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Abstract

This dissertation analyses the *Vita dei Santi Padri*, the most important collection of medieval vernacular Italian hagiography. This translation of the Latin *Liber Vitapatrium* collection of monastic hagiographies from Late Antique Egypt was completed before 1333 by Domenico Cavalca (d. 1341), a Pisan friar known for his translations and vernacular devotional treatises all written for a lay audience. The VSP has long been called a free translation but so far no one has revealed Cavalca’s *methodus interpretandi* nor related his methods of translation to the enormous success of the work both in comparison to other hagiographical works translated into Italian and also to the other European translations of the *Vitaspatrum*. This dissertation overcomes the methodological hurdles posed by the absence of the Latin manuscripts Cavalca used, the autograph manuscript of the translation into Pisano-Lucchese as well as the overwhelmingly Florentine reception by examining the textual tradition of the Latin sources and an important fourteenth-century Pisano-Lucchese manuscript. An analysis of the prologues to his four translations shows that Cavalca developed a new “pastoral translation,” which ensured that lay audiences could understand and respond to unfamiliar monastic texts. Cavalca broke sharply with medieval traditions of faithful translation and produced a work suited to laity. In the chapter on the Life of Marina, the transvestite saint, by comparing the Latin to the Pisano-Lucchese, I show that the differences are intelligible. I also compare at every step Cavalca’s translation to the Life of Marina in Middle High German, Middle Dutch, various medieval French translations, Middle English, and Old Castilian. I show that these were for the most part faithful
translations which, paradoxically, condemned them to failure among the laity. The key to lay reception of vernacular hagiography was therefore less a matter of language and more of cultural capital. In the third chapter I show that the cult of the hermit saint Onuphrius, long thought to have arrived in Italy at the time of the crusades, was flourishing in the Byzantine south in the 10th century and identify an unnoticed vernacular translation by Cavalca, which bears the characteristic marks of the pastoral translation.
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Chapter 1: The Development of the Pastoral Translation

The conversion of Giovanni Colombini (1304–67), founder of the order of Poor Gesuati, began with a domestic disturbance as we read in his vernacular Life written around 1448 by the Florentine Feo Belcari. A rich and well-connected textile merchant from Siena, Colombini was one of the leading citizens of the city and participated in its government. His younger wife was from an aristocratic background—she came from the de Cerretani family of Siena’s feudal nobility—and their union was blessed by two children, both born within wedlock. A prosperous and worldly man, he paid great attention to increasing his wealth and acting prudently in all worldly matters. For a man such as this, one who was devoted to his work and business, time was money.

One day during the year 1355 he came home from his business eager to eat his lunch quickly so that he could return to his warehouse without wasting any time and thus minimize his absence. Usually when he returned home for lunch, the table was set and the dishes were ready. But this time nothing was ready. Colombini was a merchant with a short fuse. He began to berate his wife and the maid, reproaching both for the lateness of the meal and asserting that for urgent reasons he needed to rush back to his affairs. His wife tried to calm him down, urging him to be patient by telling him that his lunch would soon be ready:

“While I order the food, take this book and read a little.” And she placed in front of him a volume, which contained some lives of female saints. But Giovanni, annoyed, took the book and, throwing it into the middle of the room, said to her, “You have no other thoughts except saints’ lives. As for me, I need to return quickly to my warehouse.” And saying these and many other words, his conscience began to prick him such that he picked up the book from the ground and sat down. When he opened it, there
appeared before him by divine will, the pleasing story of Saint Mary of Egypt, the sinner converted to God through marvelous piety. While Giovanni was reading this, his wife prepared the meal and called him to come to the table at his leisure. And Giovanni said to her, “Now you wait a little until I have finished reading this Life.” Although the narrative was long, because it was full of heavenly melody it began to soften his heart. And he did not want to go away from that reading until he had reached the end. His wife, seeing him read so attentively, considering this matter silently, was very pleased and was hoping it would delight him for the edification of his soul, particularly since he was not accustomed to reading such books. And certainly, with divine grace at work, thus it came to pass, for that story impressed itself in such a way onto his soul that he meditated upon it by night and by day. And in this fixed thought gracious God touched his heart in such a way that he began to despise each of the things of this world and not be so mindful of them; rather, he began to do the opposite of what he was accustomed to. Earlier, he was so tenacious [in holding on to his earnings] that he rarely gave alms and he did not want anyone in his house doing the same. Out of greed he exerted himself to find ways to reduce his payments from the sums he had agreed to. But after the aforesaid salutary reading, in order to take revenge against himself for his avarice, he gave in alms twice whatever was asked of him. And to those who sold him goods, he paid more than the customary amounts due. And thus he began to visit churches, fast often, and give himself over to prayer and to other devout works.¹

¹ “Intanto ch’io ordino le vivande, prendi questo libro, e leggi un poco,’ e posegli innanzi un volume, che conteneva alquante vite di sante. Ma Giovanni scandalizzatosi prese il libro e, gittandolo nel mezzo della sala, disse a lei, ‘Tu non hai altri pensieri, che di leggende; a me convien presto tornar al fondaco.’ E dicendo queste e più altre parole, la coscienza lo cominciò a rimordere in modo che ricolse il libro di terra e posessi a sedere. Il quale aperto, gli venne innanzi per volontà divina la piacevole storia di Maria Egiziaca peccatrice per maravigliosa pietà a Dio convertita. La quale in mente che Giovanni leggeva, la donna apparriè il desinare, e chiamarlo che a suo piacere si ponessi a mensa. E Giovanni le rispose, ‘Aspetta tua ora un poco per infino che questa leggenda io abbia letta.’ La quale, avvevendo che fusse di lunga narrazione, perché era piena di celeste melodia, gli cominciò ad dolcire il cuore; e non volle da quella lezione partire, per infino che al fine pervenisse. E la donna, vedendola così attentamente leggere, tacitamente ciò considerando, n’era molto lieta, sperando che gli gioverebbe a edificazione della sua mente, però che non era già usato a leggere tali libri. E certo, adoperando la divina grazia, così avvenne; però quell’istoria in tal modo gli s’impressè nell’anima che di continuo il di e la notte la meditava. E in questo fisso pensiero il grazioso Iddio gli toccò il cuore in modo che incominciò a disprezzare le cose di questo mondo ch’era usato: imperocché in primo era si tenace che rade volte faceva limosina, nè voleva che in casa sua si facesse; e per cupidità ne’ suoi pagamenti s’ingegnava di levar qualche cosa del patto fatto; ma dopo la detta salutifera lezione, per vendicarsi della sua avarizia, dava spesso due cotanti di elemosino che non gli era addimandato: e a chi gli vendeva alcuna cosa pagava più danari che non doveva avere. E così incominciò a frequentar le chiese, digiunare spesso e a darsi all’orazione e all’ altre opere divote.” Claudio Varese, ed., Prosatori volgari del Quattrocento (Milan: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1955), pp. 9–10.
Belcari tells the story of a profound and total transformation in Colombini’s priorities and attitudes and a change in behavior that reflected this reorientation away from the world and toward God. In this regard, Colombini’s story follows the model of all Christian conversion stories. In their effects, they are all similar—like the happy families in Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*—but in their origins each is unique. In the case of Colombini, reading was the spark that kindled his conversion and thus merits a detailed examination. It is very likely that the book in question was a copy of Domenico Cavalca’s *Vita dei Santi Padri* (VSP), his translation of the *Liber vitas patrum* collection of desert literature from Egypt, the land that was considered the birthplace of monasticism in the Christian west. Let us examine the reasons that make Cavalca’s book the most likely candidate.

First, however, we must take a look at Belcari and his sources for composing the Life. Feo Belcari (1410–1484) was a Florentine citizen of Sienese origin who was a client of the Medici family and who was active in civic government. He translated works from Latin into Tuscan, including two treatises by Jacopone of Todi and the Life of Brother Egidius of Assisi. He was an admirer of the Gesuati order and for their benefit translated additional works, such as the *Pratum Spirituale* by John Moschos. It was for their benefit that he composed the Life of their founder Giovanni Colombini as well as the *Vite di alcuni Gesuati*, biographies of some of the other Gesuati brethren.

In his dedicatory epistle addressed to his patron Giovanni di Cosimo de’ Medici, Belcari informs him of the earlier written sources he had used to compose the Life. The most important of these was the compendium that the Blessed Giovanni Tavelli da Tossignano (1386–1446), Gesuati bishop of Ferrara, composed in Latin around 1425 for
Niccolò Albergati, Cardinal of Santa Croce. This compendium was the prelude to the Constitutions of the Gesuati, and Bishop Tavelli sent the ensemble of texts to the cardinal. The second source mentioned was in fact the earliest biographical sketch of Colombini, which the Sienese notary Cristofano di Gano Guidini composed shortly after Colombini’s death in 1367. Unfortunately, this text in forty chapters written by a devotee of and sometime secretary to Saint Catherine of Siena has not survived. We can perhaps detect a discreet faint positivist disappointment with its primarily moralizing and didactic character when Belcari notes that the author “attended more to preach useful teachings than to narrate his memorable deeds.” Finally, Belcari looked at autograph letters as well as copies in the registers of public notaries for information and “decided for my devotion to weave together a collection of his matters that were worthy of remembrance.” Since Tavelli’s compendium survived, we have the main source used by Belcari. A comparison between the two can therefore help us to understand Belcari’s methods as a hagiographer.

The first question that must be addressed is the nature of the book in question. Belcari claims that this was a volume that contained “alquante vite de’ sante,” or lives of

---

2 See Guerrino Ferraresi, *Il Beato Giovanni Tavelli da Tossignano e la Riforma di Ferrara nel Quattrocento*, vol. 2, pp. 40–54. According to Isabella Gagliardi, Tavelli spoke to Spinello Boninsega, who had known Colombini. Since Boninsega died in 1433 at age 90, he was 24 when Colombini died in 1367. He must have joined the Gesuati at a fairly young age. See Gaspero Olmi, *I Senesi d’una volta: Opera istruttiva e dillettevole in cui alle biografie di tanti grandi che furono veri astri luminosi nel ciel della Chiesa e unito il racconto di molti fatti contemporanei, compresa la descrizione delle feste del giubileo sacerdotal di S. S. Leone XIII* (Siena: S. Bernardino, 1889).


4 However, the Milanese Gesuit Paolo Morigi cites it in his *Paradiso de’ Gesuati* (Venice, 1532). Cited in Varese, *Prosatori volgari*.


female saints. He also tells us that when Colombini opened the book, the Life that appeared was that of Saint Mary of Egypt. Neither of these assertions, however, can be traced to Tavelli’s compendium. This Latin version reads as follows:

On one of those days, when Giovanni had returned home to take his refreshment quickly as was his custom, he saw that neither the table nor the dishes prepared, and he began to complain to his wife and to be troubled in his mind, going on about the lateness. And among his complaints he claimed that he was concerned about urgent matters of business, which demanded speed. Addressing him with mild and soothing words, the woman urged him to hold on a little and said that she would prepare the dishes very quickly. “And in the meantime,” she said, “take up this book and read for a short while in it.” And Giovanni, agreeing with her recommendation, took up the book to be read. When it was opened, the delightful story appeared to him, dense with celestial melody, concerning a certain female sinner converted to God by wonderful piety. While Giovanni read it closely, his wife in the meantime prepared the lunch. And when it was done, she called her husband, saying to him that he could sit down at his pleasure. Giovanni replied to her, “You wait a bit now as long as I peruse eagerly the written story that I have just now begun.” And although in the telling of the narrative it stretched out lengthily, nevertheless by the fullness of its sound, and by its celestial rhythms, it penetrated his soul, and he did not want to turn away from that reading until he had completed it to the end. His wife, quiet and happy, continued observing the presence of the reader and hoped the reading would be beneficial to her husband. Which [benefit], by divine operation, followed after in this way. For the perusals of the reading, with the spirit having breathed from above, were so far impressed on his soul that day and night he considered it in his mind incessantly. After which, with grace having done its work, Giovanni began to condemn each of the slippery things of the world and to relax his concern for those things to which, until recently, he had been bound. He began to distribute his wealth more copiously to the poor, to visit churches, fast frequently, attend prayers, and thus punishing and subjecting his flesh to servitude, he grew toward a love of chastity, upon which he resolved with a firm decision, with the permission of his chaste wife, and he never turned away from this chastity until the end of his life.

7 “Una namque dierum, cum Joannes refectionem suam concite sumpturus domum remeasset, nec cibos mensamque paratos respexisset, ut sibi mos erat, cepit erga conjugem queri, mentemque turbari, illius arguens tarditatem. Inter querimonias etiam allegans solicitari se gerendorum urgentibus causis, quae celeritatem exigerent. Quem mitis mulier, blandis deliniens verbis, ut aequo animo sustinet parum perhortata est, offerens se citsisse mandabilia paraturum. ‘Et tu interim, inquit, codicem hunc capessito, in quo lege paulisper.’ Cujus suasione Johannes acquiescens, legendum volumen exceptit, quo aperto, amoena
Tavelli’s version is much less dramatic than Belcari’s, but all the elements the latter drew on and amplified later are present here. The wife simply hands her husband a book ("hunc codicem") and asks him to read. Belcari specifies that it was a book containing the Lives of some female saints ("vite di alcune sante"). Tavelli refers only to a certain female sinner ("de quadam peccatrice"), whereas Belcari specifies that it was Saint Mary of Egypt. How might Belcari have known these things, and what is their relation to Cavalca’s translation? The first question relates to the language of the book. Was it in Latin or was it in the vernacular? We note that according to Tavelli’s account, the book belonged to Colombini’s wife and that he seemed to be unaware of its presence in his house. We can conclude from this that she was literate, but since Tavelli did not specify the language of the book we do not know whether it was in Latin or in the vernacular. It is unlikely that a married laywoman would be literate enough in Latin to be able to read an entire book in it. The fourteenth-century Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani claims that the number of boys and girls who attended school each year ranged from 8,000 to 10,000.\(^8\) Although the instructional materials, such as psalters, were in

Latin, this would not have engendered literacy in that language.\(^9\) Villani was talking about Florence in the 1330s, and not about Siena, but it would be surprising if the Florentine commitment to some female schooling were not also characteristic of other Tuscan cities.

In Tavelli’s account, the wife gives the book to Colombini to read. We can exclude the possibility that it was in Latin from evidence in two chapters of Belcari’s Life. In chapter 13, we read that Dominic of Montichiello, who was a doctor of laws, translated a book of mystical theology by a Carthusian for Giovanni and his brethren. If Giovanni had been literate in Latin, he would not have required Dominic’s translation. In chapter 49 of Belcari’s Life, we find confirmation that he was *illiteratus*—we read that “[t]he blessed Giovanni did not know either Latin or other learning acquired by study since from the time of his childhood he attended to business.”\(^10\) Therefore, the book given to him by his wife must have been written in the vernacular.

Who was the female sinner whose Life Giovanni read? Given the immediate popularity of Cavalca’s *VSP*, this is the most likely candidate for the book given to Colombini, and it is here that we should look for female sinners. In book IV of the *VSP*, there are a number in this category who may be considered. The first is Mary, the niece of Abraham. After being brought up by her uncle as an anchorite, she was seduced by a monk and, despairing of God’s forgiveness, became a prostitute. She was ultimately discovered by her uncle and brought back to her cell, and he shared the penance for her


\(^10\) “Non seppe il beato Giovanni né gramatica né altra scienzia per istudio acquistata; però che insino da puerizia attese mercanzie.” Varese, *Prosatori volgari*, p. 20.
sins. The *Bibliotheca Agiografica Italiana* (BAI) lists only Cavalca’s translation of this Life. The second is Mary of Egypt, who also was a prostitute. Finding herself repelled by divine force from a church in Jerusalem where a relic of the True Cross was being displayed, she prayed to an icon of the Virgin Mary that, if she were to be permitted to enter the church, she would convert from her former ways. She then spent forty-seven years in the desert. The BAI lists Cavalca’s translation as well as translations of the epitome of the Life in the *Golden Legend*. The third possibility is Pelagia, who was also a prostitute. She was converted by listening to a bishop’s sermon and after her conversion lived as an anchorite pretending to be a man. The BAI lists Cavalca’s translation and translations of the abbreviated version in the *Golden Legend*. The fourth is Thais, also a prostitute who repented and became an anchorite. Here, too, the BAI lists Cavalca’s translation followed by translations from the *Golden Legend*. Since these four were the best-known female sinners from late antiquity, and since the BAI lists only Cavalca’s translations of the longer original versions, it seems most likely that the volume in the hands of Colombini’s wife was Cavalca’s *VSP*.

There are two additional clues in Tavelli’s compendium that suggest that the Life was that of Mary of Egypt, as asserted by Belcari. First is the length. The Life was rather long (“in dictamina narrationis prolixe tenderetur”). Of the four Lives mentioned above, that of Mary of Egypt is by far the longest and is thus the candidate that best fits Tavelli’s text. The account of Mary the niece of Abraham is a section of the longer Life of Abraham. We can remove it from consideration on account of its relatively short length. Also, since this Mary was a fallen anchorite who ended up as a prostitute and thus became a sinner, the expression “de quadam peccatrice” seems less appropriate for one
whose life had been holy, at least prior to her fall. The Life of Pelagia is not very long and therefore does not meet the criterion of prolixity. The Life of Thais is the shortest of the four and can also be rejected for that reason.

The second clue lies in the phrase itself. *De quadam peccatrice* is of course a general phrase and could refer to any female sinner. However, for a cleric familiar with the *Golden Legend*, as Bishop Tavelli would certainly have been (given the enormous popularity of this collection among preachers of all kinds), the phrase could call to mind the beginning of the entry for Mary of Egypt: “Maria Egyptiaca, who was called a sinner.”

I am not suggesting that Colombini’s wife had a vernacular *Golden Legend*. The only complete vernacular *Golden Legend* surviving today is Riccardiana 1254, a manuscript that was copied in 1396, and in any case the reference to the length of the story in Tavelli’s account tells us that we are not dealing with a codex containing abbreviated Lives of the saints. Rather, I am suggesting that Tavelli’s responsibilities as a preaching bishop and supervisor of preachers in his own diocese might have conditioned him to think of the original longer Life of Mary of Egypt, whether in Latin or in the vernacular, in terms of the incipit of the abbreviated version found in the *Golden Legend*.

Besides the lack of evidence for other vernacular versions of the Lives of the four repentant female sinners, there is a phrase that also points to Cavalca. Tavelli refers to its *sonoritas*, or fulness of sound, as one of the reasons the story penetrated into Colombini’s soul (the other being its celestial harmony). This reference—not so much to the words but rather to the way they sounded—underlies the oral quality of the translation. The Life

---

Colombini was reading had been translated in such a way that it sounded like speech rather than a written narrative. I will show throughout this dissertation that this sonorous oral quality, which assimilated the translation to the rhythms and cadences of a sermon, was a particular characteristic of Cavalca’s method of translation. It was part of a multi-pronged strategy designed to make the reading of hagiography appealing and easy for lay readers. I call this method of translation, which evokes the voice of the preacher in the pulpit and makes use of homiletic techniques honed by preachers to maximize their chance of touching the hearts and mind of their lay auditors, a “pastoral translation.”

