



The University of Chicago

FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

The *ERUCTAVIT*, an Old French
Poem: the Author's Environment,
his Argument and Materials

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE, IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES)

BY

GEORGE FITCH McKIBBEN

11

BALTIMORE

J. H. Furst Company

1907

THE *ERUCTAVIT*, AN OLD FRENCH POEM:

THE AUTHOR'S ENVIRONMENT, HIS ARGUMENT AND MATERIALS.

This paraphrase in verse of Psalm XLIV of the Vulgate (*Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum*) must have enjoyed no small popularity during three centuries, and in widely separated parts of the then French speaking world. This is attested by the fourteen copies¹ that survive. Of these, two contain only about a quarter of the poem; two, about one-half; while no less than ten are quite complete or nearly so.

In this study of the poem, after an outline of the investigations of well known scholars, are presented my conclusions upon its contents and plan, the author's environment and character, his materials.

Conspicuous in the poem, and no doubt explaining much of its popularity, are the passages at the beginning and end in which the poet addresses his patroness. A third address, containing only four lines and serving merely as a transition passage without identifying

¹ One of the fragments,—Paris, B. N. 902 (ms. L),—and eight of the complete copies of the *Eructavit*,—Paris, Ste. Geneviève, Lf. 13, (ms. C); B. N. 2094 (ms. A); 1747 (ms. N); 24429 (ms. G); Arsenal, 3518, (ms. H); Madrid, B. N. E. 150 (ms. B); Vatican, 1682 (ms. F); British Museum, add. 15606 (ms. E),—were copied by me between December and August, 1891-'92. The other copies, excepting that of Vienna, were at the same time rather hastily examined and compared. One of my copies, that made in the British Museum, was published in 1893, appearing with a brief introduction in the *Scientific Bulletin* of Denison University, Granville, Ohio. I have recently secured copies of the other mss.: Paris, B. N. 1536 (ms. K); 20046 (ms. M); 25532 (ms. I); Arsenal, 3516 (ms. J) and Vienna, Bibl. Palat., 3430 (ms. D).

The restored text of the *Eructavit* will be published by Professor T. A. Jenkins, of the University of Chicago. As basis of the outline of the poem, or Part II of this study, I have used my copy of the ms. in the British Museum, published in 1893, as stated above.

phrases, occurs in the latter part of the poem. These addresses¹ are as follows:—

Ll. 1–14.

Une chançon que David fist,	·I· po trop d'une sole chose :
Que nostre sire an cuer li mist,	Tant i mist cil qui la cria
Dirai ma dame de Champaigne,	Largesce que trop an i a ;
Celi cui Damedés anseigne	Largesce et li hauz despens
Et espire de toz ses biens,	Metent cusançon et espans
Si qu'en li ne faut nule riens ;	Mainte foiz an jantil corage.
Ançois i a, qui dire l'ose,	Deus doint que n'i aiens damage !

Ll. 1749–1752.

Cist vers apres conte la joie,	Cui Damedés mantaigne et gart
S'est bien droiz que ma dame l'oie,	Si qu'ele an ait antiere part.

Ll. 2079–2100.

La jantil suer le roi de France,	Qui de grant bien nos asseüre :
Recordez i vostre creance.	Qui Deu aime et de lui anquiert
Pansez, dame, de bien amer,	Seürs soit il que miez l'an iert.
De servir et de reclamer	Mout met son cuer a bone escole
Celui qui la foi nos espire,	Qui volantiers ot sa parole. .
Ou vostre jantis cuers se mire.	E vos, dame, estes toz jorz preste
Mout l'avez fin et aguisié ;	De l'oïr et d'estre an anqueste ;
Ne sai ou vos avez puisié ;	Li bons maistre don vos avez
Mes d'une chose vos faz sage,	Retenu quant que vos savez,
Que mout avez grant avantage :—	Si com il est verais amis,
Qu'un mot a an sainte esriture	Croisse le bien qu'il i a mis !

¹ These addresses, in which something of the poet's purpose appears, altho easily omitted, belonged to the original poem ; their omission, when not the result of a mutilation of the ms., may be attributed to the scribe's desire to adapt the poem to some more general use.

The various copies treat them as follows : L and M, being fragments, have only the first address ; K and H, only the second ; I, altho nearly complete, omits all three addresses ; J, a fragment and mutilated, has only three lines of the first ; D, F, G, A, N, and E contain all three ; B and C contain the first and second, but the latter, evidently by an error, has lost the identifying phrase of line 3, *ma dame de Champaigne*.

The only expressions that serve here to identify the patroness are *ma dame de Champagne*, l. 3, and *la jantil suer le roi de France*, l. 2108. These, taken together, can refer only to Marie, daughter of King Louis VII and Queen Eleanor. She became countess of Champagne in 1164, upon her marriage with Henri I, the Liberal, after a betrothal beginning in early childhood. On the death of her father and the accession of her half-brother, Philip Augustus, in 1181, she could be spoken of as "sister of the King of France." In the same year she became a widow, and her bereavement, it is thought, offered to the devout poet his opportunity.

After being forgotten for three centuries, the *Eructavit* began about two generations ago to attract some attention from students of the life, thought and speech of medieval France. Certain well known investigators have made some expression in print concerning it, as one of the many *inedita* worthy of study.¹

Prosper Tarbé deserves the credit of pointing out Sens as the author's city, and the Benedictine abbey, St. Pierre-le-Vif, as his home. This appears from the following passage, ll. 769-786, where the local saints of Sens are mentioned by name:—

Li bons archiers qui si loing lance	Qui s'aresturent droit a Sanz.
Retraist 'ii' saietes an France,	La estoit lors toz li bofois
Bien legieres et bien tranchanz,	Et li chiés de Sarazinois.

¹ Paulin Paris, *Les manuscrits françois de la bibliothèque du roi*, vii, 199, 208; Prosper Tarbé, *Poètes de Champagne antérieurs au siècle de François I*, 37, 38; Holland, *Chrestien von Troyes*, 247; D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, iv, 642; P. Meyer, *Romania*, vi, 9, and *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 1878, 50; G. Paris, *Romania*, xii, 523, and *Histoire de la littérature française au moyen âge*, 232; J. Bonnard, *Les traductions de la Bible en vers français au moyen âge*, 139; Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, ii, 689; Suchier and Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der französischen Litteratur*, 150. Reference, it may be added, is made to some particular copy of the *Eructavit*, for philological rather than literary purposes, by W. Foerster in the large edition of *Cligés*; by E. Goerlich in *Der burgundische Dialekt*, and by A. Thomas, *Romania*, xxx, 339. Opinions concerning the identity of the *dame de Champagne* varied even after 1865, when the fourth volume of D'Arbois de Jubainville's work, mentioned above, appeared. The statement of P. Meyer, *Romania*, vi, 9, foot-note, sets the matter at rest. To G. Paris is due the assignment of the year 1181 as the earliest probable date of the poem.

Li uns fu sainz Saviniens,	Par ces ·ii· fu France conquise :
Li autre sainz Potanciens.	A Sanz fu la premiere eglise
Selonc lor nons la vertu orent :	Qui a non Sainz Peres li Vis ;
Qu'anbedui sorent mout et porent.	Qu'ancor n'estoit il pas ocis
Des deciples Damedé furent ;	Quant cele eglise fu fondée
Avec lui mangierent et burent.	Qui de son non est honorée.

I. THE AUTHOR'S ENVIRONMENT AND CHARACTER.

Such a passage as that quoted above is usually thought to determine the writer's home. It may be so taken here. Our poet's general environment then was *urbs antiqua Senonum*, the Canterbury of France. The abbey of St. Pierre-le-Vif was his more particular environment. He was a Benedictine monk. The reference to the monastery seems all the more decisive for the reason that the poet says nothing of the many other religious foundations in Sens, a city which at the time was probably unsurpassed in France as an ecclesiastical centre, being popularly called "little Rome."¹ For instance, he does not mention the depository of St. Loup's relics, the abbey of St. Columba. But he chooses to give the names of the less conspicuous St. Pierre-le-Vif and its traditional founders, SS. Savinian and Potentian.² One reason for this choice may be the desire to exalt especially the earliest heralds of the Gospel ; but the stronger reason must be the local pride of the poet, as member of a community that held them in special honor. The proverb holds good here : *Chescuns prestres ses reliques loue*.

Accepting this theory, everything becomes of interest and importance that concerns Sens and the abbey St. Pierre-le-Vif, as they were in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Among the documents that afford us light on the subject are chronicles of the two

¹ Its archbishop, until the fourteenth century, claimed the title "primate of France," as an equal of the archbishop of Lyons.

² The bells cast at Auxerre by Mangin Vyard in 1560 and still hanging in the south tower of the Sens cathedral, St. Etienne, are called *Savinienne et Potentielle*. But the poet's monastery was demolished at the time of the Revolution, tho its name survives in that of the east part of the present city, it is said. See Quantin's *Dictionnaire topographique de l'Yonne*, article *Sens*.

monasteries above mentioned. The chronicler of St. Columba is anonymous; but two monks, known to us by name, Odorannus and Clarius, separated by a century, wrote of St. Pierre-le-Vif. The former recites at length the recovery, thru a dream of Queen Constance, King Robert's wife, in 1025, of the precious relics, hidden and forgotten at the time of the Norman invasion, generations before. In both chronicles abundant proof is afforded of the reverence in which SS. Savinian and Potentian were held by the people of Sens and by the monks of St. Pierre-le-Vif. Indeed the monastery is sometimes called by the names of St. Peter and St. Savinian¹ joined together. The chronicle of Clarius, who wrote early in the twelfth century, has considerable interest for us. He describes with unusual intelligence and enthusiasm several of the chief ecclesiastical events of his own time, which he witnessed or participated in. Yet he keeps himself in the background, barely mentioning his own name in narrating what was probably his proudest achievement: namely, his service as substitute for the Abbot Arnaldus and the Archbishop Daimbert on an occasion of great moment for the community. After narrating the abbot's efforts in defence of the monastery, endangered in its rights by grasping neighbors, Clarius ends his chronicle by reciting his chief's labors for the library. This had been almost destroyed by fire in 1095, shortly before his election as abbot. He made it his task to preserve and multiply the books of the monastery, and to devise means for their preservation thenceforward. In order to more fully render this important service he finally resigned his high position. The collection due so largely to his efforts consisted, in the year 1123, of twenty volumes, a catalog of which the chronicle gives. This loyal tribute of Clarius to his abbot, and the book-list, form the conclusion.²

¹See Duru's *Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne*, II, 294-314, 564-566; *Passio SS. Saviniani et Potentiani, sociorumque eorum*, etc.; charters of Pope Honorius II, Archbishop Richer, Hugues and Constance of Champagne. Cf. also the chronicle of Clarius, annis 1108, 1110, 1117. Savinian appears to enjoy a sort of primacy as compared with his traditional companions. In the *Grande Encyclopédie*, under the article *Savinien*, M. Prou treats the entire group.

²See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XIII, 38; Duru's *Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne*, II, *Chron. Clarii*, anno 1123; D'Achéry, *Spicilegium*, II, 484, 485.

It is reasonable to assume that library economy so pious and strenuous as that of Arnaldus¹ was effective in preserving and enlarging the monastery's store of books. If so, those listed in 1123 by Clarius, and others beside were accessible to our writer when, some fifty years later, he sought material of which to weave his poem.

