly virtues in moderation, but ultimately focused on participation in the active cura animarum, in this case, the newly minted ideal of intellectual achievement justified as active by the salvific effects of his divine doctrine, related in writing or speech, on the Catholic laity as well as those religious seeking to reform and expand it.

Conclusion

What, then, did the Dominican friar learn about being a Dominican male after hearing the legends of the Order’s illustrious members and saintly exemplars? If the common friar knew he would never be a saint and did not aspire to such a goal, what kinds of practical behavioral models could he take from such unattainable ideals? Historians have often been wary of using hagiographic texts in discussing historical realities, often relegating them to the realm of literary analysis. While such skepticism is somewhat justified by the reality that these saintly behaviors, by definition, would have been inaccessible to the common friar,

242 Hood, Aquinas, 108-111.
dismissing the influence of these vitae on the friars entirely would be akin to denying the persuasive, if sometimes indirect, influence of modern figures like the Marlboro Man or James Bond in both reflecting and shaping social models of gendered behavior and the behavioral realities they produce. But what exactly was the influence of these exemplars? The detailed study of the way that Dominican hagiographers structured and created their saintly male models according to hagiographic, papal, and secular expectations of masculine behavior presented in the first and third chapters suggests a fundamental and deceptively simplistic masculine behavioral ideal for the Dominican friars. The vitae of the Order’s important members repeatedly emphasized that the friar was to devote himself to the cura animarum, through preaching, inquisitorial activity, or scholarship, in order to truly fulfill the Order’s mission. Although these vitae spend varying amounts of time detailing the pious practices of the saints in fulfillment of papal expectations, established hagiographic ideals, or lay expectations of sanctity, these practices were always placed in the service of the saint’s active mission and depicted as the foundation on which true masculine sanctity was erected.

Perhaps the best way to assess the impact of hagiographic models on individual friars is to look for references to these saints in other types of Dominican documents. While such an undertaking is largely beyond the scope of this project, I would like to look briefly at one pertinent synthesis of these early hagiographic texts as behavioral models written by an influential Dominican. Perhaps nowhere is the Dominican ideal of pious behavior directed toward active service more beautifully articulated than in the encyclical letter written to the brothers by the newly elected Master General Barnabas Cagnoli of Vercelli in 1324, the year of Aquinas’s canonization, in which he exhorted his readers:

Take note, brothers, take note and see how great and precious are the gifts that God has given to you, He who, through His grace, has specially called you out of worldly darkness to this light, so that the church might shine with your doctrine, your life might be an effective example, and the Christian religion might profit. Therefore, with all of you continually persisting in prayer and dedicating yourselves to reading and preaching, let nothing appear in your words or actions except what is fitting for your sanctity, what is redolent of canonical honesty. Take note of your father Abraham, namely the most blessed Dominic, and of Sarah who birthed you, namely the illustrious religion, which is a serenity of conscience like a laugh and a pleasing grace like Paradise. See what little plants sprouting out of this brushwood are transplanted into the celestial nursery, the flowers of which--some white because of virginity, others dewy with blood because of the anguish of martyrdom, and others glittering like stars because of the clarity of doctrine and study--offer eternal fruits of great light in the presence of the Lord. You should follow them, you should...
Barnabas made his vision for the Dominican brothers clear in the first part of this eloquent exhortation, calling them to actively serve the Christian religion, here personified as a maternal woman, through their doctrine and example, in language reminiscent of the theme *docere verbo et exemplo* that littered writings of the Augustinian canons and of Dominic's *vita*. In order to achieve this role within the Church, the friars were to dedicate themselves to praying, learning, and preaching. Barnabas’ message to the average brother then was strongly reminiscent of Gerard of Frachet’s in the *Vitae fratrum*, although it was written a century before, which also focused on the prayer and pastoral activities of the Order’s members. At its most basic level such an emphasis on activity in the public realm in the lives of the brothers, deeply reflected general secular ideals of masculinity defined by public competition among other men. It also contrasted sharply with the female holy ideal which was limited in expression by the physical enclosure of holy women whose contact with their public was often literary rather than physical.

After establishing this behavioral model accessible to the majority of brothers, Barnabas then turned to the saintly ideals that the brothers were to follow and imitate. Although his description of these saints was very general, referencing only the major categories of saints--virgins, martyrs, and doctors--considering that this letter was circulated in the same year as Aquinas’s canonization and that the new saint is not mentioned elsewhere in the letter, it is not difficult to imagine that each general category would call to mind the three male Dominican saints: Dominic the founder and virgin, Peter the martyr, and Aquinas the Doctor. This association becomes even more plausible in light of the iconographic legacies of these saints, whose images decorated Dominican convents at the request of the General Chapter and were thus ingrained in the minds,

\[243\] Animadvertite, fratres, animadvertite et videte, quam magna vobis dominus et preciosa donavit, qui ad hanc lucem per sui graciam de muni tenebris specialiter vos vocavit, ut vestri doctrina fulget ecclesia et exemplari vita vigeat et proficiat religio christiana. Et ideo continue vobis oracionibus instantibus, lectioni et predicacioni vacantibus, in verbis vestris et actibus nichil appareat, nisi quod vestram deceat sanctitatem, nisi quod apud deum et homines regularem redoleat honestatem. Attendite ad patrem vestrum Abraham, beatissimum videlicet Dominicum, et ad Saram, que peperit vos, praelaram scilicet religionem, que est serenata conscientia velud risus et deliciose gracie paradisus. Videte, quales ex hoc virgulto plantule pullulantes iam sunt in celeste plantarium transplantate, quorum flores alii candidati propter virginitatem, alii sanguine roridati propter martyrii acerbitatem, alii stellati propter doctrine et studii claritatem, lucis immense fructus coram deo proferent sempiternos. Hos vos sequi oportet, hos vos optet imitari: superhabundabo gaudio, fratres mei, qui revera michi estis gaudium et corona, si vos audiero, si videro per tam laudabiles semitas ambulare.” *Litterae Encyclicae* LXXVI (1324), 238-9.
pious practices, and overall worldview of the brothers.\textsuperscript{244} These images most often showed Dominic holding an open book that represented his identity as a founder saint and a white lily of virginity, Peter holding a martyr’s palm or with a bleeding head to represent his martyrdom, and, later on, Aquinas holding a book and a pen representing his foundational doctrine.\textsuperscript{245} Thus, the three Dominican saints to some extent became generalized archetypes of sanctity depicting the extremities of Dominican accomplishment—lifelong chastity, martyrdom, or doctrinal preeminence—largely inaccessible to the majority of friars. Yet, Barnabas’ letter made it clear that these models were not static, iconographic models but dynamic ones that required both admiration of unattainable sanctity but also presented ideals of behavior toward which the friar could strive, specific paths through which they could attain both sanctity and the ultimate fulfillment of the Dominican mission. Dominic represented a holy life dedicated to virginity, monastic contemplation, and preaching; Peter the willingness to defend doctrinal orthodoxy unto death; and Aquinas the single-minded dedication to study and creation of doctrinal orthodoxy. Unlike their female counterparts, whose \textit{vita}e showcase behaviors figuratively reinvented to fit the ideals of martyrdom and doctrinal orthodoxy so as to reflect of societal expectations of women, the brothers, as men, could and were in fact encouraged to imitate all of these models literally and to the best of their abilities. By maintaining his bodily purity, studying orthodox doctrine, and defending that doctrine both inside and outside of the convent, the friar showed himself to be not only a saintly Dominican, but also a man.

\textsuperscript{244} For a very interesting study of the use of these saintly images in the friars’ individual cells as reminders of appropriate manners of prayer, study, and preparation for preaching, see Hood, “Saint Dominici’s,” 195-206.

Chapter 4. Father Figures: Paternal Admonitions and the Distillation of Dominican Masculine Ideology in the *Litterae Encyclicae*

In addition to the hagiographic texts discussed in the previous chapter, Dominican friars also regularly encountered various other materials designed to articulate, develop, and encourage a cohesive identity and behavioral model for the Order’s members. Of these materials, the encyclical letters contrast sharply with the *vitae* in terms of purpose, function, and focus.¹ Whereas the hagiographers focused on proving the sanctity of their subject and thus produced rather intangible Dominican behavioral models influenced by many factors outside of the Order’s own developmental goals, the purpose of the encyclical letters was, according to both Humbert of Romans and Peter Ferrand, to provide “some consolation and useful exhortation” for brothers.² These letters, then, articulated the Master General’s specific conception of the Order’s mission and provided behavioral guidelines for the brothers through the use of extended analogies, eloquent Latin, and personal exhortations. The related, but fundamentally different purpose, context, and expectations of genre thus provides an additional vantage point from which to assess the Dominican process of identity formation.

**The Paternal Voice: Sources and Methodology**

The production and circulation of the letters reinforced the emphasis on ideological cohesion and behavioral modification at the heart of their purpose. According to Humbert of Romans, the letters were to be written at the General Chapter and circulated throughout the Order along with any new indulgences, papal bulls, or other such documents accompanying the Chapter’s acts.³ The manuscript evidence suggests that the

¹ Benedictus Maria Reichert has edited all of these letters in *Litterae encyclicae*, with the exception of a single letter allegedly written by Jordan of Saxony, published by Thomas Kaeppeli in “B. Iordani de Saxonia Litterae Encyclicae (1233),” *APF* 22 (1952): 177-185.

² “Litterae generalae aliquae de aliqua consolatione et utili exhortatione ad fratres omnes, et aliae ad sorores sunt tunc ab eo transmittendae; et tam tempestive promulgandae cum Indulgentiis, si quae novae fuerint, vel litterae papales, vel alia praeter acta per ordinem mittenda, quod ante diffinitionem possint omnia a fratribus transcribi.” *Hor*, *De Officiis*, 182. Peter Ferrand wrote that it was the habit of the Master General to write to the brothers “litteras dulcissimas sancte consolacionis et exhortacionis epistolae” in his *Crónica Ordinis ab Anno MCCIII usque MCCCLIV*, ed. Benedictus Maria Reichert, in *MOPH* I, ed. Benedictus Maria Reichert (Louvain: Typis E. Charpentier and J. Schoonjans, 1896), 328 and in *MOPH* VII (Rome: Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1904), 6. On Peter Ferrand, rather than Gerard of Frachet, as the chronicle’s author; see Reichert, introduction to Peter Ferrand, *Crónica*.

³ *Hor*, *De Officiis*, 182, see ff. 2 above.
friars considered the encyclical letters, papal bulls, and acts of the General Chapter to be part of the bundle of legal directives coming out of the General Chapter every year, since all of these documents were copied together into a manuscript kept at each convent and specifically dedicated to the preservation of this important information, of which eight survive from the thirteenth century. While the General Chapter specified that all of these documents were to be kept in a single manuscript, the inclusion of the encyclical letters and papal bulls in that manuscript indicates the close functional association made between these documents. Thus, the encyclical letters were fundamentally related to the legal-behavioral guidelines provided by the acts of chapters and papal bulls, functioning, in many ways as the ideological, personal, and stylized component of the General Chapter’s directives.

In addition to their association with the legal authority of the General Chapter, the letters also represented and even embodied the personal, spiritual, and legal authority of the master general. According to Humbert of Romans, the master general was to “bear constant concern for the entire Order entrusted to his care and to demonstrate in himself markers of poverty, humility, and all of the Order’s observances as well as sanctity, as far as his nature allowed, in front of everyone so that he should not only edify the brothers present to him by example, but also restore those absent through his reputation.” He should also “impel those brothers in his presence toward every good work with words, those absent with letters.” Thus, the master general was called to function as the Order’s spiritual and legal exemplar, embodying the observances and values of the Order under his care and encouraging the friars to do the same through his spoken words, reputation, and written letters. As Humbert and many subsequent masters made clear, the master general’s letters were to carry this moral authority to those friars not directly present to him, indeed, to make him

---

4 On the extant manuscripts of these acts and letterae encyclicae see Reichert, introduction to ACG I:viil.
5 The General Chapters in 1245 and 1266 ordered that each convent have a single book into which the Acts of the General and Provincial Chapters would be copied, see ACG I: 32 (1245) and 135 (1266) and cited in Reichert, introduction to Litterae encyclicae, xi.
6 “Magistri ordinis officium est de toto ordine sibi commiso gerere assiduam sollicitudinem; pauperitatis, humilitatis, et omnium observantiarum ordinis, totiusque sanctitatis, quantum possible est naturae suae, prae omnibus in se monstrare indicia, ut non solum praesentes frateris exemplo aedificet, sed etiam absentes fama reficiat. Fratres praesentes verbis, absentes vero litteris promovere debet ad omne opus bonum.” HoR, De Officiis, 181.
present in his absence. In associating the encyclical letter with the master’s physical presence, the masters general utilized an epistolary trope extending back to the classical period, in which letters were the closest substitute possible to the writer’s actual presence, since, as Seneca wrote, “the imprint of friend’s hand on a letter supplies that which is the sweetest aspect of meeting in person—knowledge.” Letters were even better than a picture, Seneca vows, since they were the “true footsteps and true notices of an absent friend,” whose reception made the sender and the writer one. Medieval writers such as the twelfth century abbot and archbishop Baudri further personified the letter, ideologically conflating the action of touching a letter, for example, with touching the individual who sent it. Such corporealization of the letter in medieval epistolary tradition would have furthered the role of the encyclical letters in asserting and extending the masculine authority of the general master. Through his letter, the ideas and person of the master would have “stood” before the friars as a figure of paternal exhortation and example of mature, authoritative, governing man. The General Chapter of 1257, presided over by Humbert, specified that the masters’ letters were to be read along with the acts of the general chapter to the brothers at the provincial chapter before they elected a diffinitor, thus carrying the master’s legal and ideological exhortations directly to lower levels of the Order’s legislative hierarchy.

The medieval culture of literacy and Dominican conventual practice would have made this presence in absence a fairly ubiquitous one for the brothers. In the first place, epistolary practice emphasized the oral nature of letters in that they were largely dictated during composition, read out loud to their recipient,
utilized a modified structure taken from Cicero’s theory of oration, and featured certain auditory effects such as *cursus* meant to enhance the listening experience.\footnote{Martin Camargo, “Where’s the Brief?: The *Ars Dictaminis* and the Reading/Writing Between the Lines,” in *The Late Medieval Epistle*, eds. Carol Poster and Richard J. Utz. *Disputatio* 1 (1996), 5; Martin Camargo, *Ars dictaminis, ars dictandi* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991), 19; Giles Constable, *Letters and Letter Collections*, in *Typologie des sources du Moyen-Âge Occidental*, fasc. 17 (Turnhout, 1976), 13-14; M.T. Clanchey, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 266-72.} Important men such as the Dominican masters general would undoubtedly have had a scribe, a practice indicated by Humbert of Romans’ command that each master should have his own scribe and by Jordan of Saxony’s postscript to one of his letters declaring that he had written it by hand so as to distinguish it from his other letters.\footnote{JoS, *Epistulae*, XXXI, 37 and HoR, *De Officiis*, 194. On this practice in general, see Giles Constable, introduction to *Peter the Venerable: Selected Letters* (Toronto: PIMS, 1974), 18.} In another letter, Humbert of Romans highlighted the oral nature of his letter’s reception when he specifically ordered that a particularly important encyclical letter, written in collaboration with the Franciscan Minister General John of Parma, should be read out loud to each Dominican house and verbally translated for any non-Latin speakers within the convent.\footnote{HoR, *De Officiis*, 300 and *Expositio*, 8-9. Humbert’s command regarding the encyclical letters was taken up by the Provincial Chapter of Rome, which specifically commanded that both the acts and the encyclical letter be read to the brothers. *ACPPR*, 25-26 (1262).} Humbert of Romans and many subsequent General Chapters repeatedly commanded that acts of the provincial and general chapters, the constitutions, and papal letters were to be read to the brothers four times a year and the vocal annotations found on the remaining manuscripts of the *acta capitulorum generalium*, likely made by the convent’s Corrector, indicate that this practice was indeed carried out.\footnote{ACG I:32 (1245), 104 (1260), 269 (1293) and 290 (1298) as well as *ACPPR*, 25-6 (1262), 50 (1278) and 91 (1289). The 1320 chapter specified that recent and important papal bulls as well as the acts of the general chapter were to be read to the brothers six times a year in *ACG* II, 124 (1320). In his *Expositio*, 8-9, Humbert of Romans specified that the Corrector’s job was to prepare the readings to be read aloud at the table by selecting them, correcting them, adding punctuation, and adding oral notations (*versiculentur*) in *De Officiis*, 300 and the General chapter of 1251 had specified that the corrector of readings was to study texts necessary to his task, *ACG* I:50 (1251). It was therefore suggested that the marks placed on the manuscript of Peter Ferrand’s *Chronicle* indicating proper intonation were made by the Corrector in the prologue to Gerard of Frachet, vi.} Such immersion in the Order’s expectations would have been facilitated by the traditional monastic conception of behavioral guidelines and inspire them to take action in response to reading and hearing them.\footnote{Litterae encyclicae VII (1255), 31.} The great master general further elucidated that the encyclical letters were to be part of this reading list, whose regular oral presence in Dominican conventual life sought to make the brothers aware of the Order’s foundational reading, which emphasized ruminating on the reading material and savoring the wisdom found in the text, a
practice to which the master general John of Vercelli referred when he wrote that the admonitions of the holy fathers made at the chapters had been repeatedly written down "so that they might be conserved in the cupboard of tenacious memory." The chant-like quality of the texts' vocalization at the table, encouraged by the Corrector's annotation of the written text instructing the reader in points of pronunciation and vocal accents, would have encouraged the internalization of their message. Humbert of Romans stated that the Corrector should procure various summae about accenting, pronunciation, grammar, and Bible corrections “so that the brothers could be directed in reading and the Corrector in correcting,” an attention to detail indicating the inherent orality of written texts in the convent and the attention given to achieving proper and effective reading of the texts. Thus, the friars were encouraged in every possible way to internalize the content of the encyclical letters and to modify their behavior according to the master general’s pious exhortations.

In addition to these conventual reading practices, which familiarized the friars with the master's written word and encouraged behavioral modification, the letters also had the special power of encouraging the brothers to recall their personal experience with the master general, whose position required regular visitations of all the Dominican convents where he conducted chapters, heard confessions, corrected faults, pardoned worthy brothers, dined with them, exhorted them through sermons, collationes, as well as admonitions, and concluded his visit with a series of ordinances that cleared up doubtful matters, settled disputes, and especially buttressed religious discipline. He also travelled with his own updated copies of the rule, constitutions, privileges of the Order, admonitions of the chapter general, breviary, and missal, which he used to standardize the copies of these texts held at each of the convents. Thus, the master general was the enforcer of religious discipline and behavioral standards, a duty he carried out while embodying the same standards and saintly ideals to the best of his ability. Thus, the words of the encyclical letters, read in the

---

16 “O fili obediencie, quot sanctorum patrum instruunt et instituunt monita per capitula frequentius mandata in scriptis, ut in armario tenacis memorie conserventur” Literae encyclicae XXI (1271), 85.
18 HoR, De Officis, 301.
19 Humbert of Romans writers clearly about the master general’s responsibilities to each Dominican convent in De Officis, pgs. 183-5 and Hinenbusch summarizes this material in History, 2:203.
20 HoR, De Officis, 182.
master's absence by a chosen reader, would surely have called to mind the familiar persona of a legal and spiritual exemplar, who personally embodied the spiritual and legal ideals of the Order, and thus lent the exhortations contained within the letter special authority. The encyclical letters were not, however, simply a reiteration of the General Chapter's admonitions, although the master general did, on rare occasion, emphasize a particular point from the acts in the letter. Rather, they functioned as an ideological delineation of the spirit behind the acts written by the Order's illustrative leader and eloquently articulated an overarching, largely consistent view of the Order's mission, identity, and ideals.

Finally, the formalized nature of the genre itself would have lent the encyclical letters an authoritative air, encouraged thematic continuity from year to year, and facilitated comprehension of the letter's contents by the brothers. By the time the Dominican masters general were dictating their encyclical letters, the letter writing manuals originating in the 12th century had achieved circulation throughout Europe and were taught at every level of study. These *artes dictandi*, as they were called, dictated the rhetorical strategies to be employed by the writer and set the structure of the letters to such an extent that the genre was one of the least fluid, although most common, of the period.\(^{21}\) Although no research has been published on the specific role of the *ars dictandi* in the Dominican schools, the fact that *dictamen* was taught along with law in Bologna in Cistercian monasteries at the same time and in conjunction with grammar in French educational centers by the 12th-century indicates the ubiquity of the genre.\(^{22}\) In addition, an interesting manuscript written by a Cistercian monk who joined the Dominican Order in its nascent years, which includes a series of sample sermons and an *ars praedicandi* of Cistercian origin, as well as an *ars dictandi* with Cistercian letters and an encyclical letter allegedly written by Jordan of Saxony that was likely composed after the author had entered the Order of Preachers, suggests that the *artes dictandi* were, in fact, part of Dominican education from the beginning.\(^{23}\) Regardless, the masters general of the Order and certainly their scribes all demonstrated the highest fluency in the rules of letter writing, both by employing eloquent rhetorical strategies and adhering to

---


\(^{23}\) For a detailed discussion of this manuscript, see Kaeppeli, "B. iordani," 177-85. Regardless, the encyclical letters reflect their author's knowledge of these rhetorical treatises.
the required structure of the letter itself. This schema, based on the Ciceronian model of oration, included the *salutatio*, which conveyed the names and ranks of the people involved and sent a basic greeting, the *exordium* or *introductio*, which made the listener receptive to the writer’s message, the *narratio*, which was a narration of recent events, the *petitio* in which the writer made a request, and the *conclusio*, which summarized the material so as to implant it into the reader’s memory. The relatively concise *salutationes* and *conclusiones* remained consistent throughout the encyclical letters, with the former emphasizing the typically monastic relationship between the master general and the friars, both of whom are referred to as *frater*, and the latter consisting of a request for the friars’ prayers on behalf of their master. In addition, nearly all of the letters lack a proper *narratio* section, instead focusing on the *exordium* and the *petitio* sections, which make up the bulk of each encyclical letter.