I am, of course, assuming here that Tavelli’s use of this word betrays his own appreciation of Cavalca’s translation. This is speculative but not entirely far-fetched. Tavelli would have known from his research into the origins of his own order that Colombini was an illiteratus and that he was reading the lives of the saints in vernacular translation. Given the widespread popularity of the VSP, Tavelli is also likely to have known it firsthand. One of the surprising results of Carlo Delcorno’s extensive research into the manuscript tradition is the incidence of clerical ownership. Even though Cavalca translated for laypeople, his “pastoral translation” turned out to be very popular even among clerics and professed religious who could presumably have read or struggled through the Vitas patrum texts in their original Latin. I believe that the signs of clerical ownership in so many of the manuscripts are an indicator not necessarily of poor Latinity or laziness on the part of clerics but rather a recognition that Cavalca’s pastoral translation was useful even to them despite being written for a lay audience. And since the Gesuati started off as a lay order and used vernacular translations of ascetical literature, it is likely that Tavelli would have known the VSP. Referring to the clerics in
the order, the Gesuato Antonio Bettini had the following to say about the reading practices in the order: “They write ecclesiastical books in Latin and the vernacular and continuously distribute many devotional and ecclesiastical books to families exhorting them and comforting all by examples and words along with books aimed at the contempt of the world and the contempt of vices, exhorting and comforting them towards the virtues and to the love of God and of their neighbors.”12 Bettini here is referring to the policies used by the leaders of the Gesuati to shape the piety of lay members and their families. All of these were strategies deployed by Cavalca in his translations; it is likely that Tavelli was familiar with the VSP and that, in using the word *sonoritas* to refer to the Life read by Colombini, he recognized and named a noteworthy characteristic of Cavalca’s pastoral translation.

*Audiences and Translation Practices*

How might a copy of the VSP have found its way into the hands of Giovanni Colombini’s wife? The story of his conversion raises questions regarding the extent of female literacy among the upper levels of the merchant classes in fourteenth-century Tuscany, the nature of female reading practices, as well as other issues, such as female economic agency and privacy within the household. It is clear from Tavelli’s account that Colombini’s wife was literate in the vernacular and that she had acquired or borrowed the book from someone without her husband’s knowledge. We should not assume that the manuscript she had at home contained all four books of the VSP. Given the length of the

12 “Scribunt libros ecclesiasticos in latino et vulgari sermone et continue commodant libros multos devotos et ecclesiasticos per familias exorando et confortando omnes exemplo et verbis et cum libris ad contemptum mundi et contemptum vitiornom, exorando et confortando ad virtutes et ad amorem Dei et proximorum.” Quoted in Isabella Gagliardi, *I Pauperes yesuati tra esperienze religiose e conflitti istituzionale* (Rome: Herder, 2004), p. 166.
translation, it would have been expensive to make a copy of the entire work. For this reason, individual books of the VSP also circulated. Since Cavalca placed the Lives of the well-known female sinners and penitents in book IV, Colombini’s wife could also have had a copy of this book alone.\textsuperscript{13} It is also possible that she had a zibaldone or commonplace book into which the Life of Mary of Egypt had been copied.\textsuperscript{14}

In his Life of Colombini, Belcari emphasized the gendered nature of reading practices in fourteenth-century Tuscany. His account claimed that the book contained a number of lives of female saints (“vite di sante”). In the dramatic confrontation between husband and wife, Colombini took a look at the contents and impatiently threw the book to the floor saying, “You only think of saints’ lives [\textit{leggende}].” When he eventually picked up the book, his wife observed him reading and noted that he was “not accustomed to reading such books.” For Belcari, the reading of vernacular hagiography in general and the Lives of female saints in particular was a characteristically female rather than male activity. Even though Colombini was unaccustomed to reading hagiography, he responded enthusiastically. So far, scholars have understood his conversion primarily as a response to the content of the hagiography. To the extent that the form is considered, it is deemed of secondary importance. It is assumed implicitly that any vernacular translation would have been equally efficacious. This suggests that the main obstacle was linguistic and that once hagiography had been translated from Latin into a vernacular language, a lay reader was able to read and respond. In this model the actual practices of

\textsuperscript{13} Delcorno’s analysis of the manuscript tradition of copies of single books shows only one copy of book II, six copies each of books I and III, but ten copies of book IV. Eighteen manuscripts survive containing the first two books, thirteen with the last two, and twenty-two containing all four books. See Carlo Delcorno, \textit{La Tradizione delle “Vite dei santi padre”} (Venice: Istituto Veneto di scienze lettere ad arti, 200), p. 538.

\textsuperscript{14} On zibaldoni, see the dissertation by Lisa Kaborycha, “Copying Culture: Fifteenth-century Florentines and Their Zibaldoni” (diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2006).
translation, the cultural level of the audience, and the form in which the text was presented to the reader are considered unimportant. And yet all three are crucial factors in determining whether the lay reader will respond. It was not guaranteed that Colombini would respond to the story of Saint Mary of Egypt in the way that he did simply because the story was in the vernacular rather than in Latin. His response took the form that it did precisely because Cavalca had taken all these factors into account and produced a particular kind of vernacular translation meant to elicit such a response. Cavalca consciously shaped his translation to be appealing to lay readers unfamiliar with the traditions of Latin hagiography. It was for this reason that he did not simply make a close translation of the Latin Life.

In order to understand the interplay of these factors in Cavalca’s translation, it is helpful to look at the broader context of translation practices from Latin into Tuscan in the fourteenth century. During this period the majority of those literate in Latin were men in monastic and religious orders and at the upper levels of the clerical hierarchy. There were of course some laypeople who were literate in Latin. These included those who had had an extensive university education—such as doctors and lawyers—as well as certain professionals such as notaries, who required a knowledge of Latin in order to draft administrative records. As a general rule, however, the *literati* and *illiterati* corresponded to religious professionals who had been educated in and made daily use of Latin and laypeople who functioned primarily in the vernacular.

The translator stood as an intermediary between these two worlds. His activity made available to *illiterati* the cultural riches that were preserved in the corpus of Latin texts by translating these into a local language that they could understand. On occasion,
however, he translated into Latin works composed in the vernacular that he considered particularly meritorious and hence worthy of being brought to the attention of a broader group of educated men outside Italy who might be unfamiliar with the vernacular of the original composition. The reasons for the creation of vernacular translations were varied. In some cases translators were responding to a demand from laypeople. This was the case, for example, with Cavalca’s translation of the New Testament book of Acts of the Apostles. In his prologue to Acts he tells us that he performed this labor, “wishing, at the petition of, and for the devotions of certain devout persons, to turn into the common clear vernacular the devout book of the Acts of the Apostles.” In other cases, clerical translators made translations of texts that they hoped would bring about changes in the conduct of lay readers. The impulse behind such translations can be found in the translators’ role as arbiters and shapers of the moral universe of their pastoral charges. To this end they carefully chose those texts that they thought would be appropriately morally uplifting for laypeople and would encourage certain virtuous behaviors and restrain others that they considered inappropriate or indeed sinful. The texts they translated were seen as dynamic and powerful agents that, in the process of reading, would act as catalysts. They considered this process an active one akin to the monastic lectio, the ruminative reading of monks in which there was a dynamic interaction between reader and text, leaving the reader altered. As will be shown in the sections that follow, we can observe the way these assumptions play out in the prologues to two different translations, that in Livy’s fourth decade of his history Ab urbe condita and Cavalca’s own prologue to the VSP.

Sometime in the fourteenth century, a translator, considered by some to be Giovanni Boccaccio, translated the fourth decade of Livy’s *Ab urbe condita libri*, which deals with the Macedonian war. The strategies he laid out in his preface are similar to those deployed by Cavalca in the field of hagiography. This translator aimed at producing a work that would be read by rulers and would shape their behavior. By providing them with examples of virtuous and bad men from antiquity, he hoped to curb their vices and to promote virtue in those who were unable to read the work in Latin. In the translator’s own words: “Wanting with great effort to do something useful for the corrupt world and particularly for its rulers, and considering that according to Aristotle in his first book of rhetoric, a knowledge of ancient histories is most useful in civil matters, I decided to translate into vulgar Latin the ten books of Titus Livy Patavinus … so that from it, which on account of its high Latin and sturdy construction is very difficult for the majority to understand, the *illiterati* can gain both pleasure from the histories and gracious fruit from the magnificent and virtuous deeds.” After listing both good Roman and perfidious Macedonian and Asian examples, the translator hoped that, taken together and considered individually, these would “brace the lascivious behavior of noble readers in many matters.

---

16 “Volendo alcuna cosa con lunga fatica fare di utilità al mondo corrotto, e specialmente a’ presidenti; considerato che secondo che Aristotele vuole nel primo della rettorica sua, il sapere le antiche storie è utilissimo nelle cose civili; ho proposto di ridurcere in latino volgare X libri di Tito Livio Patavino… acciò che da quello, il quale d’alta grammatica e di forte costrutto molto è alli più ad intendere difficile, possano li non letterati prendere e delle storie diletto, e delle magnifiche opere e virtuose grazioso frutto.” F. Pizzorno, ed., *Le Deche di T. Livio: Volgarizzamento del Buon Secolo Corretto e Ridotto a Miglior Lezione* (Savona: Luigi Sambolino, 1845), vol. 5, pp. 9–10 I follow Alison Cornish in preferring the reading of the manuscript rather than the editorial correction—“riducere dal latino in volgare”—since the use of the expression “latino volgare” to refer to the vernacular also appears in Boccaccio’s *Teseida*.
and build up their minds to better things and provide the most useful counsel for their pressing needs.”

So far, by arguing for the moral utility and improving nature of reading ancient history, the translator displays an early example of the idealism of the humanists. When he turns to a discussion of his translation practices, however, he brings a new word, *sposizione*, to describe what he is doing: “Nor is it my intention in my exposition of the aforementioned Decade to follow closely in every place the letter of the author since in so doing I don’t see how I could come in an orderly way to my intended goal, which is that I wish to make clear to those who do not understand [Latin] the meaning of Titus Livy.”

For this translator, turning Livy from high Latin into “vulgar Latin”—by which he meant the vernacular (thus displaying both an awareness of the origin of the vernacular and a sense that the two occupied opposite ends of the spectrum of a single Latin language)—was not simply a matter of finding equivalents in vulgar Latin for the corresponding words in high Latin, but also necessarily involved explanation in certain places. His concern was not to produce a close translation but rather to explain Livy in a way that would allow his lay readers not just to encounter Livy’s text but also to understand it. The background of this new audience was insufficient to understand the entire text on its own, and therefore in his translation he planned to gloss those words and expressions that they might not understand.

---

17 “Le quali cose tutte insieme, e ciascuna per se considerate dirittamente, non dubito, che non possono e in molte cose le lascivie de’ nobili leggenti qui rifrenare e l’animo loro erigere a maggiori cose e ne’ necessarii bisogni porgere consigli utilissimi.” Ibid., p. 10.

18 “Ne è mio intendimento nella sposizione della predetta Deca seguire strettamente per tutto la lettera dell’Autore: perocchè, ciò facendo, non veggio che io al fine intento potessi venire acciacciamente, il quale è di voler fare chiaro a’ non intendenti la intenzione di T. Livio.” Ibid., pp. 10–11.
This project, the translator implies, is a historicist undertaking. Such an implication is of course fundamentally and perhaps naively optimistic. The translator assumes that the literati can, as a result of their learning, understand Livy’s own authorial intent. There is no suggestion here that a fourteenth-century reader of the Latin text will understand this intent any differently from a literatus reading at any other time. In the textual community of readers of the Latin Livy across space and time all would have access to Livy’s original authorial intention simply by virtue of being able to read the text in its original linguistic form.

The illiterati find themselves in an entirely different position. They must overcome the twin obstacles of linguistic incomprehension as well as incomprehension of some of the content. This last is a result of the laconic and lapidary style that is a hallmark of Livy. Were the translator simply to translate very closely, a task that he is certainly capable of doing, his readers would not understand what Livy wishes them to understand, “Since not just in one place but in many he writes so precisely, that if one were to put down only his words and nothing more, the vernacular would remain cut off to those, I say, who are not of too subtle an understanding so that they would understand as little from the vernacular text as from the Latin.”\footnote{\“Perciòcè non in luogo uno, ma in molti esso si precisamente scrive, che se sole le sue parole, senza più, si ponessono, si rimarrebbe tronco il volgare a colo, dico, i quali non sono di troppo sottile avvedimento, che così poco ne intenderebbero volgarizzato.\” Ibid., p. 11.} Therefore a close translation would not aid in the comprehension of the text. The modern reader is less likely to consider the difficulty of understanding Livy in terms of subtle versus material minds and more likely to categorize these deficits in terms of a lack of cultural capital having to do more with the opportunity for studying Latin and classical history. He or she is less inclined to
naturalize the differences between the two groups in terms of subtle and unsubtle understanding. This translator, however, notwithstanding the fact that Latinity was an acquired skill, conflates the *literati* with those of subtle understanding. And only a subtle understanding would allow a reader to grasp Livy’s true meaning.

Faced with this problem of a reader of unsubtle understanding dealing with a laconic text, the translator’s solution was to gloss the lapidary phrases of the Latin source in his translation. And yet, this departure from the notion of a *fidus interpres* caused a certain anxiety. This reveals itself in a defensive repetition of the translator’s commitment to Livy’s original meaning, which necessitated glossing in order to convey his meaning to the *illiteratus*: “Therefore, in order that every meaning of his be understood completely even by the most materially-minded, and not departing from his own meaning, I deem it useful in certain places to add some more words to his own, particularly where without so doing it cannot [be understood], and following his style without interjections where I consider it clear to follow.”

Although the translator contrasted material-minded readers of vulgar Latin to subtle-minded readers of high Latin, he clearly considered the former to lie along a spectrum of material-mindedness, whereas he seemed to regard readers of high Latin in an undifferentiated way. Because his additions to the text of Livy would take into account the needs of the most ignorant—those endowed with the lowest level of “cultural capital”—his translation would require the greatest deviation from the Latin, as he needed to use a larger number of additional words to explain Livy to those with the

---

20 “Adunque acciòché interissimamente ogni sua intenzione ezianzi da’ più materiali si compenda, non partendomi dalla sua propria intenzione, estimo che utile sia in alcun luogo con più parole alquante le sue adampiare e massimamente ovue senza così fare, non si possa: seguendo senza interporre il suo stile dove chiaro il vedrò da seguire.” Ibid.
lowest level of cultural preparation. This approach, which resembles that of a school-master who piously prepares his lesson at a level that even the class dunce can understand, meant that the translator was prepared to amplify the original in order to make sure that he could impart the proper meaning of Livy to the largest number of people.

The preface thus lays out certain themes that display an optimism concerning the possibility of moral rejuvenation, as well as a touching confidence in the ability of texts to bring about such a change in their readers. These assumptions were of course at the heart of a Latin curriculum—the *studia humanitatis*—that the humanists embraced and made popular in the fifteenth century. The translator of Livy shared these aims, but he did not assume that only the texts in their original linguistic form could mold the pliant human self into following the ancient forms of virtue. My concern here is not so much to examine the humanist assumptions of the translator, or indeed to point out that these humanist pedagogical aims could also be found in vernacular works well over a century before the better-known vernacular humanism of the court of Lorenzo dei Medici, but rather to examine the methodological statements he makes in order to explain his approach to translation. Briefly put, his statements make clear his belief that translations from Latin into the vernacular must necessarily involve a certain level of glossing if they are to convey the hidden meaning and thus accomplish the morally shaping work intended in the original. Translations without adaptations appropriate to the new audience cannot do this.

---

In his prologue to the VSP, Cavalca set forth his reasons for having translated the *Liber vitas patrum*. This prologue is not found in any of the manuscripts written in Pisano-Lucchese, the dialect of western Tuscany in which Cavalca wrote. We are therefore dependent on manuscripts that were copied in the Florentine dialect. Sometime in the 1330s or 1340s, Francesco di Ser Nardo, a scribe who was active in Florence during that period and who had copied Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, prepared a deluxe illuminated manuscript of the VSP in Florentine dialect. Like the translator of Livy, Cavalca shared a belief in the transformative potential of Latin texts to bring about changes in their readers. The difference between the two is that although both are Christians translating Latin texts into Tuscan in the fourteenth century with the aim of changing the behavior of their readers, Cavalca avoided pagan literature and the entire humanist project of reading pagan history for moral improvement (unlike his contemporary at Saint Catherine’s, Fra Bartolommeo da San Concordio), translating only venerable Christian texts. In chronological order of composition of the original texts, these include the Acts of the Apostles, Jerome’s letter to Eustochium, the *Vitas patrum* collection, and Pope Gregory’s *Dialogues*. Cavalca made clear at the beginning of the prologue that his aim was to move people to virtuous action. He did this by invoking Gregory’s perception into human psychology—that many people are moved to do good by exposure to examples rather than by reading abstractions and theories. At its heart Gregory’s aperçu is a call for narrative rather than for theory as a more efficacious

---

22 Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Vittorio Emanuele, ms. 1189 (henceforth RN). The interest of RN lies in the fact that just before the prologue the following rubric appears: “Here begins the prologue to the vita patrum, translated into our Florentine dialect” (Incomincia lo prolagho del vitapatrum traslatato in nostro uolgare fiorentino). The rubric bears witness to an early awareness in Florence of the VSP and a desire to annex it to their cultural circles by translating it from Pisano-Lucchese into the Florentine dialect.
motivator of human beings. People responded better to stories that instantiated or illustrated an argument than to the arguments themselves. If this is the case, the question then arises as to what sort of stories these ought to be and who should be their appropriate subjects. Cavalca also found the answer to this second question in Gregory: the stories ought to be drawn from the way of life of holy men, “Since it is the case, as Saint Gregory writes, that a number of people are moved to do good more by examples than by words, and since the same Saint Gregory says that the life of holy men is a living lesson.”

Cavalca’s concern was to encourage his readers to do good. His choice of verb—“to do” rather than “to be”—suggests that he was not interested merely in a transformation of the self as an end in itself. Any such transformation had to be a precursor to action. Cavalca was not attempting to turn his lay readers into contemplatives on the monastic model. Rather, he wished to push them toward the active life, a life of Christian engagement with the world involving love of neighbor and active charity. He wanted any reorientation of the reader’s heart and mind to spill out beyond the confines of the self and become visible to the world by means of behavior that would leave the world a better place.

In this respect, Cavalca had something in common with the translator of Livy. He wished to improve his society by providing a translation that would be “useful to the corrupt world.” But there the similarities end, for Cavalca used different models and had a different audience in mind for his translation. Whereas the Livy translator was primarily

---

23 “Impercio ke come scriue santo gregorio alquanti si muovono piu ad bene fare per exempli che per parole conciosia chosa che la uita di sancti huomin i sia una uiua lectione chome elli medesimo sancto gregorio dice.” RN, fol. 1ra).
concerned with guiding contemporary lay rulers by giving them access to stories of the ancient Roman leaders from the pre-Christian past, Cavalca only wished to use as models those who had led exemplary Christian lives and who were considered to be outstandingly holy. Unlike the translator of Livy, who thought that a consideration of the stories, whether singly or as an ensemble, would transform the reader, Cavalca used the image of a mirror to connote the transformative process of reading the living lesson that was a holy man’s life: “a living lesson and a mirror in which he can consider himself and reflect himself and in this way both emend and make straight his life.”