In the collection listed in 1123, next to the various books of the Bible (which are given in the order required for reading during the year), the works of Gregory the Great are most prominent. In fact there was a complete set of his expository writings, excepting only the Homilies on Ezekiel and the latter half of the *Moralia in Job*. The three works now regarded as spurious are not mentioned. Probably the missing works are more than compensated for by the work which Clarius numbers VIII, to which the simple title *Paterius* is given. This must have been the compilation by Paterius, disciple of Gregory the Great, of the latter's Bible quotations and comments thereon, usually called the *Liber Testimoniorum*. Only one work of Augustine is in the list, the *Tractatus in Epistolam Johannis*. It is the third of the collection, and is mentioned among the volumes of Scripture. In the fourth volume mention is begun of Gregory's works.

There is no record of fire again destroying the abbey of St. Pierre-le-Vif within the period that especially concerns us. In 1147, to be sure, the abbot Herbertus (altho with Theobaldus, abbot of St. Columba, he had enlisted for Louis VII's crusade) was killed by an uprising of townspeople. His successor, Gerardus, introduced the Cluny regulations, probably insuring better discipline during his rule, which ended in 1167 by resignation. In his time and in the next twenty years occur events which must have brought to the knowledge, and even before the eyes, of our poet some of the greatest personages of the time: the King of France, the Count of

¹The words of Clarius make it plain that the rules of Arnaldus were really enforced: *Excommunicavit enim omnes indifferenter qui aliquem vel aliquos suscriptorum librorum, vel venderent, vel accommodarent, vel aliquo modo efficerent, quo ecclesia perderet, et librum non rehaberet. Ipse enim Deo optulit, et qua custodia potuit munivit.* Duru's work, cited above, *Chron. Clarii*, anno 1123.

Champagne, the Archbishop of Sens, Pope Alexander III and Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. The two great princes of the church last named were exiles, being in controversy with the two most powerful monarchs of their generation, Frederick Barbarossa and Henry II of England.

The Archbishop of Sens, whose suffragans were among the most powerful prelates of northern France (four of them within the dominions of the house of Champagne), was at this time Hugues de Toucy.¹ He had presided over the Council of Beaugency in 1152 at which was pronounced the sentence of divorce releasing Louis VII from his wife Eleanor. He anointed this King's second and third queens, Constance in 1154, and Adela or Alix of Champagne in 1160. In the latter year were found the remains of SS. Potentian and Altin,²—of St. Savinian too, says Gulielmus Godellus,—by the same energetic primate, to whom are attributed five other inventions.³

His successor in 1168 was Guillaume aux Blanches-Mains, a shining example of the high-born boy-bishop of the time,⁴ a younger son of the house of Champagne,—*splendidissimus juvenis domnus*, as Gulielmus Godellus calls him, in recording his election in 1164 as bishop of Chartres. Two years before, he had been chosen arch-

¹ See *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XII, 127.

² Yet it seems that some at least of the relics thus recovered did not long remain the property of St. Pierre-le-Vif. For in 1167 Henri I of Champagne bought from the monastery the bones of SS. Potentian and Altin in return for certain real estate at Provins and Naud. This sale was probably not known to the public. I have not found it mentioned in any chronicle. The charter recording the transaction, however, is listed as no. 150 of the acts of Henri I: see D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, pp. 181, 182, 353. It should be noted that Troyes, for whose cathedral the pious count was collecting relics, has a local saint of the name Sabinian or Savinian, so familiar at Sens.

At a later time some of the precious remains were claimed in yet another place. For in 1218 it required a formal inquest, conducted by Peter of Corbeil, Archbishop of Sens, in the presence of illustrious men, to prove unfounded the claims of the Jouarre nuns to be in possession of all St. Savinian's relics.

³ See *Gallia Christiana*, XII, 49 A; *Recueil des historiens*, etc., XIII, 677.

⁴ Altho urged by the parents of Guillaume, St. Bernard refused to get for him ecclesiastical preferment. See Morrison's *St. Bernard*, 432; D'Arbois, *Histoire*, II, 464.

bishop of Lyons by the chapter which thought thus to strengthen the Emperor's cause in France.¹ But he never entered the office. As archbishop of Sens and, after 1178, archbishop of Reims, papal legate and cardinal, he rendered conspicuous service to his time. His official relations (records of which in the form of letters and charters are extant) with Thomas Becket, Pope Alexander III, Louis VII, his brother-in-law, and Philip Augustus, are well known. He asserted ecclesiastical control in and about Sens, vesting the oversight of the *ludus literarius* in his precentor.² He fostered trade and learning, promoted the growth of the communes in a way that served other towns as a model.³ But the chroniclers say he was ambitious, and that not content with anointing Philip Augustus in 1179 at Reims, he begrudged his successor Guy, archbishop of Sens, the honor of crowning him at Paris in 1180. At his solicitation, it is said, the Pope confirmed to the archbishop of Reims the right to thus enthrone the King of France.

Prelates even more ambitious had at an earlier day drawn much attention to Sens. Here from October 30, 1163, until Easter, 1165, Pope Alexander III resided, *regis expensis sustentus*, forced by the Emperor to seek refuge in France. About a year later the exiled and fugitive Primate of England, Thomas Becket, began his long stay at the monastery of St. Columba, whose shelter he left only a few months before returning to his post of danger and death. While at Sens or in the vicinity, he must have received from John of Salisbury, a fellow exile but a gentler spirit, the letter advising a change in his reading matter: the Psalms and the Morals of St. Gregory instead of canon law and scholastic philosophy.⁴

The king of France was often seen and his power was felt in Sens. Louis VI in 1121, speaking as "the eldest son of the

¹ Henri I, count of Champagne, his older brother, was at the time wavering between Pope Alexander III and the Emperor. The latter's candidate for the papacy, or the anti-pope Octavian, was besides a kinsman of Henri. See D'Arbois, *Histoire*, III, 47-54; Fournier, *Royaume d'Arles*, etc., 42.

² See *Gallia Christiana*, XII, 52.

³ D'Arbois, *Histoire*, III, 185, 237, 272; IV, 393, 705, 716.

⁴ See *Epistola* 138, *anno* 1165, Migne, CXCIX, 117, 118.

Church," made an effective protest against the Pope's purpose to render the ancient see of Sens dependent on Lyons.¹ In the forty-three years of his reign Louis VII made the town a score of visits.² In 1146 he punished unsparingly the uprising that had killed the Abbot Herbertus. Ten years later he renounced in favor of the see of Sens the *droit de dépouilles* which at the archbishop's death had been wont to cause annoyance and oppression.

But in its ordinary life Sens felt more directly and strongly the influence of the counts of Champagne. The geographical position of the town in part explains this fact. Situated in the extreme southeast of the king's dominions, it was on a sort of narrow peninsula (the lower Yonne valley) in the sea of territory belonging to the count of Champagne or to those who owned him as suzerain. These, at the time that concerns us, were chiefly the numerous and energetic children of Thibaut II: three sons and four daughters. Deduction is made for the prelate, Guillaume aux Blanches-Mains, Queen Alix (both of whom, however, stood strongly for family interests), Marguerite, nun of Fontevrault, and Marie, the oldest sister, who retired thither and became abbess after the death of her husband, Eudes II, and the minority of her son, Hugues III of Burgundy. The fiefs of the family,³ now called after Champagne rather than Blois, lay in nineteen of the present departments of France, and were greater in extent and power than the royal dominions. These they enclosed on all but the northwest side. The main traveled roads of the region led to Sens. The six annual fairs of Champagne (two each at Provins and Troyes, one each at Bar-sur-Aube and Lagny) brought thousands of merchants and their goods. The counts of Champagne guaranteed safe passage, and acted vigorously to punish robbery on the way thither, even when it occurred on the king's highway. Besides, the archbishop of Sens was one of the few overlords to whom the counts owed fealty.⁴

At four of these fairs of Champagne the monks of St. Pierre-le-

¹ Luchaire, *Actes de Louis VI*, anno 1121.

² Luchaire, *Actes de Louis VII*, table of charters.

³ D'Arbois, *Histoire*, II, 428.

⁴ *Ibidem*, IV, 884, 887.

Vif had enjoyed, we know not how long, an important commercial privilege (*le poids*). They were the official weighers. This privilege was confirmed to the monastery in 1174 by Henri I in a charter still extant.¹

In the war between Queen Constance and her son, Henri I, in 1031, one half of the town Sens was given to Eudes I of Champagne. The abbey St. Pierre-le-Vif was included in the cession. When peace was made, the count yielded possession. But the right of lodgement, the *droit de gîte*, enjoyed probably ever after by the counts of Champagne,² remained as a survival of the brief ownership. This right entitled the count and his train to free entertainment once a year. One can see what interest on both sides must have arisen from the exercise of this right during four or five generations. It goes far towards explaining why our poet should write for the countess of Champagne.

Henri I and his wife were thoroughly representative of their time. When only twenty years old, Count Henri went on the Second Crusade. At the request of St. Bernard, whose letter of recommendation he bore, he was knighted by Manuel, Emperor of Constantinople.³ By his conduct in the crusade he won the praise of Louis VII. He afterwards participated too vigorously in knightly tournaments, incurring but disregarding the rebuke of St. Bernard.⁴ His many gifts to religious establishments⁵ were in those years earning him the title of "the Liberal." In 1179 he went a second time on crusade. Immediately before his departure two of his four children, named like their parents Marie and Henri, were betrothed to the house of Hainaut. His return from Palestine occurred in the spring of 1181. He stopped on the way at Sens, where he met the young king Philip Augustus, and died at Troyes, March 16, a few days later. During his stay at Sens he may have

¹ D'Arbois, *Histoire*, III, 367, charter 230 ; also chap. 8 of the same volume ; Morrison's *St. Bernard*, 139.

² D'Arbois, *Histoire*, I, 146, 310-314 ; IV, 620, 621.

³ D'Arbois, *Histoire*, III, 14.

⁴ D'Arbois, *Histoire*, III, 18, 22.

⁵ *Ibidem*, 172-176.

claimed his right of lodgement at St. Pierre-le-Vif; but of this there is no evidence.

Charter 326, however, is proof that Marie respected her deceased husband's wishes.¹ She was seconded also in so doing by his brother, the archbishop Guillaume of Reims. The charter in question promised to the Langres cathedral an annual gift of thirty *livres*, to be taken from the fair of Bar-le-Duc. The gift was in fulfilment of a vow made by Henri while a prisoner in the hands of the Turks, who had captured him as he returned from Palestine. He was released by the influence of the Emperor of Constantinople.

Altho Count Henri I was by no means indifferent to literary culture, he does not seem to have encouraged composition in the vernacular.² This honor, both by history and tradition, is awarded to his wife, the Countess Marie. Chrétien de Troyes acknowledges her encouragement and suggestions. Poets less famous shared her patronage or at least addressed their works to her.³

The year 1164 might at first thought seem to present the most fitting occasion for offering to the countess what claims to be the translation of an epithalamium, a *chançon de chambre*, as it is called in l. 2075. For in that year Marie became the wife of Henri I of Champagne. But there is no proof of this early date. The absence of all allusion in the *Eructavit* to this eminent crusader and benefactor of the Church argues that he was no longer alive when the poem was made public.