Since the masters general were undoubtedly influenced by the pervasive and formalized requirements for both the *exordium* and *petitio* sections articulated in the *ars dictandi* while composing their letters and the friars’ familiarity with these requirements would have altered the way that they understood the letter’s contents, a closer look at the specified function of both of these sections will further inform our understanding of their author’s purpose. According to the 12th-century papal notary and later Cistercian monk Transmundus, whose *ars dictandi* achieved reasonable circulation and was consistent with other contemporary manuals, the *exordium*

is the section that prepares the mind of the hearer for the rest of the composition, and it is fully successful if the hearer becomes receptive, well disposed, and attentive. He becomes receptive when he is given a foretaste of the essence of the matter, well disposed if his good will is procured by the actions

---

24 For an introduction to these sections see Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 224-5 and Camargo, *Ars*, 22-4 and The descriptions for these five sections was based on the 12th century *ars dictandi* written by Transmundus found in *Introductiones dictandi*, ed. and trans. Ann Dalzell (Toronto: PIMS, 1995), 60-5. The unoriginal quality of this *ars dictandi*, as its contents are the result of extensive borrowing from other texts make this a good representative of the genre and the thirteen remaining manuscripts attest to its relative popularity. See Dalzell, introduction to Transmundus, *Introductiones*, ix-x and 30-6. See also Sheila J. Heathcote, “The Letter Collections Attributed to Master Transmundus,” *Analecta cisterciensia* 21 (1965): 42-7.

25 The very early letters by Jordan of Saxony and Humbert of Romans depicting such events as the translation of Dominic’s remains, the expansion of the Order, the missionary efforts of the brothers, and their tribulations with the university of Paris are exceptions. See *Litterae encyclicae* I, 1-6 (1233); V, 16-20 (1255); and VIII, 31-8 (1256).
of the participants and the circumstances attending the affair, attentive if he is assured that the business to be discussed is important, honorable, and advantageous.26

The *exordium* was then meant to inspire the reader to respond favorably to the writer’s requests by securing his good will and assuring him that these requests were critical, advantageous, and honorable. In their bid to gain the friars’ attention and make them more ideologically disposed toward implementing the letters’ behavioral expectations, the masters general largely turned to rhetorically-complicated extended analogies in the *exordia* of their letters, which collectively encouraged a unified sense of the Order’s eschatological purpose and mission within the Church militant through the use of elevated language. These analogies were then followed by a *petitio* section, described by Transmundus as “the section which sets down what is desired, with the intention of making a request,” which “may proceed by instruction, by threat, by encouragement, by advice, or by warning.”27 Thus, in contrast to the expansive, descriptive, and poetic nature of the *exordia* material dictating the ideological basis for the Order as a whole, the *petitio* sections of the encyclical letters focused on more specific behaviors that the brothers were to cultivate in in order to fulfill the Order’s mission. These *petitiones*, while certainly more specific than the metaphors used to inspire them, nonetheless tended to focus on several basic themes stated in a straightforward and exhortatory manner, leaving the gritty details of constitutional and legal changes to the acts of the General Chapter that accompanied the letter. Thus, just as with the *exordia* material, the petitions made by the Master in the yearly encyclical letter remained relatively consistent and functioned to instill several basic concepts into the brothers through repetition. Such repetition in both sections created, then, an easily identifiable set of encouraged behaviors that remained relatively consistent through the nearly 130 years encompassed by the letters.

The formalized nature of the epistolary genre, which often left little room for personal expression in the modern sense, meant that the letters provide a source of ideological continuity between the various


masters general, who slowly elaborated upon the analogies and admonitions of their predecessors. Most of the masters general expressed their sense of having stepped into the large shoes of their predecessors upon their election, both by literally articulating their connection to the past masters and, as we will see, by extensively copying the format, analogies, and general content of previous encyclical letters. Several masters general even voiced the intentionality of this repetition, done for the utility of the brothers and to increase their progress in the Dominican vocation, repeating themselves to such an extent that the brothers allegedly complained about it, a phenomenon Stephen of Basançon noted at the beginning of the petition section of his 1294 encyclical letter. In this sense, the encyclical letters functioned much as did the hagiographic texts in that they provided a relatively unchanging behavioral model limited by the particular expectations of their genre. However, the letters also reflect a gradual evolution of Dominican identity formation as each master general added his own touch and emphasized his own agenda through subtle changes to established images and exhortations, all while still operating within the structures provided by the genre and the accumulated weight of their predecessor’s ideas. The extent of his individual contribution to the tradition depended, of course, on his literary skill and interest in the encyclical letter as a vehicle for enacting change. Thus, the encyclical letters provide a glimpse of the slowly evolving ideological basis for the Order’s identity construction articulated by its spiritual and administrative head.

Despite the encyclical letters’ potential to provide information about Dominican identity formation, this source has largely been ignored by Dominican and social historians who have tended to rely on the Constitutions, acts of chapters, treatises, and hagiographic texts to answer similar questions about Dominican identity and mission. For example, the otherwise extremely thorough studies of Dominican identity in terms of inquisition and education constructed by Christine Caldwell Ames and Michele Mulchahey do not grant

29 For particularly clear examples see Litterae encyclicae XV (1264), 63, XXXVI (1285), 130, and LIII (1300),173.
30 Litterae encyclicae XXV (1273), 92; XLIX (1294), 163; XXV (1273), 92; LIX (1306), 189.
31 In a similar fashion, both Katherine Kong and Jennifer Constantine-Jackson have studied the way that Abelard and Heloise navigated the complex expectations of the epistolary genre to both subtly and persuasively renegotiate their relationship. Kong, Lettering, 55-108 and Constantine-Jackson, “Sapienter amare poterimus: On Rhetoric and Friendship in the Letters of Heloise and Abelard,” in Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse, eds. Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010).
significant attention to these letters, nor does Anne Müller's study of Dominican mission theories.\textsuperscript{32} Although there is much material in this untapped resource relevant for a discussion of Dominican identity formation in general, this chapter will focus specifically on the gendered articulation of this mission. The exhortations expressed in the encyclical letters were specifically directed at the Order's male members and thus provide a glimpse at the process of masculine identity construction in the Order. With the exception of one letter, all one hundred encyclical letters preserved in the manuscripts containing the acts of the General Chapter and originating from male Dominican convents are addressed solely \textit{fratribus Ordinis}. Although Humbert of Romans specified that the master general should write two encyclical letters at the general chapter, one directed the friars and one to the nuns, his are the only two encyclical letters addressed \textit{sororibus} found in the manuscripts containing the other encyclical letters.\textsuperscript{33} Either this injunction was generally ignored, a possible scenario in the context of the Order's long standing struggle over the Order's obligation to the women associated with it, or the encyclical letters directed to the nuns were simply not preserved by the friars.\textsuperscript{34} There have in fact been no general encyclical letters directed to all of the Order's nuns preserved in the early female convents, whose archives only contain letters by the masters general directed to that specific convent.\textsuperscript{35} Given the care which Dominican nuns generally took in preserving important pastoral letters from their male associates, it is thus unlikely that any encyclical letters were written to the nuns on a regular

\textsuperscript{32} Ames, \textit{Righteous}; Mulchahey, \textit{First'}; and Müller, \textit{Bettelmönche}. Only Daniel Antonin Mortier utilizes the letters to discuss the Master's aims, although infrequently, in his monumental work, \textit{Histoire}.

\textsuperscript{33} Humbert of Romans, \textit{De Officiis}, 182, quoted in above ff. 6. Reichert also included two letters in his appendix (II, pg. 320-22 and IV, 326-7), which were directed at the nuns of specific convents and contained in only one of the manuscripts containing the \textit{Acts} of the General Chapter and the encyclical letters and are thus not comparable to the encyclical letters. \textit{Litterae encyclicae}, 313 ff. 1


\textsuperscript{35} The nuns at Prouille, for example, only conserved three letters from the masters general, according to a 17th-century inventory of the archives, all of which discussed legislative details such as the number of sisters, the presence of the brothers in the convent, and building plans specific to the convent itself and are thus not comparable to the encyclical letters sent to all of the brothers. See Loenzert, “Archives.” For a description of the manuscript tradition of Jordan's letters in association with the Bolognese convent, see introduction to JoS, \textit{Epistulae}, xi-xiii and Heribert Scheeben, “Der literarische Nachlass Jordans von Sachsen,” \textit{Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft} 52 (1932): 64-5.
basis. All of this evidence suggests then that the friars perceived the letters as directed specifically at them, excluding the ladies who were at times under their care. The implied masculine focus of the encyclical letters becomes especially clear in comparison to the model of feminine Dominican piety espoused in Humbert of Roman’s sole encyclical letter to the nuns as well as in other non-encyclical letters written by several important early Dominicans to the Dominican nuns. These include letters by the masters general Jordan of Saxony, Ramon de Penyafort, John of Wildeshausen, and John of Vercelli, as well as Peter of Verona. The largest extant collection of letters between a Dominican master general and a nun, and hence the most well studied, is the correspondence of the Blessed Jordan of Saxony, second Master General of the Order, and Diana d’Andalo, foundress of the female Dominican convent in Bologna. Although none of these letters were officially encyclical letters in that they were not sent directly from the General Chapter and were thus more informal, their exhortatory spiritual content as well as their careful preservation by the nuns who received them—as was especially the case with the letters Jordan of Saxony, Ramon de Penyafort, John of Wildeshausen, and Peter of Verona at the convent in Bologna,—indicate that these letters helped to structure the nuns’ sense of identity, mission, and behavioral norms, just as the encyclical letters did for the friars.


37 For a complete collection of Jordan of Saxony’s letters to Diana, as well as several to a convent in Germany, see JoS, Epistulae. Ramon de Penyafort’s letters were originally published by Benedictus Maria Reichert in “Acht ungedruckte Dominikanerbriefe aus dem 13. Jahrhundert,” Historisches Jahrbuch 18 (1897), 363-74 and were republished in Francis Balme and Cesiaus Pahan, eds. Raymundiana seu Documenta quae pertinent ad S. Raymundi de Pennaforti vitam et scripta in MOPH IV (Rome: In Domo Generalitia, 1898). The letters of John of Wildeshausen and John of Vercelli are also published in Reichert, “Acht ungedruckte,” while Peter of Verona’s Letter can be found in Dondaine, “Saint Pierre Martyr: Études,” AFP 23 (1953), 91-3.

38 See such studies as Berthold Altaner, Die Briefe Jordans von Sachsen, in Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland, 20 (Leipzig-Vechta: Harrassowitz,1925), 119-127; Johannes Mumbauer, Die Briefe des heiligen Jordan von Sachsen aus dem lateinische Übersetzt un mit einer Einleitung herausgegeben (Albertus Magnus-Verlag, 1927); Walz, “Intorno”; Norbert Georges, Blessed Diana; Vann, To heaven; and Tilatti, “La Direzione,” 127-73, esp. 134-50.

39 For the manuscript tradition of the letters directed to the nuns at Bologna, see Reichert, “Acht,” 364; Scheeben, “Der literarische,” 64-5; and Walz, “Intorno,” 151-2. Peter Marytr’s letter comes to us in a 14th-century manuscript containing a large selection of texts dealing with traditional themes in monastic piety: fighting the devil, purity of heart, obedience, memory, anger, and final judgment—by several authors instrumental in shaping medieval conventual life including Augustine, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter the Venerable, and Bernard of Clairvaux. These texts, in combination with Peter’s letter, would have been very appropriate for a female monastic audience, as they highlight the themes of male conventual living available to enclosed nuns. On the manuscript see Podlaha, Adolf. Soupis Rukopisu knihovny metropolitní kapitoly Pražské, t. I (Praha 1910), 197-8.
Because these letters to Dominican women have been very well studied, the chapter will primarily focus on the model of masculine piety expressed in the encyclical letters, while interspersing pertinent examples from the female lives at relevant points in the discussion as an important point of comparison.

**A Man For Others: Ideals of Masculine Behavior in the *Litterae encyclicae***

Given the centrality of the early masters general in constructing or directing the Dominican normative and hagiographic texts, it is perhaps no surprise that the vocational ideals for the brothers espoused in their yearly encyclical letters were consistent with those found in the Dominican Constitutions, saints’ lives, histories about the Order’s beginnings, and Humbert’s *Liber de eruditione praedicatorum* discussed above. The masters general also made use of similar rhetorical strategies in their letters to depict these Dominican vocational ideals as particularly masculine, placing their ideals within literary, rhetorical monastic, and lay understandings of masculine behavior. While some of these rhetorical strategies, such as the use of militaristic imagery, have gendered implications explicitly articulated in the letters, others drew upon ideals of male behavior equally central to medieval conceptions of masculinity, but less overtly discussed as masculine. Some such themes include pursuing an active life in the world, enacting authority in a public realm, fatherhood, and demonstrating governance of self and others.\(^{40}\) As we will see, the masters general wove the threads of these gendered themes, consciously or not, into the tapestry of ideological constructions and behavioral admonitions that constitute the *litterae encyclicae*. The repetitive nature of these annual exhortatory letters makes the identification of consistently presented ideological constructions and behavioral admonitions a relatively straightforward task and it is around three major themes presented in the letters that the following analysis revolves: combatting the Devil in various manifestations, cultivating personal virtue in order to supplement the preaching message, and disseminating divine knowledge to others.

**Christ’s Soldiers: Spiritual Warfare in the *Litterae encyclicae***

\(^{40}\) See above Introduction, 11-15.
Perhaps the most obviously masculinized theme in the encyclical letters occurred in sections of the letters espousing a militaristic worldview in which the friars faced off against worldly enemies and the Devil in various guises. Such depictions of the Order’s mission, described in martial language and specifically associated with maleness, played a prominent and recurring role in the encyclical letters, appearing in about twenty percent of the letters’ *exordia*. John of Wildeshausen first employed this type of imagery in his 1246 encyclical letter—the first letter written by a master general whose status has not been contested—during an especially tumultuous time for the Order. Having been entrusted with inquisitorial responsibilities throughout Europe by the papacy, the expanding Order had recently suffered the murder of three of its inquisitor friars in Avignonnet in 1242 by Cathars, an event that so profoundly impacted the friars in the region that the Provincial of Toulouse wrote to Pope Innocent IV asking to be released from inquisitorial responsibility in such a turbulent and violent region. Four years later, at the time of the letter’s composition, the pope ordered the friars to publicly announce the excommunication and deposition of Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II, a task that was both dangerous—especially in realms loyal to the emperor—as well as ideologically challenging since it tested the Order’s nascent position as the official papal arm. Both the papal bull entrusting this task to the Dominicans and Frederick II’s letter to the General Chapter of that year used

---

41 The only existing copy of the encyclical letter allegedly sent by Jordan of Saxony is found as an example letter in an *ars dictandi* written by an early Dominican convert and was published in Kaeppler, “B. Iordani,” 182-5 and Jordan of Saxony, *Litterae encylicae annis 1233 et 1234 datae*, ed. E. Montanari, in *Biblioteca del Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici in Umbria* 10 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’Alto Medioevo, 1993). On the alleged encyclical letter of Jordan of Saxony see above, 215, ff. 41. Both LeClercq and Constable have discussed the tendency of writers to fabricate letters or falsely assign authors, particularly in the *artes dictamini*, placing the authorial assignation of this particular letter into serious question. In addition, it was not contained in the manuscripts along with the acts of the general chapter and would thus have had limited circulation. However, Peter Ferrand, in his chronicle noted that the tradition of the encyclical letters began with Jordan and the content of the letter is thematically very consistent with Jordan’s other writings and with later encyclical letters. Thus, if it is a forgery, it is a very believable one and worth consideration here. However, I will maintain the numeric labels in Reichert’s collection of all the letters for simplicity’s sake and to honor the ambiguity of this letter’s author. See Peter Ferrand, *Cronica*, 6; Scheeben, “Der literarische,” 68; Jean Leclercq, “Le genre épistolaire au moyen âge,” in *Revue du moyen âge* 2 (1946): 68; and Giles Constable, *Letters*, 49. On the debate surrounding Jordan of Saxony’s *Libellus*, including the separated section about Dominic’s translation, as encyclical letters, see above Chapter 1, 27, ff. 27.

42 For the papal bull denying this request see Innocent IV’s *Inter alia* in *BOP* I: 118 (July 10, 1243). For a summary of these events, see Mortier, *Histoire*, 1:356-71.

43 Frederick II denounced this unconventional involvement in secular affairs, as he called it, pointedly requesting that the Order return to its primary spiritual tasks of protecting the church from heresy and seeking God in a letter sent to the General Chapter in 1246. See Jean Louis Alphonse Huillard-Bréholles, ed., *Historia diplomatica Friderici Secundi: sive Constitutiones, Privilegia, mandata, instrumenta quae supersunt istius imperatoris et filiorum ejus. Accedunt epistulae paparum et documenta varia*, vol. 6, pt. 1 (Paris: Excudebat Henricus Plon, 1852): 479-80.
masculinized military imagery to describe the friars’ mission, language which is reflected in John’s letter.44

Amidst such a difficult situation, the fourth master general wrote,

The responsibility of the office entrusted to us demands that we admonish you just as sons in Christ to walk solicitously toward God in the vocation to which you have been called. Truly, running into the stadium, fighting in battle, while they encourage another with mutual yells, sound salvific war trumpets, and strike jars together, they are girded by mutual boldness, they put their enemies to flight and as the walls are falling down they enter the city of Jericho and lay waste to it. Therefore, just as sons of true obedience, striving with the most salubrious admonitions, hold mutual charity towards one another, the bond of peace, the sign of protection, the root of all good from which the branches of virtues and the fruitful works of holy labor sprout.45

The masculinized militaristic imagery used in this section, largely drawn from the Book of Joshua, would have had special relevance for the friars who were facing the reality of Dominican deaths during inquisitorial activities and were caught in the midst of a clash of titans.46 Amidst such potentially violent realities, John thus called the brothers to create an army bound together by their mutual vocation, charity, and faith that would drive off its enemies and produce virtues leading to fruitfulness. Besides the obviously masculine nature of such militaristic imagery, John’s exhortation also encouraged a sense of membership to the Order that required mutual support and defensive action, a sense of belonging similar to that undergirding the secular social factions or honor groups endemic to late medieval cities through which men demonstrated and defended their personal and collective masculine honor.47 In describing the friars as brothers, the sons of Christ, and encouraging them to collective action against a common enemy, John’s Dominican army paralleled

44 In *Humiles habitu* Innocent IV begins the sentence in which he entrusts the dissemination of Frederick’s excommunication and deposition by saying “Nos itaque gloriantes in Domino, quod ipse viris talibus suam munivit Ecclesiam, qui mori pro Christo diligunt et pati pro justicia delectantur; Fratribus eisdem…” while Frederick lauds the Order’s efforts against heresy and their efforts at placing their hand to the plow “ut in agone viriliter contendentes se prorsus ab omnibus absterinenter…” *BOP* I: 158 (21 December 1245) and Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia*, 6.1: 479-80.


46 Joshua 6: 1-27

47 See above Introduction, 16.
the composition and purpose of feud groups which likewise contained blood and spiritual relatives acting against an enemy group.48

Several other encyclical letters similarly made use of militaristic imagery as a means of unifying and encouraging the brothers in the face of often violent opposition, especially during the tumultuous early days of the Order. John of Wildeshausen, for example, employed this strategy in a letter written from Metz in 1251, just as the pope sought to expand his influence in the Italian peninsula after Frederick II’s death in December 1250 by sending a cadre of Dominican inquisitors into the region, including the charismatic Dominican preacher Peter of Verona, who would be martyred soon after his appointment.49 Amidst the expansion of their inquisitorial responsibilities, the master general began his yearly encyclical letter by describing the evilness of the present days and then urged his audience “to fortify and strengthen [their] hearts by persisting in mutual exhortation and heavenly consolation so that [their] souls, dedicated to the divine campaign and army, in which human life is spent, do not to grow tepid, falter, or look back after having been broken by labor or weakened by the weariness of cowardice, but seize the reward of eternal life by seeing and progressing through the more esteemed path of charity.”50 John structured this exhortation around Matthew 24:12, which glorified “the one who perseveres until the end” when the Gospel would be preached to the entire world, since he would be saved, a text also referenced in Dominic’s bull of canonization.51 The emphasis on perseverance, courage, and dedication to a particular vocation amidst present difficulty found in both John’s letter and its biblical root reflected the language surrounding chivalric ideals and heroic knightly behavior, in which knights were depicted heroically facing battle out of a sense of personal honor and loyalty to their


49 Prudlo, Martyred, 56-7.

50 “nos mutue exhortacions et superne consolacionis instancia corda vestra munire et confirmare cure pastoralis sollicitudine et affectu paternæ caritatis urgernæ; ne animi vestri divino tyranno mancipati et milicie, quæ vita humana desudat, labore contractæ tediove pusillanimitatis affecti tepescant aut deficiant aut retro respicient, sed proficiendo et proficiendo et prosciaphico per excellenciære viam caritatis eternæ vite bravium comprehendant.” Letteræ encyclicae, III (1251), 12-3.