For Cavalca, reading about holy men was a dialectical process in which the reader’s self intruded persistently onto the text. The assumption here is that reading was not simply a one-way process in which the story moved from the text into the reader’s consciousness; at every step there was a constant comparison between the holy man and the reader. Cavalca therefore assumed a certain level of self-knowledge on the part of the reader, who reminded himself constantly, “This is what the holy man said. This is what the holy man did. What would I have said and done under the same circumstances? Would I have behaved in the same way?” Cavalca took it for granted that when the answer to the latter question was negative, the reader would feel impelled to change his or her behavior in order to conform to the model. The nature of reading was such that the intrusion of the self into the text transformed the text into a mirror, so that the reader could at every moment see himself or herself alongside the models presented in the text.

24 “Et quasi uno specchio oue luomo si puo considerare et specchiare et per questo modo la sua uita et emendare et driççare.” Ibid.
The Abundant Hagiographical Landscape in Cavalca’s Time

Having set up this model of an active reading that transformed the reader, and with Gregory’s recommendation that the way of life of holy men was the fittest object of study, Cavalca turned to his favored choice of texts in the enormous corpus of Latin hagiographical materials, the Liber vitae patrum. He then justified his selection and explained why he wished to translate it, specifying to the audience for whom he was translating:

Considering that among all the books I have ever found this most devout book which is called the Vitas patrum contains the most beautiful and excellent examples of the perfect life of the holy fathers of old who were really a light of the world, I have translated it into the vernacular so that not just the literati but also laypersons lacking Latin can understand it and draw utility from it.

In his preface, Cavalca alluded to a very carefully considered process of selection. During the seven centuries that separated him from Gregory, the quantity of hagiographical literature had expanded greatly. Each century had produced its own crop of holy men and women. Although many of these were venerated locally, some enjoyed a wider cult across Christendom. The fama sanctitatis, or reputation for sanctity, was the foundation for any kind of veneration. The occurrence of miracles at the tomb confirmed that the dead person was a saint. Since the praesentia of the saint, which was revealed in miracles, both protected the populace and conferred prestige on the area, local impresarios such as bishops or monks or clergy wrote vitae or biographies of the saint. These were used to make the case persuasively that the dead person was indeed a saint and, for those whose sanctity was already established, to preserve and spread the saint’s memoria. Hagiographical texts became an increasingly important component of the cult of saints. Churchmen composed new ones and rewrote old ones either to improve the
style or for polemical purposes. As the liturgical commemoration of the cult of saints expanded, the demand for vitæ grew for two reasons—so that they might be included in the liturgy and so that preachers could compose sermons for the faithful on their feast days. This accumulation of new and rewritten texts meant that by Cavalca’s day the hagiographical collection in the library of any important ecclesiastical institution was large. This was certainly the case for the libraries associated with the preaching orders. As coadiutores, or assistants to the bishops, to use the language of the fourth Lateran Council, the preachers were called upon regularly to deliver homilies on the feast days of local and universal saints. In the case of the convents of Saint Catherine in Pisa and Saint Domenico in Naples, the need for a good library was acute, since the Roman province of the Dominican order had selected these convents to house the studia for the arts curriculum and theology curriculum for the training of the friars.

Dominicans and Hagiography: Attempts to Control the Landscape

Exercising control over this vast expanse of hagiographical texts was challenging. The Dominicans, as befitting their dedication to preaching and combatting heresy, were at the vanguard of this movement. They met the challenge by developing legendaries that ended up being used outside the Dominican order by anyone who was required to preach. Dominican compilers abbreviated the lives of saints and then arranged them according to the liturgical year. Producing the legendaries was a complicated process, for a compiler had to first select a vita for each saint and then obtain it if it was not already in the convent’s library. He would either abbreviate the collected lives himself or serve as the editor who supervised the work of abbreviators. These were usually other members of the compiler’s order or subordinates in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Having compiled his
legendary, he would then launch it into the world of homiletic aids. Others who found it useful would make copies of the new compilation. The number of surviving manuscripts is therefore a rough indicator of how useful preachers found these new legendaries.

One gets a sense of the breadth of the Latin hagiographical landscape and the expanding cult of saints by the increasing size of these legendaries. An early example of this characteristically Dominican tool was the *Epilogus in Gesti Sanctorum* assembled in the 1220s by Jean de Mailly, a Dominican from Metz. In his preface to the legendary, Jean tells us that he compiled it so that parish clergy could deliver sermons “to excite devotion” on the feast days of the saints despite being hampered by the lack of easy access to their *vitae*. The geographical distribution of the manuscripts, stretching from England to Italy, suggests that the work met a widespread homiletic need. Even more popular were the *Liber epilogorum* of Bartholomew of Trent, and the *Speculum historiale*, one of the parts of the massive encyclopedic collection known as the *Speculum maius* of Vincent of Beauvais. None of these, however, could compete in popularity with another collection whose runaway success—there are almost a thousand manuscripts surviving—is a testament to the fact that, more than any other collection, it met a need none of its predecessors had been able to fill. This was the *Legenda Aurea*, or *Golden Legend*, a collection of saints’ lives and liturgical feasts, which James of Varagine, archbishop of Genoa, assembled in the 1260s. Barbara Fleith has shown that this collection was used as a teaching tool in Dominican convents. Its use as a hagiographical textbook ensured that friars trained to construct their sermons in the

---

Dominican *studia* by making use of it would want copies made for the libraries of their convents. These pedagogical and pastoral needs combined to ensure that demand for the work continued. The *Legenda Aurea* had detractors within the Dominican order who raised objections regarding the accuracy and reliability of the abbreviated lives. Their dissatisfaction led the order to commission Bernard Gui to return to the sources to assemble a new legendary that would be more acceptable to the more scrupulous members of the order. Bernard’s *Speculum sanctorale* of 1329 never caught on sufficiently to make a dent in the popularity of the early work it was meant to replace.²⁶

*The Vernacular Legenda Aurea North of the Alps*

The library at Saint Catherine’s must have had a copy of the *Legenda Aurea* and perhaps even some of the earlier Dominican legendaries. Given the great popularity of the former, it is rather surprising that Cavalca did not chose to translate this hagiographical collection. It was liturgically up-to-date and thus included most of the saints whose feast days were celebrated in Pisa and beyond. A translation would have reinforced the messages preached to the laity on their feast days. James of Varagine and his team abbreviated the original *vitae* so that preachers could emphasize certain qualities. North of the Alps, other clerics translated it into various European languages. There are a number of independent translations into French. On the Iberian peninsula it was translated into Catalan and Castilian, usually under the title *Flos sanctorum*. In England, the earlier *Gilte Legende* and William Caxton’s later translation for print reveal

the demand for vernacular versions. In the German-speaking lands, the *Elsässische Legenda Aurea* circulated in the dialect of the region around Alsace. There is also a version in Middle Dutch by Petrus Naghel. In Central Europe it was translated into Czech. These various translations, some of which are preserved in splendidly illuminated manuscripts made for lay patrons at elite levels of society, indicate that translators in different parts of Europe felt that the *Legenda Aurea* was not only an appropriate but indeed the best hagiographical collection for lay audiences. We can infer this from the fact that they were undaunted by its great length. These clerics could have translated any of the smaller, more local hagiographical collections, or they could have selected Lives they considered to be good models for a compilation appropriate for the laity. Instead, they undertook the laborious task of rendering the *Legenda Aurea* into different local vernaculars. The diversity of vernacular translations suggests that there was a consensus among clerical translators that the *Legenda Aurea* was a good candidate for translation.

Why might they have thought so? I believe it was because the Latin version, although compiled as a homiletic aid for preachers, ultimately had the laity in mind. This was not true for the original, longer versions of the Lives that were abbreviated in the *Legenda Aurea*. These versions dated to a time when preaching to the laity was much less intensive. Prior to the explosion of preaching to the laity formalized by the Fourth Lateran Council, the hagiographical manuscripts preserved in monastic and cathedral libraries, and which contained the complete lives of saints included in liturgical calendars, had proved sufficient to meet the need for sermons to monks, canons, and cathedral clergy as well as for the bishop’s sermons to the faithful. The prolixity and detail of these Lives made them unsuitable for laity. The *Legenda Aurea*, on the other
hand, abbreviated these Lives to emphasize those qualities that a preacher could expand on orally when addressing his congregation. It was therefore a collection of *ad status* hagiography, an intermediate step between the original Lives that could be used for sermons to clerics and sermons to the laity. James of Varagine, knowing that the audience for his abbreviated Lives consisted of other preachers, shaped the abbreviations with the lay audiences rather than the clergy in mind. A preacher would thus be able to find appropriate themes, virtues, miracles, and telling exempla in the collection and proceed with the task of building a sermon like a jazz musician improvising on a tune.

*Preaching and the Role of Hagiography*

The biographical entry in the chronicle of the convent of Saint Catherine as well that in Cavalca’s own treatise, called the *Frutti della Lingua*, or Fruits of the Tongue, both testify to the importance he gave to preaching. In chapter 38 of his treatise (“In order to preach appropriately, correct intention and great discretion are required”), Cavalca inveighed against preachers who always wished for novelty in their sermons and thus refused to repeat earlier sermons no matter how useful they were. By contrast, Saints Augustine and Gregory and other doctors of the church wrote and preached the same materials many times over and in many places. As he explains:

But many proud and vain preachers go against this practice, and in order to appear subtle and wise are ashamed to repeat one of their sermons, no matter how useful it was, but instead they are eager to say things that are new and singular although these are not particularly useful. And most of all they disdain to preach the examples and the miracles of the saints, saying that these are matters for children
and for women, not realising that in order to change the hearts of sinners these things are the most useful.27

Both here and in other places in this treatise, Cavalca inveighed against a trend that saw preachers discussing the latest philosophical arguments taking place in the institutions of higher learning—whether conventual studia or universities—in their sermons to ordinary people. Carlo Delcorno has observed that this was true for the sermons of Giordano da Pisa, Cavalca’s fellow Dominican at the convent of Saint Catherine, who “translated into the vernacular the philosophical novelties of mature scholasticism.”28 These might very well have been interesting to some, but ultimately they were not useful eschatologically-speaking, for they engaged the intellect but not the emotions. The preacher could only induce contrition by making an emotional appeal. Since the purpose of the preacher was to change hearts, he should not be indulging in discourses that only appealed to the intellect.

Cavalca did not intend his critique of the intrusion of scholastic tendencies into the sermons of the more philosophically minded among his fellow preachers solely to reprove the vice of pride. He wished also to remind them that they should be more concerned with the pastoral needs of their audiences than in following their own interests. These preachers might be addressing the laity, but their hearts and attention were still in the convent studia. They had forgotten that study as an end in itself was not their raison

27 “Ma contro a questo fanno molti superbi e vani predicatori, li quali per mostrarsi molto sottili e savj si vergognerebbono di ripetere una lor predica quantunque fosse utile, e pero si studiano di dire cose nuove e singolari quantunque non cosi utili; e massimamente si indegnano di predicare gli esempi e li miracoli delli santi, dicendo, che sono cose da fanciulli e da feminine, non pensando che a mutare li cuori dei peccatori queste cose sono piu utili.” Bottari, p. 239.
d’être as preachers. In the Dominican order, study was always the foundation for more
effective or useful preaching.\textsuperscript{29} For this reason the word \textit{utile} (utility) is a characteristic
touchstone of Cavalca’s thought. It was the organizing principle for all of his activity and
is a word that recurs frequently in his treatises. It was with the principle of utility in mind
that preachers ought to select the materials for their sermons. And for Cavalca, of all the
\textit{materia praedicabilis} at the preacher’s disposal, hagiography was the most useful for
inducing contrition and thus changing the hearts of the laity. Sermons on philosophy
could not make the laity contrite, but stories of the saints and their miracles had a
penetrating psychological effect that touched and stirred up the emotions in ways that
theoretical discussions of logic could not do.

We have seen that venerable authorities on pastoral care, such as Gregory, and
Cavalca’s own experiences as a close observer of the psychology of the laity led them to
focus on saints as people with whom it was useful to think, read, and preach. This brings
us back to Cavalca’s choice of a book to translate. Although we can never know with
certainty why he did not select the \textit{Legenda Aurea}, we can probably reject one
possibility. Scholars have remarked on the old-fashioned nature of the collection, which
might have put off some translators, but this ought to have recommended it to Cavalca,
for his tastes were similarly old-fashioned in that he preferred older, venerable saints to
the more recent ones. One possible explanation for its lack of appeal for him is the
heterogeneity of the models of sanctity in the \textit{Legenda Aurea}. The large number of
martyrs included may have made it useful for preaching contrition, but with the passage

\textsuperscript{29} For this reason, the fourteenth-century frescos by Andrea di Bonaiuto in the Spanish Chapel at Santa
Maria Novella in Florence depict the personification of preaching as the highest sacred discipline. See M.
Michele Mulchahey, \textit{“First the Bow Is Bent in Study”: Dominican Education before 1350} (Toronto:
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998).
of a millenium since the conversion of Constantine, the lives of the martyrs recounted therein were no longer the best models for lay imitation.

*Dominicans and Desert Literature*

If this was a reason for Cavalca’s hesitation in undertaking a translation of the entire *Legenda Aurea*, what inclined him toward the *Vitas patrum*? First, desert literature was fundamental to Dominican spirituality. In Jordan of Saxony’s biography of the founder of the order, with which Cavalca was certainly familiar, it was Dominic’s reading of Cassian’s *Conferences*, also known as the Collations of the Fathers, that was said to be so influential in nourishing his own spirituality.\(^3\) Indeed, he is supposed to have taken this book, along with the Gospel of Matthew and the Pauline Epistles, wherever he went.\(^3\) The *Conferences* contained an account by the monk John Cassian (c. 360–c. 430) of a trip to Egypt in the early fifth century. Along with the *Institutes*, his other treatise, the *Conferences* introduced Egyptian monasticism to the Latin-speaking monks of the northern Mediterranean. Cassian’s book was an attempt to categorize and theorize the Egyptian monks’ way of life for the two monastic communities he founded near Marseilles. In the words of Jordan of Saxony, it contained “a treatment of the vices and also of all matter of spiritual perfection.” This treatise, composed by a monk for a monastic community, took for granted a monastic profession among its readers. Its twenty-four chapters divided into three parts dealt with topics relevant to the monastic life, such as discretion, the soul, prayer, and chastity. But it had the disadvantage of being


too much like a textbook for advanced students to be a good candidate for translation into
the vernacular for the laity.

The Vitas patrum did not have the same drawbacks. Although the texts in the
collection had also been composed by and for monks, the great advantage of the Vitas
patrum was that it contained narrative accounts rather than theoretical treatments of
monastic themes. Cast in the more familiar form of stories, the texts could capture the
attention of the laity, fire their imagination, and impart lessons relevant to living in the
world. In a certain sense these stories could be considered as a sourcebook accompanying
Cassian’s two theoretical treatises. The much smaller number of vernacular translations
of the Conferences and the Institutes demonstrates that clerics in the late Middle Ages
considered the Vitas patrum more appropriate for laity than Cassian’s works. The stories
of the early heroes of the desert, on the other hand, had a certain exotic appeal since they
were set in a familiar yet distant land across the sea. Chronologically, they were set in the
age of confessors, and so offered models of sanctity that laypeople could emulate, unlike
the martyrological models of the Legenda Aurea.

Two other factors besides Saint Dominic’s own predilection for desert literature
inclined Cavalca toward the Vitas patrum. The first was the importance of these stories
within the Dominican order. Reading them was part of the curriculum. So important
were they to Dominican identity that the collection of brief biographies of outstanding
members of the order compiled by Gerald of Frachet was known evocatively as the Vitas
Fratrum. The second was the importance of the stories in Dominican homiletic aids.

---

32 Mulchahey, First the Bow Is Bent in Study, p. 110
33 Alain Boureau, “Vitae fratrum, Vitae patrum. L’Ordre dominicain et le modèle des Pères du désert au
The preachers were supposed to encourage the extirpation of vices and inculcation of virtues in their sermons. In order to make these points, they made use of exempla. To facilitate the integration of these short stories into their sermons, preachers organized the exempla into collections with thematic rubrics. A preacher wishing to discuss avarice would be able to look in such a collection and find a number of relevant exempla. The development of this homiletic aid was primarily but not exclusively a Dominican enterprise, and the compilers drew increasingly on the *Vitas patrum* texts for their collections of exempla. This was the case with the *Summa virtutum ac vitiorum*, the massive encyclopedic treatment of vices and virtues composed in the early 1260s by the French Dominican William Peraldus. The phrase *legitur in vitis patrum* (it is read in the lives of the fathers) recurs throughout this text. This work was the most important source for many of Cavalca’s own treatises. In his *Pungilingua*, Cavalca translated and expanded Peraldus’s section *De peccato linguae* on sins of speech. Thus various factors having to do with the importance of the *Vitas patrum* within the Dominican order would have combined to draw Cavalca to this collection over other, more obvious hagiographical compendia, such as the *Legenda Aurea*.

*The Prologue to Cavalca’s Atti degli Apostoli*

As was customary for medieval writers, Cavalca preceded each of his works—four translations and nine treatises—with a prologue. This functions as an introduction to the work in which Cavalca describes the work in question and discusses how his involvement with the work came to pass and the audience for whom he intends it. In the case of his translations, Cavalca usually also includes some discussion about his principles for translation from Latin into the vernacular. In order to get a sense of the
audience for his translations and for his *methodus interpretandi*, we need to examine the four translated works as a group.

In order of composition of the original works, these are the Acts of the Apostles (late first century C.E.), Jerome’s letter to Eustochium (380s C.E.), Gregory’s *Dialogues* (594 C.E.), and the Book of the Life of the Fathers, or *Liber vitas patrum* (fourth–seventh century C.E.). We do not know the precise dates when Cavalca translated these from Latin into the vernacular. His only treatise that can be dated securely is the *Specchio dei peccati* of 1333. Since this quotes from the *Medicina del Cuore* and the *Trattato della Pazienza*, and these in turn refer to the *Specchio di Croce*, which refers back to the VSP and the *Dialogues*, these must have been written prior to 1333.\(^{34}\)

There is some reason to suppose that Cavalca might indeed have begun with the book of Acts. Leonard Boyle’s analysis of the letters sent around 1199 by Innocent III to the bishop of Metz about laymen and laywomen who met to study vernacular translations of scripture shows that the pope was concerned above all with lay usurpation of the prerogative of preaching. He did not, as is often believed, condemn vernacular translations.\(^{35}\) The association of these translations with heresy is a red herring. The people who read these translations were condemned as heretics not for their reading of scripture, but rather for their insistence on preaching, which was the prerogative only of bishops and their delegates. In Italy there were few if any translations of different books of scripture in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Cavalca was therefore

---


rather unusual in having translated a book from the Latin Bible. Let us examine what he says in his prologue.