There is perhaps some internal evidence for a much later date. It is the passage, ll. 1910–1960, where David comforts the Church, the Queen of the allegory, for her children who had died as martyrs. There would appear some fitness in a reference to the death of Marie's crusader son, Henri II, who was killed, probably

¹ *Ibidem*, 109, 383.

² The direction of his literary interest is shown probably by the name, Scholastique, given to one of his daughters. She became the wife of Guillaume, count of Macon. Guiot of Provins addresses him in song. This poet also (after a worldly life and a brief experience of the Cistercian order) was a Benedictine. See D'Arbois, *Histoire*, III, 188–208; IV, 657, 677; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XVIII, 808.

³ See G. Paris, *Romania*, XII, 523; D'Arbois, *Histoire*, IV, 634–660.

by accident, at Acre, September 10, 1197, six months before his mother died at Meaux. His official position, as titular King of Jerusalem, rendered his death a serious loss to the Christian cause in the East. Pope Innocent III, altho regarding Henri as an adulterer and his tragic end as a divine judgment, wrote to the archbishops of Reims and Sens, and to the bishop of Meaux, urging that comfort and protection be extended to Marie. She died without receiving either,¹ and without seeing the completion of the devout poem, *la Genèse*, which Evrat was preparing for her. Probably she never saw the *Eructavit*, if it was begun after the death of Henri II. But there is strong probability, I think, of an earlier date.

For the passage containing an apparent reference to her bereavement, ll. 1910–1960, finds sufficient motive in the death of Henri I, her husband, in 1181. He too was really a victim of the crusade,—his family connection furnished many,²—and therefore, according to current opinion, he was a martyr of the faith. The poet's opportunity then was, most probably, this bereavement, which came only about a year after the death of her father, King Louis VII. Even at an earlier date Marie, perhaps, had shown inclination for a more devout life.³ The cares of administration and repeated negotiations for the marriages of her children were among her burdens even before the death of Henri I. The outlay caused by his last crusade, involving probably his ransom from captivity, will explain the poet's expression, in ll. 3–14, of solicitude lest he and others suffer in consequence of her generous expenditure.

This passage, already quoted on p. 2, is probably more than a

¹ In her last days she was without the presence of the confessor for whom she had sent. He arrived too late, and found that the servants had pillaged the palace, neglecting and even treating with indignity the lady's corpse. See *Histoire littéraire*, xvi, 439; D'Arbois, *Histoire*, iv, 157.

² Between 1181 and 1197 the crusades by battle and disease took the lives of Henri I; his brothers, Thibaut of Blois, "last seneschal of the King of France," and Etienne of Sancerre; his nephew, Hugues III of Burgundy; his son, Henri II; Philip of Flanders, second patron of Chrétien of Troyes and ally of the Champagne-Blois family.

³ See W. Foerster, *Cligés*, x, in *Romanische Bibliothek*, I.

poet's conventional request for a reward. The generosity for which the lady is complimented may well have increased her financial straits. They were to become more severe during her second regency.¹

All the conditions, however, required by the dedication of a devout poem to Marie of Champagne and implied in the lines last quoted seem to exist soon after the death of Count Henri I in March, 1181.

The most fitting occasion for presenting the poem to the widowed countess in person occurred, I think, in 1185. For at the end of that year,—in the Advent season, a fitting time for the appearance of a Christmas psalm, such as the poet claims (ll. 15 ff.) to have made,—she was at Sens, honorably received by King Philip Augustus in a conference that included also her brothers-in-law, Archbishop Guillaume of Reims, Count Etienne of Sancerre, Count Thibaut the Good of Blois, and their nephew, Hugues III of Burgundy.² The conference was for the purpose of reconciling the king with the powerful Champagne family which had long been in opposition, having taken the side of Philip of Flanders in his quarrel with his former ward. On Marie's side especially there was much to forget; for the young king had married Elizabeth of Hainaut, altho she had long been betrothed to Marie's son Henri II. But a reconciliation was effected. We may regard as one of the incidents of this occasion the presentation of the *Eructavit* by its writer to the Countess Marie. Yet the point is one that cannot be proved absolutely. The probability of this earlier date, 1185, seems to me the greater, altho it must be granted that no year between 1181 and 1198, the year of Marie's death, can be fixed upon with certainty.

The poet's character, his mental furnishing and his purpose appear

¹ The financial demands made on Champagne for Henri II's seven years (1190–1197) in the Holy Land were doubtless very great. Some of his debts (and his mother's, incurred in his behalf) were assumed by his brother, Thibaut III. Henri II had raised a great sum before his departure by the *aide*, an extraordinary levy intended for such a crisis. See D'Arbois, *Histoire*, iv, 70, 86, 97; v, charter 459.

² See D'Arbois, *Histoire*, v, 6, 9.

quite plainly in his production. His expression is labored and trite at times, but he always utters devout thought and usually in biblical terms. The selection of a psalm as a theme is not surprising in a Benedictine. The *Eructavit* is in general such a poem as one would expect from a monk possessing some literary skill and ambition with a desire to edify and admonish. He is not servile in his manner of address, but rather magnifies his office as interpreter of divine things. He turns, as he alleges, a Latin original into the vernacular that it may be completely understood, "unless folly deceive." His work is to arrange it and turn it into rime :

Ll. 15-20.

Le jor de Noël au matin
 Nos dist sainte eglise an latin
 Le saume que je vos comanz ;
 Metre le vos vuel an romanz,
 Si porroiz prandre que que soit,
 Se folie ne vos deçoit.

Ll. 139-144.

De latin l'a an romanz traite
 Au miauz qu'il puet cil qui l'afaite.
 Oiant toz bons clers, dist il bien
 Qu'il n'i a antrepris de rien
 Fors la androit ou rime faut,
 S'i met le mot qui autant vaut.

This would imply that the lady needs a translator, and the following passages, that she is to hear rather than read for herself :

Ll. 1749, 1750.

Cist vers apres conte la joie,
 S'est bien droiz que ma dame l'oie.

Ll. 1687, 1688.

Qui bien orroit et antandroit
 Que cist vers conte ci androit . . .

The writer conforms to the literary conventions of his time. The beginning of the poem especially, ll. 7-14, is after the manner of a minstrel addressing a patron, and hints, as already shown, that remuneration is expected. He even attributes to David, *joculator Dei*, at heaven's gate, a similar request in ll. 235-238 :

Juglerre sui, sages et duiz ;
 Se le roi plaisoit mes deduiz,

Ce sai je bien que les sodees
 Me seroient mout granz donees.

He employs a current literary fiction also in claiming to be merely a translator, as I shall try to show. Another characteristic of medieval clerical literature is the vision, such as David begins at l. 159.

Nowhere does our poet speak of having renounced a worldly life for the service of religion, a change so common in his day. He seems one content with his circumscribed lot, who, however, looks out from the seclusion of the monastery upon the great world with intelligence and interest. Tho himself devout and single-hearted, he knows that not all are worthy in the high places of state, or even in church and cloister.¹ He possesses some simple wisdom and utters it in quotable form :

Ll. 591, 592.

Mout sont la menue jant lié
Quant lor princes a d'aus pitié.

Ll. 601, 602.

La ou droiz et justise dure
Est la terre sauve et seüre.

Ll. 1273, 1274.

Quant jantis cuers a Deu s'adrece,
Lors est doble la jantilece.

Ll. 1291, 1292.

Car se ce que Deu plaist ne fait
Qui plus i puet, plus i mesfait.

Ll. 1305, 1306.

Amez Deu et justise et pais,
Si regneroiz a toz jorz mais.

Ll. 1499, 1500.

Qui le mal fait et le bien faint
Ne dessert mie que Deus l'aint.

In ll. 733, 734 he makes a pun, by merely omitting a letter :

Mout devriens avoir l'arc chier,
Et mout devons amer l'archier.

Observe the parallelism in the above quotation and in the following one, ll. 1170–1172, where chiasm also appears :

Qui leauté aime et covoite,
Qui het pechié et felonie
Bien doit avoir haute baillie.

Our writer is alive to the etymological meaning of words :

Ll. 1196, 1197. Jhesu Criz an estes nomez :
Ce est sauverres ancrésmez.

¹ The passage, ll. 1509–1540, is too long for quotation.

The following lines, 777, 778, occur after a couplet containing the names of SS. Savinian and Potentian :

Selon lor nons la vertu orent,
Qu'anbedui sorent mout et porent.

A proverb appears to receive a new turn in ll. 1511, 1512 :

N'est mais esposée le roi,
Qu'an son anel n'a que le doi.

In an earnest passage upon the duty of earthly rulers and the shortness of life, an unusual word is used, *cergie* or *cergiée*, to express the duration or time of a taper's burning. It is not found in Godefroy, nor have I found it elsewhere :

Ll. 1297, 1298. Vie d'ome est si abregiée
Que ce n'est mes qu'une cergiée.

We see in many other places also not a little skill and some originality. Yet we cannot claim for him a high place among poets. His limitations are plain. Nevertheless, tho his art and *esprit de suite* are open to criticism, we cannot withhold admiration for something far more important. He shows courage and humanity in standing for an unpopular cause: toleration for the Jew and the Turk. The passage, ll. 839-848, deserves quotation :

Deus comanda, n'an dotez mie,	A que nos alons au besoing.
Des Jueus que nus nes ocie ;	Autretel poons des Turs dire :
Ainz les laissons antre nos vivre,	Por ce les suefre nostre Sire,
Por ce qu'an lor loi sont li livre	Qu'a aus poons nos aparçoivre
De nostre foi et li tesmoing	De quel vilté nos somes soivre.

Attentive reading of the *Eructavit* affords no means of identifying the writer. We must continue to call him, as did Prosper Tarbé, *l'Anonyme de St. Pierre-le-Vif*. We must grant that he shares the current thought of his age in speaking of *li Juif contralieus*, ll. 127-133, and of the caviling Jew in ll. 1158-1179. But it is a pleasure to be able to credit him with sentiments of toleration so far in advance of his time.

II. THE POEM'S CONTENTS AND PLAN.

In the outline here offered, three things are sought: to state in order the themes and substance of the various divisions; to give in their places the verses or phrases of the Latin Psalm which serve as headings in most of the manuscripts; to note the number of lines in each division.

• The address to the patroness and the announcement of the poet's purpose: to turn from Latin into Romance the Psalm that the Church says on Christmas day in the morning. Ll. 1-20.

Introduction, first part: David as a minstrel at heaven's gate, desiring to celebrate the Incarnation.

As a king, preparing for his son's marriage, sends word to his lords and causes minstrels to sing and play, so God by the prophets heralded the coming of his Son.

David, one of the prophets, composed this song. He offered himself as *jongleur* long before the marriage of God and the Church, announced by the angel Gabriel. David, sitting like a real penitent, was given a vision. An angel led him to heaven's door, but it was closed by Adam's fall. Abashed, yet eager to enter, David, instead of calling, plays his viol and begins this song: "*Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum; dico ego opera mea regi.*" Ll. 21-204.

Introduction, second part: Dialog between David, asking entrance and offering his song, and a Voice from within, refusing.

"If admitted, I should play the viol, with the words, and receive great reward from the King:"

'Lingua mea calamus scribae, velociter scribentis.'