51 “Et quoniam abundant iniquitas, refricies caritas multorum: quia autem perseveraverit usque in finem, hic salus est. Et praedicabitur hoc Evangelium regni in universo orbe, in testimonium omnibus gentibus: et tunc veniet consummatio.” Matthew 24:12-4 also in BOP I: 67 (July 3, 1234).
lord. This ideal was, then, twofold: it required knights to fight violently against actual enemies and to uphold the ideal of knighthood, which ultimately transcended death. Ramon Llull for example, wrote in his *Llibre de l’Orde de Cavalleria*,

“If knighthood was more about physical force than the force of courage, it follows that the Order of Knighthood more strongly aligns with the body than with the soul, and if it did this, the body would have greater nobility than the soul. But since courage’s nobility can’t be conquered or overpowered by a single man or all the men who exist and a single body is conquered and seized by another; the dishonorable knight who, when he flees battle and abandons his lord, fears bodily force more than acting dishonorably and weakness of courage, does not use the office of knighthood and is not a servant of or obedient to the honored Order of Knighthood, which takes its beginning from nobility of courage.”

Thus, according to Llull, privileging physical comfort over the ideal of chivalrous behavior—fleeing battle—was to associate oneself with the body, which could be violated and seized, and was therefore associated with the feminine. For both John of Wildeshausen and Ramon Llull, courageous adherence to an ideal—the chivalric code or the path of charity—allowed the knight/friar to over come bodily exertion or fear of death brought upon by battle/inquisitorial activity, and, ultimately, to transcend the feminized body and act out a masculinized ideal. Although John’s own words did not specify the exact task to which the friar was to dedicate himself, the association with Matthew’s gospel linked this specifically to preaching the Gospel to all people with the reward of personal salvation, while his reference to charity, a central characteristic in the Dominican normative text studied above, implies a desire to save sinful souls. In addition, by encouraging the brothers to persevere through tribulation, John also drew upon the tradition of steadfast, nonviolent resistance to secular pressure associated with male martyrs in hagiographic texts, bishop saints defending ecclesiastical prerogatives, and monks resisting secular pressures. Thus, John used an elegant militaristic analogy to place the Dominican mission—seeking the salvation of souls through preaching and inquisition out

---

52 See examples in above chapter 1, 14-16 and 51.
53 See, for example, Blamour’s honorable death in above chapter 3, 27-8.
54 “Si cavaylaria fos en força corporal més que en forsa de coratge, seguire’s que orde de cavaylaria se concordàs pus fortement ab lo cors que ab la ànima, e si ho faés, lo cors agra major nobilitat que la ànima. On, con nobilitat de coratge no pusca ésser vensut ni apoderat per hun home ni per tots los hòmens qui són, e .1. cors sie vensut per altre e pres, lo malvat cavayler qui tem pus forment la força del cors con fuig a la batayla e desempara son senyor, que no fa la malvestat e la flàquesa de son coratge, no usa de l’offici de cavayler ni és servidor ni hobedient a l’honrat orde de cavaylaria qui fo començament per nobleia de coratge” Llull, *Llibre de l’Ordre*, book II.16, 179.
55 On medieval associations between the body and femininity as well as between firmness and masculinity, see above chapter 1, 34-5 and 70.
of dedication to charity and the Lord, despite great physical comfort and risk—among literary and hagiographic ideals of male behavior.

Humbert of Romans also employed military imagery to rally the brothers in response to external attacks on the Order, specifically the attacks by the scholars at the University of Paris beginning in 1252, who sought to limit the friars’ involvement with the university and questioned the ideological foundations of their vocation. Although this heated exchange was largely limited to the exchange of angry words and letters—described by both sides as “defamations” and “injuries” that “wounded” one another—it did reach the point of physical violence during the height of the conflict. In a letter to the Bishop of Paris in April 1256, Pope Alexander IV described a situation in which “malice boiled” in the hearts of some clerics so much that, beyond sending incriminating letters, “they also wounded some of the Parisian brothers with blows from sacrilegious hands” and “wickedly threatened to do worse and more serious things to them.” The situation was so threatening that the brothers were afraid to leave their convent to beg for their meals. The first of Humbert’s letters to the Order about the situation was sent in April of 1256 in the form of an epistola consolatoria and contained an extended and provoking narratio of the tribulations suffered by the brothers in Paris. The exordium of the letter began by describing the general conflict surrounding the Order as the Devil’s attempts to attack and divide the brothers, the reemergence of a terrifying Leviathan, and Belial’s attack on Christendom. After describing this situation in the exordia and detailed narratio, Humbert returned to militaristic imagery in the conclusio of the letter telling the brothers that “the army should imitate the prince, the fighters should follow the highest one, and the faithful members should be conformed to Christ, the leader, under the flag of faith” and that now “the soldier is roused to battle and tested by war-like

57 In addition to the description of events found in Humbert’s letter, Litterae encyclicae VIII, 33-6 (1256), the violence in Paris is also documented in the university records from varying perspectives in Denifle, Chartularium I:292-340, especially 292-315. For a summary of events, see Hinnebusch, History, II:71-98 and Mortier, Histoire, I:435-475. On the significance of injuria, see above chapter 1, 68.


59 This type of letter was dubbed consolatoria by Richard William Southern in Medieval Humanism and other Studies (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), 89-90. The narratio of the events at Paris can be found in Litterae encyclicae VIII, 33-6 (1256).

60 Litterae encyclicae, VIII, 31-2 (1256).
blows, the athlete is chosen for the contest.”61 As in John’s letters, Humbert constructed a dichotomous worldview that pitted the friars, banded together into an army shaped in Christ’s image, to “battle” against external persecutions, making use of language reminiscent of the unitive theory inherent to masculine participation in lay honor groups, military campaigns, and chivalric literature.62 The fifth master general made the gendered implications of his metaphor clear in the encyclical letter sent the following year from Florence, where he speculated that God had seen fit to center these troubles around Paris “so that He should allow a more difficult conflict to develop where our larger and greater army had gathered from all parts of the world, abounding in every armament, able to resist adversaries more powerfully and to fight them manfully.”63 While Humbert’s use of militaristic imagery reflected the verbal damage suffered and lobbed by the friars as well as the physical violence endured by them in Paris and in their inquisitorial activities, the metaphor also depicted the conflict in particularly masculine terms both overtly, by using adjectives such as strenui and viriliter, and subtly, by emphasizing aggressive militarism, a collective defensive mentality, service to a great lord, and persistence in the face of opposition, ideals inherent to the late medieval conceptions of masculine behavior amidst which some of the friars had been raised.64

While the militaristic imagery employed by the early masters general often directly responded to challenges to the Order’s existence as it struggled to find a permanent place in late medieval society, later masters tended to employ the same imagery to reinforce a coalescing Dominican mission. This mission more and more came to involve defending themselves and the Christian faithful from the Devil in various guises and responded to the specific task engaged in by the Order after its first years of existence—defense of doctrinal orthodoxy. It was again Humbert of Romans, who first used this analogy to directly pit the preaching friars


62 On the importance of unity and brotherhood to medieval knights in the chanson de geste, see Gaunt, Gender, 22-70. On the bonds within honor groups see Boehm, Blood, 51-64 and Narbona Vizcaíno, Malhechores, 83-128.

63 “…ut ibi permitteretur fieri conflictum graviorem, ubi maior et melior nostra milicia de diversis mundi partibus congregata, omni armatura abundans, resistere possit validus adversarius ipsoque viriliter impugnare.” Litterae encyclicae IX, 44 (1257).

64 Thomas of Aquinas, for example, who was licensed for his mastership at Paris during the height of the conflict, was raised in an important aristocratic household in which the militaristic ideal of noble masculinity was undoubtedly taught, even to a son placed in a convent at the age of five. Hinnebusch, History, II: 74. On his childhood see BG, Vita, chaps. 1-3, 168-9.
against a specific enemy. In his 1255 joint encyclical letter with the Franciscan Minister General John of Parma, written partially in response to the battle at Paris which had challenged both Orders, the mendicant leaders articulated a vision in which God had sent the two Orders to work together for the world’s salvation at the end of the failed first age.65 Included in the midst of several analogies describing these Orders, the authors asserted that the “wicked enemy sees how great is our edification of the people, our utility, as well as our ability to glorify the Lord that follows from the glue of charity” and strives with all his might to disrupt this bond. Because of this, the leaders expressed the hope that “the Evil one should find us men of virtues manfully resisting him by defending the most precious essence of the aforementioned charity, which is left over from the fathers, and watching over it with every defense.”66 Rather than the more general defense against tribulations expressed in his other letters, this joint encyclical letter clearly pitted the Devil against the mission of both Orders, which the friars should defend by engaging in virtuous acts: edifying souls, being useful to others and their Order, and glorifying God. The two leaders also specifically characterized the nature of this mission as masculine within the analogy, employing the relatively infrequently used adjective viriliter.

Later masters general reiterated this masculinized imagery of battle between the friars and the Devil, further defining it as a battle for the possession of human souls and subtly linking it with inquisitorial activities. In the colorful and complicated introduction to his 1266 encyclical letter, for example, John of Vercelli claimed that the Enemy especially sought “on the day of war to put to flight those who, striving with the bow of preaching, are invading the castles of the human mind in a salvific victory with arrows of sacred

65 *Litterae encyclicae* VII, 25-31 (1255) and Mortier, *Histoire*, I:460. This eschatological vision of the two Orders in church history was also present in Dominic’s bull of canonization and inherent in the hagiographic legend regarding the meeting of Francis and Dominic, who engaged in a conversation of mutual admiration, and encounter to which the joint encyclical letter also referred when they wrote “O quantum exemplum mutue caritatis et pacis reliquerunt nobis patres nostri franciscus et beatus dominicus ceterique fratres nostri primitivi, qui sic in vita sua se tenere dilexerunt, tamque sincere caritatis indicia sibimet ostenderunt, videndo se sicut angelos dei, suscipiendo se invicem sicut Christum, honore se ipsum proveniendo, profectui mutuo congaudendo, alternis se preconis extollendo, utilitates mutue promovendo fideliter, a scandalis et turbacionibus alterutris cavendo cum summus diligentia et prudencia.” *Litterae encyclicae* VII (1255), 27. On the alleged meeting between the two saints, Rosalind Brooke and C.N.L. Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1975); 89-103.

66 “Vidit invidus hostis, quanta edificacio populi, quanta utilitas nostra, quanta materia glorificandi dominum ex supradicte caritatis glutino sequedatur...Inveniat nos ille nequam viros virutum sibi viriliter resistentes, in defendenda preciosissima substancia predicte caritatis relict a tribulis et omni custodia observanda.” *Litterae encyclicae* VII, 27 (1255).
eloquence, which the invading king of the pride’s sons has dammingly occupied.”

Thus, the brothers should gird themselves in heavenly armor as “powerful individuals,” since “the weight of war has been roused against them and those who avenge the king’s name with sacred and skilled guidance, will be particularly attacked until death.”

In this letter, John clearly defined the Devil as the friars’ main antagonist, further specifying that the Devil acted to win over people’s minds and seize their souls as the reward for his labor. Likewise, in his 1279 letter, John once again addressed a fraternity at war, this time a war conducted “not for the purpose of pillaging temporal goods, but of perniciously destroying souls.”

The brothers, he said, should “clothe themselves in the armor by which they will not only be able to destroy the most depraved weapons, but also to triumph gloriously over that adversary who is circling, seeking one whom he might devour.”

Once again, John depicted the friars engaged in battle against the Devil, here described as a devouring lion in an image taken from Peter’s first letter, over the ultimate fate of human souls. Although neither reference specifically mentioned heresy, John’s description of the Devil’s occupation of human minds and the friar’s battle to dislodge him with preaching is reminiscent of descriptions of heresy as an internalization of ideas found in Dominican inquisitorial manuals and reflected the militaristic language used in papal bulls directing inquisitorial efforts.

In addition, the historical situations faced by the brothers during the composition of both letters, characterized by extensive Dominican involvement in inquisitorial activities and further

---

67 “Invalescit doloso circuitu caliditas inimici inardescens precipue contra illos et querens, ut eos in die belli convertat in fugam, qui predicacionis archum intendentes, sacrorum eloquiorum sagittis invadunt, salutari victoria castra menticum humanarum, que rex super filios superbie invadens damnosius occupavit, ipsum venenosum colubrum obstetricantis manus ingenio exinde educendo.” Litterae encyclicae XVII, 68 (1266).

68 Propter quod, fraternis carissimis, accingimini ut potentes et, quam docuit apostolus, celestis inditum armaturam, quia contra vos inciduntur pondus belli, et illi preservi impetuntur ad mortem, qui sibi regis nomen sacro et sollerti sui regi iner decarnum.” Litterae encyclicae XVII, 68-9 (1266).

69 “Ecce, fratres carissimi, in campo certaminis constituti, dum contra vos sentitis bella consurgere, in quibus non de rapiendis transitorioris agit, sed de perimendis perniciosius animabus, dei vos convenit induere armaturam, quia non solum extinguerunt omnia tela nequissimi valeatis, verum eciam de adversario illo, qui circuit, querens quem devoret, gloriosius optimum.” Litterae encyclicae XXI, 112 (1279).

70 The Dominican inquisitor Rayner Sacconi, for example, a converted Cathar and colleague of Peter of Verona, discussed the recalcitrance of the Cathars he encountered, by writing “Erroris namque venenum, quod ex ore antiquus serpentis biberunt, non sinit eos de peccatis suis aliquem habere dolorem” in Rayner Sacconi, Summa de Catharis, in François Sanjek, “Raynerius Sacconi O.P., Summa de cathariss.” AFP 44 (1974): 46. Partially quoted in Ames, Righteous Persecution, 30-31. Likewise, Numerous papal bulls urged the Dominicans in Lombardy toward greater effort in the war on heresy using oppositional and militant imagery. See, for example, Ad extirpanda in BOP I: 209 (15 May 1252) and reiterated on November 30, 1259 in ibid., 382; Cupientes in ibid., 396 (9 October 1260); Ne commise in ibid., 396 (15 October 1260); and Precelsi dispositoris in Ibid., 400 (27 November 1260).
casualties for the Order would likewise have reinforced the association between John’s soul-snatching Devil and heresy.\footnote{John of Vercelli himself had served as provincial prior in Lombardy from 1258-64 during expanding inquisitorial activities and violence against Dominican friars in the region. The chronicler Vincentio Maria Fontana placed these events in 1284, while the Annales parmenses date them to October 29, 1279 and it is to the latter date that Mortier adheres. See Vincent Maria Fontana, ed. Monumenta dominicana breviter in synopsis collecta (Rome: Typis and Sumptibus Nicolai Angeli Tinassii, 1675), 121; Georgius Heinricus Pertz, ed. Annales Parmenses Maiores a. 1165-1335, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica 18 (Leipzig: Verlag Karl W. Hiersemann, 1925), 688; and Mortier, Histoire, II:324.} In October of 1279, for example, supporters of a lapsed heretic called the Todesca, who had been condemned by the Dominican inquisitor Father Florio, attacked the Dominican convent in Parma while she was being burned at the stake, dragged the friars into the street, and beat them severely causing the death of a 40-year veteran of the Order, Jacob of Ferrara, as well as the removal of the friars from the city for the next seven years. In order to combat the threat of physical violence, John encouraged the brothers by describing their mission in hyper-militaristic terms, thus lending an overtly masculine tone to the preaching mission by emphasizing the friar’s ability to enact violence on their enemies through preaching and eloquence. Thus, John evokes traditions of rhetorical virility and hagiographic traditions of male martyrdoms involving which emphasized their verbal skill.\footnote{See above chapter 1, 60-2 and chapter 2, 113-6.}

Finally, the fourteenth-century masters general further elaborated on the friars’ role in an epic spiritual war by emphasizing their role as protectors of the Lord’s flock, a role consistent with late medieval gendered understandings of governance and patriarchal responsibility as a sign of mature masculinity.\footnote{See above introduction, 14-15.}

Writing from Florence in 1321, for example, Hervé de Nédellec, one of the most celebrated philosophers and theologians of his day, stated that the Order had been founded “so that...the Christian army could fight the strongest visible and invisible enemies more securely” and “strengthen the weak for the many wars.”\footnote{“Ut...contra visibles et invisibles hostes fortissimos christianus exercitus securius dimicaret” and “ut videlicet ignaros in agendis instruerent, roborarent in bellis multiplicitibus debiles et specula mundi se ipsos cernenibus exhiberent.” Litterae encyclicae LXIII (1321), 228. Bernard Gui notes Hervé’s reputation as an excellent scholar in his Libellus Magistrorum Ordinis Praedicatorum, saying, “Vir fuit simplicitatis et innocentiae columbinae, celebris fama et opinione super omnes suos coaetaneos in scientia et doctrina”. He was also a master of theology in Paris and a judge in the tribunal of Jean de Pouilly, the successor of William of St. Amour, whose theory of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was condemned by John of XXII in 1321. See Bernard Gui, Libellus seu Tractatus Magistrorum Ordinis Praedicatorum necnon et priorum provincialium provinciae Provinciae seu Tolosanae, in Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio, ed. Edmond Martène, vol. 6 (Paris: Montalant, 1729), col. 413 and BOP II:152, discussed in Mortier, Histoire, 2: 532-9.} The master exhorted the brothers to clothe themselves “not with physical arms, but spiritual ones,” since they
“fight for God not the world and conduct battles fought principally against spirits,” so that they could "stand against the devil’s traps and manfully defend the Lord's flock from the bites of wolves.” Their mission further included the goals of "healthily wounding and purging the abscesses of vices from the hearts of the faithful" and "making war on the feral enemy of the human race." As did prior masters general, Hervé depicted the spiritual world as an epic battle between good and evil in which the brothers functioned as leaders of the Christian army, who defended other Christians from the Devil's pernicious influence, trained them to fight in the battle themselves, and cleansed others of vice, rendering this vocation particularly masculine through the use of the word *viriliter*, engagement of militaristic concepts, and emphasis on the friar's role in governing others. The master’s reference to wolves, an image commonly applied to heretics in both inquisitorial manuals as well as Dominican artwork, would have associated this cleansing mission with inquisitorial activities as would the continued violence against Dominican inquisitors occurring during this period.

Dominican inquisitors in the Italian peninsula, for example, found themselves increasingly and often violently embroiled in the Guelph/Ghibelline conflicts in which heretical sects, pursued by the Dominican inquisitors, allied themselves with anti-papal elements. Likewise, the friars became the target of anti-papal fervor in Germany where they had been entrusted with the task of reading the pope's condemnatory letters and bans.

---

75 "Et quia deo militamur non mundo, et ipsius prelia contra potestates aereas principaliter preliamur; non arma carnalia, sed spiritualia induamini pocius, ut possitis contra insidias stare dyaboli et gregem dominicum a luporum morsibus viriliter defensare. Vestiti itaque lorica justicie, galea salutis protecti, gladio acipiti verbi dei accincti, arcum sumite, pharetram sagittis acutis implete, ad vulneranda salubriter et purganda de fidelium cordibus apostemata viciorum ac debellandum humani generis ferinum inimicum." *Litterae encyclicae* LXXIII, 228-9 (1321).

76 For an extended description of the wolves and sheep analogy used in Dominican inquisitorial texts, see Ames, *Righteous*, 23-56. In 1311, for example, the attendees of the provincial chapter presided over by the future Master General Barnabus Cagnoli and held in Milan were attacked and beaten in retribution for the burning of the popular heretic turned bandit *Dulcino* in response to the Dominican inquisitor Emmanuel Testa's condemnation in 1307. See Fontana, *Monumenta*, 160 and Mortier, *Histoire*, III: 4.
against the popular emperor, a thankless and often dangerous task. In the midst of these stressful and
dangerous events, the Master General Hugh de Vaucemain, a French theologian and former provincial prior,
neatly summarized the militaristic analogies of the previous letter by writing:

Take note, my brothers, that the enemy of the human race prepares more subtle traps for the professors of
the highest poverty and the heralds of divine will the more courageously that he sees that they have entered
the field of spiritual battle, unburdened by the baggage of temporal things, protected by the shield of faith,
and girded with the sword of evangelical preaching, who not only attending to your own salvation in silence
but also, concerned about the salvation of others, destroying the millstones of the unjust, are busy seizing
his prey from his teeth.

Thus, Hugh used militaristic imagery to define the Dominican mission, which included a dedication to fighting
the Devil—specifically in the form of heresy—with effective preaching even amidst physical violence, through
which efforts the friar procured his own salvation and the salvation of others. In attempting to encourage the
brothers in their tasks, the masters’ letters paralleled the speeches made by and expected of male patriarchs,
heads of feuding groups, who were expected to inspire their men to courageous action in times of crisis
through rhetorical skill, a behavioral expectation partly based on the tradition of heroic epic, which formed
part of knightly education and contributed to the formation of class ideology. In that sense, the basic
message imparted by these Dominican masters during times of violent opposition to the Order, issued "with
the solicitude of pastoral care and affection of paternal charity," reflects Archbishop Turin’s simple, but

---

77 For example, when the pope sent Bernard Gui and Bertrand de la Tour to Italy on a mission to pacify the Lombards, the
friars witnessed first hand the partisan and endemic hostilities in the region, where churches lay despoiled, religious
were displaced and imprisoned, and warfare made the road so treacherous that the friars feared to send letters lest
their messenger be harmed, an unfortunate fate which befell a certain John who was killed while attempting to deliver
their letters to Avignon. The reports of the two papal nuncios regarding their peace keeping mission can be found in
Sigmund Reizler, ed., Vatikanische Akten zur deutschen Geschichte in der Zeit Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayerin (Innsbruck:
Verlag, 1891), especially pgs. 30 and 35-6 and the pope’s responses to these letters can be found in BOP II: 133-5. See
also A. Thomas, “Bernard Gui: Frère Prêcheur,” Histoire littéraire de la France 35 (1921): 188-9 and Guenée, Between,
54-6. Among the religious discharged due to hostilities, the Dominican chronicler Galvanes de la Flamma noted that the
Dominicans in Milan were expelled from the city “by the seculars” in Fratris Galvagni de la Flamma cronica ordinis
praedicatorum ab anno 1170 usque ad 1333, ed. Benedictus Maria Reichert, in MOPH (Rome, 1897), 109 and discussed
in Mortier, Histoire, II: 542. Finally, Pope Benedict XII sent an angry letter to Louis of Bavaria for the ill-treatment of the
Dominican friars who had upheld the papal ban of excommunication by not saying mass in January 1339 in Litteras

78 Peter Ferrand, Chronica, 23.

79 “Attendite, fratres mei, quod paupertatis altissime professoribus et divine preconibus voluntatis, eo parat insidias
subtiliores humani generis inimicius, quo magis eos conspicuit animosius spiritualius ingressos campum certaminis, a rerum
temporalium sarcinis expeditos, scuto protectos fidei et evangelice predicacionis gladio accinctos, qui nedom
salutem vestram in silencio procurantes verum eciam de aliorum salute solliciti molas iniqui conterentes, de eius
dentibus eripere satagitis predam eius…” Litterae encyclicae LXXI, 251-2 (1333).