Cavalca begins by telling us that the request for the translation came from devout laypeople. As a Dominican, an order founded to fight against heresy, he was constantly alert to the threat this posed to the church and its hierarchy. In his treatise the *Pungilingua*, he inveighs against the Apostoli. These were the followers of Fra Dolcino who took on the mantle of leadership after Gerardo Segarelli of Parma was burned in 1300. Dolcino himself was burned at the stake in 1307. Cavalca’s willingness to translate this book shows us that lay readings of vernacular scripture could and did occur without the slightest suspicion or taint of heresy. Indeed, he reveals his esteem for those who asked him for the translation by using the same adjective—devout—for them, for their religious activity involving the book, and for the book of Acts itself:

> Wanting, at the petition of and for the devotion of certain devout persons, to cast into the clear common vernacular, the devout book of the Acts of the Apostles, which Saint Luke the Evangelist compiled and put together once he had written his gospel.36

Cavalca does not specify who these people were, but his trust in them and the way in which they will use his translation is clear. He is providing them with the translation for their *devozione*, their own devotional activities. The situation in Pisa is a far cry from the one in Metz, where the bishop did not know who had translated into French the books that the laymen and laywomen were discussing and preaching.

---

The situation in Metz is worth examining briefly. The bishop wrote to the pope informing him that “both in the diocese and the city of Metz a multitude of laymen and laywomen dragged along not a little by a certain desire for the scriptures had the Gospels, the Pauline letters, the psalms, Gregory’s Moralia in Job, and many other books translated into French for themselves and, relying on this translation so freely—would that it were prudently as well—in secret gatherings the men and women presumed to burp out these things among themselves and to preach to each other.”

I am struck by the absence of any explicit mention of the book of Acts, but it is certainly possible that it was included in the “many other books” mentioned in the bishop’s letter. However, since he mentions the Gospels, the epistles, and the psalter individually before moving to non-biblical books, it seems unlikely that these people had commissioned a translation of Acts.

Innocent’s response was sent in three letters. His attitude toward the situation is not immediately condemnatory of laypeople. According to Innocent’s first letter, which was addressed to all the faithful in the city and diocese of Metz, “the desire of understanding the Holy Scriptures and a zeal for exhorting according to them is something not to be reprimanded but rather to be encouraged.” He did not condemn the translations in any way. The problem for the pope lay not in the fact that they had had translations made into the vernacular, but rather in the secrecy of the gatherings, their usurpation of preaching, their contempt for their priests, and their separation from the rest

---

37 Quod tamen in diocesi quam urbe Metensi, laicorum et mulierum multitudo, non modica tracta quodammodo desiderio scripturarum, Evangelia, epistolae Pauli, Psalterium, Moralia Iob et plures alios libros sibi fecit in Gallico sermone transferri, translationi huiusmodi adeo libenter—utinam autem et prudenter—intendens, ut secretis conventionibus talia inter se laici et mulieres eructuare presumant et sibi invicem predicare; qui etiam eorum aspermantur consortium qui se similibus non immiscant, et a se reputant alienos qui aures et animos talibus non apponunt.
of the faithful. As Boyle points out, in the pope’s reflections on the matter he “never once mentions the translations.”

In his second letter, which was sent only to the bishop and chapter at Metz, he wanted the bishop to search out with care the truth: the identity of the author of the translation, the intention of the translator, the faith of the users of the translation, the reason for their teaching, and whether they venerated the Apostolic and Catholic Church. Nowhere does Innocent identify the translations themselves as being problematic in any way. Nor is there any suggestion that the act of translating was wrong or in any way reprehensible. He was more concerned with the intention and attitude of the people involved in this affair. He wanted to know which cleric had translated these texts, but more important than this identification was the translator’s purpose in providing the laity with these translations. The implication here is that a translator with good intention could provide the laity with vernacular versions of scriptural texts without this being problematic in for the Church. Innocent recognized the lay hunger for understanding Holy Scripture, despite their inability to read them in Latin. So long as they were people of orthodox faith, a vernacular translation was not a problem.

According to the prologue, Cavalca translated Acts because he was requested to do so by unidentified devout persons. If the papacy had not prohibited such activity, his assertion is perhaps all the more surprising when we note that, in a meeting of the

---

General Chapter of the Dominicans at Bologna in 1242, it was decided that “[n]or should any of the brethren henceforth translate from Latin into the vernacular the sermons or collations or other holy scriptures.” Edoardo Barbieri takes *alias sacras scripturas* to mean the books of the Bible, but the use of the adjective *alias* suggests that there is some sort of equivalence between these holy writings and the antecedent sermons, which were delivered in the morning, and the collations, which were sermons delivered post-prandium in the afternoon or evening. The placement of *sacras scripturas* at the end of the list of items contained in the legislation rather than at the beginning makes it unlikely that this is a reference to the Bible. In Innocent III’s letter to the bishop of Metz, there was a clear hierarchy in the listing of the books that had been translated into French. The biblical books were listed before the non-biblical books. Within the first category, the New Testament books were listed before the Old Testament psalter. We note a hierarchy even within the category of New Testament books, since the Gospels are listed before the Pauline epistles. After the psalter, Pope Gregory’s *Moralia in Job* rounded out the list of books actually identified. At the end came the “many other books.” This sense of a well-defined hierarchy of textual authorities starting with the Gospels is one that the pope and the papal chancery would have shared with the Dominicans and other clerics. The Dominicans, as preachers of the Word of God, may have been proud of their sermonizing, but it is most unlikely that they thought of their sermons as in any way equivalent to the Bible. Had the chapter wished to prohibit translations of the Bible, they would most likely have phrased their legislation as follows: “Nec aliquis fratrum de cetero divinas scripturas vel sermones vel collationes vel aliam materiam predicabilem de

---

It seems, rather, that the Dominicans were trying to exercise some kind of control over what they considered their intellectual property—sermons and other materials relating to preaching, such as collections of exempla and other homiletic aids—and did not wish these to continue to be made available to laity.

If, however, “alias sacras scripturas” is indeed a reference to the Bible, then we are left with two choices. Either Cavalca was unaware of the decision taken in 1242 or, if he knew about it, he consciously decided to flout this legislation. If this was the case, he must have felt that there were good reasons to make this particular text available to laypeople. As Barbieri notes, most of the surviving vernacular Italian Bibles date from the fifteenth century, and the New Testament was translated in the mid-fourteenth century. There were some translations of individual books of the Bible in Cavalca’s time, but there was not yet a corpus of the Gospels widely available in the vernacular.

Barbieri raises the possibility that Cavalca’s translation was meant to support the Dominicans as the true heirs of the Apostles against heretical rivals who also claimed to follow the apostolic life. This is certainly plausible, given the number of times Cavalca inveighs against the heretical sect known as the Apostoli. However, there was another reason why Cavalca may have chosen this book of all the books of the Bible to translate for his lay readers. At first glance it is strange that he did not choose to translate the Gospels as these would have provided the laity with all the sayings and doings of Jesus during his earthly existence. Since passages from the Gospels were used as periscopes in sermons, it seems odd that he chose Acts. This book, however, also provided a model for relations between the Apostles and their followers that could be applicable in the
fourteenth century to the Friars and the laity. In his translation of the Life of Anthony, there is a passage in which Anthony thinks about Acts:

[R]ecordabatur quomodo et apostoli omnibus spretis secuti fuissent salvatorem. Et multi in Actibus Apostolorum, facultatibus suis venditis, pretia ad pedes eorum detulissent egentibus partienda.  

Cavalca’s translations emphasizes the mental attitude of the apostles and explains the details of the lay philanthropy:

venne pensando come gli appostoli dispregiando e lasciando ogni cosa aveano seguito Cristo e molti altri discepoli, secondo che narra negli Atti degli Apostoli, vendendo ogni loro possessione poneano lo prezzo ai loro piedi, e per loro mano gli comunicavano a tutti i fedeli.

In the Latin Vita the followers of the Apostles sold their goods and gave the proceeds to the Apostles to share with the needy. Cavalca emphasizes the role of the Apostles as the intermediary between the disciples and the needy persons. In his vision of Acts, the laity should channel their philanthropy through the friars.

The Sequence of Cavalca’s Translations

It is generally believed that Cavalca’s four translations preceded the composition of his eight treatises. The only dated treatise is the Specchio dei Peccati from 1333. Carlo Delcorno has shown from the pattern of internal references that this treatise refers to the Libro della Pazienza e Medicina del Cuore, which in turn cites the Specchio di Croce and two of the translations—the Dialogo di San Gregorio and the Vita dei Santi Padri. Depending on these internal references, he concluded that all of Cavalca’s translations preceded the treatises. Although the absence of dated manuscripts of the Atti degli

---

Apostoli and Jerome’s letter to Eustochium prevents certainty on this point, I propose—based on a reading of the prologues—that these two translations also preceded the composition of the treatises. I suggest that if these four translations are arranged in order of the increased complexity of the prologues, they reflect Cavalca’s increasing confidence in his own literary activity and his capacity as a translator. Placed in this order, they also trace a movement from translations undertaken because he was requested to do this work to translations made at his own initiative in order to actively shape the piety of those layfolk who had originally approached him. If this is a reliable guide, then the order of the translations was the following: Acts of the Apostles, Jerome’s letter to Eustochium, Gregory’s Dialogues, and the Vitas patrum.

Of these four, Acts is the only one that was unambiguously requested of Cavalca. The first sentence of this prologue referred to a petition by certain unspecified devout persons as the genesis of the translation. After a discussion of the text and its author, he explained his method of translating scripture and took pains to state that he had minimized the number of instances where he had to change the order of the words. Cavalca ended by explaining that he had divided the text into chapters for ease of comprehension. These four concerns—audience, text, method of translation, and reader comprehension—are repeated and elaborated in the prologues of the other three translations.

For Jerome’s letter to Eustochium the genesis of the translation is less clear. Here the ambiguity hinges on the word *autorita* in the first sentence of the prologue. In the printed edition, we read that Cavalca wished—on the authority of many religious women, and other honorable virgins and many other devout persons—to translate Jerome’s letter
into the vernacular. The alternative reading in the other manuscript consulted by the editor was *utilita*, or utility. If we follow the reading in that edition, then this translation, too, came about as a result of an external request. There is a certain parallel structure in the opening sentence of this prologue and that of Acts that suggests that Jerome’s letter was the second of Cavalca’s translations. His prologue to Acts begins as follows:

“Volendo a petizione e per divozione di certe divote persone recare a volgare comune e chiaro lo divoto libro degli *Atti degli Apostoli*.” In the letter to Eustochium, his prologue reads: “Volendo per autorita di molte donne religiose e altre oneste vergini e ancora molte altre divote persone che non sanno grammatica recare in vulgare quella bella *Epistola* la quale san Girolamo mando ad Eustochia nobilissima vergine di Roma inducendola ad amare e ben guardare la santa verginita e a bene renunciare lo mondo tutto.” If *utilita* is the correct reading, then we see Cavalca taking the initiative as a translator. It is worth noting that in his prologue to Acts, Cavalca did not explicitly address how the book was to be read and understood. This reticence may spring from the fact that it was a book of the Bible. Nevertheless, his choice of chapter titles reveals that he stressed the themes of conversion and preaching. In the prologue to the letter, however, Cavalca makes explicit how the text was to be read—it provided instruction on how to love and guard holy virginity and how to renounce the world. The appearance of this statement marks Cavalca’s attachment to the monastic program of late antique Christianity and reflects his commitment to reshaping lay piety along ascetic lines.

Turning now to the prologue of his translation of Gregory’s *Dialogues*, we find a new justification for translation. Here the genesis of the translation lay not in an external

---

request, as was the case with Acts and possibly also for the letter to Eustochium, but rather in a complex sense of obligation to the laity for their charitable contributions, which kept him alive. The Dialogues were among the devout works that were singularly useful, and for this reason Cavalca decided to translate them for the benefit of simple folk who were devoid of Latin. In the task of building the tabernacle, each person was called upon to make a contribution, and this translation was to be his offering. The prologue also introduces a new theme, absent in the earlier two translations—the criticism of the learned literati. The appearance of this topic and the defensive justification make more sense if we assume that some people had criticized his earlier translations. If we assume that this is simply a topos of humility, then we must also explain why this was absent in the prologues of the earlier two translations. Criticism of these translations by his fellow churchmen would also explain the more expansive justifications for having deviated from the Latin text.

Finally, when we come to the prologue of the Vita dei Santi Padri, we find an explanation of his methods of translation with neither defensive tones nor aggrieved justifications for not having stuck closely to the Latin text. This sense of confidence in his abilities probably marks the point when Cavalca realized that his translations were meeting a real need among the laity and that he did not be concerned with the objections of his highly educated clerical colleagues.

I) The Prologue to the Acts of the Apostles

Cavalca’s prologue to his translation of the Latin text of the Acts of the Apostles gives us information about four themes—his intended audience, the text that he has
translated, his method of translation, and his concern to make his translation a reference tool for his readers. The prologue reveals the care Cavalca took in making this book available in the Tuscan vernacular for those people unable to read Latin.

The Audience for His Translation

Calvada begins the prologue of his translation of Acts by discussing its genesis. Producing a vernacular Book of Acts was not something he had thought of independently. Rather, it was something that he did in response to a request, a petition, from certain devout laypeople. Who these people were, Cavalca does not specify. The most we can know about them is that they were literate in the vernacular, or they would not be able to make use of the translation. In his article on this translation, Edoardo Barbieri raises the possibility that the adjective devoto is not just a generic term used to describe pious men and women but may refer to those who were members of Dominican confraternities. Beginning in the 1260s, groups of laymen associated themselves into confraternities known as Battuti or Disciplinati because their form of penance was flagellation. G. G. Meersseman notes that initially the confraternity of the battuti in Bologna were known officially as the devoti, as was also the case at Perugia and Imola. However, he does not list Pisa among the cities where the Comune recognized the disciplinati as an ordo devotorum. The convent of Saint Catherine in Pisa did have three confraternities associated with it by the end of the thirteenth century. Two of these were Marian—the Laudesi della Vergine, which sang in praise of the Virgin, and the Raccomandati della Vergine. The latter had been founded in 1262 following the model of

---

a Roman confraternity that would later be known as the Gonfalone. The third
confraternity was known as the Disciplinati della Croce, and in 1312, while Cavalca was
a member of the convent, it absorbed the Marian confraternity of the Raccomandati so
that both followed a common rule. This confraternity was also known as the Compagnia
del Crocione.

Could Cavalca’s work have been produced for members of the confraternities
associated with his convent? Delcorno points out that research on the presence of the Vita
dei Santi Padri—and by extension other works by Cavalca—among books owned by
confraternities is insufficiently advanced to establish confraternal ownership of Cavalca’s
works. Meersseman notes that in Florence in the fifteenth century, according to the
statutes of Disciplinati di S. Domenico, members were to listen to some spiritual
Teaching. He believes that these were probably “opuscoli devoti” by Cavalca or Giovanni
Dominici. Although it is very likely that any lay confraternities associated with the
Dominicans read Cavalca’s translations and treatises, the impression one gets from his
prologues is that they were meant broadly, for all laypeople of both sexes and not just for
those who had had joined a confraternity or an order of penitence.

Cavalca’s choice of vocabulary supports taking a more expansive view of his
audience. First, had he been requested by members of the confraternities associated with
Saint Catherine, it seems likely that he would have said so in the prologue. It would also
have been natural to mention the names of the confraternities. Second, he would probably
have used the terminology that the members used in order to refer to themselves. The

46 Carlo Delcorno, La Tradizione delle “Vite dei santi padre,” p. 523.
statutes of the confraternities have survived in a manuscript from the early fourteenth century. The manuscript begins by invoking glory and honor to the Trinity, the Virgin, Saint Dominic, Saint Catherine, and the entire heavenly court. Then the following sentence appears: “Here begins the life that the members of the Company of the Cross, the Raccomandati, and the Praise of the Virgin Mary should follow.” The word used for members is confrati. The Latin chronicle of the convent, composed in the mid-fourteenth century, contains brief biographies of its friars and is therefore the primary document for information on Cavalca and his brethren. It has this to say about his literary activity: “Not lazy, he translated many books into the vernacular, he composed many works in the vernacular, for people devoted to God, which up to now are read with great devotion.” Here the expression “pro personis deo devotis” is clearly a generic phrase meant to describe a larger audience of pious men and women rather than the smaller group of people who were members of the confraternities. The same chronicle tells us of the involvement of Giordano of Pisa with these confraternities: “He first founded the disciplinati in Pisa, whose beginning was a good one, and the Society of the Holy Savior, which was founded through him, was the first in the city of Pisa.” The chronicle uses the word disciplinatos to refer to the members of this confraternity and not devotos. To be sure, there is wide variety in the terms used for members of lay confraternities, and the distinctions between these are not always clear. However, since the word disciplinati exists in Italian, had Cavalca wished to refer to the members of the confraternities

49 “Non otiosus, multos libros ad vulgarem reduxit, multa opera in vulgari composuit pro personis deo devotis.”
associated with his convent, he would have used either *disciplinati* as a noun, just as it appears in the chronicle, or *confrati*, which is the word used in the statutes for the common rule for the three main lay associations.

The entry for Cavalca in the convent chronicle contains additional evidence supporting a broader audience for his work. It begins with the statement that “he was considered as a saint by reputation and rightly so for he conducted his religious life faultlessly.”

We may conclude from the use of the phrase *ut sanctus* that his reputation for holiness was widespread in Pisa and not just a reflection of the respect the other friars in the convent had for him. In that had been the case, the chronicle would have used the word *sanctitas* or some variation thereof, such as *sanctitatis vitae suae*, to underscore his holy way of life. By the mid-fourteenth century the word *sanctus* would have had a narrow semantic field, particularly to a Dominican chronicler, and would have contained the twin notions of an impeccable way of life and as a broad-based recognition of the same. It is exceedingly unlikely that the writer would have used the word loosely. After naming some of Cavalca’s treatises, the chronicler moves on to describing the broad urban stage upon which Cavalca undertook his charitable works: “All the sick people, both the poor and others, he comforted by visiting them indefatigably; he procured necessities for all the indigent people in the city. He preached most fervently and frequently, and every Sunday he addressed the word of God to prisoners and the inhabitants of poorhouses.”

---


52 “Omnes infirmos, tam pauperes quam alios, infatigabiliter visitando confortatabat, omnibus indigentibus civitatis necessaria procurabat. Ferventissime et sepissime predicabat, captivis et hospitalium pauperibus omni die dominico verbum domini proponebat.” Ibid.
nook and cranny of the city of Pisa performing works of mercy. Since the majority of the population was illiterate, the urban population of Pisa could not have been the main audience for his works. However, since he dealt with people from all strata of Pisan society, we can assume that the audience for his writings was the entire literate population of the city (and not just the members of his convent’s confraternities), even if those who actually read them were the more devout members of this group, the *personis deo devotis*, in the words of the chronicler.

*The Text in Question*

After establishing the origin of the translation, Cavalca then describes the text:

The devout book of the Acts of the Apostles, which Saint Luke the Evangelist, once he had written his Gospel, compiled and ordered, beginning to talk mainly of those things that followed after the Ascension of Christ, up to which point he had ordered and ended his Gospel according to what he himself shows at the beginning of this work of the Acts of the Apostles, which he wrote and sent and dedicated to a friend of his whose name was Theophilus.  