"Tell me not to write it. The tongue, impelled by the heart, will express it better . . . Let me wait at the door till the King come forth Open the door a little, that I may look in."

The angel lifts him up. He finds heaven's door open. With joy

beyond compare he gazes in at the marriage, prepares his viol, draws the bow and begins the words, singing of the King and the Queen nine verses each. Ll. 205–366.

The King's beauty.

Speciosus forma pre filiis hominum.

Fairer than any creature are you, O King. In this beauty is spiritual might.

Diffusa est gratia in labiis tuis.

Beautiful is your mouth; your voice, comforting and persuasive.

Propterea benedixit te Deus in eternum.

Beautiful shall you be in the manger, at your baptism in the Jordan, in your miracles, in blessing the bread, on Calvary, at the resurrection and ascension. Ll. 367–488.

The King's sword and its power.

Accingere gladio tuo super femur tuum, potentissime.

David longs to see accomplished what God has decreed, and begs the King to take without delay his sword. This has power to separate the sinner from his sin, even from hatred. Ll. 489–544.

David's praise of the King's twofold beauty.

Specie tua et pulchritudine tua.

His sinless, human beauty draws to him all the world. His divine beauty sustains angels and feeds saints. His sweetness,—for him to whom God gives to see it,—infinitely surpasses worldly joy. Ll. 545–564.

David's appeal to the King to begin his reign.

Intende, prospere, procede et regna.

David appeals coaxingly to the King: "All men great and small desire your coming. We, your messengers, have summoned angels, men, and all the world to praise you." Ll. 565–586.

The King's three marks or attributes.

Propter veritatem et mansuetudinem et justitiam; et deducet te mirabiliter dextera tua.

David reminds the King of his truthfulness, his pity and justice. "You have promised to keep your covenant with Israel. Your

second mark is pity, shown to the humble and penitent. Relying on your third manner, we pray that justice be done us upon the devil, who overpowers or cajoles us sinners. Ll. 587-668.

The King's bow and arrows.

Sagittae tuae acutae, populi sub te cadent, in corda inimicorum regis.

David has delayed speaking of the King's arrows and of his bended bow. In this verse he teaches their meaning.

The wood of the bow was the Old Law. The King made it mild. He put on the string, the Gospel, which bends the Law to send forth the arrows, the apostles.

From Jerusalem the King shoots all about to fulfil his truth. To Lombardy and Rome he shoots St. Peter and St. Paul; to France, right to Sens, two arrows, St. Savinian and St. Potentian. He shot everywhere. All the earth, from the sunrise to Ireland, was conquered. But the Turks and Jews he left. "Many an evil he suffered for our good." Ll. 669-874.

The King's throne and scepter.

Sedes tua, Deus, in seculum seculi: virga directionis virga regni tui.

The throne stood on four firm feet in the fairest spot of paradise. A mighty baron holds each foot, supporting the king and bearing him about: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel. At their sides, four beasts, each having form according to his *senefiance*. These are the evangelists: Matthew by Isaiah, Luke by Jeremiah, Mark by Daniel, John by Ezekiel.

Now let us hear how the King has himself carried about. He is seated in the Holy Church, which wishes to endure and fight till judgment day. These prophets and evangelists make the King known to all ages.

The King's scepter is his justice. It is the guiding rod wherewith the father chastises the son whom he loves. Ll. 875-1163.

The righteous King anointed. David addresses him.

Dilexisti iustitiam, et odisti iniquitatem: propterea unxit te Deus, Deus tuus, oleo laetitiae prae consortibus tuis.

The honor of the crowning is the lofty theme. A caviling question of the Jew is answered in scripture by David: lordship and honor

are his who loves fealty, hates sin and baseness. Therefore the Son of God is exalted above angels and men.

Of this David speaks : "O Lord, who love righteousness and hate iniquity, God who fills you with his grace anoints you with the Holy Spirit as Savior and King." Ll. 1164-1209.

The King's perfumed garments and the royal handmaids.

Mirra, et gutta, et cassia a vestimentis tuis, a domibus eburneis: ex quibus delectaverunt te filiae regum in honore tuo.

The rich attire, shaped by the Holy Spirit and given to the King by the Queen, was the human form that he took in Our Lady. The sweetness that David smells, the wedding guests receive instead of spiced wine (*pimant*).

The myrrh signifies the death which Jesus Christ suffered in human form, restoring us to life.

The balm shows the anointing of the resurrection day.

The cassia, which thrives in watery places, signifies the true cross which has such power in baptism.

These odors, issuing from the King's garments, draw the soul to adore this Lord so loving. Therefore, David says, noble ladies and maidens hold his service an honor. Nobility is doubled when devoted to God, and baseness is ennobled.

Those who have power, skill of mind, should do what pleases God. For you who hold dominion Solomon the king, divinely inspired, wrote a counsel : "man's life is a taper's duration;" power is a trust which will be continued to the worthy forever. Ll. 1210-1315.

The lovely Queen in her beauteous garments.

Abstitit regina a dexteris tuis in vestitu de aurato: circumdata varietate.

David has spoken of the King's weapons, apparel and beauty. He now speaks of the Queen at his side. She is to him as dawn to sun. Her ornaments excel all that heart can conceive. The King looks fondly upon her. In him she sees her sole delight.

When David sees this divinely prepared marvel and this joy, he determines to sing of the Queen, counseling her to hold fast the joy that it be not lost. Ll. 1316-1351.

David's fatherly admonition to the Church.

Audi, filia, et vide, et inclina aurem tuam: et obliviscere populum tuum, et domum patris tui.

David speaks to the Church as to his daughter, in her instructing every Christian soul.

"Hearken now, daughter. Believe what all the prophets said, promising thy Savior whose liege lady thou shouldst be."

"Daughter, before birth thou wast betrothed to him. See if God has not done what he promised. Is there duke, king or count like him who asks thy love? He maintains in their brightness sun, moon and sky."

"Deceive not thy heart. Sincere love is all the King asks of thee. Joyful must thou be, friend of the heavenly King. He has dominion over all."

Ll. 1352-1472.

David's fatherly admonition to the Church, concluded.

Et concupiscet rex decorem tuum: quoniam ipse est Dominus, Deus tuus, et adorabunt eum.

David, having instructed the Church how she must conduct herself in tender love to the King, desires also to promise great reward that she may cheerfully await his coming.

"Daughter, if thou love him, the King will love thee. The Holy Spirit will be thy messenger. The Holy Spirit will bear thy message to him. Be not false or feigned."

"Keep thyself from covetousness whereby the devil ensnares both bishops and deacons. Simony will make thee a false wife whose finger only is in the ring. If those who receive high places are worthy men, then thy head will be fair and gentle to all the humble."

"Tho the King delay, fear not; guard thine honor. If erring, fear not to return. For by Jeremiah God assures thee that he is not proud and cruel as men of the world are."

Ll. 1473-1620.

Honor to Mary the Virgin.

Et filiae Tyri in muneribus vultum tuum deprecabuntur: omnes divites plebis.

David foresaw that Saint Mary would be honored and adored.

"You, who shall be both daughter and mother of God, lady high and glorious," says he, "save virginity unimpaired. Nature obeys God. An uncorrupted Man shall be born, the Holy Spirit overshadowing." Ll. 1621-1668.

The Holy Lady's adornments.

Omnis gloria ejus filiae regis ab intus, in fimbriis aureis circumamicta varietatibus.

This verse shows that the Holy Maid was exceeding fair. In her heart, prized by the King above all else, are her ornaments. Good thoughts, prompting good deeds, are her jewels. Ll. 1669-1694.

Adducentur regi virgines post eam : proximae ejus afferentur tibi.

Digression : David's portrayal of judgment ; his warning against pride (53 lines).—The King and Our Lady's glorious train (7 lines).—Digression : the poet's address to the patroness (4 lines).

Ll. 1695-1760.

The King and Queen attended with joy by angels and the saved. The manner of the resurrection. The cause of the angels' joy. The happiness of the saved and their crowns.

Afferentur in laetitia et exultatione : adducentur in templum regis.

By a likeness that David narrates we can understand the great joy that God gives to his own. In this world, when the crown is to be assumed, the king and queen are escorted by lords and people with rejoicing. Such joy as the queen then feels the saved shall have in God's presence.

Say not that I imagine it. For each soul shall have nine angels to embrace and carry him about.

On that high Saturday angels shall go forth seeking souls, clothing them in bodies, bringing them with joy before God, whose train shall thus be made full.

The angels will rejoice because of God's work and pity : He has become of our race and has welcomed us as brothers.

The saved shall not delay serving and honoring him. They shall have crowns of different flowers, each as he deserves. Crowns of precious stones they shall have, causing the wearer,—unlike kings of this world,—no care, no war, no fear of death. Ll. 1761-1904.

The Queen's offspring; the martyrs of the Church.

Pro patribus tuis nati sunt tibi filii: constitues eos principes super omnem terram.

You must set the table for the spiritual feast: David, joyful and divinely inspired, sings three beautiful verses. He goes within, delighted. He determines to sing of the Queen's sons, comforting her.

"With deadly anguish you saw them slain. Now they are lords of paradise, noble martyrs, holy apostles. Like the pains of her who bears a child are your sorrows at their sufferings, when they despised this world."

Ll. 1905-1968.

Memory and gratitude in heaven. Blessed condition of the saved. God their sustenance. Power and meaning of the sacrament. Death overcome.

Memores erunt nominis tui in omni generatione et generationem.

All those in paradise will have in sense and in memory that God has delivered them from destruction. Praise will be their employment. Boundless knowledge, untrammelled power of motion, no need of food, no bodily ill, shall be theirs. God will be their food. The sacrament teaches this. "Death, now do whatsoever thou canst, for thou thyself shalt die!"

Ll. 1969-2050.

Universal praise to God. Joy surpassing thought.

Propterea populi confitebuntur tibi in eternum; et in seculum seculi.

David says that all will join in praising the Lord. Each one utters "his good word in sweet melody," none saying too much or too little. Of this joy and praise, which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, the Apostle Paul tells us.

Ll. 2051-2079.

Closing words on the purpose of David's psalm. Ll. 2080-2087.

Epilogue or final address to the patroness. Ll. 2088-2109.

The added poem: the martyred Isaiah's thirst miraculously quenched; his efficacious prayer recommended; the prayer, addressed to the three Persons of the Trinity.

Ll. 2110-2177.

Nearly all the complete copies of the *Eructavit* (MSS. A, I, N, E, C, D, F, G) end with this added poem, which follows the address to the patroness without any apparent separation. It is lacking only in MS. H and in the incomplete MSS. K, J, L and M. The question arises: Is it authentic; that is, did the author include it in his composition?

Unfavorable to its authenticity are three circumstances, which, however, admit of explanation:

First, line 2080, *ci endroit faut Eructavit*, may indicate, not the end of the entire composition, but only the end of its main portion, the poet's alleged translation of David's psalm. For his sense of proportion leads him to end, as he had begun, with a brief statement, ll. 2071–2100, of the purpose of his composition and with an address to his patroness. Last of all he puts what is "in place of the *Gloria*."

Second, the last and essential part of this addition, ll. 2131–2168, the prayer or doxology without the narrative transition, is found attached to another poem, a metrical version of Solomon's Song.¹ Of that composition, written probably between 1176 and 1181, only one copy exists, dating from the thirteenth century. The added poem in question seems less likely to have originated there than here at the close of the *Eructavit*. For, altho this addition is in the same meter as the body of the poem, it is there preceded by another addition in different meter, a version of the *Stabat Mater*.