80 Agnus MacKay, "Religion, Culture, and Ideology on the Late Medieval Castilian-Granadan Frontier," in Medieval Frontier
Societies, ed. R. Bartlett and A. MacKay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) 233 and 235; and Karras, From Boys,
26-7; Rodríguez-Velasco, Order, 104.
effective speech to the small band of knights facing a large Muslim cohort: “Barons, my lords, Charles picked us for this purpose; We must be ready to die in our King’s service. Christendom needs you, so help use to preserve it...Battle you’ll have, of that you may be certain, here come the Muslims—your own eyes have observed them...If you should die, blest martyrdom’s your guerdon; You’ll sit high in Paradise eternal.”

Thus, the masters equated the Dominican vocation with the knightly ideals presented in chivalric literature pervaded lay understandings of violent masculinity by emphasizing membership in a defensive brotherhood, patriarchal ideas of protecting the Christian family, and bravery in the face of persecution, replacing actual swords used by Christian knights with Dominican swords of rhetoric. The fact that the master generals chose these martial images as the material in their letters’ exordia—the portion of the letters meant to convince the listener that acquiescing to the letter’s request would be honorable and advantageous for him—suggests that they considered the associations with lay ideals of honorable masculinity inherent to this vocation to be sources of inspiration and identification for the Order’s members. In addition, since the exordia were also to render the listener receptive to the letter’s message by providing a foretaste of the letter’s essence, placement of this militarized imagery here suggests that the masters also considered the themes of masculine behavior present in this imagery to be foundational for the behavioral guidelines contained in the rest of the letter. Such imagery thus presented the masculine ideals of secular behavior as the motivation for and ideological foundation of the Order’s mission.

This highly externalized piety enacted in the public realm contrasted sharply with the individualized and internalized vocational practice laid out in the Order’s letters to women, apparent from the primary analogy used to discuss the female Dominican: the sponsa Christi. Just as images of knighthood embodied secular ideals of male behavior, nuptial imagery was consistent with late medieval understandings of female social roles, which emphasized the need for women to be under the protection of a man. Thomas of Cantimpré had likewise reflected these lay ideals of the male-female relationship when he redirected
Margaret of Ypres' love for a layman to Christ. The designation of female Christian virgins as the brides of Christ can be traced back to the third century and although late medieval theological conceptions of the union between the feminine soul and the masculine Christ taken from the Song of Songs were theoretically equally applicable to men and women, specific references to nuptial imagery were more often associated with female religious than male, most often found in writings to nuns, and more fully elaborated by the nuns themselves in the later medieval period. Nuptial imagery likewise dominated the presentation of the feminine Dominican vocation in the early letters written by male Dominicans to their female brethren. In the first paragraph of his first letter to Diana of Andalo, for example, written before the foundation of the convent in Bologna, Jordan wrote,

The letters that you have sent to me arose from desire. Therefore, I will also say a few things to you about the cause of heavenly desire. Dearest sister, the desire of the holy fathers invited your spouse, Christ, the son of God, to suffering and he came. Why therefore would he not come toward delights, toward you, after he was invited by your desires? Therefore, focus all of your desire on heaven.

Jordan elaborated on Christ as a bridegroom elsewhere in the letters when he encouraged the sisters to take comfort in their heavenly spouse, who was continually present to them during times of tribulation, and to enjoy His embraces in the marital bed. Ramon de Penyafort and Humbert of Romans also addressed the sisters as brides of Christ, bidding them to enjoy their husband’s embraces and to supplicate Him on behalf of

85 See above chapter 2, 88-9.
86 Kate Lowe, “Secular Brides and Convent Brides: Wedding Ceremonies in Italy during the Renaissance and Counter-Reformation,” in Marriage in Italy, 1300-1650, eds. Trevor Dean and K.J.P. Lowe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 41-6; Rosin, Hagiographie, 113-123; Bynum, Jesus, 18 and 138; Carolyn Diskant Muir; “Bride and Bridgroom? Masculine Identity in Mystic Marriages,” in Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages, eds. P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 58; Christopher C. Craun, “Matronly Monks: Theodoret of Cyrrhus’ Sexual Imagery in the Historia Religiosa,” in Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages, eds. P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004). This is not to suggest that late medieval religious men did not present themselves using the nuptial imagery or that religious women’s understanding of their relationship with Christ was limited to nuptial imagery—Bynum’s study suggests otherwise—but that such imagery continued to be associated much more often with female religious.
87 For examples where Jordan specifically references the nuns as brides of Christ, see JoS, Epistulae, XXIV, 41-2 (1223); XXIV, 28-9 (1223); XXXI, 36-7 (1225); XLIV, 50 (1225); XXXII (1226); XXVII, 33 (1226); XIV, 16 (1229); X, 12 (1229); XLVIII (1229), 54; and XI, 26 (1230). Scholars have noted the prevalence of the sponsa Christi image including Tilatti, “Direzione,” 144-5; Coakley, “Gender” 451-2.
89 For examples in Jordan’s letters where he encouraged the nuns to enjoy Christ’s embraces or refers to the marital bed, see JoS, Epistulae, XXVIII, 33 (1226); XIV, 16 (1229); XI, 26 (1230). For examples of Jordan’s directives for the nuns to take comfort in Christ as their spouse, see Ibid., XXI, 25 (1223); XXXI, 36-7 (1225); XLIV, 50 (1225); XXIV, 28-9 (1225); XXXII, 38 (1226); abd X, 12 (1229).
others from their privileged position in the holy marriage bed. For the Dominican nuns, then, Christ the Spouse was to take the place of a worldly spouse, living with them, protecting them, helping them to endure difficult events, speaking to them, and even embracing them. Unlike the militaristic analogy used to discuss the male vocation, the sponsa Christi image encouraged a highly individualized and even internalized vocation, where the nun was to develop a deeply personal relationship with Christ, who in turn provided the kind of protection and guidance required for women by late medieval social norms.

The implicit goal such an affective and matrimonial relationship with Christ was, at least initially, personal salvation achieved within the convent. In fact, the early Dominican leaders actively encouraged the sisters to separate themselves emotionally and physically from the world. Jordan many times emphasized the need for Diana and the sisters to emotionally and spiritually disconnect from worldly concerns by instead focusing entirely on Christ, writing in a 1227 letter, for example, “And behold, you have Him more completely the more fully you gave yourselves to him, withdrawing your bodies and souls from this evil age so that your one spouse might possess you entirely.” Practically, Jordan discouraged Diana from maintaining personal attachments to people, several times indicating that she should not be too aggrieved over several family deaths or lament Jordan’s absence, since Christ was the far superior companion, who could comfort her and take care of her needs. Dominic himself, although not specifically mentioning the sponsa Christi image, had nonetheless encouraged full enclosure for the nuns, who were not to let anyone in the convent except those prelates who came to preach to them, in a letter written to the convent in Madrid also preserved in the archives at Prouille. Thus, while the early masters general encouraged the nuns to physically and spiritually withdraw from the world through a highly individualized relationship with Christ, they simultaneously

90 Ramon de Penafort, Gregory IX’s confessor, described the sisters of St. Agnes as “ad pedes domini cum Maria sedentes et sponsi vestri degustantes dulcedinem, domini videlicet Ihesu Christi, utpote ipsius speciem, in quem desiderant angeli prospicere, contemplantes...” in Raymundiana, XXIV, 48 and wished them “salutem et copiam amplexonum Sponsi sui” as Master General in Ibid., XLIX, 84. Master General Humbert of Romans also addressed the sisters as Sponsa Christi and encouraged them to make themselves worthy of Christ in his 1259 encyclical letter to them in Litterae encyclcae XLb, 50 (1259).

91 “Et ecce tanto habetis ipsum integrius, quanto dedistis ei plenis vosmetipas, abstrahentes ab hoc saeculo nequam et corpora vestra et animas, ut solus sponsus vester totum possideat...” Jordan’s salutatio in the letter wished that the nuns “quaerere et suscipere Christum Iesum” JoS, Epistulae I, 3 (1229). For other examples where Jordan encouraged the nuns to focus on Christ rather than the world around them (or Diana’s relationship with Jordan), see XXIV, 28-9 (1225); XXXII, 38 (1226); XXVII, 33 (1226); I, 3-4 (1229); XLVIII, 54 (1229)

92 Dominic wrote to the sisters of Madrid, “Nulla egrediatur per portam et nullus ingrediatur; nisi episcopus vel alius prelatus causa predicandi vel visitandi” in Koudelka, Monumenta, doc. 125, pg. 126.
encouraged the friars to immerse themselves in and reform that same evil world as members of God's army. While the friars were to work toward the salvation of the entire world, incurring their own salvation through that effort, the Dominican nuns were to seek personal salvation through developing a personal and affective relationship with Christ within the walls of their convent. Thus, the overarching imagery used to describe the vocations of both male and female religious reinforced late medieval understandings of gender, which encouraged men to prove their masculine honor by performance in the public sphere, while encouraging women to maintain their purity by remaining in the ideological and actual home. This social and theoretical understanding of gendered roles meant that space was also gendered in the medieval period, where the home was considered a feminine space of purity and safety, but also open to attack, penetration, and defilement by enemies.  

Thus the Dominican masters' fundamental understanding of the Dominican soldier and bride of Christ had strong resonances with lay understandings gender roles and gendered spaces.

Another area whose representation in the encyclical letters contrasted sharply with the female ideal presented in other Dominican letters was the cultivation of personal piety, a topic which was, as we have seen, a realm of practice open to both men and women. Reflecting Dominican hagiographic, historic, and normative texts, the masters first utilized militaristic imagery in their letters to the friars in order to masculinize the struggle against personal sin. However, rather than emphasizing intensive physical mortification as the marker of heroic asceticism, the masters general instead used militaristic imagery depicting the Devil as the enemy in an attempt to heroize the demonstration of personal virtue, achieved by largely unspecified needs, for the sake of edifying others. In addition, they firmly subjugated the practice of cultivation of personal virtue to the active cura animarum by reiterating a "practice what you preach" mantra, espoused clearly in Humbert of Romans' Libellus de eruditione praedicatorum. In their letters to Dominican women, on the other hand, the masters general emphasized cultivation of bodily and spiritual purity before God, admonitions which women like Diana interpreted to mean a practice of intensive bodily mortification. Through their presentation of the masculine Dominican ideal of cultivating virtue, the Order's leaders linked

---

93 See above chapter 2, 122, ff. 205.
94 See above chapter 1, 39-50; chapter 2, pg. 82-98; and chapter 3, 147-54 & 178-90.
95 See above chapter 2, 128-31.
Dominican praxis with literary understandings of chivalric knighthood as well as lay ideals of the “true man” whose inner ideals matched his actions, thus extending the foundational image of masculine Christian knighthood from the exordia into the realm of everyday behavior.

The most obvious way that the masters harnessed the ideological power of the Christian knight rhetoric from the exordia was by utilizing martial imagery in their presentation of cultivating personal virtue, emphasizing the masculine nature of engaging in self-correction, fighting the Devil by conquering personal sin, and presenting an appropriate example of virtuous living to those around them. The initial epistolary inspiration for this approach came from the same 1246 encyclical letter by John of Wildeshausen depicting the battle of Jericho discussed above in which John encouraged the brothers to “run in the stadium.”96 This phrase referred to Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians in which Paul discussed his ability to take on the traits of different types of people so as to be able to convert them better while describing himself as a runner in the race to win the incorruptible crown, who did not fight aimlessly, but rather disciplined his body and made it serve him so that, as he says, “after having preached to others, I myself am not rejected.”97 Thus, John’s initial compact, yet ideologically expansive militaristic analogy, also evoked the more personal war against sin faced by each friar called to dedicate himself both to the cura animarum and to his own salvation, a theme repeatedly reiterated throughout the later encyclical letters.

It was John of Vercelli, the master general described by Jacob of Soest as constantly traveling by foot between Dominican convents in order to personally and often covertly inspect the lifestyle of the friars under his care, who first developed the ascetic theme inherent in John of Wildeshausen’s military analogy, using it to

---

96 “Equidem currentes in stadio...” Litterae encyclicae I, 7 (1246). For a full translation and citation of the passage see above pg. 216, ff. 45 above.
97 “ne forte cum aliis praedicaverim, ipse reprobus efficiar;” 1 Corinthians 9: 19-27.
...overtly encourage the brothers in the pursuit of personal virtue.\textsuperscript{98} John opened his letter by telling the friars to run with untiring steps so that they came closer to achieving the crown of eternal life, for “it is fitting that each of you, running in the stadium of this life, however far you have progressed since the beginnings of your conversion and manner of living, should diligently consider any negligence or omission, if he has any, with the scale of reflecting examination, he who is about to be redeemed with a reward worthy of fervent zeal during the remaining time conceded to him.” \textsuperscript{99} Here John expanded upon the brief biblical reference made in John of Wildeshausen’s letter focusing entirely on the aspect of Paul’s exhortation dealing with the cultivation of personal virtue while leaving aside the Apostle’s twin focus on the salvation of others. The self-reflective mood and focus on cultivation of personal virtue of this \textit{exordium} is also found in both the joint encyclical letter sent by John of Vercelli and the Franciscan minister general Jerome of Ascoli that same year, which similarly asks the brothers to examine themselves closely and remove any blemishes as well as encouraging them to respect each other.\textsuperscript{100}

Later masters general externalized the cultivation of personal virtue by depicting it as a militarized fight against the Devil requiring specifically masculine characteristics, a theme characteristic of early monastic depictions of sin and based upon the model of the Desert Fathers.\textsuperscript{101} Although John of Vercelli first designated sin as an external person that the friar was to “fight manfully” against within the encyclical letters, ...
Munio of Zamora clearly indicated the identity of this external enemy as the Devil, exhorting the friars to avoid fighting among themselves, "to love [their] neighbors by hating vices, and to strive manfully toward correction according to the decrees of [their] vocation, which is to be conserved by discernment's examination." In pursuing this path of correction, Munio said that it is not enough to ask for the correction provided by their superiors, but that they must also seek the wise counsel of the older brothers so as to avoid the Devil's tricks. 102 Munio's use of the term discernment [discretionis] was also generally linked to the late medieval inquisitorial mission where the brother was to use his powers of discernment to spot heresy. 103 Such an association emphasized the doctrinal, intellectual, and spiritual nature of the friar's self-examination rather than focusing entirely on embodied sin to be eradicated through bodily discipline. The highly learned Aymericus Guliani also encouraged the brothers to envision sin as a demonic enemy, who should be conquered, through the use of self-discernment when he exhorted the brothers to "run more comfortably along the path of heavenly commands just like agile runners and triumph more gloriously over the complaining enemy whom he has destroyed like Christ's fighters." He followed this concept of the war against vice—by this point standardized within the encyclical letters—with an exhortation for the brothers to "measure themselves by the scale of the divine judge" so that they "know in what way they are lacking, or rather, what is present in them and how they can return their vows to God." 104 In addition to the nebulous concept of avoiding "vice," Barnabus of Cagnoli more specifically portrayed prayer and contemplation as particularly masculine in his discussion of virtue, asking the brothers to emulate Moses, who overthrew his enemies by praying and contemplating, since "elevated above the common state of the secular world, they gaze eagerly toward divine things by praying and by making war on vices they strike down the encircling

---


103 On the role of discernment in inquisitorial texts see Elliot, Proving, 233-263 and Ames, Righteous, 25-6. The idea of discernment was also present in the other Dominican texts discussed earlier in which various friars had the ability to discern a true vision from a demonic fallacy. See above chapter 2, 108-9.

104 "Ut viam celestium mandatorum tanquam cursores agiles, in infimus non detenti, commodius transcurrere valeatis, et tanquam Christi pugiles bello indicto vicis et de adversario querente, quem devoret, gloriosius triumphare, ad ulteriorem graciam et vicinioram saluti cura suscepti officii me compellit, vos gracie filios replicatis monitis et sermonibus annis singulis invitare. Ecce, frates carissimi, inprimis debetis libra iusti iudicii vos metiri ut sciatis, in quo deficitis vel pocus, quid desit in vobis et qualiter redditis domino vota, que vestra labia distinxerunt." Litterae encyclicae LIX, 189 (1307). See a similar reference in a letter by Hervé de Nedellec in Litterae encyclicae LXXV, 234-5 (1323).
attacks, which are hostile to salvation, through manly actions. As did John of Vercelli, Munio of Zamora, and Aymericus Guliani, Barnabus clearly emphasized the masculine nature of the friar’s struggle against sin by externalizing vice as a demonic influence that was to be conquered through self-examination, employing martial imagery to describe the nature of this spiritual self-correction, and specifically describing this process as “manly.” Such a characterization was consistent with forms of specifically masculine ascetic practice demonstrated in the hagiographic tradition, monastic tradition, and other Dominican texts.

Although the masters general employed military and masculine imagery in their discussion of self-correction, this self-correction, with the emphasis on discernment, seemed not so much focused on eradicating sin from the body as the tradition of heroic asceticism had done, but on generally eradicating vice through unspecified means, a focus that contrasted sharply with Dominican ideals for women, as we will see.

A few masters general specified more clearly which virtues were to be cultivated by the friar in the process of fighting sin, depicting virtues that were largely oriented around their effect on others. For example, Munio of Zamora encouraged the brothers to exhibit good manners, maintain a good reputation, and be vessels of virtue and organs of the holy spirit, in other words, to act “as God’s sons and coheirs” as well as “vigorou athletes fighting bravely.” The focus of Munio’s exhortation here is the cultivation of virtues for the purpose of external and public display, since it was through the friar’s own manner and reputation that the Holy Spirit could work. Barnabus also gave specific instructions about the virtues to be cultivated, but described this process in militaristic terms, writing that the friars should “receive the arms of sanctity, the training of a divine soldier; zeal for discipline and let abstinence from food, harsh clothing, the yoke of obedience, censure of silence, regularity in habits, desire for knowledge, and the splendor and beauty of honesty grow” in them.

In other words, the practice of virtue was seen as a stepping stone toward the friar’s larger goal which was,

---

105 “…qua revera elevati supra communem statum seculi, et orando inhiant ad divina, et bellando cum vice circumferentes insultus obvius ad salutem virilibus actibus comprosternunt.” Litterae encyclicae LXXVIII, 243 (1327).

106 For an introduction to traditions of masculine asceticism, see above chapter 1, 32-4.

107 “…sicut dei filii, coheredes regni, quod promisit deus diligentibus se, pignus ipsius et arram pariter vestris iam in cordibus possidetis, sic athlete strenui fortiter dimicantes coronam quadam prelibazione tenetis, sic cursores celere braviunm capietis, sic cultures vinee dei sabbaoth denario non timebitis defraudari. Eya ergo, karissimi fratre, in agone fortiter certantes, in stadio veloci ter precurratis, celeriter in vinea desudantes in regno perhenniter exultetis.” Litterae encyclicae XXXIX, 137 (1288).

108 “Accipite igitur arma sanctimonie, exerciciunm divine milicie, studium discipline, vigeat in vobis abstinenencia ciborum asperatione vestimentorum, iugum obeiciuncie, censura silencii, regularitas morum, sapiencie studium, splendor et speciositas honestatis.” Litterae encyclicae LXXIX, 246 (1330).
according to Barnabus, “to persist fervently in the exaltation of the faith, to call the people toward obedience of the Roman church with exhortatory words, and to fight manfully in both words and writing against what you know to be contrary to the faith.” Barnabus thus considered the cultivation of virtue as training that a friar needed in Order to preach effectively, draw people to the Church, and oppose anything contrary to the faith, in other words to enact the Dominican *cura animarum*, rather than an end in and of itself. This emphasis on the accumulation of personal virtue as the foundational aspect of and training for the preaching vocation likewise reflects the training that squires underwent in order to become knights, which required developing courtly manners and chivalric virtues in addition to martial skills. Beyond being foundational behavioral practices, however, the skills learned by the squire helped him to understand the fundamental nature of knighthood itself—the ideology surrounding the chivalric code. Ramon Llull, for example, concluded a chapter about the virtues to be displayed by knights with the admonition that it was important for a knight to train himself and his son in good customs and nourishment, since it was through these things that “the honor of knighthood was maintained” since “knighthood was not in the horse nor in the arms, but in the knight.” More fundamentally, Llull argued that it was these customs that made a man into a knight rather than a beast, a state often placed in opposition to maleness in medieval theory, thus marking practice of appropriate manners and display of virtues the distinguishing feature of masculinity itself. The Dominican masters, then, linked the cultivation of personal virtue among the brothers to the foundational and preparatory stage of knightly development.