Barbieri noted the length and complicated syntax of the first sentence, both of which are unusual for Cavalca’s prose, and interpreted them to be a result of Cavalca’s need to provide a solemn incipit to the work. It seems to me, however, that Cavalca wished above all to establish the historical veracity of the Book of Acts. His strategy was to present it as a continuation of a Gospel and thus underscore its authority as issuing from the pen of a venerable author, the evangelist Saint Luke. For this reason, Cavalca

---

53 “lo divoto libro degli atti degli apostoli loquale santo Luca vangelista poichèbe iscritto lo suo vangelo compilòe e ordino incominciando a parlare massimamente di quelle cose che seguirono dopo l’ascensione di cristo infino alla quale ordino e termino lo suo vangelo secondo ch’egli medesimo mostra nel principio di questa opera degli atti degli apostoli la quale iscrisse e mando ed intitolo a uno suo amico ch’ebbe nome Teofilo.” *Atti*, p. 2

emphasized its narrative quality—he says the book is an account of the “things that followed” Christ’s Ascension into heaven. It was thus not just a sacred but also a historical document whose truth value rested on the evangelist’s recounting of deeds that had actually occurred. As Barbieri noted, the prologue envisioned only a literal reading of the text.

Why was this important to Cavalca? One possibility is that this was the only safe reading for laypeople not trained in the study of the Bible and the various forms of medieval exegesis of Holy Scripture, such as the allegorical, anagogical, and tropological. This was the standard line taken by clerics concerned that laypeople might fall into heretical understandings of scripture. It seems to me that Cavalca was less worried that the devout laity for whom he was translating would be susceptible to these misreadings and misunderstandings. Rather, he was concerned with strengthening their ability to counter claims to the apostolic life made by certain heretical groups active during his time. By providing them with a translation of this text, Cavalca allowed them to read for themselves what the apostolic life in the early church had consisted of, so that they would not have to depend on heretics for their information. In the forty-eighth chapter of the *Esposizione del Simbolo*, his last treatise, left unfinished at his death, Cavalca lists various errors in the articles of faith pertaining to Christ’s divinity. Under the errors pertaining to the effects of grace, Cavalca lists the error of Montanus and Prisca and “of many others.” These heretics believed that “Christ’s promise to send the Holy Spirit was not accomplished in the Apostles but in them. And against this [error] it is spoken clearly in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is shown and it says how the Holy
Spirit came upon the Apostles assembled together in the form of tongues of fire.”55 For Cavalca, one important use of Acts was as a proof-text to confute claims by any groups that asserted the descent of the Holy Spirit upon themselves. One gets the impression that his long list of various heresies in chapter 48 of the *Esposizione* was not meant to be a historical overview but rather to facilitate the recognition and condemnation of any ancient heretical ideas that might reappear in his own time. In this respect it is reminiscent of the list of the dozen or so heresies in the layman Salvo Burci’s anti-heretical tract of 1235 known as the *Liber Suprastella*.56

*Methods of Translation*

After his discussion of the text, Cavalca explains his method of translation. He is faced with two problems—the general profundity of any Latin text and the particular problems of translating Holy Scripture:

I offer for understanding that since words written in Latin cannot be investigated and turned inside out like clothing and turned into the vernacular on account of the profundity of their meanings and for the multiple significations and understanding of the words of Holy Scripture, I changed in certain—but in few—places the order of the words to better and more clearly express in the vernacular the meaning and understanding of Saint Luke and of the words of the aforementioned book; I add a few words of my own to better explain certain words of the aforesaid book.57

---

57 “Io do ad intendere che perche le parole scritte in grammatica non si possono investigare e recarle in volgare per la profondita delle sentenzie loro e per la molteplice significazione e intenzione delle parole della santa scrittura muto in certi ma in pochi luoghi l’ordine delle parole per meglio e piu chiaramente esprimere in volgare la sentenzia e lo notendimento di santo Luca e delle parole del detto libro; alcuna parola pongo da me per meglio isporre alcuna parola del detto libro.” *Atti*, pp. 2-3
Cavalca begins with a homely image in which he distances translation from the domestic act of reversing clothing. The garment retained the same shape when turned inside out but now showed another side. Translating from Latin, however, necessitated changing the shape of the garment, since Latin words were more densely compressed with meaning than their vernacular equivalents. One required multiple words in the vernacular to express a single Latin word. In the case of the Bible, embedded within the Latin words were the different senses of scripture. How was the translator to meet these challenges? Cavalca admitted that the translated text would not have the same shape as the original because the vernacular version necessarily had to be more verbose. He also rejected word-for-word translations, preferring instead the sense-for-sense translation recommended in Jerome’s famous letter to Pammachius. And yet he still felt a certain constraint to follow the word order of the original text as closely as possible. This is why he makes a point of insisting—somewhat defensively—that he only changed the word order in a few places. This statement had to do, for the most part, with the exception Jerome had made for the special case of translating scripture to his general rule to translate according to the sense. Cavalca was also translating scripture, but his commitment to producing a comprehensible translation for his lay readers overrode any concerns he may have had about the order of words being a mysterium fidei. It is telling that, although he refers earlier in the sentence to meanings and multiple significances in the plural in the case of Latin, he shifts to the singular—sentenza and ‘intendimento’—when referring to his vernacular rendition of the saint’s words and his book. His concern

58 “For I myself not only admit but freely proclaim that in translating from the Greek (except in the case of the holy scriptures where even the order of the words is a mystery) I render sense for sense and not word for word.”
is with the literal or the historical meaning of the Book of Acts, and any changes he makes to the word order, or extra words he adds in the vernacular only, serve to clarify this meaning. One may note as well that although in his prologue he considered Acts as a historical narrative, Cavalca did not, at least at the beginning of his activity as a translator, feel at ease with omission as a technique in a sense-to-sense translation. He still felt constrained to follow the word order as much as possible, and to add the minimum number of words that would be sufficient to express in the vernacular the meaning of the Latin.

Reference Tools

At the end of the prologue Cavalca expressed his concern for making his translation easy to use. In the thirteenth century, theologians in Paris developed a small-sized Bible that included both the Old and New Testaments. Stephen Langton had divided Acts into twenty-seven chapters, but chapter 23 was subsequently divided into two so that the number of chapters in Acts went up to twenty-eight. Cavalca most likely encountered the Latin Book of Acts in this form. We see that he envisaged that laypeople would use his translation as a reference tool:

And since the aforementioned book speaks of diverse matters and sets forth many questions, in order that it be understood better and that each person can find what he or she wishes, I have divided it into the following chapters below.\footnote{“E perche il detto libro parla di diverse materie e pone molte quistione accioche meglio s’intenda e possa ciascuno trovare quello che vuole holla distincta negl’infascritti capitoli.” \textit{Atti}, p. 4}

Cavalca divided the text into thirty-two chapters instead of following the chapter divisions of the Latin Bible. He did this to reduce the average length of a chapter so that his lay readers would have an easier experience in reading the text. But it was not just a
matter of expecting lay readers to have shorter attention spans. Had this been the case he
could simply have numbered the chapters from one to thirty-two. He wanted to make sure
that his lay readers understood the text in orthodox ways. For this reason, along with the
chapter divisions, he provided thematic rubrics that would inflect his readers’
comprehension of the text. Rather than simply encountering a long block of text, they
would first read the chapter title and then move on to the text. Thus in chapter 3 the title
confutes the claims of the Montanist heretics and their modern followers. We read: “How
the Holy Spirit came upon them in the form of fire and how they preached in different
languages and converted a good three thousand people.”\(^{60}\) By providing a list of the
chapter titles at the end of the prologue, Cavalca in effect provided his readers with a
thematic index to the Book of Acts, one that pushed his readers toward an orthodox and
therefore safe understanding of a work that could otherwise be interpreted in ways that
the church considered heretical.

II) *The Prologue to Jerome’s Letter to Eustochium*\(^{61}\)

Cavalca’s prologue to his translation of Jerome’s letter to his spiritual charge, the
Roman aristocratic virgin Eustochium, bears many similarities—both of structure and of
vocabulary—to his prologue to Acts. These similarities suggest that he completed the two
translations close in time. The debate over the sequence of the two translations has
centered on a note in the first person in a fifteenth-century manuscript (Florence BNCF

\(^{60}\) “Come lo spirito santo venne in loro in ispezie di fuoco e come predicavano in varie lingue e convertirne
bene tremilia.” *Atti*, p.5

Belles lettres, 1949). For Cavalca’s translation, see *Volgarizzamento del Dialogo di San Gregorio e
prologue appears on pp. 356–58.
Palat. 13).\(^{62}\) From the colophon we learn that it was copied by Messer Bastiano, the son of Giovanni di Bastiano di Niccolo Monti, who was prior of the Florentine republic in 1458, and that he completed his copy in 1487.\(^ {63}\) This miscellany contains an abbreviated version of Cavalca’s translation of Jerome’s letter to Eustochium (fols. 91r–96v), at the end of which appears the note referring back to an earlier translation of Acts: “Read and consider the scripture and you will find that all the just passed over to it (heaven) after various tribulations. I have written in the Acts of the Apostles that many tribulations are necessary to enter into the kingdom of heaven—finished.”\(^ {64}\)

Carmelina Naselli attributed the authorship of the note to Cavalca.\(^ {65}\) Filippo Salmeri, in his edition of the Sicilian translation of the Tuscan version of Jerome’s letter, rejected the reliability of this note in establishing the sequence of Cavalca’s translations. He attributed it—without an argument supporting his rejection of Naselli’s position—to the fifteenth-century copyist and claimed that this person probably shared a commonly held belief that Cavalca was the translator of the letter.\(^ {66}\) Barbieri noted Salmeri’s

---

\(^{62}\) BNCF Palatino XIII is a vernacular manuscript beginning with the Life and Miracles of Saint Jerome. An abbreviated version of Cavalca’s translation of the letter to Eustochium follows. The text that follows “Di molte stoltizie di quelli che indugiano a ritornare a Dio” is perhaps an abbreviation of Cavalca’s treatise Trattato delle Trenta Stoltizie. The other texts include miracle stories, a Flos Doctorum, a letter sent to Saint Catherine of Siena, the Lives of Saints Martha and Mary Magdalene, texts by Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, a text on the transitus of the Virgin, prayers, a text on God’s love for his servants, a preparation for confession, and hymns of praise. See Francesco Palermo, I Manoscritti Palatini di Firenze, e ordinati ed esposti, 3 vols. (Florence, 1853–68), vol. 1, p. 19. For a more detailed description, see Luigi Gentile, I Codici Palatini, 3 vols. (Florence, 1889), vol. 1, pp. 10–14.


\(^{64}\) “Leggi e considera la scrittura e troverai che tutti li iusti per molte tribulazione ci passaron. Scritto o negli Atti degli Apostoli che per molte tribulazione c’è bisogno d’entrare ne regnio de cieli – finito” (fol. 96r). The note is transcribed in Filippo Salmeri, ed., Epistula di Misser Sanctu Iheronimu ad Eustochiu (Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici sici, 1999), p. xiv.

\(^{65}\) Carmelina Naselli, Domenico Cavalca (Citta di Castello: Il Solco, 1925), p. 77.

\(^{66}\) Salmeri, Epistula, p. xiv. He surveys the history of the attribution of the Tuscan translation to Cavalca (pp. xiv–xviii) and concludes on the basis of similarities of expression between the Tuscan translation and other treatises by Cavalca that he was indeed the translator.
scepticism but followed Naselli without, in turn, giving a reason for rejecting Salmeri’s position. He took the note as proof that the *Atti degli Apostoli* preceded the *Pistola ad Eustochia* but did not examine either Naselli’s arguments in favor of Cavalca or Salmeri’s attribution of the note to the copyist.  

The use of the first person (“I have written in the Acts of the Apostles”) suggests that the author of this note was the translator of Jerome’s letter rather than Bastiano the copyist. He addresses the reader directly to reinforce the notion that the tribulations involved in preserving virginity and renouncing the world—themes expressed in Jerome’s text and reinforced by Cavalca’s chapter titles—were worth enduring since there was no easy path to heaven. The following features of the note favor Cavalca’s authorship: On a stylistic level the use of paired verbs, in this case the imperatives *leggi e considera*, though hardly unique to Cavalca, is common throughout his works. In terms of content, more important is the use of scripture as the main point of reference to prove an assertion. In this case the reader is told that the claim that the just reach heaven through tribulations can be proved by reading the Bible. A characteristic feature of Cavalca’s style of argumentation is an almost complete avoidance of references to secular authors and instead a reliance first on Scripture and then on the writings of the saints as the principal authorities he relies on to make a point. The note then provides a more precise reference—to the Acts of the Apostles. In the Vulgate this is Acts 14:21, but since Cavalca had divided some of the chapters of the Latin text (1, 4, 7, 9, and 12) the relevant passage appeared in chapter 18 of his translation: “per confermare e confortare animas discipulorum exhortantes ut permanerent in fide et quoniam per multas tribulationes oportet nos intrare in regnum Dei.”

---

68 “Confirmantes animas discipulorum exhortantes ut permanerent in fide et quoniam per multas tribulationes oportet nos intrare in regnum Dei.”
gli discepoli a costanza, dicendo e mostrando, che per molte tribulazioni è di bisogno che noi entriamo nel regno del cielo.”

Note the use of paired verbs in the vernacular where the Latin used only a single verb. Thus “confirmantes” is expanded to “confermare e confortare” and “exhortantes” to “dicendo e mostrando.” But it is the use of the word *bisogno* that ties the note to Cavalca’s translation of Acts. The phrase “che per molte tribulazione c’è bisogno d’entrare ne regnio de cieli” in Palat. 13 is almost identical to “che per molte tribulazioni è di bisogno che noi entriamo nel regno del cielo” in the Acts. Indeed, the slight variation makes it more likely that the author of the note was Cavalca, for this was a phrase he had in his mind and that he translated here from memory rather than by consulting his own earlier translation. As noted by Salmeri, Cavalca referred to this phrase in two of his later treatises. In his *Trattato della Pazienza* he wrote “E però si dice negli *Atti degli Apostoli*, per molte tribolazioni ci conviene entrare nel regno del cielo.” And in his last treatise, the *Esposizione del Simbolo degli Apostoli*, he said “e così anche disse S. Paolo che per molte tribolazioni ci conviene entrare nel regno del cielo.” Why is there a difference between the translated phrase as it appears in Acts and in these two later treatises? It appears as though Cavalca used “c’è bisogno che noi entriamo” at the beginning of his literary activity, when he was a translator, but replaced it with the more succinct expression “ci conviene entrare” later in his career, after he had written devotional treatises and honed his writing style.

---

There is another reason to tie the note to Cavalca—his fondness for the word *tribulazione*. Jerome’s letter ends with a quotation from the Song of Songs: “Aqua multa non poterit extinguere caritatem et flumina non cooperient eam” (8:7). In his translation of Jerome’s letters, the Florentine notary Ser Nicolò di Berto di Martino Gentiluzzi da San Gimignano included the letter to Eustochium. His translation, which unlike Cavalca’s was not capitulated and forms a single solid block of text, follows the Latin very closely: “Le molte acque non potranno spegnere la carità e non sarà coperta da’fiumi.” The 1497 Ferrarese edition—no doubt at the instigation of the castigator at the press who had a copy of the Latin text at hand—corrected the vocabulary and the use of the passive voice so that the printed text was even closer to the Latin: “Molte acque non potranno extinguere la carità et li fiumi non la copriranno.” Cavalca, however, concerned that his lay readers would not understand the quotation from the Song of Songs, explains that the waters and the rivers signify the tribulations that impeded Eustochium’s progress to heaven: “The many *tribulations* or delights or temporal goods, all of which things the waters signify, will not be able to extinguish my charity, so much is it aflame, nor will the rivers, which are the impetuous temptations and the much graver *tribulations*, be able to impede it.” The note then is picking up an important word that was part of the original version.

If we are to assume that the note was written by the copyist Bastiano, then we must explain two oddities. In the absence of the customary prologue indicating that he

---

73 Jerome was probably quoting from memory, as the Vulgate reading is “Aqua multae non poterunt extinguere caritatem nec flumina obruent illam.”
75 “Le molte tribolazioni o delizie o beni temporali, le quali tutte cose l’acque significano, non poteranno spegnere la mia carità, tanto è accesa, nè li fiumi cioè le impetuose tentazioni, e le viepiù gravi tribolazioni la potranno impedire.” Bottari, pp. 437–38.
copied these texts for the benefit or consolation of others, such as family members, it seems safe to assume that he produced the miscellany primarily, if not exclusively, for his own devotional use. Its combination of vernacular religious texts is characteristic of such manuscripts copied by laypeople. In such a case, if the manuscript was for personal use, it is unlikely that he would have addressed himself, saying, “Read and consider the Scripture and you will find that all the just reached heaven through many tribulations,” with its reference to an external text (scripture) not in the miscellany. There would also be no need for the persuasive tone of the exhortation if the author of the note, the reader, and the copyist were one and the same person. The persuasive rhetorical quality makes the most sense if the author is assumed to be separate from his readers. If Messer Bastiano accepted Jerome’s thesis that the path to heaven was a difficult one, he would not need to convince himself. We are instead hearing the voice of someone who is so familiar with scripture that he is able not only to allege it as an external authority buttressing the particular argument made in the text in question—Jerome’s letter—but also to then specify the book of the bible—Acts—in which the proof appears. This quality of summing up the essence of a work finds parallels not in Cavalca’s other translations, for these texts were too complex to be thus simplified into a single theme, but in his later treatises, which often had short poems condensing the themes examined in the treatises that could be committed to memory.

The other oddity of the note is its use of the first person: “I have written in the Acts of the Apostles that many tribulations are necessary in order to enter the kingdom of heaven.” There is no evidence of a translation of Acts into Italian in the hundred and fifty years between Cavalca’s vernacular translation and Malermi’s printed Italian Bible of
1471 (in which Malermi simply reworked Cavalca’s translation without translating afresh). Even if Messer Bastiano had indeed translated Acts and that translation was not copied and so remains unknown to scholars, we are still left with the problem of why someone whose command of the language was such that he could translate from the Latin would bother assembling for himself a vernacular rather than a Latin devotional miscellany. The easy answer is that Messer Bastiano was the copyist, not the author of the note.

But should we assume Cavalca was the author? There is still perhaps a problem with attributing the authorship of the note to him. There is not yet a critical edition of the *Pistola* so it is not possible to determine if the note appears in any other manuscript. The other problem is that in his treatises Cavalca tends to use impersonal constructions rather than the first person. Thus in the *Trattato della Pazienza* we read, “Si dice negli *Atti degli Apostoli,*” and in the *Esposizione del Simbolo* we find, “si parla chiaramente negli *Atti degli Apostoli*” and “si legge nel libro della *Vita de’ Santi Padri.*” It is nevertheless still possible that in distilling the message of Jerome’s letter he used the first person out of a sense of pride in his accomplishment as a neophyte author and as the conscious creator of a textual community of pious lay readers of which he was the fulcrum. The note could be considered the first internal reference in Cavalca’s oeuvre. Indeed the references within his later treatises to his earlier works suggest that Cavalca assumed that his readers had at hand copies of the treatises to which he referred—a five-foot shelf of devotional works, so to speak. If he was discussing something that he had

---

76 Salmeri asserts this but does not list the manuscripts he consulted. Salmeri, *Epistula,* p. xiv. The 1764 Bottari edition does not include the note.
already treated elsewhere, in an earlier treatise, he referred the reader back to that work. He therefore did not see his works as simply individual stand-alone entities but rather as parts of a cumulative whole.