Third, the first line, *Une douce proiere i a*, seems at first a disclaimer of authorship. But the impersonal turn would appear demanded by the riming word *Gloria* in the next line.

Favorable to its authenticity are the following circumstances, which appear weightier, altho not perhaps decisive.

The triple division of the added poem (the divine names serving as headings) would seem an attempt to conform this last part to the main poem.

Further, this addition is found in all complete copies of the *Eructavit* except one, as stated above; in other words, in two of the

¹See Bonnard's *Traductions de la Bible en vers français au Moyen Age*, 152–162.

three classes into which, as Professor T. A. Jenkins informs me, the mss. fall. Besides, the language shows general agreement with that of the main poem.

Finally, the poet's words, ll. 2101–2102,

Une douce proiere i a
Qui est an leu de *Gloria*,

show that it is used with a purpose: it is to serve as the *Gloria* after the psalm. The strength of his purpose appears in the miraculous incident serving as transition,¹ and renders him insensible even to the anachronism of ascribing to the prophet Isaiah a prayer that is in the Christian form.

I suggest therefore that not only the transition passage, ll. 2101–2130 (the story of Isaiah's thirst miraculously quenched and the recommendation of the prayer as efficacious), but also the prayer or doxology that follows, ll. 2131–2168, should be considered at least as included by compilation or adaptation in our poet's production, perhaps even as original with him.²

¹ The reader may judge of this by seeing the passage itself, ll. 2101–2120, which is here quoted :

Une douce proiere i a	Quant li soierre s'arestoit
Qui est en leu de <i>Gloria</i> ,	Prist le prophete une granz sois ;
Si est estraite d'Ysaïe,	Mes por ce que li cuiverz rois
Qui apela Deu en aïe	Ne soffri qu'an li donast boivre,
Quant li crués rois Manassés	Deu comança a remantoivre.
Qui par linage estoit ses niés	Par cez paroles le proia
Le traist de Iherusalem fors	Et Damedés li anvoia
Si le soia parmi le cors.	Un fil d'iaue devers le ciel,
Por le tormant qui graindre fust	Soëf et douce come miel.
La sie fist feire de fust.	Si tot come il l'ot aalee
En cel angoisse ou il estoit,	Si en fu l'ame a Deu alee.

This is immediately followed by a recommendation of the prayer, as still efficacious, —“whoever on Friday mornings says it in Romance or in Latin, is never overtaken by sin,”—and then begins the prayer, *Merci de moi*, etc.

² In his brief notice of the Madrid ms., *Bulletin de la Société des anciens Textes français*, 1878, 50, P. Meyer quotes two passages of the *Eructavit*, the second of which is from this added poem.

In leaving this discussion of the poem's contents and plan we must admit that the writer does not consistently adhere to his purpose. This was, at the beginning, ll. 353-364, to represent David as singing to the King and Queen in turn nine verses each.

He had the same Latin text of the Psalm, it seems, that the printed copies of the Vulgate have contained since 1592. The division into verses was practically the same. The first verse, altho expounded at length by Augustine and other commentators, our writer leaves untouched, recognizing probably that it is merely a title. From the two halves of the second verse he gets the headings for his introduction, separating it into two parts. Then by dividing verses 3 and 8 he is able to command the required number of verses to serve as headings for the body of his poem. The verses are sometimes distributed in phrases or clauses. In two cases more than one verse is used as a heading. We may grant that he has fulfilled the purpose announced to use *De chascun .ix. vers entiers*, employing rather freely, with a poet's license perhaps, his terms and his texts.

But the other part of his plan, direct address by David, he is far from carrying out. He neglects it in about half of the poem, and apparently contents himself with addressing the reader. In one passage of transition, ll. 1749-1752, he addresses *ma dame*, the patroness. Probably, however, it is the poet's skill that leads him to avoid direct address in the long passages about the King's arrows, ll. 663-868, and throne, ll. 869-1154. Apostrophes of such length would be difficult to manage.

At several points the poet indulges in a digression, as my outline shows. In other places, toward the close, he introduces material that seems irrelevant. But he thus rounds out a composition which like many produced at that period, is not distinguished for organic unity. On the other hand one omission on his part must be noted. He fails to comment on one phrase of verse 9, *a domibus eburneis*,¹

¹ The poet's failure to comment on this phrase indicates, I think, that he had not within reach Jerome's exposition of Ps. XLIV, (which is also addressed to a lady), *Epistola LXV ad Principiam*. For here the comment is so in the line of our poet's quaint fancy that he would almost certainly have used it, if it had been known to him. Jerome says :

altho the heading contains it in all the complete copies and most of the commentators explain it. In l. 1578 an anachronism is committed. Here David is made to quote Jeremiah, mentioning him by name, contrary to the poet's custom.

III. THE MATERIALS OF THE POEM.

This part of my study was begun with the theory that the *Eructavit* is a translation of some extended comment on Psalm XLIV; that the poet's task was, as he says, ll. 15-20, 139-144, to turn Latin into Romance verse. Search was therefore made for an original among the earlier commentators.

The most important expositions of Psalm XLIV, written before our poet's time, are those of Augustine, Jerome, Cassiodorus, the Venerable Bede, Haymo of Halberstadt, Radbertus Paschasius, Bruno of Würzburg, Bruno of Köln or perhaps of Monte Cassino, and Peter Lombard. These and many other authors of devout works were consulted by me, but nothing like systematic translation or paraphrase was found to have been made from them. Passages here and there were identified, but to no great extent.

The first long passage of the *Eructavit* that I was able with confidence to refer to an earlier writer was that on the King's arrows, ll. 663-868; and this not to any of the comments on Psalm XLIV, but to Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*, XIX and XXXIV. For nowhere does this writer offer a general exposition of the psalm in question. It became plain on further search that Gregory, as usual modifying and extending the ideas of Augustine, must be called our poet's master rather than any other single writer. Yet there is no continuity of imitation, no systematic borrowing even here.

I abandoned therefore the theory entertained at the start, becoming convinced that the poet's claim, in ll. 15-20, 139-144, to be a mere translator into verse is a matter of literary convention, intended

Laetificabis eum *de domibus eburneis* sive ut melius in Hebraico scribitur, *de templo dentium*; et laudes Domino canes, totaque saeculo mortua, angelorum imitaberis choros.

probably to render his composition more acceptable and authoritative.¹ He is certainly a translator in many passages, and from the Latin too. But his expressions about putting into Romance the poem written by David and used by the Church on Christmas morning mean merely that his production is based on Psalm XLIV of the Vulgate. It furnishes him a general theme and a series of texts, which he treats according to the fanciful, allegorical style of his patristic masters and of his own time.

The author of the *Eructavit* draws from many sources, some of which I cannot identify. Probably much of his material is the commonplace of medieval clerical thought. Some of it is often found in several writers, who may have been accessible. We may safely assume that there was some growth in the library of St. Pierre-le-Vif in the fifty years that followed 1123. We may assume also that occasionally in the *scriptorium* or cloister, the memory of a fellow-monk furnished a quotation or a thought which the poet was able to use without consulting any book.

His manner of handling materials borrowed from others is by no means servile. Whether he deals with generally current thought or something that clerks only know, the poet puts into it something of his own. He at least chooses, arranges or expands in his own way. Perhaps his use, ll. 140, 146 and 359, of the words *afaitier* and *agencier*, indicates sufficiently his method.²

¹Such a claim is very commonly made by Old French poets. For examples see Völker (*Zeitschrift f. rom. Philologie*, x, 485 ff.) on the word *Romance*.

Compare the words of Chrétien de Troyes at the beginning of *Guillaume d'Angleterre* and, more particularly, of *Le chevalier de la charette*. In the latter case, after crediting Marie of Champagne with *la matiere et le sans*, he promises, it would seem, to carefully refrain from putting into his task anything but labor and thought:

Et il s'antremet
De panser si que rien n'i met
Fors sa painne et s'antancion.

So too the rather wide liberty exercised as translator by Petrarch, and defended by him upon the authority of Horace, appears in his Latin version of Boccaccio's *Griselda*. See Robinson and Rolfe's *Petrarch*, pp. 191-193.

²On the meaning of *afaitier* as used of translation into verse, see the beginning of Pierre's *Bestiaire*, which he prepares "sans rime tot selonc le latin que Fisiologes uns

For instance, the idea of David as *joculator Dei*, one naturally arising from that of the psalm as a marriage-hymn¹ is expressed more fully by Haymo of Halberstadt and by Peter Lombard than by other expositors. I quote from both, putting in parallel column some extracts from the introduction of the poem to show that the poet expresses the same thought and also how he handles it:

Peter Lombard, Migne, cxcI, 437. *Eructavit*, extracts from ll. 80-306.

Propheta ergo, quasi ad has
nuptias intromitti desiderans, ut sibi
aperiatur, se velle sponso cantare,
ait :

Eructavit cor meum, etc.

Haymo, Migne, cxvi, 347.

In duobus primis versiculis utitur
similitudine joculatoris, intrare vo-
lentis, ad nuptias, et captantis
benevolentiam janitoris, praevidens
Christi et ecclesiae nuptias, volens
cantare de eis, et quasi intromitti,
parat sibi auditores, dicens se fecisse
cantilenam de nuptiis, et velle can-
tare regi.

Uns des prophetes fu David . . .

Si poroffri il son servise

As noces Dé et sainte eglise . . .

Mes la porte trova il close

Por ce que n'osa apeler,

Si comança a viëler :

A la corde toche l'arçon,

S'ancomance ceste chançon :

Eructavit cor meum

Ancore parole a son huissier,

Si le comance a losangier :

“ Biau sirë, .i. po me conforte :

Por Dé antrueve moi la porte

Se je leanz antrez estoie,

Avec les moz viëlerioie.

Juglerre sui, sages et duiz ;

Se le roi plaisoit mes deduiz,

Ce sai je bien que les sodées

Me seroient mout granz donées

Ma chançon vuel dire le roi.”

In either of these Latin quotations, especially in the longer one, altho the shorter is the more dramatic, we see the figure that shapes

des bons clers d'Athènes traita,” at his patron's wish, “porce que rime se velt afaitier de mos concueillis hors de vérité.” Mann's *Der Bestiaire divin* des Guillaume le Clerc, *Französische Studien*, vi, 304.

¹The term *epithalamium* is applied to Psalm XLIV by Augustine, Cassiodorus, Bede, Haymo, Radbertus Paschasius and Peter Lombard in their comments. The expression, *chançon de chambre*, used in l. 2075 (see below) seems intended as a translation. I have found it nowhere else.

even in minute details the animated introduction of the poem, ll. 21–204, 205–366. The extracts, in the arrangement of which I have taken some liberty with the order, show the spirit and form of this introduction fairly well. Here as elsewhere, the poet uses borrowed material with freedom: much of it he puts into a dialog; he uses the device of a vision; he makes David the prophet and singer of the marriage. In the latter point, which is insisted on from beginning to end of the *Eructavit*,¹ he is like Radbertus Paschasius.²

It may be said that the poet's method of collecting material is eclectic,—*il prend son bien où il le trouve*,—also that he is original rather than servile in employing it. Further, he seldom notifies the reader when the thought is borrowed and almost never gives credit by name. The few exceptions to this rule have to do with the Bible, and will be treated farther on. The poet's own personality is kept out of sight: he is anonymous, almost impersonal. He makes his authorities share in the same studied reserve. Let us grant, however, that, altho his influence might be increased by the great names which complete frankness would have led him to mention, his art has done well to keep them back. They are indeed too numerous to mention. His pages would bristle with names; for his poem, like the *Roman de la Rose*,³ draws from many different writers.