Another important aspect of the knightly ideal also foundational to the masters’ depiction of Dominican *praxis* was the idea of the martial hero as a man whose word was coherent with his action, an ideal exemplified by the Cid. Such transparency, that is, consonance between the interior and the exterior was

---

109 “Agnoscite vos esse fidei pugiles preelectos, ideoque circa exaltacionem fidei ferventer insistite, ad obedienciam sancte Romanae ecclesie verbis exortatoris populos advocate que fidei noveritis esse contraria verbis et scriptis viriliiter impugnate.” *Litterae encyclicae* LXXIX, 247 (1330).

110 Ramon Llull, for example, wrote “E lo fiyl de cavayler cové que sie enans sotsmès que senyor e que sàpia servir senyor; cor; en alta manera, no conexeria la nobilitat de sa senyoria con seria cavayler; e per acò, lo cavayler deu sotsmetre son fiyl a altra cavayler, per ço que aprenega a tyayar e a guarnir e les altres coses qui.s pertayen a la honor de cavayler” in *Llibre de l’Orde*, book 1.12, 169-70.

111 “Per la custuma e lo bon nodriment que cavaler fa a son cavayl no ès tant mantenguda la honor de cavalaria con és en la costuma e en lo bon nodriment que cavayer fa en si mateix e en son fiyl; cor cavalaria no stà en cavayl ni en armes, ans stà en cavayler” Llull, *Libre de l’Orde*, book VI.22, 217. On men in opposition to beasts, the body, irrationality, and the feminine, see Karras, *From Boys*, 67-108.
coded as particularly masculine and placed in opposition to the hypocrisy, deception, and artifice of the feminine and the heretical.\textsuperscript{112} As we have seen, the admonition to the brothers to embody the message that they were trying to preach, which paralleled lay and literary ideals of the “true man,” was a foundational aspect of the Dominican ideal presented in the Dominican texts under study here and this admonition was also endemic to the encyclical letters.\textsuperscript{113} Humbert, for example, told the brothers to be a “mirror of life and exemplar of sanctity to all...by working diligently, by manfully placing [themselves] in opposition to all evils, by always following praiseworthy examples, and by inwardly rejecting those things which show themselves to be otherwise, by displaying every good thing to the extent of our abilities, by happily enduring attacking enemies, and never ceasing to do good...”\textsuperscript{114} The exhortation for the brothers to act as an example of sanctity to others as a way of reinforcing the preaching message was ubiquitous in the encyclical letters and particularly in the \textit{petitiones}, playing a central role in the discussions of ascetic practice and cultivation of virtue among the brothers.\textsuperscript{115} For example, John of Wildeshausen took up this theme by calling the brothers to “entice the laity with doctrine, provoke them with merits, and render [themselves] such debtors to all the wise and unwise, that, running in the odor of your oils, they salvificly return their vows to the Lord.” He described them as “leaders of those walking in darkness” and called them to have “the form of wisdom and truth,” to make sure that “their works were consistent with their words,” “and "to strive to do as well as teach" since “the voice of example is more effective than the voice of the mouth.”\textsuperscript{116} For John, the purpose of accumulating personal virtue was the edification of one’s neighbor, an externalized idea of cultivating personal virtue and one consistent with hagiographic ideals for the holy bishop whose zeal for souls led him

\textsuperscript{112}See above chapter 1, 57-8.

\textsuperscript{113}For other exhortations to the friars to be exemplars of sanctity in general, see \textit{Litterae encyclicae}, Ib, 9 (1246); XXXVIII, 134 (1287); XLIX, 163, (1294); L, 166 (1296); LIV, 177 (1301); LXIII, 200 (1310); LXIV, 206 (1312); LXV, 206 (1313); LXIX, 219 (1317); LXXIX, 247 (1330); LXXX, 249 (1331); and LXXXIII, 259 (1336). For a discussion of this in previously studied texts see especially above chapter 1, 34-8 and chapter 2, 40-3 and 55-8.

\textsuperscript{114}“Demus eciam operam, dum tempus habemus, thesaurizare nobis cumulum meritorum, quae docemus et intelligimus, non negiter operando, malis omnibus nos viriliter opponendo, laudabilia semper exempla sequendo et, quae se habent aliter, penitus respuesto, bona quaeque pro viribus proponendo, adversa irruencia lete suscipliendo et a bono numquam cessando...” \textit{Litterae encyclicae} V, 18 (1255).

\textsuperscript{115}See ff. 98 above.

\textsuperscript{116}“Laycos doctrinis allictae, meritis provocate, sapientibus et insipientibus debitores vos tales reddite universis, quod in odore unguentorum vestrorum currentes, reddant domino salubriter vota sua...Allorum quidem duces, lumen eorum qui in tenebris sunt, eruditos insipiencium, habentes formam sciencie et veritatis...Consonent verbis opera, et unusquisque facere studeat et docere. Nam efficacia est vox operis, quam vox oris” in \textit{Litterae encyclicae} Ib, B (1246). See also \textit{Ibid.}, II, 11 (1250) and XC, 281 (1346).
to dedicate himself to pastoral work in the community. This aspect of John of Wildeshausen’s thought would come to fruition in a letter written by John of Vercelli, the master general known for adherence to the ascetic method of fulfilling his duties, almost thirty years later when he wrote,

Let ancient things fall from evangelical lips and consecrated hands so that it is clear to those seeing you that God selected you from the world, whose words do not harmonize with earthly things, but offer and testify to those things which taste of heaven, and, so that the true and faithful testimony be in your mouth, let the efficacy of your works testify to the sincerity of your heart and the truth of your words, lest it be said that your works don’t agree with your words…”

Over and over again the masters encouraged the brothers to act in a way consistent with their preaching by cultivating honesty, patience, composed manners, discipline, purity, and knowledge so that their “preaching is not held in contempt because of a failing in the example of living” and so that it “might result in the conversion of sinners through the example of good.” This theme thus drew from literary and lay ideals of the “true man.” In addition, it emphasized externalization of personal virtue as a form of public display through which the friar performed his vocation among others, thus reflecting theological and lay understandings of masculine active performance.

Thus, in place of a weeping, praying, monastic figure of Dominic’s legacy, the masters general focused instead on the use of masculinizing words and imagery in their descriptions of “renouncing the world” as well as strongly associating cultivation of virtue with fulfillment of active service in the world, two depictions far more compatible with secular ideals of masculinity and perhaps more appealing to friars engaged in a world where the accumulation of wealth, attainment of professional honors, and living well defined masculine


118 “Audiunt, quid loquatur eis et in ipsis dominus deus, dum asciunt et investigant sacre scripture verba, que de ore procedunt, ut iam non loquantur opera hominum, sed talibus pleni sermonis et spiritu domini coartati de pleno eructant verba bona, consolacionis monita, edificationis exempla. Recedant preterea vetera de labiis evangelicis, de manibus consecratis, ut liquide cernantibus patet, quod vos dominus elegerit de hoc mundo, quorum loquela non musicat de terrenis, sed que sapiunt celestia, sapidius proferant et testentur et, ut sit in ore vestro verax testimonium et fidele, sinceritati cordis, veritati sermonis efficacia operis attestetur, ne dici possit, quod verbis non concordent…” Litterae encyclicae XVIII, 72 (1267).

119 “ne propter exemplaris vite defectum predicacio contemptur” Litterae encyclicae LXXV, 235 (1323) and “Ad hec habende humiliatis et patienzie non obliti summum apicem virtutum attingere studeatis, ut predicacio vestra per exemplum bonorum conversionem pariat peccatorum” Litterae encyclicae LXVII, 213 (1313). See also Ibid., XII, 13 (1260); XVI, 66-7 (1265); XIX, 74 (1268); XXXV, 127 (1283); XXXVI, 131 (1285); XXXIX, 138 (1288); XL, 141 (1289); L, 168 (1297); LVI, 182 (1304); LVII, 185 (1305); LIX, 190-1 (1307); LXVI, 211 (1314); LXVII, 213 (1315); LXXV, 235 (1323); LXXVI, 238 (1324); LXXVIII, 245 (1327); LXXIX, 247 (1330); LXXXI, 252-3 (1333); LXXXII, 257 (1334); LXXXVII, 271-2 (1341); and XCI, 282-4 (1347).

120 See above introduction, 11-14.
success stories. This is not to say that no master general called the brothers to engage in cultivating personal virtue without any reference to the Order’s evangelizing mission—a few do just that—but to emphasize that an overwhelming majority of letters contain this kind of portrayal of virtue within the *petitio* section.\textsuperscript{121} Indeed, even as the masters devoted more and more time to discussing conventual life, personal habits, and cultivation of personal virtues in response to the “degeneration” of the Order from the early 14th century, whose members all too often sought honors, riches, and special privileges in exchange for their positions, they continued to link these “personal” practices with the public mission statement of the Order: the *salus animarum*.\textsuperscript{122} The placement of these admonitions to “practice what you preach” within the *petitio* section, also marks this mantra as the practical application of the masculine militaristic themes present in the *exordia*, the behavioral exhortation central to the ideological goals for the Order.

The particularly masculine nature of the emphasis on external piety and the harnessing of personal pious cultivation to the active salvation of souls in the encyclical letters again becomes apparent through a brief comparison to the ideal of ascetic behavior encouraged for the Order’s women. Inherent to the concept of withdrawing from the world and accepting Christ as a spouse at the heart of the early masters’ vision for the nuns under their care was the idea of being worthy of the divine spouse by cultivating purity. Jordan, for example, encouraged Diana to improve “any deformity or stain by a zeal for beauty, lest, God forbid, the spouse’s sacred eye is offended in the least amount,” to be “pure of heart and innocent in life,” and to rejoice with him because she will be led after Mary, “a beautiful, finely formed, and blemish-free dove.”\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{121} The following letters contain no reference to the conversion of souls or preservation of the Order’s reputation in their discussions of cultivating personal virtue and stem from a period when the Order faced increasing external as well as papal pressure to reform. From 1337-41 for example, Hugh de Vaucemain resisted papal attempts to reform the Order’s constitution while Garin de Gy l’Évêque was ordered to reform the Order internally in the midst of the first outbreak of plague. *Litterae encyclicae* LXVI, 208-10 (1314); LXXV, 234-5 (1323); LXXXII, 254-7 (1334); LXXXIV, 263 (1337); XCV, 294-6 (1354); and XCVI, 297-9 (1355). See Mortier, *Histoire*, III:115-39 and 221.

\textsuperscript{122} Albert of Chiavari writes against “ambition” the “death of religion” LIII 1300 and Elias Raymond revoked all privileges granted to convents or individual so that he can start from the beginning in appointing them in *Litterae encyclicae* XCVIIIb, 306-9 (1368) and laments in his 1376 letter that the brothers seek ends other than perfection for reasons that are beyond him in *ibid.*, C, 311-12 (1376). The General Chapters of 1343, 1344, and 1346, for example, contain numerous edicts curbing excesses in the Order, focusing on education reform as well as adherence to the regular life in *AGG* II: 285-312.

\textsuperscript{123} “...quidquid deformitatis est aut maculae, studio pulchritudinis excolatur; ne, quod absit, vel in modico sponsi sacer oculus offendatur. Sit cordis puritas, sit vitae innocentia...” JoS, *Epistulae*, XXXIV, 40-1 (1223) and “Adducentur quidem post eam scilicet virginem Mariam...Haec enim una columba sua, formosa sua, tota pulchra, et macula non est in ea.” *Ibid.*, XXIV, 28 (1225).
successor, the newly elected Master General Ramon de Penyafort, likewise linked the idea of purity, interiorization of sin, and physical mortification in a letter of consolation written to the nuns at Bologna during a time of unspecified persecutions against them, exhorting them to allow God's lash to further purify their already existing purity and piety with frequent blows, since the Devil was only attacking them externally because they had already defeated him internally. For Ramon, as with Jordan, purity was the goal for these women, who primarily fought against internal temptations, but should look to Christ to help them endure the external attacks that followed. Humbert of Romans most clearly articulated this emphasis on physical and spiritual purity inherent to the sponsa Christi metaphor, writing in 1259,

In a miraculous divine honor, the son of the eternal king chose daughters of man for himself, and joined himself to them in marriage. Without a doubt, He, who himself is a mirror without stain, wishes his wives to be without a wrinkle or blemish so that they are holy not only in body but also in spirit, so that no filth appears in them. Just as a husband of carnal flesh sees visual beauty, thus Christ regards beauty of the heart.

In order to be worthy of this spouse, Humbert told the sisters to guard virtue, engage in manners pleasing to God, cleanse themselves through tears, transform their hearts to see Christ, have a clean conscience, remain physically enclosed in avoidance of the outside world, be quiet, and engage only in honest conversation. Thus, while the focus of the friar's ascetic practice was leading others to God through virtuous example, the feminine Dominican ideal focused spiritual purification so as to cultivate a personal relationship with Christ and achieve personal salvation.

In addition, while the masters general encouraged the Dominican brothers to engage in virtuous living as an example for others, emphasizing virtuous behavior as a way of achieving this, the ideal presented and internalized by the Order's nuns specifically focused on physical purity. Dominic himself, independently of the sponsa Christi imagery, had encouraged the nuns at the convent in Madrid to fight “with the ancient adversary through fasting, since no one will be crowned except for the one who fights genuinely,” to be silent in all places where talking is forbidden, to avoid idle conversation, to observe strict enclosure, and to be

---


126 *Litterae encyclicae* XIb, 50-51 (1259).
unsparing “in disciplines and vigils.”127 Thus, like the friars, the nuns were to fight against the Devil in their spiritual lives, but for these women the Devil was internalized and localized to their own bodies, whereas their male brethren were encouraged to fend off the Devil’s external attacks so that they could battle him in the external world. While Jordan often encouraged the sisters to cultivate spiritual virtues similar to those encouraged for the Order’s men, including regular prayer, meditation, obedience, labor, silence, being merciful, kind, humble, patient, modest, and charitable, Diana and the nuns at St. Agnes seemed to focus the bulk of their practice on bodily mortification, engaging in such extreme ascetic behavior that Jordan became alarmed and repeatedly exhorted them to moderate this behavior for health reasons.128 In one letter, Jordan ordered the sisters to “fight not only manfully, but also wisely...until little by little you subject your flesh to yourselves, not hastily and progressing in each test of spiritual virtues, not by flying, but by ascending the ladder of perfection step by step, you will thus come to the limit of all perfection.”129 In this exhortation, Jordan associated intensive asceticism with masculine characteristics, likely heroic asceticism, while associating wisdom with less intensive asceticism. Thus, the second master general, encouraged the nuns in Bologna to be less masculine in their approach to asceticism. Regardless of their stance on the extent of physical mortification, all of these early masters agreed that the primary responsibility of the nuns was to cultivate personal purity, pursue spiritual perfection, fight the Devil’s internal temptations, and maintain as close a relationship to their celestial spouse as these endeavors allowed them to have. While for the friars the cultivation of personal virtue was only to be pursued to the point where their externalized demonstration of these virtues supported their overall preaching message, namely until they had received enough training to be

127 “Pugnate, filie, cum antiquo adversario ieuniis instanter, quia non coronabitur nisi qui legitime certaverit. Volo de cetero ut in locis interdictis, scilicet in refectorio, in dormitorio et oratorio silentium teneatis...Non disciplinis et vigilis parcatis. Sitis priorisse vestre obedientes. Nolite ad invicem confabulari nec tempus vestrum in fabulationibus expendatis.” Koudelka, n. 125, pg. 127.

128 For Jordan’s exhortations to other virtues, see JoS, Epistulae, XVII, 20-2 (1223); XXIV, 41-2 (1224); XXVII, 31-2 (1225); XXXIX, 45 (1227); XI, 26 (1230); XVI, 19 (1230). For Jordan’s requests for more moderate ascetic practice, see Ibid., XXVII, 31-2 (1225); XI, 26 (1225); XXXIII, 39 (1225); XXII, 26 (1225); XLIV, 46 (1225); XXVII, 31-2 (1225); XVIII, 22-3 (1226); XIII, 27 (1227); XXXIX, 45 (1227); I, 4 (1229); and XVI, 19 (1230).

129 “Pugnate igitur non tantum viriliter, sed etiam sapienter, quia dicit Salomon, quod cum dispositione itur ad bellum. Et vos tunc prudenter pugnatis, dum paulatim carmen vestram vobis subicitis, non praecipitantes; et ita in singulis spiritualium virtutum experimentis proficiences, non volando, sed pedetentim ascendendo scalam perfectionis, tandem pervenietis ad finem omnis consummationis” in JoS, Epistulae, XXVII (1225), 31-2.
effective soldiers in Christ’s army—the idea of perfection or purity was not even mentioned in the letters to men,—, cultivation of spiritual perfection was the ultimate end of female Dominican religious vocation.

In their construction of the basic Dominican vocation as a sort of Christian knighthood in which the friar battled the ubiquitous and dangerous forces of heresy, the Dominican masters relied upon the ideology of chivalric culture and the ideal of knighthood. In replacing the actual arms of the knights with eloquence and effective preaching, the masters also drew on a long tradition of masculine ideals beyond the battlefield, but which were no less culturally influential and effective, including the rhetorical tradition of oration, religious ideals of masculine performance, and intellectual ideals of maleness. This ideology closely undergirded the idea of “practicing what you preach,” which likewise drew upon literary and rhetorical models of masculine transparency and with lay understandings of the “true man,” whose inner wishes matched his actions. Although the friar could not wield a knife against his enemies, the masters’ close association of the Dominican mission with secular ideals of knighthood also reflected the actual alignment of these groups in the face of heresy. Thus, Humbert of Romans wrote that Innocent III had called the Albigensian Crusade “so that the material sword could thoroughly cut down the unfruitful vines that the sword of God’s word was not able to clean up” and Ramon Llull wrote, “Thus, since our Lord God has elected the clergy to maintain the holy faith through necessary Scripture and prohibitions, preaching it to the unfaithful with such great charity that death is desirable to them, thus the God of glory has selected knights who conquer and overpower the unfaithful, who each day fight to destroy the holy church, through force of arms.”

In other words, the ideology of Christian knighthood espoused by the masters gave the Dominican sword of rhetoric the backing of secular justice and violent reprisal. This reality placed the friar in the wider constructs of late medieval judicial culture, which was becoming a more honorable recourse of retribution for laymen involved in reciprocally violent relationships.

---

130 “…ut infructuosos palmites, quos verbi Dei gladius putare non poterat, ipsos priusquam vineam Domini sabaoth demolirentur ad libitum, materialis gladius penitus amputaret” HoR, *Legenda*, chap. 22, 384 and “On, enaix con nostro senyor Déus ha elets clergues per mantenir la sancta fe ab Scripturas e ab probacions necessàrias, preýciant aquella als infels ab tant gran caritat que la mort sie a ells desirable, enaix lo Déu de glòria ha elets cavaylers qui per forsa d’armes vensen e apoderen los infels, qui cade die punyen en lo destruïment de la sancta Sgleya” Llull, *Libre de l’Odre*, book II.2, 173.

131 See above introduction, 17-18.
The Patriarchal Garden: Masculine and Divine Authority

If the central theme of the militaristic imagery employed in the letters was the friars’ ability to enact violence on their enemies through effective preaching, the Dominican masters also used a very different type of imagery to describe the Dominican academic and preaching vocation: gardening. While such imagery does not appear particularly masculine on the surface, garden imagery was at the heart of Cistercian ideologies of anti-heretical action as the monks sought to extend the monastic garden outside of the convent and protect the “Lord’s vineyard” from heretics. In addition to the direct link to heresy, the garden images in the encyclical letters also drew upon deeply rooted gendered traditions, which associated a woman’s body with a garden and field. Transmitted to Christian ideology through the Song of Songs, which depicted the beloved’s body as an enclosed garden, medieval exegetes typically associated this hortus conclusus with the ‘closed’ body of the Virgin Mary, which, as Honorius of Autun described it, produced blossoms of virtues and gave birth to Christ’s fruit. According to Richard de St. Laurent in De laudibus B. Mariae Virginis, the enclosed garden represented Mary’s spiritual and physical virginity. The Virgin in the Song of Songs, however, was simultaneously interpreted to represent the Church, the soul, the Bride, mother, and child of God. Thus, the Dominican masters’ discussion of the friars’ interaction with the garden of the Church, provided ample opportunity for the development a masculine ideology for the Order’s war on heresy and overall mission. Unlike the militaristic imagery, however, the horticultural themes presented in the letters contained far more complicated gendered connotations for Dominican praxis, reflecting the ambiguity present in activities such as prayer and study, practices with which the other Dominican sources under study here also struggled. However, through their gendered discussions of these practices, the masters nonetheless created a behavioral model for the friars that contrasted markedly with the female vocation and drew upon lay ideals of reproductive masculinity, self governance, and patriarchal authority.

132 Kienzle, Cistercians, 78-134.
133 Cant. 4:12 and Ross, Figuring, 111.
134 Quoted in Ross, Figuring, 111
135 Ibid., 242-3, ff. 11.
Perhaps unsurprisingly, it was again Humbert of Romans who first introduced this horticultural imagery, which then took up permanent residence in the exordia of later letters. Directly after employing the military analogy discussed above in which the brothers faced the Leviathan and Satan, who attacked in many different ways, the Master described the brothers’ position in the following terms:

A frantic and wild beast, having emerged from the forest of the world, sought and attacked the leafy, fruitful, and fragrant vine and, with utterly savage spirits strove to demolish that which, more beautiful in appearance, more pleasant in smell, and sweeter in fruit, delights, restores, and inebriates the entire world. The right hand of the heavenly farmer, through our glorious father, God’s confessor, Dominic, planted a fruitful olive tree in the garden of the church militant, which is making the entire dry and arid world fertile with the bud of life and abundance of knowledge.