It is also possible that Messer Bastiano mistakenly copied “scritto o” (I have written) from an exemplar that actually said “scritto e” (It is written). Even if this is so, the case for attributing the note to Cavalca is not vitiated, for the structure, the tone, and the contents are consistent with his other works. Nor is the fact that the other translations lack similar notes to the reader necessarily a problem. As mentioned earlier, the Book of Acts, Gregory’s Dialogues, and the Life of the Fathers were complex texts whose themes could not be easily condensed in a brief recapitulation. Jerome’s letter to Eustochium was the shortest of the four works Cavalca translated. It was also thematically concise. The note expressed in a manner that was not too reductive the message that the temporary trials involved in renouncing the world and preserving virginity were worth the timeless eschatological rewards.

Whether Cavalca was also the author of the abbreviated version of the Epistola in Palatino 13 cannot be determined without an examination of the manuscript and a comparison with the unabridged translation. Even if the abbreviator was someone else, it is possible that he retained it as a practical and succinct distillation of Jerome’s rich composition. However, even if one sets aside the problem of the note’s authorship, evidence from this prologue concerning Cavalca’s increasing confidence as a translator strengthens the assumption that the letter followed his translation of Acts. It is to the prologue that we must now turn.
As was the case with the prologue to the Acts, this prologue begins with the genesis of the translation and uses the same word—*volendo*. Here, however, there is a problem. In the 1764 edition, the principal manuscript uses the word *autorita* (authority), whereas the alternate reading is *utilita* (utility): “Wishing by order of many religious women, and other honorable virgins and many other devout people besides, who do not know Latin.” If one takes the former reading, then Cavalca produced the translation not at his own initiative but in response to a command from the three groups of people listed. The expression *per autorita di* could also mean by decree or by order, according to the *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana*. The first example listed for this usage is from the fourteenth-century Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani, who used the expression to explain the basis of a tax on the clergy. Although the GDLI assumes the decree is from someone with legitimate power to issue the command and, in the case of Villani, it was an old papal letter authorizing the tax, the sense here is of action taken with reference to an external entity that initiates or authorizes the activity.

In his essay on patronage and the relationship between the author and his public, Francesco Bruni pointed out that patronage may be both individual and collective. As an example of collective patronage, Bruni offered Cavalca’s prologue without changing the reading from *autorita* to *utilita* or noting that the latter was the reading in the manuscript of the 1764 edition. Bruni’s placement of the translation in the context of group patronage suggests that for him the expression “*per autorita di*” must mean an importuning request that verges on a demand. If this was the case, then Cavalca’s next request that verges on a demand. If this was the case, then Cavalca’s next

---

78 “Volendo per autorita di molte donne religiose e altre oneste vergini e ancora molte altre divote persone che non sanno grammatica.” *Atti*, p. 356.
translation was once again a response to an external demand. These indications of translation as response are absent from the prologues of the *Dialogues* and the *Vita dei Santi Padri*. This suggests that Cavalca moved from translating texts because he had been requested to do so by devout members of his flock to translating texts on his own initiative that he felt would be beneficial for them. Bruni noted that the Pistola was not a commission in the impersonal sense in which patrons have little or no existing relationship to the producer and the decision to make the commission is entirely independent of the producer. The demand for such a translation had been inspired and stoked by Cavalca’s own sermons and catechetical activity. The translation thus took place within the context of an existing relationship between Cavalca and his readers in which he had conditioned them to make such demands of him.\(^{80}\)

The prologue identifies three groups of people who are predominantly but not exclusively female. They are religious women, other honorable virgins, and many devout persons. These three groups were bound together by their lack of command of Latin and their common desire to read Jerome’s letter to Eustochium. It seems likely that the religious women were nuns. The chronicle of the convent of Saint Catherine noted Cavalca’s interest in promoting female monasticism when it mentioned his role in moving the monastery of the Misericordia to a new location and providing for its material needs.\(^{81}\) Elisabetta Salvadori’s research in the Pisan archives has clarified his

---


involvement with the older benedictine monastery of Saint Anne, the recently-founded Misericordia of 1308, and the monastery of Saint Martha, which, according to an addition to the chronicle in a later hand and picked up in the later Annales, was founded by Cavalca as a house for former prostitutes.\footnote{“Hic convertit meretrices, et ex eis fundavit monasterium Sancte Marthe.” Ibid.} Given the nature of Jerome’s letter, the religiose donne were probably the nuns of Sanit Anne (and perhaps also the Misericordia\footnote{The Misericordia was the new monastery formed in 1308 by the reopening of an older institution, the Repentite di S. Maria Maddalena, which had been closed for a while. Salvadori, “Fra Domenico Cavalca,” p. 112 n. 31. This was a house for reformed prostitutes which had been opened in 1240 and suppressed in 1290. See Katherine Ludwig Jansen, The Making of the Magdalen: Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), p. 180 nn. 51, 55. In 1326 it received a bequest made to the “conventui dominarum de Misericordia de Repentitis de Spina de Pisis.” Salvadori, “Fra Domenico Cavalca,” p. 112 n. 29. The use of repetitis suggests that the new foundation had the same function as the old. The addition to the chronicle, however, names Saint Martha as Cavalca’s foundation for the prostitutes he converted, implying perhaps that this was no longer the function of the Misericordia, regardless of its name in legal instruments.} rather than those of Sanit Martha) and members of the Dominican third order. The second group, the “altre oneste vergini,” likely consisted of unmarried women living with their families and who had not made any kind of formal religious profession but nevertheless sought to live their lives in the world according to monastic values as much as possible. The third group—“ancora molte altre divote persone”—clearly included not only both men and women but also those who were married.

In the prologue to Acts the people who asked for the translation were simply described as “certe divote persone.” One gets the sense here that the Acts translation had been a very great success, for the audience of Jerome’s letter, a text of narrower interest than the biblical Book of Acts, has expanded well beyond the “certain devout persons” of the Acts prologue. One can imagine the process by which this took place. As has been pointed out, it was sermons that created the demand for translations into the vernacular. The chronicle entry noted that Cavalca was an assiduous preacher. In his sermons to the
laity he would have discussed Acts and the way of life of the apostles and thus created an interest among his listeners to read the biblical text for themselves. They asked him to translate the book and he obliged. We must also imagine that although Cavalca did not add his name to the prologue to identify himself as the translator, his prominence as a preacher and his ties to a broad section of society would have ensured that those who copied the manuscript in Pisa knew that he was responsible. More importantly, all those who encountered the translation would have noted from the prologue that Cavalca was willing to translate texts upon request.

The translation of Acts then found its way from lay circles into female monasteries. The nuns copied it for their own use and perhaps also for others. Like the laity for whom it was originally intended, they too would have noted that Cavalca would translate texts when asked to do so by those without a grasp of Latin. But it would not have been just nuns without Latin who read Cavalca’s translation. Clerics who were literati and therefore did not need a translation would nonetheless have been aware of its existence and both read and used it in their sermons, since Cavalca’s explanations of Latin terms made it a useful homiletic tool for preachers addressing the laity. Thus the translation moved beyond the intended audience of devout laypersons and was read by nuns and also by male clerics.

A reverse process was at work with his translation of Jerome’s letter to Eustochium. Its relevance to female asceticism—whether institutional or private—is self-evident. What was its appeal to the married men and women who made up the third group? As was the case with his Acts translation, Cavalca’s chapter titles provide a key to how he wished his readers to understand the text. Since I will discuss his rubrics in
greater detail later, suffice it to say here that only three of the thirteen titles refer to virginity. Cavalca’s genius was to present the text as a primer on virtues and vices with additional information on renouncing the world, resisting temptation, and the benefit of the Incarnation. To be sure, these were all themes that were present in the letter, but Cavalca’s chapter divisions and titles made it a guide to correct living for all Christians—male and female, single and married—rather than just a narrow treatise on preserving female virginity, as Jerome’s own Latin title to the letter, *Ad Eustochium de virginitate servanda*, suggested. Cavalca obviously referred to this text to illustrate many different themes in his sermons, for his chapter titles all correspond to topics on which the friars were expected to preach. Thus, his catechetical concerns combined with his desire to shape lay spiritual life along monastic lines. By presenting what is essentially a gendered ascetic text of late antique monasticism in this polyvalent way in his sermons, he stimulated a demand for it among both men and women. Dressing it in this universalizing form and keeping it consonant with the values aired from his pulpit, Cavalca managed to broaden its audience well beyond the “donne religiose” and the “altre oneste vergini” to a much larger group—the “molte altre divote persone,” whom he managed to convince that this was a text they could not live without. Such was the appeal of his divisions and chapter titles that some six and a half centuries later, Ippolito Isola used them in his 1870 edition of Ser Nicolò di Berto di Martino Gentiluzzi da San Gimignano’s translation of the same letter, even though Ser Nicolò, following his Latin exemplar, had translated the letter in a single text block without divisions.\(^8^5\)

---

\(^{84}\) See Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, chapter 135, in which he lists his own works.

The Text in Question

Cavalca’s description of the text and its author is straightforward in comparison with the complex sentence in the prologue to the Acts. The reason for this was that he had no polemical purpose in mind in translating this letter. He did, however, want to represent it as dealing with a broader theme than female virginity. The challenge he faced was to make the text appealing and relevant to both sexes and to married people. He therefore presented the text as also embracing the broader theme of detachment from the world: “...recare in vulgare quella bella pistola, la quale s. Girolamo mandò ad Eustochia nobilissima vergine di Roma, inducendola ad amare e ben guardare la santa verginità e a bene renunciare lo mondo tutto.”

In the Acts prologue Cavalca took pains to establish that the author was also that of the Gospel account and that Acts was the historical continuation of the Gospel. Such concerns are not visible here. Cavalca simply named the author and the recipient of the letter. In his description of the text we note that he was not just interested in virginity and worldly renunciation as discrete events, but also in the dynamic psychological process by which they were first reached and subsequently maintained. In other words, he saw them not as static but as a dynamic process requiring constant attention. The challenge was to ensure that the difficult readjustment of secular values and their replacement by monastic Christian ones would stick. By presenting the text as a story not just about virginity but also about the mental process of worldly renunciation, Cavalca made it relevant to all Christians and not just those who undertook monastic vows.
A problem that Cavalca faced in translating Jerome’s letter was the very large number of
scriptural references. In the monastic context this posed no difficulty, for monks were
well versed in scripture and were also trained in its interpretation. They would have been
expected to recognize and understand the biblical passages Jerome quoted so frequently.
This could not be presumed for a lay reader, and a translation that included all the
scriptural references would make for a confusing and a bumpy ride:

[D]o ad intendere a ciascuno che legge che perche s. Girolamo dettando la detta
pistola esce in certi luoghi in certi motti e proverbi e quasi certe parole mozze
de’ profeti e delle storie della scrittura, delle quali pogniamo che ogni grande
letterato in teologia abbia intendimento, nientedimeno in volgare vengono a dir
quasi nulla cioè che non se ne ha perfetto intendimento e non suonano bene;
don’d’io ho ne’detti passi cresciute e isminuite le parole e mutato l’ordine della
lettera, per dare più utilmente e chiaramente ad intendere la sentenza.

Unlike the Atti degli Apostoli, whose meaning Cavalca had presented as univalently
literal or historical, the biblical passages with which the Epistola was liberally sprinkled
required training in theology to be properly understood. When translated into the
vernacular they would make no sense to someone untrained in exegesis and therefore
lacking a complete understanding “nor would they sound good.” This unexpected
attention not just to questions of meaning but also to the aural quality of the translation
reveals Cavalca’s implicit assumption that good translations ought to resemble human
speech. Rather than transform a Latin text into a vernacular one, the transmutation he
sought was to turn text to living voice. Unlike modern voice recognition software, which
turns speech into a written document on the computer, he sought the opposite and greater
challenge—how to turn text into speech. The great success of his translations and
treatises can be attributed in part to this aural quality of his writings, which evoked human speech. The silent reader and those in the audience listening when Cavalca’s works were read aloud, heard, I would argue, a narrative that actually sounded like human speech, rather than like written text recited by a speaker.

In order to do this, Cavalca had to emancipate himself from the traditions of medieval translation practices, which stressed fidelity to the base text. This was all the more the case for translations of the Bible. In his Acts prologue, Cavalca explained that he had changed the order of the words only in a few unavoidable places and had added words in the vernacular to express the densely-packed meaning of Latin words. There was no question of cutting things out of a sacred text. In the case of a patristic text such as Jerome’s letter, he exercised a greater freedom in making changes both by addition to and by subtraction from the Latin text: “onde io ho ne’detti passi cresciute e isminuite le parole e mutato l’ordine della lettera per dare più utilmente e chiaramente ad intendere la sentenza.”

The success of his Acts translation had made Cavalca more confident in his abilities. The defensive tone that had earlier marked his statements about his translation methods are nowhere to be seen in this prologue. There are no apologies for having changed the order of the Latin text or for having added more words to clarify the source. But it is not just the lack of defensiveness that shows Cavalca’s increased confidence. It is also the casual way in which he mentions a new principle of his method of translation, that of diminution. He now feels free to leave out portions of the Latin text that either make no sense or do not sound good. The goal is still to render the meaning usefully and clearly, but now the translator has given himself the liberty to prune. This is a more
expansive view of the “sensum ad sensum” approach Jerome recommended to
Pammachius. His Acts translation was also a sense-to-sense translation, but there he felt
constrained to preserve as much as possible of the source text. Now he had shuffled off
those restrictive traditions in a way that set him well apart from other translators, such as
Ser Niccolò, who retained in his translation all of Jerome’s biblical quotations even if
they might not be understood by a lay reader or sound euphonious. The statement about
diminution marked a new stage in Cavalca’s thinking about translation. It showed clearly
that his primary loyalty was to shape his translation and enhance its aural quality in a way
that ensured his target audience would respond to it and would comprehend the text’s
essential message. He was much less concerned to simply reproduce the text in another
language, something that he was obviously well capable of doing.

Reference Tools

As was the case with the *Atti degli Apostoli*, Cavalca divided the text of the letter to
Eustochium into chapters. But unlike Acts, which had its own division into twenty-eight
chapters in the Vulgate, Jerome’s letter had no internal divisions. Cavalca divided it into
thirteen chapters and listed them at the end of the prologue. He provided thematic rubrics
for each chapter so that the reader encountered a thematic index even before he or she
read the actual text. These titles adumbrated themes, all of which were familiar to
Cavalca’s readers from his preaching, and thus conditioned the reader toward a particular
interpretation of the text. This occurred because the reader encountered the interpretative
rubrics twice—first at the end of the prologue and then at the beginning of each chapter.
Thus the first chapter title was about renunciation of the world and family, the second
about resisting temptation and the virtue of humility, the third was on the sin of greed, the
fourth on the sin of luxury, the eighth on vainglory, the twelfth on loving Mary, and the thirteenth on the Incarnation. The sixth title, “Come si scusa che non biasima il matrimonio ma pone innanzi la verginità,” shows Cavalca picking up Jerome’s argument that he was not criticizing marriage. We observe him trying to assure married readers that although virginity stood before marriage in a hierarchy of goodness, marriage itself was not bad. This attitude also undergirds the section on heresies in his Esposizione del Simbolo degli Apostoli, in which one of the heresies listed is that married people cannot be saved. By choosing rubrics drawn from themes emphasized in the pulpit, Cavalca made the text seem relevant to a much broader section of laity than professed female virgins.

Finally, there is an oddity worth noting in the presentation of the titles. This shows Cavalca’s extraordinarily acute attention to detail in his attempt to make the text easy to use. The text was addressed primarily but not exclusively to women. Cavalca had observed that even literate women were not familiar with Roman numerals. He therefore used Arabic numerals so that they could easily find the chapters they wished to read: “Nel numero del capitolo primo diro 1 e per queste figure dell’abbaco da uno insino in 13 si è il numero de’capitoli, acciochè le donne sappiano ritrovare i capitoli presto.”

The prologue also reveals trends in reading practices in the fourteenth century. It shows that long before the age of information overload Cavalca envisaged that people did not want to have to read an entire text simply to find the particular passage that they were looking for. He had perhaps observed that some female readers might want to

---

86 See Ann Blair, Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
consult only the section on greed. He wished to make their lives easier by rendering his translation as user-friendly as possible. It is this care for rendering a text easy to use and to consult that is a hallmark of Cavalca’s works and the reason why they were a success among readers of all stripes.

III) The Prologue to the Dialogo di San Gregorio

A comparison of the structure of the prologue of Gregory’s Dialogo to those of the Atti and the Epistola prologues reveals a new level of discursive complexity that is also found in the prologue to the VSP. The four prologues therefore fall into two groups. In the prologue of Dialogo we observe for the first time an extensive deployment of the topos of humility, which, since it was missing in the prologues of the Atti and the Epistola, can perhaps be explained by the criticism Cavalca received for his earlier two translations from clerics who objected to his methods. There is, in addition, a very defensive address to carping critics, which, since it is absent from the VSP prologue, suggests that the Dialogo was the third of the four translations he undertook.

The Genesis of the Translation and Its Audience

One important way in which the Dialogo differs from the two earlier translations is in its genesis. In the earlier cases Cavalca had responded to an external request from pious laypersons and some female religious. Here for the first time we find him translating out of a pressing sense of personal indebtedness. This is translation as expiation, work undertaken to relieve the burden of an anxiety that was both temporal and eschatological. The obligation that he felt was, put another way, horizontal and vertical, the first to his fellow men and women and the other to his God. Cavalca was
acutely aware of the fact that he did not work with his hands and that his continued material existence was the result of charitable contributions from the laity. The Dominicans had justified their acceptance of charity on the basis of their ministry. Saint Dominic had abandoned manual labor, but the Constitutions of the Order had insisted on poverty. Dominicans were to preach the word of God to the people and in exchange were permitted to beg for sustenance. What distinguished Cavalca from other preachers was an abiding sense that all of his diligent homiletic work was still insufficient to discharge the debt he owed to his flock. He needed to be useful to them so that he would not be found wanting at the Last Judgment:

Perciocchè come dice s. Paolo debitore sono alli savj ed alli semplici e perchè come religioso di povertà vivo delle limosine di ciascuno, vedendomi non poter esser utile alli semplici e alli letterati per lo mio poco senno e non poter pagare questo debito alli savj perchè sono povero di scienza, avevami pensato acciocchè in nel cospetto di Dio non fossi al tutto apppresentato inutile, per utilità almeno d’alquanti idioti e non savj di scienza, recare in volgare il Dialogo di s. Gregorio, lo quale infra le altre opere divote singolarmente è utile.

Cavalca began with a reference to Romans 1:14\(^7\) in which Saint Paul recognizes his obligation to Greeks and non-Greeks, and to the wise as well as to the foolish. In the next verse of his epistle, Paul presents his preaching as a response to his obligation to these groups. Although Paul did not explain why he was so obliged, Cavalca seems to have understood these verses in terms of a reciprocal exchange in which he, the debtor, provided spiritual food to those who had nourished him physically. The alms and support that he received as a mendicant created an obligation toward the donors. These included not just the laity but also the archbishopric of Pisa from which the Convent of Saint

---

\(^7\) "14 Graecis ac barbaris, sapientibus et insipientibus debitor sum 15 ita quod in me promptum est et vobis que Romae estis evangelizare."
Catherine had to have received support. Cavalca thus felt a sense of obligation to a broad spectrum of Pisan society, from the humblest layperson to highly educated clerics at the cathedral of Pisa.