Let me now show where the poet appears indebted to the great Fathers of the Church, Augustine and Gregory the Great. Both

¹ At the very close, ll. 2071–2076, just before the final address to the patroness, the poet takes leave of his work:

Ci androit faut <i>Eructavit</i> ,	Le fondemant de nostre foi.
Li biaux saumes le roi David,	Chançon de chambre l'apela,
Ou Damedés nos mostre au doi	Einsi com Deus li revela.

As early in the poem as l. 82, David is introduced as the divinely inspired author of what our poet presents in translation:

Ceste chançon que j'ai escrite
Trova il par saint esperite.

² Migne, cxx, 993.

³ See Langlois, *Les sources du Roman de la Rose*. His conclusions appear to be accepted (*Romania*, xxi, 435), altho on pp. 21, 23 he seems in error concerning the husband of Marie of Champagne.

may be called his masters, tho the latter probably receives oftener the tribute of imitation.

In the first passage to be indicated Augustine alone must have the credit of having attracted the poet. It is the fine outburst about the Lord Beautiful, from Augustine's *Enarratio in Ps. XLIV*, parag. 3, B. C. This eloquent passage is well handled in ll. 393-482. Some lines and phrases of the poem set side by side with the Latin will make plain the fact that Augustine's thought is used and with skill :

Augustine, *Enar. in Ps. XLIV*, 3. Extracts from ll. 393-482, *Eructavit*.

Nobis ergo jam credentibus, ubique	Et bele iert la senefiance . . .
sponsus pulcher occurrat. Pulcher	Quant li ange se mosterront . . .
Deus, Verbum apud Deum : pulcher	Biaus seroiz et sans nul teche
in utero virginis, ubi non amisit	Lorsque vos gerroiz an la creche,
divinitatem, et sumpsit humanita-	Quant la grant biauté ou vos estes
tem : pulcher natus infans Verbum ;	Aparcevront les mues bestes.
et cum esset infans, cum sugeret,	Vostre aparicions iert bele,
cum manibus portaretur, coeli	Que l'estoile vendra novele . . .
locuti sunt, Angeli laudes dixerunt,	Que les .iii. rois aconduira . . .
Magos Stella direxit, adoratus est	Quant la virge relevera
in praesepe, cibaria mansuetorum.	Qui au tanple vos offerra,
Pulcher ergo in coelo, pulcher in	Bele iert cele processions . . .
terra . . . pulcher in miraculis,	Sera vostre biautez mout granz
pulcher in flagellis ; pulcher invi-	Quant vos feroiz les morz revivre . . .
tans ad vitam, pulcher non curans	La voire croiz iert li autex
mortem : pulcher deponens animam,	Ou recevra li pere Dex
pulcher recipiens ; pulcher in ligno,	De vostre bel cors l'offerande . . .
pulcher in sepulcro, pulcher in	Aprés la resurrection
coelo.	Seroiz biaus a l'ascension . . .

In the lines upon the eagle as the symbol of the Evangelist John, a thought occurs that Augustine expresses completely in the beginning of *Tractatus xxxvi*, *In Evangelium Joannis*, and partially in the first sentence of *Tractatus xx* of the same work. The poet reproduces the fuller form, but changes the figure :

Augustine, *Tract. xxxvi*,*In Ev. Joan.**Eructavit*, ll. 1047-1060.

In quatuor evangeliis . . . Joannes apostolus, non immerito secundum intelligentiam spiritualem aquilae comparatus, altius multoque sublimius aliis tribus erexit praedicationem suam . . . et de Domini divinitate, quomodo nullus alius, est locutus. Hoc ructabat quod biberat. Non enim sine causa de illo in isto Evangelio narratur, quia et in convivio super pectus Domini discumbebat. De illo ergo pectore in secreto bibebat : sed quod in secreto bibit, in manifesto eructavit . . .

Sainz Jehanz, qui ce nos conta,
Fu l'aigle qui si haut monta,
Si ot li rois haut conseilier.
Mout li presta riche oroilier
A la Ceine ou il recina
Quant sor son piz son chief clina.
Mout ot cele ore bon repos,
Que toz li monz estoit enclos
An cel oroilier qu'il avoit :
C'est el piz Dé qui tot savoit.
Bien dut le soir dormir soëf
Quant a son chavet ot la clef
Qui la gloire Deu li ovri
Et son tresor li descovri.

We come now to portions of the poem that show indebtedness to both Augustine and Gregory.

A long and striking passage of the *Eructavit* is a highly allegorical explanation of the King's bow and arrows, ll. 663-868. Here is set forth and dwelt upon a thought that was widely current among medieval commentators.¹ Augustine expresses a part of it in his *Enarratio in Ps. VII*, parag. 14. His sentences appear to be in the poet's mind in ll. 673, 703, 704, 717-719 and many more. We may judge by putting the two side by side :

Arcum ergo istum, Scripturas sanctas libenter acceperim, ubi fortitudine Novi Testamenti, quasi nervo quodam, duritia Veteris flexa et edomita est. Hinc tanquam sagittae

Li fuz de l'arc fu la viez lois . . .
La sainte evangile qu'il dist,
Ce fu la corde qu'il i mist. . . .
Justise vers pitié ploia,
Quarrius et darz nos anvoia . . .

¹ The following writers employ the same figure for substantially the same thought : Jerome, *Ep. LXV ad Principiam* ; Cassiodorus, Bruno of Köln or Monte Cassino, Haymo of Halberstadt, and Bruno of Würzburg on Ps. vii ; Peter Lombard on Ps. XLIV.

emittuntur Apostoli, vel divina	Li apostre qui Deu oïrent
praeconia jaculantur.	Et si dïciple qui le virent
	Sont les saïetes qu'il anvoie.

A supplement, as it were, to the above occurs in Augustine's *Sermo* 298, parag. 2. It ends as quoted below, and may be compared with ll. 726-733 of the poem :

Quibus sagittis factum est quod	Mout est soés et douz cist fers
sequitur, <i>Populi sub te cadent.</i>	Qui si perce le cuer del vandre
Bona sunt talia vulnera. Vulnus	Que nus ne set quant il i antre.
amoris salubre est.	Buer est nez cui cil fers ataint :
	C'est li cos don nus ne se plaint.

Gregory the Great, as already stated, nowhere expounds Ps. XLIV as a whole. In various passages, however, of his expository works and his homilies he comments upon the King's bow and arrows as the Scriptures applied in preaching. He differs from Augustine, whose authority had no doubt made the figure well known, in dwelling upon it at greater length and in not expressly saying, but only implying that the arrows signify the Apostles and the preachers of the Gospel as well as their messages. He agrees with Augustine in the allegory of the bow and the cord: the severity of the Old Testament bent and mitigated by the grace of the New. The passage is too long to quote.¹

As stated above, we may safely conclude that the book so briefly mentioned by Clarius (*Hinc sequitur Paterius in VIII volumine*) was the well known *Liber Testimoniorum* of Gregory's secretary, Paterius; and that it served our poet, according to the long prevalent custom, as a ready manual of reference for Gregory's comments on the books of the Bible in order.

With the aid of Paterius the poet probably found the alleged passage² from Gregory's *Homil. IX in Ezechielem*. Or Paterius may

¹ It is found in the *Moralia in Job*, XIX. See Migne, LXXVI, 133, 134.

² The term *alleged* is here used because, as the editor acknowledges in a foot-note (Migne, LXXIX, 866), the passage cannot be identified in Migne's text of the homily itself which Paterius claims to quote from.

have furnished him almost the same material in comments upon Ps. VII, 13; LXXVI, 19, found in the *Moralia in Job*, XIX, and referred to above. In the latter case Paterius has not quoted the passage in full. In both cases the arrows are interpreted as representing, not the preachers, but their messages.

Two other comments, enforced by this figure and not found in Paterius, are those of *Moralia in Job*, VII and XXXIV.¹ The former, quoting Is. LXVI, 19 (*ad gentes in mare, in Africam, et in Lydiam . . . in Italiam, in Graeciam*) implies the going forth of messengers as well as their words. It may have prompted in the poet's mind the idea of the apostolic "spheres of influence," which he carries out with so much detail, ll. 750-826, following in general the tradition recorded by Isidore, *De ortu et obitu patrum*, 133.

The poet shows some originality and a medieval thoroughness in allegorizing, in explaining the feather on the arrow, which neither of his masters had mentioned. The following are the lines, 720-722:

Et la pane qui les convoie,
Sainz Esperites qui les maine,
Qui lor done force et alaine.

Upon verse 7 of the Psalm, that is upon the King's throne and scepter, the poet gives us nearly three hundred lines. Most of this long passage deals with the four great prophets, each attended by a beast at one of the four feet of the throne. The beasts symbolize the Evangelists. Here Gregory furnishes much material, a little of which suffices the poet. The beasts or living forms are not assigned according to Augustine, *In Joannis Evangelium, Tractatus XXXVI*, 5,² the lion for Matthew and the man's likeness for Mark; but according to Gregory's Fourth Homily on Ezekiel: the man's likeness for Matthew, the lion for Mark, the ox for Luke and for John the eagle,—the symbols used by Jerome also, *Expositio Quatuor Evangeliorum, Prologus*.

¹ See Migne, LXXV, 769 and LXXVI, 728.

² Leonem pro rege positum . . . propter potentiam . . . Haec persona tributa est Matthaeo. Lucas autem . . . vitulo deputatus est . . . Marco homo . . . assignatus est. Restat aquila: ipse est Joannes.

Here the poet must have looked beyond Paterius,¹ for the latter repeats only a part of Gregory's comment on Ez. i. The whole is found in *Moralia in Job*, xxxi,² and shows that Paterius omits the only name used by Gregory, that of John. At the beginning of Gregory's *Fourth Homily on Ezekiel*³ occurs a more detailed exposition of Ez. i, 10, with assignment by name of the four Evangelists.⁴ The few lines which indicate the characteristic of each Gospel and suggest the symbolic animal for each writer seem to serve the poet as material for his outline of the long passage, ll. 875-1160. From the following extracts it may be clearly seen that he mentions the Evangelists in the order indicated by Gregory's descriptive phrases and with the same thought in each case, both in regard to the writers of the Gospels and in regard to the acts of the Savior's life therein related :

Gregory, *Moralia in Job*, xxxi.

Eructavit, extracts from ll.
902-1080.