The imagery from the first portion of this metaphor expanded upon a passage from Psalms—also used as the opening to Dominic’s bull of canonization—, which described how God took a vine from Egypt and planted it in a new land, nurturing it until it grew to cover the world. Now, however, the psalmist lamented that the Lord was neglecting the vine by allowing any passerby to pick its fruit and standing by while a wild boar from the forest stripped the vine and the beast of the field fed upon it, asking Him to place his Hand over “the man on his right and the son of man” whom the Lord had strengthened for himself. Humbert followed this introduction with a section detailing the events at Paris and concluding with the militaristic language discussed above encouraging the brothers to fight. Humbert’s indication that demonic attacks on the Order occurred through many different methods perhaps encouraged the brothers to assign a myriad of identities to the wild boar attacking the Lord’s vine. In addition to identifying it with the Parisian masters, the brothers may also have associated it with heretical attacks since Cistercian writers, papal bulls directed to the Order, and Peter Martyr’s vita frequently referred to heretics as the “little foxes” seeking to destroy the Lord’s vineyard, a reference to Canticles, which Humbert’s choice of the verb demoliri and his extended description

---

136 Although this letter was only addressed to the friars at Orleans, the letter was found in a collection of John of Vercelli’s letters and was found there by William of Tocco, who attributed it to John. Thus, the letter continued to influence the Order’s compositions outside of the convent in Orleans. Litterae encycliae, 31, ff. 1.

137 “Impugnavit vitem frondosam, fructiferam et fragrantem ex Silva seculi egressum aper ferus invidie et furiosus impetit, et efferatis animis funditus satagit demoliri, que nitore pulchrior, odore suavior, dulcior fructu delectat, reficit, inebriat orbem totum. Olivam ubarem, gemma vite ac scientie ubertate universam terram aretem et aridam fecundatem celestis agricole dextera per gloriosum patrem nostrum confessorem del Dominicum, celtum unitatem, in agrum plantavit ecclesie militantis.” Litterae encycliae VIII (1256), 32.

of the vine’s beauty, smell, and fruit reflected.\textsuperscript{139} Indeed, the papacy had continued to emphasize Dominican inquisitorial activity in France throughout the Parisian crisis and often employed the image of the "little foxes" destroying the vine to describe heretical activity.\textsuperscript{140} Four months prior to Humbert’s letter, for example, Alexander IV, entrusted inquisitorial responsibilities to the Dominican Provincial Prior of France, “so that the root of heretical iniquity might be cut down and the Lord’s vine might bear the fruit of catholic purity when the little foxes who were demolishing it with evil bites had been destroyed.”\textsuperscript{141} In Humbert of Romans’ analogy then, the Devil, through the Parisian masters, heretics, and others, were attacking the Lord’s church—His beautiful vine or the garden planted by His right hand—while the Dominican Order was an olive tree planted by Dominic at the instigation of God that could revivify the Christian garden through the example of living and knowledge in the face of such attacks.

The feminized nature of the garden under attack—the beautiful, delightful, sweet-smelling, fruitful garden-body that intoxicated all who beheld it—and the violent way in which the beast sought to violate and destroy it, is reminiscent of lay conceptions of woman as a bewitching body, open to brutalization from other men, and thus requiring male protection.\textsuperscript{142} Indeed, attacks on women’s bodies—ritual cuts on the face, arms, or genitals—were often performed symbolically by other men in late medieval society as a way to shame their male protectors, who had been unable to defend them.\textsuperscript{143} In one particularly shaming case, for example, a group of Valencian men pursued Garcia Doso to his home in 1378 hoping to take vengeance and, when he had locked himself safely inside, instead violently beat his unfortunate mother who had been locked outside. Both Garcia and his mother brought the case before the \textit{Justicia Criminal}, with Garcia emphasizing that they had attacked his home (a feminized concept) and his mother charging that the group beat her “on her account and

\textsuperscript{139} See, for example, \textit{BOP} I: 213 (March 15, 1252); 214 (1252); 241 (March 9, 1254); 275 (April 13, 1255); 292 (Dec. 13, 1255). \textit{Canticles} 2. For a discussion of this image in Cistercian and Dominican texts, see Ames, \textit{Righteous}, 42-3 and Kienzle, \textit{Cistercians}, 109-34. On this image in Peter Martyr’s life see above, 158, ff. 90. Everwin of Steinfeld also used the image of the wild boar to encourage Bernard of Clairvaux to pen an anti-heretical text in response to the “evil multiplicity” of heretical sects, writing “I ask that you take up the reed pen against the wild beasts” in \textit{Epistola CDLXXII: Evervini Steinfeldensis praepositi ad S. Bernardum: de haereticis sui temporis} (Ex tomo IV operum. S. Bernardi, antea sermoni 65 in \textit{Cantica canticorum praeposita}), in PL 182: cols. 676A-679D.

\textsuperscript{140} See above, 242, ff. 139.

\textsuperscript{141} “...specialiter est commissum...ut...radix iniquitatis hereticus succidatur; et vinea Domini, externatuis vulpeculis, que perversis moribus demoliuntur eandem, fructus affert catholice puritatis...” \textit{BOP} I: 292 (Dec. 13, 1255).


\textsuperscript{143} Meyerson, “Assaulting,” 14-15.
on account of her son.” Destruction of the feminized garden, understood as the Church and the soul as well, by heretics would have required defense and revenge by Dominican friars in the same way that violating a man’s wife, mother, or daughter likewise required some form of violent or equivalent vengeance. Thus, Humbert’s depiction paralleled deeply held ideals of masculine honor and feminine shame to characterize the heretical attack on the church and motivate them to action in his seminal exordia.

As the encyclical letters progressed, different masters general utilized the horticultural imagery introduced by Humbert of Romans in creative ways to discuss the process of becoming a successful preacher and, eventually, inquisitor, often playing with gendered imagery while doing so. One of the first major themes emphasized with horticultural imagery was the idea of receiving divine gifts of knowledge and then pouring this knowledge out again onto others. Augustine had discussed this idea in his De doctrina cristiana, where he instructed the preacher to pray before he preached and “to lift his thirsting soul to God, so that he might discharge what he drank, or pour out that with which he was filled. For about any matter which is to be discussed according to faith and love, there are many things that might be said and many ways that they are spoken by those who know them. Who knows what is expedient to say to us or to be heard by us at this moment, except He who sees the hearts of everyone?” For Augustine, then, the preacher was to be a conduit for God’s will that would direct him toward useful edification of the listener through the vehicle of prayer and the Dominican masters expressed a similar concept for their preachers. For example, Hugh de Vaucemain, a master of theology at Paris and provincial in France at the time of his election structured the entire encyclical letter sent to the brothers in 1334 around the garden analogy, identifying the garden as a place watered with the graces of the divine farmer so that “He should divert streams of light and grace from it into the entire plane of the field, namely, the entire community of faithful.” The Order, Hugh continued, “while avoiding the enticements of the dying world and embracing evangelical poverty, places its nest among

144 The widow said that “divi que.l dit esvalement, colps, aristolades, que li donaren los sobredits, li donaren a la dita dona ço del seu propri e del dit fill seu” in Narbona, Malhechores, appendix docs. 3 and 4, 185-200. The quote is on pg. 196.
145 “ipsa hora iam ut dicat accedens, prius quam exserat proferentem linguam, ad Deum levet animam sitientem, ut eructet quod biberit, vel quod impleverit fundat. Quum enim de una quaque re, quae secundum fide diluctationemque tractanda sunt, multa sint quae dicantur, et multi modi quibus dicantur ab eis, qui haec sciunt, quis novit quid ad praeens tempus, vel nobis dicere, vel per nos expediat audiri, nisi qui corda omnium videt?” Augustine, De doctrina, book 4.15.32, 137.
the heights; while it abandons its own will because of the light yoke of obedience, it bears most pleasing fruit to the Lord; while it devotes itself assiduously to the study of truth, the eyes of the mind are prepared for the joyful sight of the deity.” Hugh then devoted the rest of the letter to a discussion of the four virtues—obedience, charity, poverty, study of helpful knowledge—poured into the Order’s garden by the divine gardener. Hugh’s schema for Dominican praxis, then, involved cultivating personal virtue, contemplating divine things, studying the truth, producing fruit for the Lord, and ultimately, personal salvation. Hugh’s analogy and the progression emphasized the friar as conduits for God’s graces called to influence the rest of the world by cultivating God’s gifts so that they could be externalized to others, that is, pouring out what God had poured in. Garin de Gy l’Evêque later described the Order as God’s garden which was always watered and contained a fountain that watered the four corners of the world and never failed, drawing on the fountain imagery presenting similar ideas in earlier letters. The use of garden imagery here thus associated the Order with Mary, who, as the mother of Christ, was considered to fulfill the metaphorical function of giving form to the Word and thus making it accessible to humanity. In medieval literature, Mary was also described as a garden watered by God that produced four fountains that, with the mediation of the evangelists, became the textual word of the Gospel books.

Unlike Mary, however, the masters general depicted the friars’ role as both giving form to the word and directly disseminating it without an intermediary author by emphasizing the importance of habitual study and meditation on divine word and scripture. Barnabus of Cagnoli wrote in 1326, for example, that God had selected the Dominicans specifically so that he might “cleanse and remove the stains of errors of others” through them and the friars should thus “reside continually in the most plentiful flood of scriptures in reading, writing, studying, and meditating: filled with their milky sweetness, [they] will be able to pour out honeyed letters from heaven’s honey and, drinking the water of salvific knowledge from the savior’s fountain,

---

147 Hic hortus irriguus est ordo noster floridus, qui...dum mundi labentis blandimenta contempnens, evangelicam amplectitur paupertatem, colocat in arduis nidiem suum; dum per obedientie leve iugum propriam desert voluntatem, deo gratissimum fructum affert; dum assistit assidue studio veritatis, ad iocundum deitatis intuitum mentis eius oculus preparatur...” Litterae encyclicae LXXXII, 254-5 (1334).
148 Litterae encyclicae XCI, 286 (1348). See also Ibid., LXXV, 264 (1339) and XCI, 286 (1348).
149 Ross, Figuring, 109-117.
to irrigate the Lord's garden abundantly."\textsuperscript{150} John of Wildeshausen, also characterized study as a full time academic and meditative discipline, encouraging the brothers to busy themselves "day and night" listening to, learning, and meditating on information associated with their profession, then preaching at an appropriate time.\textsuperscript{151} Some masters depicted this process of internalizing the materials studied as an individual act, encouraging the friars to conceal themselves alone in their cells in order to meditate upon sacred readings so as to allow themselves the physical and mental space to ruminate over things learned, "like clean animals ruminating over the sweet fodder of scripture," i.e. like a cow chewing its cud.\textsuperscript{152} John of Vercelli also encouraged this type of individual meditation albeit in a less earthly fashion, writing,

So that [the preacher of the word] might drink more abundantly from the irrigating waters of sacred scripture to be afterwards poured out for the salvation of his neighbors, let his cell be pleasing to him, let him strive, hiding away, to occupy himself continually in that way with such zeal that he forms himself into the beautiful image of the habits found in the readings and likewise bestows sanctity upon himself along with knowledge; and thus he can send arrows from the quiver of scripture for the purpose of salvifically wounding his listeners.\textsuperscript{153}

Thus, study also involved private, individual meditation on the things learned so that the material was not only mentally absorbed, but also made the friar the embodiment of this knowledge that was then used to save

\textsuperscript{150} "Quia vero vos singulariter elegit deus, per quos maculas et errores mundet et auferat aliorum, iuxta fluenta plenissima scripturarum legendo, studendo, meditando, continue resitete: quorum lactea repleti dulcedine, literas de melle celis melleas eructare possitis ac, ex fontibus salvatoris haurientes aquas sapienie salutaris, hortum dominicum uberius irrigare" in Ibid., LXXVII, 241 (1326). See also John of Vercelli who wrote "ut autem ad exercendum tante sublimitatis et utilitatis officium reddamur ydonei, occupemur libicen in studii lectionum, ut haurientes aquas in gaudio de fontibus salvatoris illas postmodum ad irriganda corda fidelium opportunius infundamus" in Ibid., XXXIV, 124-5 (1282); XXXIII, 121 (1281); 121; LX, 192 (1308); LXI, 195-6 (1309); LXX, 221 (1318); LXXIII, 259 (1336); and LXXXIV, 263 (1337).

John of Vercelli used the light imagery of the exordia, writing "Sacrarum igitur lectionum studiis sollicito, prout nostri ordinis cuius zelus fervenci debet in nostris cordibus iugiter reforere, ut instituta admonent, intendamus, lecta memorie studiosius commendantes, unde formentur mores nostri, per quos in medio prave nacionis conversantes vite radiis fulgeamus" in Ibid., XXV, 91 (1273). Other masters avoid specialized imagery, but simply emphasized the need to direct study for the salvation of souls. See, for example, John of Vercelli’s 1270 letter, in which he writes "Sit auri patula verbo dei, armario illud memorie recommendans, tempore congruo in salutem credencium proferendum…" Litterae encycicae XX, 77 (1270). See also Ibid., XXV, 94 (1274); XXXIIIb, 101 (1279); XXXVI, 131 (1285); LIII, 173 (1300); LXVIII, 216 (1316); and XCIV, 292 (1352).

\textsuperscript{151}Litterae encycicae III, 13 (1251).

\textsuperscript{152} Munio of Zamora wrote in 1285, "Teneat vos diuicius cella celans celo proximos ruminantes ibidem velud animalia munda, dulcia pabula scripturarum, ut refecti in secreto per ea ad animarum salutem eructetis alis verbum bonum" in Litterae encycicae XXXVI, 131 (1285).

\textsuperscript{153} "Et ut de sacrarum scripturarum aquis irriguis copiosius hauriat in proximorum salutem postmodum effundendis, eidem placeat cella cellans, ibique tali studio se iugiter taliter occupare nitatur; quod in eorum (et) morum formet decorum, et tribuat simul cum sciencia sanctitatem; et sic de ipsarum scripturarum pharetra sagittas mittat acutas ad audiencium corda salubriter vulneranda." Litterae encycicae XXXIII, 121 (1281). For similar metaphors see also Litterae encycicae XXII, 112-3, (1279); XXXIIIb, 118 (1280); and LVII, 185 (1305).
Thus, while Mary required an intermediary to give textual and oral form to the Word (whether Christ himself, who preached, or the evangelists, who wrote), the Dominican friar was depicted as both receiver and translator of the Word. In addition, while Augustine had made prayer immediately prior to preaching a necessity for the “pouring in and pouring out” image, the masters inserted the process of seeking the truth, that is, of studying doctrine, as a sort of meditation and prayer that allowed the friar to discern for himself how to reach his listener. The masters’ presentation of the preacher as divine conduit thus made the preacher less of an immediate prophet for divine will and more of a necessary interpreter of the divine message. In this sense, the masters envisioned the friars’ position much as Bernard of Clairvaux had described that of an abbot: a patriarchal figure whose apostolic authority and teaching office combined with the sacramental authority of ordination placed him in the position of scriptural interpreter for the convent. Since, in the monastic view, scriptural understanding came only to a few through divine revelation, this position of interpretation was limited to a few select individuals capable of unraveling such profound, divinely ordained, meanings. Thus, the friars’ relationship to the rest of society was comparable to the abbot’s authoritative and pastoral relationship to his convent.

In emphasizing the interconnectedness of meditation and study to be utilized during the friars’ formation, the masters general both reflected Bernard’s monastic view of authoritative scriptural interpretation and Augustine’s important distinction between memorization and interpretation, a distinction which carried gendered connotations. Before discussing the importance of prayer before preaching, Augustine wrote, “a man only speaks as wisely as he has progressed in the holy scriptures” not as much as he has progressed “in those things that are to be read more often and commanded to the memory, but in those that are to be understood well and the sense of which as been diligently investigated.”

154 This emphasis in the letters on this private, secret, and isolated aspect of study provides nuance to Michele Mulchahey’s argument that the Order’s approach to education was a collective endeavor around which convent life was structured. While such individual study relied upon an approach to education that allowed for personal time and physical cells, the internalization of the knowledge gathered in study discussed by John of Wildeshausen was also a highly individual experience with God. See Mulchahey, “Societas studii: Dominic’s conception of Pastoral Care as Collaborative Study and Teaching,” in Centro, Domenico di Caleruega, 441-66.

155 Kienzle, Cistercians, 69.

156 “Sapienter autem dicit homo tanto magis vel minus, quanto in scripturis sanctis magis minusve profecti: non dico in eis multum legendis memoriaeque mandandis, sed bene intelligendis, et diligenter earum sensibus indagandis” Augustine, De doctrina, 4.5.8, 119.
reflected this distinction between memorization and understanding in Dominican study and preaching preparation, in his 1283 encyclical letter sent from the General Chapter at Montepulciano, when he wrote “And, therefore, studies of sacred writings are to be pursued with great care, on account of which we ought to thoroughly examine divine eloquences with frequent meditation, so that, illuminated by this, we can direct others, whom we ought to teach by word and example, to the saving path and to display the light of morals and faith, which they may follow.” 157 Both Bernard’s conception of the abbot and Augustine’s distinction between memorization and understanding—manifested in the Dominican masters’ description of study—meant that the skilled preacher could unveil the hidden, allegorical truth of the Scriptures and the divine message through study and individual meditation. This distinction between literal meaning and allegorical understanding of sacred texts was heavily gendered in the medieval tradition, which considered women to be literalists whose corporeality and lack of reason made them incapable of understanding material beyond the letter. Interpretation and employment of textual allegories in education and preaching, was, then a gendered trait limited to men. 158 Thomas of Chobham, for example, allowed female abbesses to read from the Scriptures to their charges, but not to “expound sacred Scripture by preaching” since they would be unable to provide an intelligent interpretation of the texts. 159 Thus, in emphasizing the friars obligation to “meditate” on divine scripture as a way of unlocking its secrets, the Dominican masters reflected theological and scholastic understandings of the rational man, whose ability to reason made him uniquely able to understand and relate the complicated meanings of Scripture, thus masculinizing both study and prayer in Dominican life.

The masters general likewise masculinized the potentially feminizing nature of cultivating personal virtue and study by focusing on its ultimate purpose—preaching and the salvation of souls—describing this in horticultural terms as providing fruit for the Lord. John of Vercelli and Barnabus of Cagnoli’s writings, for example, emphasized the necessity of meditation and study for cleansing others of sin through salvific doctrine. Hervé de Nedellec likewise emphasized the centrality of fruit production to the Order’s mission,

157 “Et ideo sacrarum scripturarum studiis est cum multa sollicitudine vigilandum, propter quod divina debemus eloquia frequenti meditacione scrutari, ut illuminati per ipsam ceteros, quos exemplo docere debemus et verbo, in viam possimus dirigere salutarem, eisque morum et fidei lumen ostendere quod sequuntur.” Litterae encyclicae XXXV, 128 (1283).
158 Solterer, Master, 3-4.
159 Related in Waters, Angels, 20.
writing in 1339, while detained at Avignon and engaged in a struggle with Pope Benedict XII on issues surrounding the Order’s constitution and projected internal reform, that the Order should be “watered by salvific admonitions and exhortations so that it should bear more plentiful fruit and fruit sweeter to divine taste and so that it should produce verdure of sanctity infused with the waters of the river of wisdom flowing from the Savior’s fountain, just like the tree of life in the midst of paradise, and lead the faithful to the joys of perennial life through salvific doctrine.”

Many other letters emphasized this process of educating oneself for the purpose of saving others, often using the basic word formula “pour in so that you can pour out” and brief references to the horticultural imagery found in the letters’ exordia, thus drawing on the masculinized ideologies inherent to this imagery. The Order’s fundamental goal as depicted in this imagery was thus not personal admittance to Heaven for each of the brothers, but rather the production of individuals who led others to God. The production of faithful Christians, metaphorized as ‘fruit,’ is also consistent with earlier Christian martyrdom accounts, especially those by Prudentius, which harness the martyr’s male body to a more usually feminized idea of fertility as a means of creating more Christians through conversion.

The idea of cleansing the faithful through preaching and the cura animarum also drew upon the masculine hagiographic tradition of the holy bishop.

The masculine nature of the masters’ admonitions to study and meditation become very clear when contrasted with these activities in letters about the Dominican female vocation. In the first place, while the masters’ exhortations for the friars to study were ubiquitous and in harmony with the fundamental Dominican vocation espoused in the Constitutions, the friars only twice encouraged the nuns to study in the

---

160 “Sacre religionis nostre plantarium ut fructus uberiorem afferat et divino gustui offerat dulciorem, convenit salutaribus monitis et exhortacionibus irrigari ut quasi lignum vite in medio paradisi fluentis sapienici manantibus aquis de fontibus salvatoris infusion sanctitatis viorem proferat, et salubris doctrine fructibus ad vitæ perenni gaudia fideles perducat.” Litterae encyclicae LXXXV, 264 (1339). Regarding the four year struggle between the master general and the pope, see Mortier; Histoire, III: 115-139. On the theme of returning fruits to the Lord see Litterae encyclicae VIII, 31-2 (1256); XXVIII, 100 (1274); XL, 141 (1289); LV, 179 (1302); LVI, 182 (1304); and XCII, 286 (1348).

161 For examples of the imagery of pouring in for the purpose of pouring out, see John of Wildeshausen’s 1246 letter and John of Vercelli’s 1280 letter where he writes, “Quare studete infundere, ut possitis effunderet” found in ff.150 above, respectively. In addition, Aymericus Guiliani wrote “Ut effundatis, infundite, ut producatis ferventer atque frequenter de scripturarum plenitudine verbum bonum...” in 1305 in Litterae encyclicae LVII, 185 (1305).