Discharging this debt posed a problem for Cavalca, which he expressed in a complex topos of humility that had as its foundation the groups listed in Paul’s epistle. On the one hand, he could not be useful either to simple people or to the literati owing to his lack of intelligence. On the other, he was unable to discharge his debt to the wise because he was poor in knowledge. Thus Cavalca presented himself as poor materially, owing to his religious vows, and also metaphorically. Given the absence of such language in his earlier prologues it seems as though something had happened after he translated Jerome’s letter to Eustochium to prompt this phrasing. Carlo Delcorno concluded from the absence of Cavalca’s name on the surviving teaching rolls of the Roman province of which the Convent of Saint Catherine was part that he had never reached the level of lector in the Dominican schooling system. We can not know for certain, but it may have been that brethren who held advanced degrees were among those who severely criticized his methodus interpretandi in the Epistola. In its prologue, Cavalca, when talking about the difficulty of understanding the biblical passages Jerome quoted, had said of these that “ogni grande letterato in teologia abbia intendimento.” Although he was talking about the problem of rendering these passages into the vernacular, the manner in which he referred to these “great men lettered in theology” suggests a profound sense of separation from the group of men with advanced degrees who taught at universities and at the Dominican conventual schools. Had he chosen to say something along the lines of, “One needs to have studied theology to understand these passages, which will not make sense in the
vulgar tongue,” he would have expressed himself in a way that would have included himself, clearly and without question, among those who understood the biblical quotations. Cavalca and all the other *fratres communes* of the order had undergone basic training both in the arts curriculum and in theology in order to become competent preachers capable of discharging the catechetical responsibilities of their order. Only some of them would have gone on to study at an advanced level. It is also clear from his treatises that he had read widely in theology, for he supported all his assertions with quotations from important writers of the Christian tradition. Nevertheless, the way in which he mentions the theologians in the *Epistola* prologue evokes a certain feeling of insecurity. They appear to be far above both himself and the laity in their understanding of theology and the Bible.

Despite inadequacies that made it difficult to fulfil his sense of Pauline obligation to all levels of society, one other factor forced his hand. This was the great fear that he would be found wanting in the eyes of God. This vertical obligation required, while he lived on earth, that he be useful to his fellow humans. It was this crushing sense of the divine retribution that would fall on him for not meeting his duties to his neighbor that made him decide to continue his activities as a translator regardless of what any carping critics might have to say. This sense of duty is present in what is believed to be his first devotional treatise, the *Specchio di Croce*. In its prologue Cavalca began, very tellingly, with the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:14–30). After recounting the story of the master who gave his servants talents to invest before going away on a trip, Cavalca explained that the one who, upon his master’s return, had not increased the money alloted to him was punished for being a “useless servant” and thrown into the place of darkness.
Cavalca explained that Christ was the master and humans were the servants. He had an abiding fear of being considered a useless servant who would end up damned. As a result, the word *utile* appears repeatedly in this prologue in a way that is not seen in the prologues to his two previous translations. He appears to have decided that he could at least be useful to those who were “idioti”—those unable to read Latin—and the “non savj di scienza”—those not wise in knowledge. This characterization of his audience is strikingly negative when compared to the characterizations in the two earlier translations, where he used rather more positive terms for his readers. In the *Atti* prologue these were “divote persone,” and in the *Epistola* prologue they were “donne religiose, altre oneste vergini e molte altre divote persone che non sanno grammatica.” In both instances Cavalca mentioned first the piety of his audience. In the *Atti* prologue their lack of Latin was not explicitly evoked but rather implied, since they had requested that he translate Acts. In the *Epistola* this deficit was explicitly stated but in a neutral way. In the *Dialogues* prologue, however, Cavalca defines the audience entirely in what they lack—Latin and knowledge.

What appears to have changed is not Cavalca’s attitude to the laity but his sense of self in relation to the more educated of his brethren. One gets the impression that he had been so bruised and battered by their critique that he felt hard-pressed to find anyone whom he could help. By defining his audience in the way he did, he presented himself as only fit to translate for those who were opposites of the theologians in terms of education and cultural capital. In a state of diminished confidence, he saw himself now as a lowly translator for the very littlest people. Perhaps one of these “big men” had criticized the freedom with which Cavalca, who was neither a lector nor a master, had presumed to
translate a letter by Jerome, one of the Church Fathers. This in turn probably led Cavalca not only to begin the prologue with new protestations of his inadequacy, but also to end it with a defensive justification of his work.

Since Cavalca invoked Paul and presented himself as a debtor in the Pauline sense, it is useful examine how he might have understood the word. Medieval theologians did not understand *debitor* in Romans 1:14 to mean that Paul owed something to the groups he named. Rather than seeing here an indication of indebtedness, they interpreted the word to mean that Paul felt an obligation to preach the Gospel to everyone. Cavalca’s understanding of the Epistle to the Romans was conditioned by exegetical tools, such as the earlier glosses of the monastic tradition and the more modern postils developed by the friars. He frequently mentioned the *Glossa Ordinaria* in his treatises, so we know he depended on it for elucidating scripture. This assemblage of glosses and commentary on the Bible was standardized by 1160 and summarized patristic and medieval exegesis.88 According to the marginal gloss, Paul was a debtor “because he was sent to all.”89 The interlinear gloss appearing above the biblical text emphasized preaching but ended up begging the question: “To evangelize, and just as I owe this to others, thus do I to you since I am a debtor to all.”90 Besides the *Glossa Ordinaria*, the most authoritative set of postils was that produced under the direction of Cavalca’s contemporary in Paris, the Franciscan scholar Nicholas of Lyra. His *Postilla litteralis super Bibliam* was not

---

90 “Euangelizare, et sicut aliis dedeo ita et vobis quia omnibus debitor sum.” Ibid.
completed until 1332 and therefore probably appeared too late to have been used by Cavalca.\footnote{The postil speaks of Paul’s preaching of Christ’s gospel as resulting from his call to the office of apostle: “Debitor sum: ad predicandum eius euangelium ex officio appellatus.” Nicolaus de Lyra, Postilla super totam Bibliam (Strasbourg, 1492; reprint Frankfurt: Minerva, 1971), vol. 4, aaiii.}

Within the Dominican commentary tradition Cavalca would have turned to the writings of Aquinas and the postils produced under the name of Hugh of Saint Cher (c. 1200–1263).\footnote{I refer to Hugh as a single author for convenience.} In his commentary on the Pauline Epistles Aquinas emphasized that preaching and its usefulness provided the context for the preceding phrase.\footnote{“Ut aliquem fructum habeam et in vobis sicut in ceteris gentibus.”} He explained that the utility of preaching was its fruit and that the fruit in question could be understood in two ways:

In one way it is as though he says, “that I might make fruit in you through my preaching.” John 15:16: that you should go and bring forth fruit. In the other way it is as though through their conversion the fruit becomes greater for him according to John 4:36: And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life everlasting.\footnote{“Deinde ponit causam duplicem propositi, quarum prima est utilitas, unde dicit ut aliquem fructum habeam in vobis sicut in ceteris gentibus quibus, scilicet, praedicavi. Quod potest dupliciter intelligi. Uno modo quasi dicat: Ut faciam aliquem fructum in vobis per meam praedicationem. Io. xv, v.16:Ut eatis et fructum afferatis. – Alio modo quasi ex eorum conversione ei fructus accrescat, secundum illud Io. iv, 36: Qui metit mercedem accipit et fructum congregat in vitam aeternam.” Thomas Aquinas, Super Epistolas S. Pauli Lectura, ed. Raffaele Cai (Turin: Marietti, 1953), vol. 1, p. 18.}

For Aquinas, preaching benefited both the listener and the preacher. His interpretation thus introduced an eschatological perspective that was missing in the Glossa Ordinaria and Nicholas’s postil. Aquinas’s interpretation strengthened and justified the mission of the preaching orders, which also saw themselves as the new apostles. It was this double perspective, at once temporal and eternal, that Cavalca absorbed. In his case, however, as
the prologue shows, rather than being reassured, he felt great anxiety that his efforts as a preacher would prove insufficient for his salvation.

In his commentary on 1:14 Aquinas did not gloss *debitor* but instead underlined the obligation Paul felt to preach to all:

> The other matter moreover is the obligation which hung over him on account of the duty that he had taken on. I Cor. ix, 16: If I preach not the Gospel, woe is unto me, etc. And since he had taken on the entire apostolate to the gentiles he asserted that he was a debtor/obliged to all according to I. Cor. ix, 19: For whereas I was free as to all, I made myself the servant of all.\(^95\)

In his commentary, and by his intertextual reference to 1 Corinthians 16–19, Aquinas emphasized the enormous pressure Paul felt not just to preach as much as possible but also to preach to all peoples. This understanding of the Pauline *debitum*, or obligation, emphasized more generally by Humbert of Romans and more specifically here by Aquinas, clearly influenced Cavalca deeply, as his entry in the chronicle of the convent of Saint Catherine paints the portrait of an indefatigable preacher.

Aquinas did not comment on “sapientibus et insipientibus,” and Cavalca’s understanding here was conditioned by Hugh’s postils.\(^96\) Hugh’s commentary on the Bible was strikingly different from the *Glossa Ordinaria* in that he assumed that his readers were members of the preaching orders. It contained moralized readings that also offered a trenchant critique of certain tendencies that he must have observed among the brethren, such as a reluctance to preach to humble people or those located in distant

\(^95\) “Alia autem causa est debitum quod sibi imminebat ex suscepto officio. I Cor. ix, v.16: *Si non evangelizavero vae mihi* etc. Et quia universalem gentium apostolatum susceperat, omnibus se asserit debitorum, secundum illud I Cor. ix, 19: *Cum essem liber ex omnibus omnium me servum feci.* Ibid.

places. Such critiques clearly resonated with Cavalca, for his treatises contain many similar objections to practices among clerics and preachers that he found objectionable. For Hugh, the moral meaning of “debitor sum” was that preachers and the learned owed a duty to those subject to them on account of the talent committed to them in Matthew 25. After explaining that Paul felt an obligation not just to those who were close to him but also to those who were far away in Rome, Hugh adds that this was said against those who always wished to preach to those nearby. In his *expositio*, Hugh critiques bishops by glossing “sapientibus et insipientibus” to mean that “bishops should be equally willing to go to visit the poor and the rich and that this is not the case only because the rich are scandalized more quickly than the poor when they ask for him and he does not come.”

What is noteworthy in this interpretation is not just the social critique of episcopal partiality to the well-off members of society (because they are squeakier wheels), but also the economic association of *insipientibus* with the poor. Criticisms such as these and similar ones in Humbert of Romans’ *De eruditione predicatorum* resonated with Cavalca, who shared a similar commitment to pastoral care at the lowest levels of society.

I have suggested that although Cavalca believed that every preacher following Paul’s example should preach to all groups within society, it was the criticism of his more educated colleagues—the *sapien*ti—that pushed him toward a mission to the *insipienti*.

There is a certain irony here, for the *semplici*, the term he used for Paul’s *insipientes*,
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98 “Sapientibus et insipientibus: non enim eis qui prope sed et vobis romanis qui non estis prope: Contra illos qui semper prope volunt predicare.” Ibid.
99 “Sapientibus et insipientibus: ergo eadem ratione episcopus aequaliter debet ire ad visitandos pauperes et divites: quod verum est nisi aliqua subcit ratio: vt si requiratur a diuitibus et non veniat cito: citius scandalisantur quam pauperes.” Ibid.
were of course the small minority of educated laypeople who could read and write in the vernacular and who were sufficiently well off to command copies of the manuscripts of Cavalca’s translations. Nevertheless, from the elite viewpoint of a certain kind of cleric—probably the sort who had criticized Cavalca—those who were not literate in Latin formed a crowd of simple folks in which those who could read and write in the vernacular were indistinguishable from those who could not. I am not suggesting that Cavalca himself shared this contemptuous perspective but that the unusual language in the prologue resulted from the fact that he was now addressing both his original intended audience and his critics. As a result, the respectful language of his first two prologues gave way in the third, probably unconsciously and defensively, to language that was tainted by condescending attitudes and vocabulary.

*The Text Selected for Translation*

Despite this new and ponderous sense of his limitations, Cavalca still felt pressed to do something so that he would not be found wanting when his soul was judged. It was this relentless eschatological pressure to be useful that forced him to move beyond an awareness of his deficits, an awareness that might otherwise have led to paralysis. His sense of fear and guilt propelled him to continue his activities as a translator. This time, however, in the absence of a request from members of his flock, he selected a work on his own initiative. He had a choice of books, since the prologue informs us that the “Dialogue of S. Gregory was singularly useful among the other devout works” at his disposal. Although Cavalca did not explain why the *Dialogues* were so useful, we can surmise from the contents of the four constituent books why they were so appealing. Originally written around AD 593 they contained vivid and entertaining stories of saints
and miracles that were dear to monastic readers over the centuries, for they reinforced certain themes, such as God’s continuing presence in the world, the power of the saints over heretics and the malignant ingenuity of demons, and the inescapable presence of the afterlife. All the catechetical themes that the preachers had to emphasize in their sermons were present in this collection of stories, so it is not surprising that they were excerpted in homiletic tools such as exempla collections. Unlike the *Vitas patrum* collection, the *Dialogues* did not contain any potentially slippery or confusing genres, such as the Apophthegmata. Since Gregory had placed in the mouth of Peter the subdeacon, Gregory’s interlocutor, either the proper understanding of the story just related or a question about it which Gregory then answered, he was able to exercise strict control over the proper understanding of the matters discussed. The stories consequently served a didactic purpose within his project of constructing an orthodox Christian spirituality. This text was therefore well-suited for translation into the vernacular for the laity, for whom it could serve as a sourcebook that reinforced Gregory’s catechetical aims.

Cavalca was not the only cleric who thought this work useful for laypeople. The first translation on the Italian peninsula of the work was that of the Sicilian Franciscan Giovanni Campulu da Messina. To understand how his translation came about one needs to turn to the Catalan physician and theologian Arnau de Vilanova (c. 1238–1311). Arnau became a tutor to Frederick III of Aragon, who was elected king of Sicily. In 1310 he wrote a letter of spiritual direction to Frederick in which he included recommendations for his wife, Eleanor of Anjou, who was the daughter of Charles II of Naples and Mary of Hungary. In the *Informació espiritual al Rei Frederic de Sicília*, Arnau inveighs against secular literature and recommends in its stead pure and clear translations of the Gospels:
Arnau recommended that the king police his lady’s readings so that she would neither have nor suffer to be read to her in her quarters such secular literature as romances and worldly vanities. In its place she, her daughters, and her companions were, on Sundays and feast days, to either read or have read aloud for them the Gospels in the vernacular. Arnau had been physician to Boniface VIII and protected by other popes, so what we find here is a high-placed cleric living during Cavalca’s time who not only took vernacular translations of scripture not only for granted but also saw them as necessary for the spiritual health of laypeople.

Whether or not Frederick implemented the recommendations of Arnau, the translator’s prologue and colophon make it clear that Friar Giovanni undertook the work of turning Gregory’s Dialogues into Sicilian at the request of Queen Eleanor. This situation presupposes certain discussions between Eleanor and her confessor in which various works were presumably considered. Arnau’s recommendations did not result in translations into Sicilian, however. It is certainly possible that there was no need for a new translation, since French translations of the entire Bible had been completed by the third quarter of the preceding century. As a member of the ruling Angevin house of Naples, Eleanor was brought up speaking French at the court. Arnau’s recommendations could easily have been fulfilled by the use of existing French vernacular Bibles. Eleanor’s request for a translation of the Dialogues tells us not just that she was literate in two different vernaculars but also that this particular text had been recommended to her by a
cleric at her court. Like Cavalca with his audience of laypeople, this cleric felt that the
*Dialogues* were appropriate and useful reading for the queen. Once she had been
persuaded, she commissioned the translation. Giovanni makes it clear that it was she who
was the driving force behind the translation:

Questa opera si è facta per mano di Frate Giovanne Campoli di Messina
dell’ordine de frati minor, ad instantia e devotione di nostra segniora Madonna
Alionora regina di Siciglia; sì che ogna persona che leggerà nella dicta opera
prieghi Iddio per lei devotamente, e per lo nostro segniore il Re Friderichuo suo
marito, et anche per tucta loro herede.

Giovanni emphasized that Eleanor was the patron in two different ways. First, her agency
was expressed in describing its genesis: the translation was made at her command—“ad
instantia”—and for her devotion. The second way that Giovanni underlined the
importance of her patronage was by placing her at the head of a list of members of the
royal family who were to be remembered in the prayers of those reading the translation.
Since she was the principal patron, they were to pray for her first. Only then were they to
pray for her husband the king, and finally for their many children. Thus the act of
commissioning the translation was to reap eschatological benefits for her and her entire
family. The assumption here was that readers who came across so useful a book would
pray for the person who commissioned it.

The readers were reminded of Eleanor’s patronage both at the beginning—in the
prologue—and at the end—in Giovanni’s colophon:

E cumplectu esti lu libru de sanctu Gregoriu lu quali si intitula ‘Libru de lu
dialaghu de sanctu Gregoriu,’ lu quali si esti traslatatu da gramatica in vulgaru pir
Frati Iohanni Campulu de Missina de l’ordine de li frati minuri, a devucione e
riquesta de la excellentissima Madonna Alianora pir la grati de Deu regina de
Sichilia.
In the colophon Giovanni replaced the “ad instantia” of the prologue with “riquesta.” The effect is more personal, and the absence of any mention of the king here makes it clear that this commission had been entirely Eleonor’s. Thus, roughly a decade before Cavalca made his own translation out of a belief that it would benefit laypeople, a Franciscan had translated the Dialogues out of the same belief that it would benefit a queen and all who read it at her court.

The Old English Translation

The earliest vernacular translation of the Dialogues was that commissioned by King Alfred (849–899) from Waerferth, who was bishop of Worcester from c. 872 to c. 915.\textsuperscript{100} was by Asser asserted Waerferth’s identity as the translator in his Life of King Alfred.\textsuperscript{101} The translation survives in three manuscripts two of which have prefaces in the first person and thus present themselves as written by the king.\textsuperscript{102} The third manuscript lacks this royal preface but has instead a metrical preface written by Bishop Wulfsige to accompany the dissemination of the copy Alfred sent him. The two prefaces indicate in different ways how the Dialogues were thought to be useful.


\textsuperscript{101} Asser, Life of Alfred, chap. 77, “… imperio regis libros dialogorum Gregorii papae et Petri sui discipuli de Latinate primus in saxoniam linguam, aliquando sensum ex sensu ponens, elucidatim et elegantissime interpretatus est.”