<p>Et quamvis singula ad unumquem- que evangelistam convenient, (dum alius humane nativitatis ordinem ; alius per mundi sacrificii mactationem, quasi vituli mortem ; alius potestatis fortitudinem, quasi leonis clamorem insinuat ; alius nativita- tem verbi intuens, quasi ortum solem aquila aspectat), possunt tamen haec quatuor animalia ipsum suum caput cuius sunt membra signare. Ipse namque homo est, quia naturam nostram veraciter</p>	<p>Sainz Mathieus fu sor Isaïe, Si ot d'ome vis et figure : Por ce que l'umaine nature Que li rois prist an la pucele . . . De l'autre part . . . Ot une samblance de tor : Sainz Luques sor Saint Jeremie . . . Le vrai sacrefiement, Que Damedés li rois feroit. Sainz Mars ot samblant de lioncel Si estoit sor Saint Daniël. An la vangile le meist . . . N'i a celui qui miauz vos die</p>
---	---

¹ Migne, LXXIX, 983.

² Migne, LXXVI, 625.

³ Migne, LXXVI, 814-816.

⁴ Quod enim quatuor haec pennata animalia sanctos quatuor Evangelistas designent, ipsa unius cuiusque libri evangelici exordia testantur. Nam quia ab humana generatione coepit, jure per hominem Matthaeus ; quia per clamorem in deserto, recte designatur per leonem Marcus ; quia a sacrificio exorsus est, bene per vitulum Lucas ; quia vero a divinitate Verbi coepit, digne per aquilam significatur Joannes, etc.

suscepit ; et vitulus, quia pro nobis	Commant vint Deus de mort a vie.
patienter occubuit ; et leo, quia	Une grant aigle qui haut vole,
divinitatis fortitudinem susceptae	Ce fu mes sire Sainz Jehanz . . .
mortis vinculum rupit ; et ad extre-	Nos mostre que Ezechiël
mum aquila, quia ad coelum de quo	Et Sainz Jehanz ensamble sont . . .
venerat, rediit. Homo ergo nascent-	Ce sont li dui qui plus haut volent,
do, vitulus moriendo, leo resurgendo,	Qui plus parfondement parolent.
aquila ad coelos ascendendo.	

The parallel is less plain in the case of the fourth Evangelist. But it should be remembered that the ascension of Christ has already been celebrated by the poet, ll. 469–488, in a passage that is yet to be treated here.

Before leaving this long and characteristic presentation of the King's throne, moulded by Gregory's idea of the symbolic beasts, let us note a change in the poet's conception. At first, ll. 880–888, he emphasizes the firmness of the four supports :

Li trones sist sor .iiii. piez,	Se ciaus et terre et mers tramblast,
Si fu si fers et atachiez	Ja li sieges ne se crollast,
Que riens ne le peüst mover	Si fermemant estoit assis
Por painne ne por estovoir.	Au plus bel leu de paradis.

But with the mention, ll. 883–888, of the “four barons of great merit,” that is, the prophets, the King is represented as borne about by them on his throne :

Si anbraça chascuns .i. pié.
Cil portent le roi et sostienent,
Avec lui vont partot et viennent.

Near the close of the passage, ll. 1080–1116, the prophets and evangelists bear about the King for his diversion and also to announce him to mankind in all ages. Here a further change is to be noted : the evangelists are no longer merely represented by the symbolical beasts, but they are present and help the prophets in bearing the King, ll. 1091–1094 :

Cil .iiii. et .iiii. ce sont .viii. ;	Le roi desduient et deportent,
Mout bel service li font tuit :	De siegle en siegle le comportent. ¹

The longer connected passages have been referred to their most probable sources. The credit is divided between the two great Fathers of the Church, Augustine and Gregory the Great. In most instances we note that the ideas first uttered by the former were afterwards given by the latter the form and scope in which they became generally current. This is true of the two important passages that I shall discuss next.

The digression on pride, ll. 1695–1748, is based on Eccli. x, 15, *Initium omnis peccati est superbia*. Augustine (*In Epistolam Joannis, Tractatus* VII, 2 ; VIII, 6, 9 ; *In Joannis Evangelium, Tractatus* XXV, 15, 16, and elsewhere) urges the lesson. *Quemcumque enim diabolus superbum fecerit, vincit*, he says, and *Caput omnium morborum superbia est,—quia caput omnium peccatorum superbia*. But Gregory (*Homil. XXXIV in Evang. and Moral. XXXIV*) enlarges upon the same text : he expounds and expands it with the details which the poet uses to a considerable extent. The latter's enumeration of sins is not so complete as that of Gregory, yet he says :

D'orguel viennent maint mauvais	Et maint pechié que nuls ne cuide.
vice,	S'autre pechiez d'orguel ne vient,
Larrecin, murtre et avarice,	C'est li orguiauz qui le sostient.
Et trahisons et homicide	

He seems to add a touch of his own, probably a lurid reminiscence of some contemporary liturgical drama, in the concluding lines, 1738–1741, of the digression on pride :

Li orgueilleus, tuit eslaissié,	Et li deable après bruiant,
S'an torneront aval fuiant,	Tuit livré an peinne vantoire.

The poet's teaching about the lost angels, ll. 1793–1830, who fell by pride and whose loss is repaired by elect men, believing and

¹The poet's own experience may be serving him here : he is employing perhaps a reminiscence of the Pope upon the *sedia gestatoria*, having seen Alexander III thus borne in state while sojourning at Sens.

humble,—this also appears in Augustine (*Enchiridion*, XXIX), but receives in Gregory the form which the poem reflects. The spurious comment of Gregory on I Kings VII: 13, 14¹ speaks of the fallen angels as an order. This expression, taken with his well known teaching of the ninefold organization of the angels, affords the poet ground for his assertion, which he bases on scripture, that there were ten orders in the beginning. His further assertion, that nine angels, one from each order, shall minister to each soul in the resurrection of the just, I cannot refer to its source. Note the following comparison of parts of the passages mentioned :

Gregory on I Kings, VII, 13, 14.

Eructavit, extracts from ll.
1797–1816.

Tunc vero angelorum damna reparantur, cum quidquid de ordine conditorum spirituum, eorum superbia sublata beatitudini fuerat, de electis hominibus adimpletur Urbes sublatae sunt illae perditae multitudines angelorum. Sed tunc redduntur, quando de electa natura humana assumitur, unde quod de angelis periit, suppleatur.

Nos savons par les escritures
Dont les paroles sont seüres,
Que .x. ordres d'anges estoient . . .
L'une . . . contre lui s'enorgoilli . . .
Ses trabucha jusqu'an abisme . . .
Qu'il sont or deable anpenné.
An leu de çaus qui lors chaîrent . . .
Sera li hom qui s'humelie,
Qui bien croit Deu et merci crie ;
Qu'an leu d'orguel iert simpletez
Et douçors et humilitez.

Where Augustine and Gregory seem to furnish the same material, I regard the latter as the poet's master for the reasons that have been advanced and for the following: The general trend of devout thought was along paths trod by Gregory; he was a Benedictine; he was held in especial reverence at St. Pierre-le-Vif, where his head was cherished among the relics until 1628,² and his homilies appear to have been classed in our poet's time with the holy books appointed for reading in the monastery.³

¹ Migne, LXXIX, 213, 214.

² In that year it became the property of the papal see. See *Gallia Christiana*, XII.

³ The library catalog of Clarius thus describes the fourth volume. In IIII, omeliae XL, beati Gregorii, papae, et Actus apostolorum, et VII Epistolae Canonicae, et

In two striking passages of some extent, and in some briefer ones, the poet shows indebtedness to the *Physiologus*, which in that time supplied so much material to devout moralizers. The first evidence of such indebtedness is seen in the thought and form of the conclusion to the poet's fine imitation of Augustine's outburst on the Lord Beautiful. In the last part, ll. 471-482, he thus speaks of the ascension of Christ :

La amont an cele contrée	Cil respondront <i>cum gaudio</i> :
Iert des angles granz l'assanblée ;	<i>Deus potens in prelio</i> !
Mout i sera la joie granz,	Ce iert a dire, tot sanz faile,
Et par defors et par dedanz.	Li rois revient de la bataille :
Quant cil dedanz avront crié :	Ostez la bare, ovrez la porte,
<i>Quis est iste rex glorie ?</i>	Anfers est pris, la morz est morte !

This can be best explained as a successful reproduction of the well known passage of the *Physiologus* on the Lord's resurrection and ascension as symbolized by "the first nature" of the lion.¹

Another passage, concerning the lion directly, concludes that part of the poem which deals with the Evangelist Mark and the prophet Daniel as representing the Lord's resurrection. It is found in ll. 997-1016 :

Daniël par ceste aventure	Ainz se gist morz jusqu'a tierz jor.
Et par les moz de l'escriture	Lors li vient li peres antor,
Tesmoigne la surrection ;	Et quant il li a son tor fait,
Et Sainz Mars au vis de lion	Si s'arestes, si giete .i. brait
Li aiüe a porter le roi.	Sor son faon qu'il trueve mort.
Si vos dirai raison pourquoi :	Por ce qu'il brait et crie fort
Nos trovons, et voirs est provez,	Si an avient une mervoile :
Que quant li lionciaus est nez	Que li faons de mort s'esvoile
Qu'il n'a an lui fun ne alaine,	A la voiz qu'il ot haute et clere,
Ne ne li bat ne pox ne veine ;	Si reconoist et seut son pere.

This application of "the third nature" of the lion has found

Apocalypsis. Haec omnia leguntur a Pascha usque ad Pentecosten. Et in eodem volumine apostoli Pauli Epistolae.

¹ Mann's article cited above, *Französische Studien*, VII, 231.

expression in many medieval writers. A list of parallels is given by Goldstaub-Wendriner,¹ which list, however, does not contain this instance, nor that in the *Physiologus* of Hildebertus,² nor a briefer one in Bartsch's *Chrestomathie Provençale*, 335. At the time of our poet the thought was already a commonplace, altho probably not yet made popular in the translations or adaptations of the *Physiologus* by Guillaume, Gervais and Pierre.³ The Latin version of Origen's comment on Gen. XLIX, 9, in which reference is made to the *Physiologus*, is probably the earliest of allusions to this thought which had so great a fortune. But some materials appear to be furnished to the Christian imagination by one line of Vergil and by certain credulous statements of Pliny.⁴ The *Physiologus* was generally current among clerks and, directly or indirectly, must have prompted the passage. But it may have been modified by Isidore's *Etym.* XII, II, 5, since it states that the whelp, born dead, receives life, not (as the *Physiologus* says) at his father's breathing upon his face but, as Isidore says, *patris rugitu et fremitu tremefactus*. The writer of the *Eructavit* is nowhere a close imitator of his authorities, yet he reminds the reader of Philippe de Thaün's *Bestiaire* and *Li Cumpuz*⁵ in using this modification (which is Origen's as well as Isidore's) and also in his repeated use of the word *senefiance* in pointing the moral.⁶

There are traces in our poem of other devout compositions in the vernacular.⁷ In the introduction, ll. 62–78, we find an allusion to the descent of Christ into hell, which development of I Peter III, 19, is probably due to the Gospel of Nicodemus. To the same work⁸

¹ *Ein Tosco-Venezianisches Bestiarius*, 24, 25.

² Migne, CLXXI, 1217.

³ Mann's article cited above, *Französische Studien*, VI, 201, 302, 304.

⁴ *Georg.* III, 245; *Nat. Hist.* 8, 16, 17.

⁵ Th. Wright's edition of the *Bestiaire*, pp. 80, 81; *Computus*, ll. 1673–1692.

⁶ *Eructavit*, ll. 397, 903, 941, 1142, 2017.