162 Ross, Figuring, 60-80.

extant letters by the early master generals. In the first of these exhortations Jordan encouraged Diana to learn the spiritual language by desiring heavenly things so that, she “would understand whenever [she] returned to a book containing spiritual things or heard a preacher speaking spiritual things,” while in the second, he encouraged all of the sisters, “to diligently read, love, and efficaciously fulfill God’s precepts and to correct through his grace whatever small thing they discover in themselves.” While both of these admonitions indicate that reading was part of the nuns’ pious formation, the scarcity of the references within the corpus of letters sent to the Order’s women, certainly compared to the plethora of admonitions to the nuns regarding virtuous behavior and of admonitions to the friars to study, indicates the innately gendered approach to intellectual study within the Order. In addition to the disparity in quantity of admonitions, the calls to study differed in their focus. While Jordan’s exhortations to the nuns at Bologna encouraged reading as a way of rising above worldliness, understanding basic divine precepts, and applying them to their own behavior, the focus of the repeated calls to study in the encyclical letters to the men instead emphasized their role as a conduit for divine knowledge and their mandate to spread this divine knowledge to others. In addition to being present in the Dominican sources directed at the Order’s men studied here, such an emphasis on other people’s salvation rather than personal salvation again reflected ideals of pastoral care in male hagiographic texts, late medieval understandings of male governance, and medieval ideas of masculinity enacted through an active and public life.

Finally, the masters general also developed the theme of cultivation inherent to the horticultural image in the process emphasizing patriarchal themes of fatherhood and governance at the root of lay ideals for mature masculine behavior. Beginning with Humbert of Romans the masters general several times depicted themselves as cultivators of the Order’s garden, placing themselves in a position of patriarchal authority over the brothers. The fifth master general opened his inaugural letter with a reference to the Song

---

164 *Constitutions antique*, prologue, 311.

165 “Tu, ergo, carissima, si spiritualis idigna, desiderio in caelestibus habita, ut, quandoque reversa ad aliquem librum spiritualia continentem, ad praedicatorum spiritualia loquentem, intellegas” and “Sorores salutis, quibus, iuxta exhortationem sancti patris nostri Augustini, opto, ut praecepta Dei infatigabiliter legant, diligent, efficaciter compleant et, quidquid in se pravum deprehenderint, per gratiam suam corrigan” JoS, *Epistulae Ii, 59* (1222) and *XLIII, 48* (1234).

166 See above introduction, 14-15.
of Songs in which the bride lamented working in her brothers’ fields, while neglecting her own, saying “I have not cultivated my own vine.” The new master general, stating that this passage was an allegory for all prelates, admitted that he himself was not sure whether he had guarded either his own conscience appropriately or the province previously entrusted to him, but had nonetheless been elected by the brothers to be the next master general, a trope that several masters general repeated in their own inaugural letters. The focus of the agricultural imagery here is both on the cultivation of personal virtue as well as on the guardianship of those under the individual’s care, providing a bipartite ideological focus similar to the one contained in the militaristic analogies. In this clever elaboration on the typical hagiographic trope where humility makes a saint refuse advancement opportunities, this imagery would also have resonated with secular ideas of self-governance and spiritual governance of others since it focused on the internal and external eradication of vice. Other masters general developed the idea of internal and external eradication of sin as did John of Vercelli, who considered himself to be the Order’s cultivator who had to “pluck out the shoots of human sickness” so that they did not grow into huge bushes and dammingly impede the nursery’s progress over which the cultivator had sweat and labored. According to John, the master general was responsible for the eradication of sin both internally and for those under his care, language that reflects secular ideas of masculine paternal governance of self and others through constant exhortation toward betterment. Humbert of Romans also considered efforts to encourage growth in others to be a mark of fatherhood, writing that his attempts to “move [the brothers] toward better things with holy exhortations” are a mark of “paternal solicitude,” while his efforts to console the friars in time of tribulation sprang from “maternal love.” Thus, by invoking the imagery of the cultivator, the masters general masculinized the vocation by overtly associating it with secular ideals of patriarchal authority and responsibility.

167 “Vineam meam non custodivi.” Song of Songs 1.6.
168 *Litterae encyclicae*, IV, 15 (1254). See also XV, 64 (1264); and LIII, 173 (1300).
169 See above introduction, 14-15.
170 “...id manum dilgentis cultoris exquirit oportune discipline studio frutices infirmitatis humane, que in ipso interdum pullulant.” *Litterae encyclicae* XXVII, 100 (1274).
171 See above introduction, 14-15.
172 “Imposita fragilitati mee cura regiminis animarum vestrarum requirit, ut non solum paterna sollicitudine vos ad meliora prohievere sanctis exortacionibus studeam, sed in affectu materno vobis intendam pro tempore consolidandis, ut spiritus vestri in domino confortati ad omnia sustinenda se recipient forcores” *Litterae encyclicae*, VIIIb, 39 (1256).
The masters generally also extended this masculinized position of self-correction and governance to eradicating vices from the external world in several other letters. John of Vercelli, for example, commanded that “vice be cut out with fear’s sickle and the seeds of justice from virtue’s sacred nursery blossom with continual fruits” since this path was “the vehicle of the just, an example to the unjust, the confounding of the stubborn, the condemnation of the rejected, and the royal path fortified by the defense of the eternal king.”

John’s program of eradicating vice could have applied equally to self-correction and to the correction of others defined as it was as the means of enacting justice in the world. The imagery of tearing out weeds and brambles from the Church’s garden was also found in a letter written by Pope Innocent IV to a provincial prior and inquisitors in Provence, which stated that the special mission of the Order was “to strip out harmful things from the field of the faithful and to plant beneficial things,” imagery taken up by later popes in a variety of circumstance, but particularly when addressing inquisitorial activities.

John himself may very well have been making reference to inquisitorial activities in the 1273 letters, since a papal bull issued earlier that year dealt with Dominican inquisitorial efforts in France. In another example, Munio of Zamora used agricultural imagery in 1290 to discuss the friars’ mission, stating that God had brought forth the Order’s founders, “eradicators of vices and planters of virtues” in a dying age who gave “remedy of salvation to the world” through peaceful conversation, honesty, purity, contemplation, truth, prayer, and fervent preaching.

Munio, in this final encyclical letter, focused on the Order’s mission within the wider world, perhaps reflecting...
the Order’s continued involvement in dangerous inquisitorial activities. Bernard of Jusix gendered this process of cultivation masculine, by encouraging the brothers to work tirelessly in cultivating the Lord’s vine and seeding the Lord’s field since “we are all ordered to extend our hands manfully towards arduous things which exceed the weaknesses of the flesh.” Bernard’s agricultural imagery defined the Dominican masculine vocation as continuous and difficult labor, working to uphold the faith on the Lord’s behalf, and overcoming bodily weakness to achieve this mission. The masters general thus used the horticultural imagery not only to establish their own position of governance, but also to encourage the brothers to function as governors among others, thus establishing the friar’s vocation in terms of self-correction, pastoral responsibilities, and even inquisitorial identity, as particularly masculine by reflecting secular concepts of male patriarchal and paternal authority.

It was Master general Garin de Gy l’Evêque, a theologian at Paris, who most clearly and beautifully drew together these three components of the horticultural imagery—the brothers as a conduit for divine grace, their mandate to produce fruit, and to act as cultivators of holiness—in his encyclical letter sent from the General Chapter in 1348 in the midst of the first outbreak of plague. After describing a magnificent garden where Jesus could eat and collect lilies, Garin composed a beautifully written horticultural metaphor worth translating in bulk here:

Hence it is, dearest brothers—you, who are the perennially irrigated garden of God, whose waters originating from the fountain irrigating the four corners of the world never fail, ministering more loftily through contemplation and further down through holy action, planted by the royal hand in the garden of the church militant, not for the purpose of gathering the first fruits, but rather for the purpose of producing and rearing them first among yourselves through the choice of holy habits and then among others through fragrant transfusion, with the sacred graces poured into the hearts of others by the holy spirit— I exhort you in the Lord, as far as you are placed into charity’s chain and obligation by God’s word having been united to the substance of our flesh in a life-giving manner, that you not only be fruitful vines for yourselves, but rather by sowing the spirit’s words throughout the garden of holy mother church, you produce fruit, which remains in eternity with the tree bearing fruit in all twelve months. Arid hearts should conceive and give birth to flowers because of your holy preaching, just like Aaron’s rod, among those selected by the Lord of spiritual army and heavenly graces, but it should also be able to stop the tumults of worldly storms and excesses, so that the world’s waves are silenced. Thus, remain in the Lord, dearest ones, for every good tree

---

177 In 1286, for example Honorius IV arranged for the return of the Dominicans to their convent in Parma which they had abandoned in protest seven years prior after enduring a retaliatory assault by local heretics, while Nicholas IV’s controversial bull Inter cetera caused major protest because of the favors it gave to the Order. See Pertz, Annales parmenses, 688-92 and Mortier, Histoire, II:325-6.

178 “…ad ardua, que carnis excedunt infirma, iubemur extendere viriliter manus nostras.” Litterae encyclicae LV, 179 (1302).

179 ACG II:172, 186, & 283; Denifle, Chartularium, II:429; and Mortier, Histoire, III, 220-1.
thus bears good fruit, namely, the fruit of justice, which is sown in peace and receives dignity from acts of patience.180

Thus Garin, drawing upon the writings of previous masters general, gendered this Dominican vocation—defined by reception of God’s grace, cultivation of personal and communal virtue, and the production of the fruit of souls—as particularly masculine by emphasizing paternal and patriarchal themes of governance in his discussion of cultivation in a way that reflected secular understandings of male behavior and by reflecting the masculine ideals of the holy bishop and saintly scholar present in hagiographic texts.181 In addition, they made limited use of military imagery and gendering adverbs such as viriliter to characterize this mission as a particularly masculine one. Garin’s extended metaphor also highlighted the sexualized nature of this cultivation, since he equated preaching with the process of engendering children in the audience’s hearts by using the virga. By the late medieval period there was a complicated and rich linguistic tradition surrounding the term virga, which described the vine staff used to beat soldiers in the Roman Empire, the ritual rod used to discipline monks, and the instrument used to punish slaves. Thus, the virga was an instrument of inflicting violence and discipline on an inferior. By extension, the word virga was often employed metonymically to denote the phallus, a “rod” used to inflict blows through sexual penetration.182 Thus Garin’s description of preaching as Aaron’s rod makes rhetorical, oratorial, and doctrinal skill a fundamental symbol of masculine prowess used to impregnate, discipline, and dominate a feminized audience. Garin’s description also clearly articulates the hierarchical nature of the Order’s organization, organized along a gendered progression, where the master general took patriarchal responsibility for training the friars, characterized as the Order’s garden

180 Hinc est, fratres dilectissimi, quod vos, qui estis hortus dei semper irriguus, cuius non deficient aque fontis irrigantis per quatuor mundi capita, superius per contemplacionem et inferius per sacram actionem irrigium ministrantes, insiti manu regi in horto ecclesie militantis, ad premissa nedaum concipienda, quinimo parturienda et educanda verus sacris gracios a spiritu sancto in cordibus aliorum transfusis, prius in vobis per morum sanctorum electionem, dehinc in proximorum cordibus per odoriferam transfusionem, exhortor in domino, quatenus in nexu et vinculo caritatis verbo dei nostre carnis substancie supersubstancialiter unito sic inseratis, ut non solum veri palmites fructiferi sitis vobis ipsis, quinimo per hortum sancte matris ecclesie verba spiritus inserentes fructum faciatis, qui maneant in erno cum arbore fructus duodecim per menses singulos afferente. Vestris enim sanctis predicacionibus corda arida quasi virga Aaron flores concipere et parturire debent in electis a domino virtutis spiritualis et celestium graciarum, sed et procellas tempestatum et luxuum mundanorum sistere valeat, ut silenti mundi fluctus. Sic state in domino, karissimi, sic enim omnis arbor bona bonos fructus facit, fructus silentie iusticie, qui in pace seminatur et per actus pacienciae dignitatem recipit. Litterae encyclicalis XCII, 286 (1348).


182 Coon, Dark, 86-7.
and thus feminized, to exercise that same patriarchal authority over wider Christian audiences in which role
the friar functioned as a virile, reproductive, and even sexualized male. This hierarchical organization reflects
lay understandings of patriarchy and the young men under his control, whom he dominates, controls, but
trains to become patriarchal men, as far as their social class would allow. As with the extensive militaristic
analogies, the placement of these extended horticultural analogies in the *exordia* section of the letters
suggests that the masters general thought that the themes inherent in them would encourage the brothers to
fulfill the behavioral guidelines presented in the *petitiones*, perhaps due to the strong resonances with secular
ideals of masculine behavior contained in this imagery. Thus, the general masters created an ideal of
masculine behavior in the encyclical letters that relied upon literary, religious, rhetorical, and lay
understandings of appropriate male behavior—culminating the Christian knight and spiritual gardener who
engendered Christian offspring through preaching—to encourage the friars toward more appropriate
behaviors.

**Conclusion: Men, Women, and the Burden of Gender**

The rhetorical flourishes, complicated analogies, and repetitive admonitions that characterize the
encyclical letters all worked to deliver a relatively clear and consistent message: To fulfill the Dominican
vocation, a friar, fired by a deep desire for universal salvation had to combat the Devil’s ubiquitous presence in
the world and achieve the salvation of all souls by being a personal exemplar who embodied the message of
sacred texts—which he had internalized through diligent study, meditation, and cultivation of personal piety
—and by teaching this message to others through every available means. It was an entire ministry directed at
the externalization in appearance and word of the friar’s life work, a vocation firmly rooted in the world
outside of the convent and Christendom, and a career in which the friar worked ceaselessly to mold himself
into a conduit for God’s grace. While the masters employed several different rhetorical strategies to
masculinize these particular aspects in accordance with secular ideals of male behavior, as we have seen, the
mission itself, focused as it was on an active, externalized, and other-centered vocation, was also inherently
masculine drawing upon a plethora of late medieval secular ideals of masculine behavior. In addition, the

---

[183] Ruth Mazo Karras traces this development among several different subgroups in *From Boys*.
ideal presented for the Order’s men contrasted sharply with the ideal presented for Dominican nuns, which emphasized an affective relationship with the divine, emphasized spiritual and physical purity, and the nuns’ intercessory role within the Order.

The early master generals acknowledged this gendered disparity and incorporated it into their overall understanding of the Order’s ideology by using the “pray for me” motif. Because they considered the nun’s connection to and personal influence on Christ to be so much greater than their own, the early masters general repeatedly asked the sisters to pray on behalf of themselves and their mission, giving the nuns credit when things went well, thus assigning the role of intercession so often associated with the Order’s special patron, Mary. Jordan of Saxony, for example, repeatedly asked Diana to pray for him as he sought to add members to the Order or sought the cure of a sick friar, attributing any positive results to the efficacy of her prayer. According to Jordan’s understanding of their respective vocations, although he and Diana were both motivated in their vocation by a great love for humanity, this love nonetheless required different lifestyles from them, based upon their gender, in order to fulfill that vocation; she was to “remain stable while he wandered about.” These mutually supportive roles allowed them to fulfill a vocation that could not be done by a single person since Diana provided the prayer and meditation that was necessary for the Order as whole, but simply impossible for him to fulfill in the course of his pastoral obligations. Both Peter of Verona and Ramon de Penyafort expressed a similar sense of intermingled gendered vocations within the Order, asking for the prayers of their female counterparts since they themselves were too involved in pastoral or

184 On Mary as an intercessor in hagiographic texts, see above chapter 2, 180-96.
185 JoS, Epistulae, XXXV, 41 (1223); XIX, 23-4 (1223); XX, 24 (1223); XXI, 25 (1223); XXXIV, 41 (1223); XL, 46 (1224); XXVII, 31 (1225); XLV, 51 (1225); XXXII, 39 (1226); XXXIX, 45 (1227); I, 4 (1229); XIV, 16 (1229); X, 12 (1229); XVI, 19 (1230); VII, 9 (1231); VI, 9 (1231); II, 5 (1232); L, 58 (1232); and XLII, 47 (1235). Peter of Verona also requests the prayers of the nuns at a convent in Dondaine, “Saint Pierre,” 92.
186 “De me noli esse sollicita, quia ille idem, qui te custodit Bononiae remanentem, ipse, ut spero, me quoque custodiet in diversis itineribus ambulantem; quoniam, quod tu in quiete permanes et quod ego in diversa perambulo, totum pro sola ipsius facimus caritate” in JoS, Epistulae, IV, 7 (1231). McGuire also pointed out these separate and complementary means to the same end in Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250. Cistercians Studies Series 95 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1988), 397-8.
187 In a 1228 letter, Jordan wrote, “vale, carissima, et ora pro me frequenter et fideliter ad Dominum, quia indigeo propter multiplices defectus meos. Raro enim oro et ideo tuas etiam sorores meone, ut defectum meum suppleant in hac parte.” XII (1228), 15. According to Edith Pasztor, this interdependency in fact marked a huge change in concepts of female monasticism, one that was intimately tied to the friars’ highly externalized mission for the salvation of others, in fact making it possible through their intercessions, even while their daily lives may not have looked any different than their female monastic predecessors in Donne e sante. Studi sulla religiosità femminile nel Medioevo (Rome: Edizioni Studium, 2000), 118-119 and mentioned in Roncelli, “Domenico,” 85-6.
administrative responsibilities to engage in extensive contemplation.\textsuperscript{188} Thus, while the idea of acting as a
divine conduit applied to both the Order’s men and women in the \textit{litterae encyclicae}, their audience and type
of divine influence differed greatly. The Order’s men were encouraged to imbibe and then spread divine
knowledge to all other people, while the women were encouraged to establish an affective spiritual bond with
the divine and serve as an intercessor for the Order’s men.

While neither Jordan nor Humbert seemed to struggle excessively against his gendered vocation, both
Peter of Verona and Ramon de Penyafort expressed a sense of longing for a more contemplative existence, one
linked in the Order’s ideology with femininity, even while they reinforced this gendered ideology by
acknowledging their debt to the women who prayed on their behalf. In one of his only remaining pieces of
writing, Peter of Verona wrote the following to the convent of nuns he had founded in Milan in 1247,

\begin{quote}
I received your desired letters with a rejoicing spirit and understood from their tenor, that progressing from
virtue to virtue day in and day out, you have deserved the reward of a soldier of the cloister. You have
ascended into the mountain of sacrifice: I still delay in the valley of solicitude and have expended almost my
entire life on behalf of others. You, putting on the feathers of contemplation, transcend all of these things:
however I have been ensnared in the mire of external concern to such an extent that I am not able to fly…I
am not able to gaze upon the freedom of God’s sons, nor am I able to aspire toward it. Help me with your
prayers, dearest sister…I can not turn back from the path along which I walk. I am not far away from that
end which is predetermined for all flesh…therefore, pray for me now, dearest sister…I know that the
assiduous supplication of a just one is effective and that another’s intercession can accomplish what my
own vows cannot obtain.\textsuperscript{189}
\end{quote}

Here Peter clearly contrasted the divergent behavioral expectations of Dominican men and women, seeing the
highly contemplative female model as the primary method of personal salvation while expressing concern
that his nascent vocational path—centered around service to others, external salvation of souls, and activity
within the world—might fail to help him achieve personal salvation. He, as with Jordan of Saxony, also
ascribed an intercessional role to the sisters hoping that they might aid him from their privileged position of

\textsuperscript{188} Dondaine, “Saint Pierre,” 91-2 and Balme and Paben, \textit{Raymundiana} XXIV, 48 (1231-6).
\textsuperscript{189} “Litteras tuas desiderabiles animo letabundo suscepi et ex tenore earum plenius intellexi, quod de die in diem de
virtute in virtutem proficiens claustralis milicie braviun meruisti. Ascendisti in montem sacrificii: ego, adhuc in valle
solicitudinis moror et pro alis fere totam vitam meam expendi. Tu, pennas contemplationis assumens, hec omnia
transcendis: me autem glutnum aliene solicitudinis adeo in viscavit, quod non possum…Ego autem libertatem filiorum
Dei, sicut vellem et desidero, respirare non valeo, nec ad ipsam respirare possum…Adiuva me in orationibus tuis, soror
karissima; \textit{dies mei transierunt}, iuxta verbum Job. Per viam qua ingredior non revertor. Non sum longe ab illa meta que
prefixa est omni carni; iam canos vidimus hore finalis prenuncios. Ora igitur, soror dulcissima; inter secretiores
lacrimas tuas ibi memoriam facias, offerens in conspectu Filii Dei: scio quod multum valet deprecatio iusti assidua, et
personal perfection. Both Peter and Jordan's understanding of these gendered vocational roles also reflected lay understandings of gendered spheres, in which the home was associated with the feminine and protected from the outside world, while public spheres were centers of male action.

Although many of Peter's words may have been rhetorical, designed to augment the sisters' sense of vocational responsibility and importance to the Order rather than to denigrate his own, he was not the only friar to express a sense of regret that he did not have more time for the contemplative life. In the first line of his inaugural encyclical letter sent from Paris in 1264, for example, John of Vercelli wrote,

“Losing all hope of even longing for the remedies of rest after my labors, I have discovered that the hard work that I have sustained in the office of procurator is to be increased, not taken away. I had thought that the daily cares under which I was burning of heat and frost would be relieved by excursions of nocturnal silence, but I have discovered that the relied upon and granted night of tranquility has been changed into a day of burden and labor.”