⁷ Attention may be called to a contemporary production marked by similar thought and style, entitled *De David li Prophecie* (ed. Fuhrken, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XIX, 189). The only known copy is dated 1180 and stands side by side with the *Eructavit* in MS. 15606, British Museum. The fact that the two poems were copied in succession by the same scribe may have rendered more striking their natural resemblance.

⁸ Cf. Philippe de Thaün, *Computus*, 30, l. 866, Th. Wright's edition.

may be referred the allusion to Longinus and his spear-thrust, ll. 1258–1259. Philippe's *Bestiaire*, ll. 299–305, contains a statement, upon Augustine's authority, concerning Saturday as the final day of reward for the faithful. The *Eructavit*, ll. 1824, 1825, thus begins to speak of the resurrection of the just :

A cel haut jor de samedi
Sera por voir si com je di

In two passages upon the incarnation, ll. 87–134, 1619–1660,—both developed from Luke I, 35,—are reflected the arguments of Jerome's *Contra Helvidium*, of Ambrose's hymn, *Veni, redemptor gentium*; of Isidore's *De ortu et obitu patrum*; of Radbertus Paschasius in his *De Partu Virginis*. The latter author, it must be remembered, wrote also the longest exposition of Psalm XLIV, as has already been stated. He was a Benedictine, and wrote both productions for devout women living as cenobites. The controversy of our poet's generation upon the person of the Virgin Mary must have brought again into notice his writings and others of like nature. A popular explanation of an unspeakable mystery is perhaps to be recognized in ll. 119–120 :

. . . Deus
An son precieus cors se mist
A la voiz que li anges dist.¹

The poet shows familiarity with the current literary usages of his time, as I have shown ; his style shows, further, that he employs the current phraseology of the poets. Even the compositions in which love is the theme are not unknown to him, as the following passage proves, ll. 1439–1450, where David exhorts the Queen concerning her wifely duties :

¹ The same idea appears in the ancient hymn beginning : *Ave, virgo, mater Christi, Qui per aurem concepisti, Gabriele nuncio*; and in a very much later and different composition, Molière's *L'Ecole des Femmes*, v, 4,—Arnolphe's words to Agnes. For the Latin quotation in this reference I am indebted to Professor F. De Haan, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Aime le roi par fine amor,	Fine amors t'aprendra a faire
S'aneliras de jor an jor ;	Comant tu li porras miez plaïre ;
Et que plus sera l'amors fine	Fines amors viennent de lui
Plus iert la biautez anterine.	Et fins joies com de celui
Fille, aime le roi finemant,	Qui onques d'amer ne se faint,
Nule rien plus ne te demant.	Ne ne demande fors qu'an l'aint.

The reader of the *Eructavit* is frequently reminded, as one would expect, of Chrétien of Troyes as well as of devout authors by the set phrases that serve to round out the line. Many of these they have in common, or at least very similar in form. Most of them are confirmatory in meaning, and stand so as to make the rime.¹

In ll. 461, 462 the poet turns a devout phrase with a word that Chrétien has employed of wholly worldly enjoyment. This is the term *melite*² which the *Eructavit* uses in this couplet of the deliverance from spiritual evil effected by the Lord's resurrection :

Que vos delivërroiz d'Egipte,³
Si les ammanroiz en melite.

The conviction that our poet was familiar with Chrétien of Troyes deepens when such a parallel as the following is noted :

Eructavit, ll. 568-569, 573-574.

Cligés, ll. 6730-6733.

“ Issiez fors, sire, si regniez.	“ Biaux sire, or vos an revenez !
Nos qui vostre message somes . . .	Que tuit vostre baron vos mandent.

¹ Here are those that catch the eye in our poem, mentioned in the order of their occurrence : Si com raconte li escriz ; De ce n'ot il nule dotance ; ce sachiez bien ; qui onques ne manti ; ce li fu vis ; tot sanz faille ; sanz dotance ; por voir ; S'est bien raison que le vos die ; n'an dotez mie ; merci Deu ; Si vos dirai la raison pourquoi ; Nos trovons, et est veritez ; Si com nos le trovons an livre ; suz tote rien ; Conté vos ai, si com je dui ; Antandez moi, si aprenez ; Or escote si com je di ; De ce est il seüre chose ; por verité.

For similar set phrases in Philippe and Guillaume, see Mann's article above cited, *Französische Studien*, VI, 293, 294.

² Upon this obscure word, see Förster's *Erec und Enide*, note to 2358, and *Romania*, XX, 149.

³ A figure for the bondage of sin, used by Augustine (*Sermo* 24, parag. 3) and Gregory (Migne, LXXIX, 187, etc.),—probably a commonplace in our poet's time.

Vos creature vos atendent ; Mout vos desirrent et demandent
Mout vos soaident et demandent." Qu'anpereör vos vuelent feire."

In spite of the much smaller scale of his work, and the difference in subject and vocabulary, our poet shows a strong resemblance in style and rhetoric to Chrétien. In the simpler rhetorical devices they have much in common. For instance, in the use of enumerations, of alliteration, of synonyms, one sees attempted in the *Eructavit* what Chrétien's works employ in such abundance.¹

In conclusion I return to the Bible as, nevertheless, the poet's chief source of material. Those texts which the poet seems to have taken in the form employed by the Fathers of the Church, especially by Augustine and Gregory the Great, have been already pointed out. But it may be said that the whole poem is biblical in tone, and even in thought and words. Numerous instances of quotation or allusion can be pointed out, some of them referring repeatedly to the same text.

Those directly referred to their authors by the poet are few, as will be shown. But there are more than a hundred instances in which biblical thought is used. Sometimes the very words are used in an unmistakable way. Note the following: *Fons hortorum, puteus aquarum viventum*, Cant. iv, 15, seems to be reproduced in ll. 2019: *Sachiez que c'est fontaine et puiz*; and Ps. xxxiii, 11, *Inquirentes autem Dominum non minuentur omni bono*, may be recognized in ll. 2033, 2034:

Qui Deu aime et de lui *anquiert*,
Seürs soit il que miez l'an iert.

Sometimes, altho the decisive words are repeated, the thought is widely divergent, or has become highly figurative.

Certain texts, one should perhaps say certain themes, are favorites with the poet. Thus his expressions upon heavenly joy as superior to that of earth or surpassing thought (ll. 220-224, 1565-1570, 2065-2070) appear to be framed with the help of I Cor. ii, 9 and Is. lxiv, 4. He warns against pride and the abuse of power (ll.

¹ See R. Grosse's treatise, *Der Stil Chrestien's*, *Französische Studien*, I, 218 et seq.

1287 ff., 656–658, 1722 ff.) in terms that suggest Eccli. x, 11 and Sap. vi, 35 as the source.

The Gospels are drawn upon about forty times, that of Luke most frequently. The annunciation and the virgin birth are dwelt on and returned to with predilection. Of the Epistles, that to the Hebrews appears to serve the poet oftenest; next is the First Epistle to Peter; while that to the Romans and that of James are used with equal frequency, seven times each. The Apocalypse about as often supplies the thought.

The Psalms, without counting the one that serves, verse by verse, as the basis of the poem, are quoted oftener than any other Old Testament book. This is not surprising in a poet who is at the same time a Benedictine. The book of Proverbs may be put second; then Genesis; next, with about equal frequency, Solomon's Song and the apocryphal books, *Ecclesiasticus* and *Sapientia*. The apocryphal chapter xiv of Daniel, *Bel and the Dragon*, plainly influences the poet where the Evangelist Mark and Daniel the prophet appear, typifying the resurrection, in ll. 969–972:

Quant il virent Saint Daniël	Antre aus fu tote une semaine,
Si furent simple comme aignel :	Qu'onques n'i ot ne mal ne paine.

The poet shows the Bible an honor not given to the Fathers of the Church, nor to the commentators from whom I have shown that he draws. All these he leaves unmentioned. But four of the biblical writers, besides David who is always before us, are named when quoted: Moses, Solomon, Jeremiah, Paul. In ll. 333–336, Moses commends sincerity and well-doing. The reference is probably to Deut. xxxi, 6–8. The lines in question are:

Moyſes nos dist et ansaingne	A bien faire soient tuit preu,
Que nus el siegle ne se faingne :	Qu'an i puet bien perdre son leu.

In treating the duty of an earthly ruler, ll. 1293–1308, he quotes Solomon's counsel, probably referring to Sap. vi; 2–6, 10, 22, 23. He makes David (see p. 27) quote Jeremiah's comfort to Israel, as an erring wife. The reference is to Jer. iii, 1; the lines are 1578–1612, of which the first four are as follows:

Deus te mande par Jeremie De si cruel ne de si fiere,—
 Qu'il n'est mie de tel maniere,— Comme ces janz del siegle sont.¹

The Apostle Paul is twice quoted by name: at ll. 517–518 and 2065–2066. The scripture alluded to is probably, in one case, Rom. VIII, 1–12; in the other, I Cor. II, 9. The first couplets of the two passages are respectively as follows:

Si croie bien toz jorz les los, De cele joie et de ce los
 Que dist li apostres Sainz Pos . . . Nos dist li apostres Sainz Pos . . .

In this study I have aimed to restore the poet's environment, showing especially the relation of his monastery at Sens to the counts of Champagne. I have presented the plan and outline of the poem with such fulness that it may serve as my interpretation also of the production. I have endeavored besides to show the following as probable:

1. That the poem was presented to the Countess of Champagne at Sens in the Advent season of 1185.

2. That the poet drew from many sources, most of his material coming from Gregory the Great or thru him from Augustine; that devout writings near his own time, and even contemporary secular literature were familiar to him; that his chief indebtedness, however, was to the Bible.

¹ Guillaume's *Bestiaire divin* uses a similar expression in contrasting the devout and the worldly in their conjugal behavior. The following lines show a striking resemblance:

Ne sont mie de tele nature Plusors genz qui el siecle sont . . .

They occur in his passage upon the turtle dove. See Mann's article cited above, *Französische Studien*, VI, 281.

VITA.

I was born at Lima, Ohio, in 1851, son of John and Mary (Kendall) McKibben; graduated in 1870 from the Lima High School; taught in the public schools of Ohio at various times during two years.

All my undergraduate work, except that of the junior year (which was had in the University of Rochester, N. Y.), was done in Denison University, Granville, Ohio, where I received the degree of A. B. in 1875, and in whose Preparatory Department I served from April, 1876, to June, 1879, as teacher of Greek and Latin.

Graduate studies were then pursued during three years: in 1879–1881 at the Baptist Union Theological Seminary, Morgan Park, Illinois, where I had the privilege of Dr. William Rainey Harper's instruction in Hebrew, and experienced the kindness and generous interest that marked him to the end of his life; in Europe, 1881–1882, chiefly at the University of Leipzig.

In September, 1882, I began serving as professor of modern languages at Denison University, and have been occupied since 1892 with the Romance languages only. The year 1891–1892 was spent at Romance studies in Europe, mostly at Paris where I had the privilege of hearing MM. Léon Gautier and Paul Meyer of the *Ecole des Chartes*. In several summer quarters of recent years I have attended courses in the Romance Department of the University of Chicago, enjoying the instruction, among others, of Professors Karl Pietsch and T. A. Jenkins. Their seminars, especially the latter's in 1905, I have attended with marked advantage.