Later in his tenure, John wrote that all of the brothers should carve out time in their lives for prayer, “for even if every moment should be dedicated to divine work and no small moment of time should be without spiritual progress, nonetheless, one ought to select certain hours for oneself and have a portion of suitable time for oneself, which, dedicated to this divine work, does not feel the injuries of external occupations,” a sentiment which Berenger de Landore echoed 35 years later. The very originality of John's aggravated acceptance letter, unique as it was among the encyclical letters as a whole, lends his lamentation about a lost future of peaceful contemplation after an office of unwanted labor an air of authenticity. However, no protestation against the burdens of a friar's responsibilities, seems more keenly authentic than that of the renowned

190 Not all of the brothers saw this coexistence of mission between the nuns and the friars, but rather complained bitterly that the care for these women prevented the brothers from achieving their true mission: preaching, especially to heretics, and contemplation as they specified in their negotiations with the papacy over this issue. See Grundmann, Religious Movements, 107, 121, and 125. On Jordan's calls for the nuns' intercession, see above 255, ff. 182.
191 See above chapter 2, 122, ff. 205.
192 “Contra spem a spe cadens, ad quietis suspirantem remedia post labores, sudores, quos sub cura procuratoris prioratus sustinui, augeri reperi non precidi. Putabant diurnas sollicitudines, sub quibus estu urebar et gelu, nocturni silencii occursibus relevari, sed nocem tranquillitati creditam et concessam inveni mutatam in diem gravaminis et laboris” Litterae encyclicae XV, 63 (1264).
193 “Si preterea deo familiaritate coniunctus, quam sibi satagat oracionum frequencia vendicare. Nam etsi omne tempus divino operi debeat consecrari, et nullam prorsus particulam a spirituali profectu vacuum esse conveniat, debet tamen certas eligere sibi horas et habere penes se apti temporis porcionem, que divino huic operi dedicata extrarum occupationum dampna non senciatur, nec pie obstinantis relaxetur in hac parte propositum, nisi spiritus assistens oracionibus aliud dictaverit faciendum” Litterae encyclicae XXXIII, 120 (1281). Berenger de Landore wrote less passionately, “Oportet ergo, ut ad spiritualem intelligamiam assurgatis, non satagare cum Martha circa frequens ministerium, sed sedere ad pedes domini cum Maria et au dire assidue verba eius et in corde tenaciter conservare” in Ibid., LXVI, 211 (1314).
canonist and later master general Ramon de Penyafort. Sometime between 1231 and 1236, while he was the personal confessor to Pope Gregory IX, Ramon wrote to the sisters at St. Agnes,

Because, having been established in the whirlwind of the curia, I have scarcely or rarely been able to touch or, so that I speak more truthfully, even to see from a long distance the fair weather of contemplation and, occupied with the early morning blearness of Leah and in many ways with fruitfulness, I can’t at present reach toward Rachel’s beauty, toward which I nevertheless have aspired, albeit weakly, from the days of my youth, it is a great joy and consolation to me, when I consider that I am frequently in your prayers through you and your sisters’ ministry, who, sitting at the Lord’s feet with Mary and tasting the sweetness of your spouse, namely the Lord Jesus Christ, contemplating his beauty that the angels desire to see, I feel sustain me.  

The gendered dichotomy in Ramon’s letter is clear: as a man, he must devote himself to a bustling, externalized activity in the world that left him little time for meditation, while the sisters were to concern themselves with the reception of holiness achieved through quiet, internalized contemplation and it is this very dichotomy that makes Ramon reliant on his female brethren. Indeed, John Coakley has posited that it was precisely this gendered view of religious vocation that drew mendicant friars to function as confessors to holy women, namely, so that they could share in the woman’s affective relationship with God that their busy lives did not allow them to achieve.  

Ramon’s longing for the contemplative life takes on a special poignance and authenticity in light of his eventual resignation from the mastership after only two years and subsequent retirement to the Dominican convent at Barcelona, a move he underwent because, as he wrote to Peter Nolasco, a friend and founder of the Order of Mercy, not so that he could devote himself to leisure, but so that he “did not falsely hold onto those things which are for saints and illustrious men like a useless servant.”  

While both Ramon and John of Vercelli specifically complained about administrative responsibilities, which Ramon characterized as “fruitless” to contrast with the Order’s focus on gathering the fruit of souls, Ramon nevertheless clearly associated male sanctity or achievement as active service within the Order and sacrificing
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194 “Quoniam in turbine curie constitutus vix vel raro attingere vel, ut dicam verius, eciam a longe prospicere valeo contemplacionis serenum et circa Lie lippitudinem matutinam et circa fecunditatem multipliciter occupatus [ad] Rachel pulchritudinem, ad quam tamen a diebus juventutis aspiravi, licet debiliter; statu presenti pervenire non possum, grande gaudium et ingens consolacio michi adest, dum frequenter considero me vestris oracionibus per ministerium vestrum et sororum vestrarum, que ad pedes domini cum Maria sedentes et sponsi vestri degustantes dulcedinem, domini videlicet Ihesu Christi, utpote ipsius speciem, in quem desiderant angeli prospicere, contemplantes, sencio adjuvare” in Balme and Paben, Raymundiana XXIV, 48 (1231-6).

195 Coakley, "Friars, Sanctity" and Women, Men.

196 Ramon wrote to Peter to encourage him to stay in his position as head of the Order of Mercy, writing "Cum enim certo scias diversas esse coelorum vias, secundum diversas vocationes nonlem a te me miserum imitari, qui constitutus ab homnibus in supremum Religionis officium assumptus, ab eo me abdicavi, non ut vacarem otio, sed ut inutilis servus, quae sanctorum et virorum nominatorum sunt, vane non tenerem" in Balme and Paben, Raymundiana LXI (1240), 96.
one’s personal desires for the good of others. As do the Dominican hagiographic texts, Ramon depicted positions of governance—whether in acting as a personal confessor, administrator in the Order, or overseeing others with masculine holiness—as an unwanted but required vocational path, while designating restful contemplation as an aspect of female piety, youth, or failure to live up to the demands of Dominican masculine sanctity articulated in the Dominican hagiography, encyclical letters, and normative texts. Although the writings of these men represent only a small portion of the programmatic rhetoric issued in the encyclical letters by the masters general in an attempt to shape a cohesive male vocational identity for the Order, they nonetheless provide evidence that some friars did in fact feel restricted by their gendered vocational responsibilities, much as their female counterparts sometimes chafed at the behavioral restrictions imposed on them because of their gender. Thus, the encyclical and other pastoral letters written by the leaders of the Dominican Order presented distinctive and relatively rigid behavioral guidelines specific to each sex that closely reflected secular ideals of gender and familial structures, while also reflecting and reinforcing Dominican hagiographic ideals, thus creating an obligation under which both the Order’s men and women sometimes chafed.
Conclusion: *Utilitas and the Dominican Masculine Ideal*

Shortly after his resignation from the Dominican generalship and subsequent appointment to the archbishopric of Santiago de Compostela in 1318, Berenger de Landore wrote the following words to the General Chapter held in London, "For behold my most beloved fathers and most longed for sons, my joy and crown, removed from your presence and deprived of your solace and intimacy in which I have been nourished since boyhood and educated from infancy, I have fallen into worldly affairs and am enveloped in the waves of secular storms..." Although Berenger's words clearly articulated an ideological delineation between the Dominican Order and the outside world and thus reflected a traditional monastic ideal of separation from secular culture, the ideals developed throughout the early Dominican texts discussed in this study suggest that the standards of male behavior promoted for the Order's male members in fact had much in common with those promoted for their secular brethren. As the lives of Dominic, the Dominican Constitutions, the *Vitae fratum*, Humbert of Romans' text on preaching, Dominican hagiographic texts, and encyclical letters have shown, the fundamental goal of the Dominican masculine vocation was *utilitas* to the Order and Christian society, that is, fulfilling the *cura animarum* by drawing souls to God through preaching, inquisitorial activity, and theological excellence. In essence, this vocation called the friars to exercise spiritual and theological authority in the public realm, to compete in the masculine hierarchy of their own Order and the wider Church for prestigious positions, audiences, and monetary support, as well as to demonstrate spiritual governance over themselves, their Order, and the entire Christian community. Thus, the activities expected of Berenger as a nobleman, a Dominican friar, and an archbishop were perhaps not as incompatible as his poignant writing would suggest, undergirded as they all were by the important characteristics expected of all late medieval men: competition in a public masculine hierarchy, membership in and defense of a designated homosocial group, and demonstration of governance over others. Rather than drawing clear boundaries between Dominican and secular realms, the early Dominican writers studied here instead created an opposing feminine model for Dominican women, which was likewise consistent with secular ideals of
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1 "Ecce etenim patres mei dilectissimi et desideratissimi fratres mei, gaudium et corona, a vestra presencia elongatus et vestro privatus solacio et convictu, in quo a puero sum nutritus, ab infancia educatus, devolvor ad seulum et involvor fluctibus seculariumi tempestatum..." *Litterae encyclice*, appendix doc. VI, pg. 329-330.

2 For Berenger's biography, see Mortier, *Histoire*, II, 478-80.
feminine behavior. This feminine model included enclosure, highly affective piety focused on the figure of Jesus, as well as emphasis on physical asceticism, purity, and prayer. Rather than incorporating female imagery into their self-descriptions, masculinizing pious behaviors socially resonant with female gender roles, or viewing themselves as subverting secular ideals, Dominican men instead placed these images and behaviors onto the women within the Order. In doing so, they simultaneously constructed an internal gender dynamic that reflected the expectations for the male-female relationships structuring late medieval society as a whole. Thus, the Order that had nourished Bérenger de Landore from his childhood was structured around the gendered familial roles he would have encountered as a youth in that the male members of the Order demonstrated masculine characteristics and behavioral patterns while enacting spiritual governance over women, feminized members of the Order, and—depending on their relative position along the masculine hierarchy inherent to the Order—the wider community through active service.

Such a strong correlation between the behaviors prescribed for late medieval Dominican men and the basic tenents undergirding secular gendered ideals marks a departure from the picture of medieval religious ideals painted by historical research. Classicists have largely argued that early Christian men adopted the ideals of the Roman masculine civic ethos and military ideology in constructing Christian ideals of martyrdom and ecclesiastical governance in the early days of Christianity. However, as Mathew Kuefler has described, part of this process of constructing a Roman ecclesiastical identity consistent with civic ethos involved the rhetorical incorporation of feminine imagery to describe the Christian bishop.3 Historians of the early and high medieval periods, on the other hand, emphasized the polarity between monastic ideals for men and those presented for their secular counterparts, focusing on expression of violence and sexuality, religious men as a third gender, and the “feminine” nature of the language, imagery, and behavioral ideals presented to medieval monks.4 While historians such as Caroline Walker Bynum have challenged this oppositional paradigm, specifically in terms of the feminine language employed by religious men in the medieval period, the overall scholarly portrayal of masculine religious ideology in the medieval period places it in opposition to secular ideals.5 If we accept the conclusions of this scholarly research, it would seem from our texts that the

---

3 Kuefler, Manly, pg. 125-160.
4 See introduction, 3-4.
5 Caroline Walker Bynum, “Jesus.”
Dominican process of institutional identification represented a return to Classical models of Christian masculinity in that Dominican ideology paralleled established secular ideals for male behavior rather than sat in opposition to them. Indeed, Dominicans appear to have even more closely embraced secular male ideology than their Classical counterparts since Dominican texts did not incorporate overtly feminine imagery into their models of male behavior as Classical Christian authors allegedly did, but instead placed this imagery, and other gender ambiguous imagery like it, solely onto the Order’s women, the “brides of Christ.”

The close study of Dominican sources presented here, however, challenges the basic assumption at the heart of the historiographic debate about medieval masculine religious identity, which proposes that medieval religious men had to compensate for the loss of masculine status suffered upon entering religious life. Such compensation was necessary, according to historians, because religious life was inherently less masculine than secular life, which hinged upon sexual expression and violent action, two behaviors forbidden for religious men. Without the ability to express themselves as men in these pivotal ways, religious men were thus forced to find alternate avenues of masculine self-expression in their behavioral patterns, pious expression, and self-presentation.6 Recent historical studies, however, have produced a much more nuanced understanding of medieval perceptions of maleness beyond violent and sexual expression that calls into question whether such a compensatory understanding of religious masculine identity is based upon historical reality or is instead a historiographic fallacy stemming from modern, rather than medieval, understandings of masculine expression.7 The preceding detailed study of formative Dominican sources placed alongside recent research in medieval masculinities would suggest that the compensatory model for masculine expression played a minimal role in institutionalized identity among late medieval Dominicans, especially concerning sexuality and violence. In the first place, the Dominican authors studied here spent relatively little time discussing sexual expression in the texts, but generally considered controlled sexuality to be a baseline for sanctity in what appears as more of an homage to hagiographic and monastic traditions rather than a central or ideologically fraught vocational expectation. Second, although the Dominican authors studied here do

---

6 This theme runs through Jacqueline Murray, “Masculinizing Religious Life: Sexual Prowess, the Battle for Chastity and Monastic Identity.” In Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages, eds. P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004) and Ruth Mazo Karras, “Thomas Aquinas’s Chastity Belt.”

7 See above introduction, 1-18.
make ample use of violent, militaristic analogies to describe themselves and their vocation, to argue that this compensated for their inability to enact actual physical violence rests on the assumption that secular men could engage in physical violence as an expression of their masculine prerogative and status whenever it suited them to do so. Historical realities, however, suggest otherwise, since violent expression in the late medieval period was, in fact, highly structured and regulated. Although feuding culture remained deeply entrenched in many late medieval communities, this culture was defined by hierarchical structures, cultural rules of engagement, and legal sanctions through which violent action was directed. Likewise, historians of violence have noted the gradual transition in the later medieval period away from privatized, personal feuding culture and aristocratic knightly action toward a developing legal culture, urban bourgeois model of controlled violence, as well as the formalized duel. In a sense, then, Dominican emphasis on non-physical, violent, divinely-channelled, yet strident action against Christianity’s challengers reflects this transition in secular understandings of suitable forms of violent male action rather than marking a rejection of secular masculine norms of violence or compensation for loss of male status. Thus, the idea of a sense of religious masculinity based upon compensation for loss of masculine status incurred by renunciation of sex and violent action fails to account for the nuances of both secular and Dominican masculine identity in the later medieval period.

Rather than focusing on these two issues, the Dominicans under study here instead emphasized a mission that physically and behaviorally integrated them within a more broadly conceived idea of proper male behavior, translating the governing authority central to perceptions of patriarchy to spiritual authority

---


9 This transition was by no means geographically or theoretically consistent with most medieval towns maintaining both legal and paralegal structures for righting wrongs. For the most thorough study of the nature of feuding culture and the transition away from it, see Edward Muir, *Mad Blood*. See also Marvin B. Becker, “Changing Patterns of Violence” and Daniel Lord Small, “Faction and Feud.”
exercised in the public realm by the Order’s men. Indeed, the process of asserting themselves as men while simultaneously meeting the expectations of the Order’s vocation does not seem to have been especially angst-ridden or compensatory, but was rather organically steeped in religious traditions and secular models for acceptable male behavior. Reading these texts, it is hard to imagine that Dominican friars would have had to struggle more to integrate their conceptions of themselves as men into their chosen vocation than did other men from the period, whose particular vocations also structured their processes of self- or institutional masculine expression in certain ways. Journeymen, for example, were unable to reach the status of independent house-holding artisan associated with mature masculinity for economic reasons and thus occupied a perpetually inferior social position in which they remained dependent on other men, unmarried, and deprived of local influence. Because of this socio-economic situation, these men tended to express their sense of maleness by organizing their owns guilds, drinking in taverns, and engaging in illicit sexual relations, a set of behaviors viewed with suspicion by their socio-economic superiors since it seemed to undermine the idea of governance at the heart of privileged masculine identity.10 In other words, secular masculine expression in the late medieval period was in some way directed, restricted, or defined by class, politics, economics, and religious values. Thus, although Dominican authors certainly conceived of themselves in opposition to secular culture in many ways, it is problematic to conceptualize Dominican masculinity as a reaction against a monolithic sense of hegemonic masculinity with very specific behavioral expectations employed by all secular men. This study instead suggests that masculine religious identity was one of the plethora of “masculinities” constructed and enacted in the late medieval world that remained in constant dialogue with one another, unique blends of behaviors rooted in fundamental theoretical understandings of maleness filtered through various social, religious, economic, and political circumstances.11

While the focus of this study has been Dominican masculine self-representation in relation to religious traditions and secular culture, the influence of the behavioral ideals expressed in the Order’s normative texts would have undoubtedly been felt beyond exclusively Dominican spheres. Although

10 Karras, From Boys to Men, 138 and Merry Wiesner, “Guilds, Male Bonding, and Women's Work.”
11 This perspective of masculine identities was eloquently voiced by Arthur Brittan and has been applied in many historical studies of medieval masculinities, but could use further consideration in the study of religious masculinity. See Brittan, Masculinity and Power, chapter 5 as well as Murray, Introduction to Conflicted Identities.
changes in Pluenced the relationship of secular men to the Church could potentially shed light on our period in gendered terms, how the mendicant vocational ideologies affected this perception, and how these men had done?

A discussion of how secular men conceived of the role of religious men in the later medieval vocations called them to assert themselves as men in the public arena in different ways than prior religious members starting in 1300? Additionally, how did individuals outside of the Order respond to friars whose vocations called them to assert themselves as men in the public arena in different ways than prior religious men had done? A discussion of how secular men conceived of the role of religious men in the later medieval period in gendered terms, how the mendicant vocational ideologies affected this perception, and how these changes influenced the relationship of secular men to the Church could potentially shed light on our

12 The acts of the provincial chapters, for example, are littered with general admonitions regarding travel, diet, and clothing restrictions for the brothers and commands limiting their contacts with women as well as containing reprimands and penances issued to specific individuals. See C. Douais, ed. Acta capitulorum provincialium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum, première province de Provence, province romaine—province d’Espagne (1239-1302). Toulouse: Édouard Privat, 1894; Thomas Kaeppeli and Antonio Dondaine, eds., Acta Capitulorum Provincialium Provinciae Romanae (1243-1344) in MOPHXX (1941). For a summary of the situation, see Bennet, Early Dominicans, 145-56. The scholarly discussion of decay within the Order is discussed at length by Michael Vargas, Taming a Brood of Vipers, 124-60.

understanding of religious masculine identity and its impact on wider ecclesiastical influence. Some cursory evidence from late medieval England indicates that land-holding secular men viewed mendicants as homosexuals for "stealing" young men for the Order while existing outside of the traditional understanding of male husbandry because they lacked property. Re-visiting research on anti-Dominican positions and rhetoric in terms of the gendered imagery propagated within the Order would thus help add nuance to our understanding of the sometimes tense relationship between secular men and their Dominican counterparts in the late medieval period as well as the role of this gendered posturing in wider ecclesiastical history of the period.

In addition to the implications of Dominican identification with secular ideals of masculinity for late medieval perception of the church as a whole, the Dominican ideal of masculine religiosity may also have had implications for the relationship between the Order, Christendom, and those considered to be outside of prescribed norms, namely heretics, Jews, and Muslims. Since late medieval ideas of masculinity fundamentally involved action, often violent in nature, against a perceived enemy group, the alignment of Dominican religious identity with secular concepts of masculinity, the other against which early Christians and medieval monks had positioned themselves, would have left the Dominicans in need of a different sort of group against which to define themselves, from which to protect themselves and their compatriots, and against whom to strive as men. Perhaps this need for an ideological other against whom to practice manly action played a role in the increasingly zealous Dominican attention to various heretical groups, the remaining Jews in Europe, and Muslims beyond the borders of Christendom in the later medieval period. Certainly the enemy lurking in the pages of the early Dominican texts studied here was the often shadowy and undefined "heretic" against whom the Order's great members and saints heroically strove. Additionally, the texts make some references to Muslims in this capacity. Likewise, the vita of Ramon de Penyafort, whose canonization was not achieved until the 17th century despite repeated attempts by the Crown of Aragon, heroicized his actions against Muslims and Jews in the Iberian peninsula, while the career of the great 14th century Dominican preacher and saint Vincent Ferrer, considered by some to be the apex of late medieval Dominican

---

14 Neal, Masculine Self, 115.
hagiographic fashioning, was intricately intertwined with the fate of Iberian Jews and Muslims. The Dominican texts studied here also encouraged the brothers to take action against these groups by making use of masculinized imagery in their presentation of the conflict. While increasing action against heretical groups, Jews, and Muslims was undoubtedly tied to wider historical trends, a greater understanding of Dominican masculine self-fashioning might shed further light on the fervor with which Dominicans dedicated themselves to inquisitorial and preaching activities against non-Christians in the later medieval period since it was through these behaviors that they concurrently expressed their identity as Dominicans and as men.

Although historians have paid significant attention to the role of feminine gender ideology on the behaviors, self-perception, and action of late medieval religious women, often seeing this ideology as one greatly limiting personal religious expression, similar attention has not been paid to late medieval religious men, who are generally perceived as having been issued a societal carte blanche to express their religious inclinations as they saw fit, unfettered by gendered ideologies. The normative, hagiographic, and epistolary Dominican texts under study here, however, indicate that Dominican men also functioned under a clearly defined behavioral ideal for them as specifically men, which determined the path of religious expression that they were expected to pursue within the Order. While it would certainly be inaccurate to say that a Dominican friar would have had as difficult a time engaging in extensive mystical practices as a nun would have had attempting to preach, there is nonetheless a clear expectation for masculine behavior in the Order, with which the majority of Dominican men complied. Indeed, this survey of early Dominican sources has shown several instances in which the pious practices of certain friars were redirected toward the Order’s masculinized vocations and certain accomplished Dominicans expressed a longing to engage in the pious practices of their

female counterparts. Likewise, the influence of religious masculine gendered identity on larger historical events in the late medieval society, that is masculine identity as a contributor to major historical trends, remains in the shadow of political, economic, and other social aspects. The centrality of the masculine ethos in the creation and actualization of the Dominican ideal discussed in this dissertation would suggest, however, that the individual and corporate concept of *age viriliter* could have had a major impact on the activities of important religious groups and their interactions with the world around them. Just as the mantra of “acting like a man” undoubtedly influenced, if not defined, the *habitus* that informed the daily lives of most late medieval men, the Dominican sources discussed here would indicate that it also undergirded the worldview, self-identification, and daily actions of Dominican men, with potentially profound socio-religious implications.
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