In the case of the royal preface, even if written by Alfred himself, a clerical, likely an episcopal, presence hovers behind the scenes making its presence felt:

I Alfred, honored by the gift of Christ with the glory of kingship, have clearly perceived and often heard through the testimony of holy books, that for us, to whom God has granted such heights of worldly distinction, there is the greatest need that amid these earthly anxieties we should bend and turn our minds to the spiritual duties. And therefore I required and asked of my loyal friends that they would write for me out of God’s books, the following information concerning the virtues and miracles of holy people, so that, I, strengthened through the exhortation and love, amid these earthly tribulations, might from time to time think of heavenly things.¹⁰³

The preface evokes a scene in which the king, although ostensibly speaking for himself, had clearly internalized the recommendation of his bishops not to allow the great pressures of his secular royal duties to take over all his time and attention, to the detriment of his spiritual welfare. We note the parallel with the beginning of Gregory’s Dialogues, where he was so worn out from his pastoral responsibilities that he had no time left for contemplation. The Dialogues are presented as a transformative tonic for the busy monarch. Once he had read them he would no longer be able to return to his former self, when he was too weak to carve out time for spiritual edification in a busy schedule spent on pressing matters of state. The Dialogues were valuable precisely for their great persuasive power. Although written by Gregory about holy men and women in Italy, the Alfredian preface assumed that the reader drew universal messages concerning the virtues and miracles from stories set in a different country and time. The “exhortation and love” contained in them would impress themselves onto his mind in a way that “strengthened” the weak will. As a result, in the future when the king might be in the

¹⁰³ Godden, “Waerferth and King Alfred,” p. 36, translating the preface in Corpus Christi College, University of Cambridge, MS 322.
midst of myriad earthly claims on his time, the memory of the reading would be powerful enough to draw his attention away from mundane matters and toward heaven. The power of the *Dialogues* was such that, once read, they could attract the busiest layman in the kingdom and turn him away from secular affairs.

If the royal preface presented reading the *Dialogues* as a transforming first step that could reorganize the priorities of a lay monarch, the episcopal preface in the early eleventh-century manuscript British Library MS Cotton Otho C.i is much more explicit about the subsequent steps that would raise the reader heavenward. M. R. Godden plausibly suggests that Bishop Wulfsige wrote this metrical preface to make up for the absence of the royal preface in the copy Alfred sent him.\(^\text{104}\) It too is in the first person, but here we have the book speaking rather than the king, who is referred to in the third person. The case for the usefulness of the book is made by the book itself:

He who sets out to read me through will close me with appropriate recompense. If he wishes many good examples of the spiritual life, he may find them in me in order that he may very easily ascend to the heavenly home where there is ever joy and rapture—bliss in those dwellings for those who may see the Son of God Himself with their own eyes. That may the man perceive whose mind is sound and then through his understanding trusts in the help of these saints and carries out their example—as this book explains.\(^\text{105}\)

---

\(^{104}\) Godden, “Waerferth and King Alfred,” p. 40. If this was the case, the argument for Waerferth’s authorship of the prose preface is strengthened. We can imagine that he completed the translation and sent it to the king. If Alfred had originally intended it only for his personal use that could explain the absence of a translator’s preface. Alfred then changed his mind and decided the translation was to be distributed and had a copy sent to Wulfsige. He also asked Waerferth to provide him with a preface for subsequent copies. Once Wulfsige knew that Alfred wished the translation to be disseminated he provided his own metrical preface and sent out the translation. Alfred did the same once he received the preface from Waerferth. The two surviving manuscripts are eleventh-century copies descending from the manuscripts sent out by Alfred and Wulfsige.

Wulfsige starts by asserting that the time spent reading the translation was time well spent. The book’s power lay in its being a storehouse of exempla for a way of life committed to spiritual rather than temporal values. It showed the reader how to get to heaven and, by providing many such examples, made the case that this could be done “very easily.” What is noticeable is that the preface did not assume that the reader had to undergo a conversion to monasticism, but it then went on to limit the benefits of the reading to those with “sound minds.” It also undercut somewhat the claim that it was easy for all to reach heaven, for even those with sound minds had to employ their understanding to seek out the aid of the saints and to use them as models for their own lives. Despite these caveats, the preface struck an optimistic note, for it assured the readers not only that they would be able to have this ease of attaining heaven but also that the book would explain how to do this. For Bishop Wulfsige the Dialogues functioned as a practical manual, a “how to” book, so to speak. There is no sense here that this was a monastic text whose appeal was limited to those who had taken monastic vows. We do not know the audience for which Alfred intended this work once he had decided, as seems likely, that the work was not for him alone. Unlike with his translation of Gregory’s Cura Pastoralis, the intended audience probably did not include other bishops for they, unlike Alfred and Pope Gregory, would not have been so beset with administrative duties as to have no “time to think of heavenly things.” One gets the same impression from Wulfsige’s metrical preface. Had he intended to disseminate it to other bishops he would probably not have presented it as a “how to get to heaven” book. Wulfsige’s preface, like Alfred’s, seems to assume instead an audience of literate laity in need of such a road map. The two prologues indicate how two bishops in Alfred’s realm
thought Gregory’s *Dialogues* were relevant and useful to busy laypeople. Although they were writing in a different time and a different place from Cavalca, nevertheless all three were facing the same problem—the translation of Latin devotional texts into the vernacular for lay audiences. Cavalca did not explain why he thought the *Dialogues* were “singularly useful among other devout works,” but it is probable that, like Waerferth and Wulfsige, he thought of them as a practical manual.

*The Problem of Translating from Latin*

Having opened the prologue with a discussion of his limits and identified his audience, Cavalca moved on to a lengthy discussion of the problems of translating from Latin. Indeed, the space he devoted to this was much greater than either the brief discussion in the *Atti* prologue or the lengthier discussion in the *Epistola* prologue:

Ma volendo incominciare trouai lo suo latino in tal modo dettato che nomi pare di potere seguitare al tutto lordine della lettera perciò che tal cosa pare bene dettata per gramatica che redotta in uolgare secondo lordine delle parole non pare neente. Et alcuna uolta alcuna picchola parola per gramatica e di tanta singnificacione che se ne puo trarre intendimento se non per molte parole. Et alcuna uolta per fare bel dettato si pone [70rb] molte parola e volendole rechare a uolgare intendimento si puono e deono per trare piu bella sententia molto abreuiare.

Cavalca began by highlighting the difference between Latin syntax and sentence structure in the vernacular. He observed that Gregory followed the rules for classical Latin syntax. This meant that Cavalca was not able to follow the order of the words in his translation. The rules for a stylistically well-turned sentence in Latin were such that an attempt to reproduce the syntax of the original would result in a meaningless construction in the vernacular. He then identified two other problems, each the opposite of the other. The
first was the density of meaning of even a small Latin word. This was a problem he had faced in his translation of Acts, except in that case he was alluding to the multiple senses of Holy Writ. Here the challenge arose not from the genre but from the Latin language itself. Boccaccio, in his translation of Livy, had discussed the same issue—one simply needed more words in the vernacular to express that which was laconically expressed in Latin words pregnant with meaning. The other problem had to do with a high Latin style that favored prolixity and that was not appropriate for his audience of laypeople. Confronted with these twin challenges the translator concerned with drawing the best and most beautiful meaning from the Latin text for a vernacular understanding—“ulongare intendimento”—not only was permitted but indeed was obliged to—“si puono e deono”—abbreviate greatly.

This is a rather astonishing statement. One cannot help feeling that it was a shot Cavalca fired across the bows of his critics for their excessive subservience to Latin texts. It was a methodological manifesto for a kind of translation that focused entirely on meaning rather than form and that did away with a blind respect for Latin words simply because they were Latin words. Cavalca gave himself permission to identify Latin thickets and call them such, and he also gave himself and other translators permission to approach Latin thickets with an axe and in fact told them it was their duty to do so. One gets the impression that had he been seated at a performance of The Importance of Being Earnest he would have stood up and cheered Gwendolyn when she said, “When one has something unpleasant to say speaking one’s mind is no longer a duty it is a pleasure.”

His statement marks a new step both in Cavalca’s theory of translation and in his confidence as a translator. The aim of translation is not to reproduce the source text as
faithfully as possibly in a new tongue but rather to draw out the most beautiful meaning. The translator’s loyalty is no longer to the text but rather to the meaning of the text. This in turn is a function of the particular audience for whom he was translating. If we imagine him standing between the source and the audience, the traditional way had him facing the source. For Cavalca, the translator ought to face the audience instead. Its needs—this is the “uolgare intendimento” mentioned—should determine the shape of the translation rather than the contours of the original and the intendimento of the literati. The translator should view the text with a critical eye to probe its essential meaning and add to and subtract from it whatever was necessary in order to bring out this meaning. The paucity of the vernacular and the prolixity of Latin were equally problematic in his eye, and the translator was to feel free to add, cut, and reshape so as to produce a more streamlined text that was made to measure for its new audience.

It is clear that these statements about methodology were aimed at his critics, since the simple people for whom his translation was intended were not able to read the Latin originals and compare them to Cavalca’s renditions. They were therefore not in any position to criticize his work and pass judgment on him for having taken liberties with the Latin texts. From his point of view, he probably knew from the circulation and copying of the Epistola that he was doing something right. Forty-one manuscript copies survive to the present day, and there must once have been a larger number. Cavalca could not of course have known the reception history of the translation, but it seems reasonable to surmise that he was aware of its circulation within Pisa in his own day.

106 See Filippo Salmeri ed., Epistula di misser sanctu Iheronimu ad Eustochiu (Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, 1999). Salmeri did not, unfortunately, provide dates for these manuscripts, so it is not possible to check how many date from the fourteenth century and how many are in the Pisano-Lucchese dialect.
After this bold methodological statement of how one ought to translate, Cavalca described what he actually did. He then justified his deviation from the expected norms of medieval translation practice by a rather clever move. He quoted Gregory himself:

Onde avengnia che mmi sia faticoso per lo mio pocho intendimento tuttauia lo meglio che sso e piu apertamente recho in volgare lo predetto libro e non seguitando al tutto lorde delle parole ma llo meglio che posso ponendo almeno la sententia e llo intendimento del libro e sforçandomi di seguire le parole doue conueneuolmente posso. Et a ccio mi conforta molto santo grigorio medesimo e inducic per suo esempio lo qual dicie in fine del suo prolago di questo libro che non intende di scriuere lorde delle parole a llui dette ma di dittare la sententia per lo modo che piu piaccia. Et cosi io uolendo rechare in volgare pongho lo uolgare piu chiaro e piu ordinato che posso non seguitando al tutto le parole ma interamente ponendo la sententia.

Once again Cavalca evoked both his limited understanding and his desire to continue nevertheless with the translation as best and as openly as he could. He was, however, sticking to his guns for he stated once again that he would not entirely follow the word order of the Latin but would prioritize instead the meaning and the understanding of the book. He still felt greatly pressured to stick to the word order for he then added that he would follow it wherever he could do so conveniently. The statement has the concessive quality of someone who has taken a new and different approach from the tried and true old ways, been criticized for the innovation and who persists in it while reassuring his critics that he has not jettisoned the old ways entirely.

To justify his deviation, Cavalca relied on the example and authority of Gregory. In his prologue the pope had said that he had not intended to report verbatim the accounts that had been told to him but that he would write down the meaning in the most pleasing way possible. Cavalca was claiming venerable antecedents for his approach. What Gregory did with his sources, Cavalca would do with Gregory. An examination of the
end of the prologue of the *Dialogues* reveals that Cavalca represented Gregory as giving him rather more freedom in handling his sources than was actually the case. Gregory was concerned with establishing the truth value of the stories he was about to recount and rebutting sceptics:

Sed ut dubitationis occasionem legentibus subtraham, per singula quae describo, quibus mihi haec auctoribus sint conferta manifesto. Hoc uero scire te cupio quia in quibusdam sensum solummodo, in quibusdam uero et uerba cum sensu teneo, quia si de personis omnibus ipsa specialiter et uerba tenere uoluissem, haec rusticano usu prolata stilus scribentis non apte susciperet.¹⁰⁷

In order to remove any doubts among his readers, the pope said that he would name the sources of each of his stories. He also wanted to make it clear that in some cases he only put down the substance or gist of the story. This was not, however, a general rule, for in cases where he remembered all the words of the narrator he had set them down as well rather than just the essence of the story. In certain other cases where the stories had been related in particularly rustic speech, he presented them in a more elevated style, since the pen of the writer could not aptly take up those things proffered according to the rustic custom. The implication here is that the stylistic rewriting was confined to these cases alone and therefore was not true for all the reports Gregory had collected. Cavalca translates this passage as follows:

Ma accio chio tolga ongni dubbio alli legitori di cio chio scriuo, pongo da chui l’uditti. Et questo uoglio che sappi che dalchune cose pongo solo la sententia e dalchuni altri seguito le parole e lla sententia come luditti. Et questo fo percio che se di tutte le persone uolessi seguitare lordine delle parole percio che mi furono dette da huomini roççi non sonerebbono bene agli orecchi degli uditori e non si potrebbono ordinatamente scrivere[71vb].

Although Cavalca translated the first part faithfully, in the second part he presented Gregory as having rewritten everything that was told to him because all those who reported the stories to him had been rustics. Thus the subtle distinction that Gregory had made between those whose rustic speech needed reworking and others whose speech he felt he could report verbatim disappeared in Cavalca’s translation of this passage. There was another telling change that showed Cavalca’s acute sensitivity to and prioritizing of the way sentences sounded to the human ear over the way they appeared on the page to the eye of the reader. Gregory had spoken of the writer’s pen being unable to take up rustic speech. Cavalca talked instead of how the stories would sound bad to the ears of his listeners: “non sonerebono bene agli orecchi degli uditori e non si potrebono ordinatamente scrivere.” This was a Freudian slip. Gregory wrote for a world predominantly of monks engaged in silent reading and rumination—hence his preoccupation with the style of the written words. Cavalca lived in a world of listeners. He expected his translations to be read aloud to an audience of simple folk that included those who could read and write as well as those who were completely illiterate. It is telling that the final phrase, “e non si potrebono ordinatamente scrivere,” comes after “non sonerebono bene agli orecchi degli uditori,” almost as if it were a result clause. It is as though Cavalca was saying that the rough speech could not be written down in an orderly way because it did not sound good to the ear. It seems as though his unconscious litmus test for writing was the quality of its oral performance. Anything that might sound bad read aloud was not worthy of being written down.
To return to Cavalca’s own prologue, we note that after alleging Gregory as his source and authority he repeated that he would not stick closely to word order but would follow the meaning entirely by rendering the Latin into a vernacular that was clear and orderly: “Et cosi io uolendo rechare in uolgare pongho lo uolgare piu chiaro e piu ordinato che posso non seguitando al tutto le parole ma interamente ponendo la sententia.” The tone here is one of increased confidence. Pope Gregory’s words about his method of reporting gave Cavalca the confidence to treat the Dialogues with the same kind of Gregorian freedom. He emphasized, however, that even though he was not following translating all the words in the text—which is to say he was omitting some of them, omissions that had upset some of his critics—he was putting the substance of Gregory’s text in its entirety into the vernacular. This is the force of “interamente ponendo la sententia,” which balances and makes up for not including all the words of the source.

Cavalca was aware that he would still be criticized for this approach despite his claim that he was simply treating the text in the same way the venerable pope had treated the reports of the stories he wrote down. He was therefore quick to assert that any criticisms of the translation were to be laid at his door alone and not that of Gregory. He persisted in his task of producing something potentially blameworthy because he knew it would still be useful for simple people:

Et auengnia chio sia cierto che questa opera quant e dalla mia parte biasimar si possa no o pero uoluto lasciare di farla per utilita delli senpici. Et se auessi trouato alchuno piu sofficiente di me che in cio si fosse uoluto affatichere non sarei ardito di metterci mano, non t[r]ouandolo [70va] abbo fatto lo meglio che sso.
This avowal of his blameworthiness was missing in the two earlier prologues, and its presence here strengthens the impression that he had been criticized for his most recent translation. The criticism must have been severe, for he said that had he found someone more competent who was willing to fatigue himself by translating the text, he would not have burned to do so himself. This goes well beyond the standard topos of humility in medieval prologues in which the author of a work bemoans his lack of ability. It is much rarer to find comparisons to Cavalca’s claim that he would not have undertaken the work at all had he been able to find someone else who was more skilled at the task. In Cavalca’s case, the use of “non sarei ardito di metterci mano” (I would not have been so bold to try my hand) conveys a sense of transgression that is best explained if we assume that he had had his knuckles firmly rapped previously and that this time around he was providing copious explanations for why he was persisting in his translations and using the same methods that had earned him criticism before.

Cavalca’s Pauline word choice for the laity is revealing, for it contains not just a justification for his work but perhaps also a veiled critique of those who spent their time entirely wrapped up in lofty intellectual concerns. At the beginning of his preface Cavalca had said that he found the Dialogues singularly useful among all the other devout books. In the section just discussed he writes that he had not been able to find anyone willing to undertake the tiring labor of translating the Dialogues or indeed other texts that would be useful for simple people. Reading this part of the prologue one has the feeling that Cavalca felt that his more educated colleagues were ignoring the pastoral needs of this group of people by not providing them with translations of appropriate Latin texts of Christian spirituality. One senses the frustration he felt at their unwillingness to
do this while at the same time criticizing him for his translation of Jerome’s letter to Eustochium. Mixed in with Cavalca’s self-denigrating remarks is an implicit critique of the manner in which his colleagues were discharging their pastoral responsibilities. He was therefore stepping in to fill the deficit, and, in the absence of those who could do it better, he went ahead with a new form of translation—a pastoral translation—that took into account the needs and cultural capital of the laity. To be sure, Cavalca was not explicit on this point, but his earlier methodological statement about the necessity for abbreviation is best understood in the context of his perceptive view of the lay audience for whom he was translating monastic texts. He contented himself by saying that in the absence of better translators, he had stepped forward and done the best that he could.

Cavalca ended the prologue with an appeal to both his target audience and his critics. Most of the final section was addressed to the latter, and it is here that the reader’s earlier suspicions that he had been criticized find their confirmation:

Priego dunque li umili e senpici chenne piglino quella utilita che possono e ddo licentia alli saui e letterati chella biasimino come uogliono. In della hedificatione del tabernacolo lo quale singnifica la santa ecclesia fu tenuto ciaschuno dofferere quello che potea secondo lo suo stato a singnificare che a hedeficare la santa ecclesia de fedeli ciaschuno de fare quel bene che puo. Offerischano dunque li saui e gran letterati della riccheçça della loro scientia grandi cose e facciano libri sottili che op per la pouerta della uirtu e della scientia mia non so ne posso offerere se non cose grosse e molto comuni [70v].

Cavalca set up an opposition between two groups of people who he expected would read his translation and from whom he expected very different responses. The first was made up of the humble and simple folk for whose edification he had translated the Dialogues. The second consisted of the wise and those lettered in Latin. To this group, Cavalca gave permission to blame or criticize his work as they wished. In the parallel structure of the
sentence the humble are opposed to the wise and the simple to the lettered. By setting up this opposition, Cavalca revealed himself to be sympathetic to a long-standing strand in the history of Christianity that viewed learning with suspicion when it became an end in itself and was not firmly subordinated to seeking salvation. In the early third century A.D. Tertullian, in his *Prescription Against Heretics*, placed pagan learning and Christian simplicity in opposition when he asked polemically, “What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?” In Confessions VIII:8 Augustine expressed his anxiety at noticing that the unlearned were seizing heaven by force while he and his learned colleagues were caught up in flesh and blood. Closer to Cavalca’s own times, just a century earlier Saint Francis had associated learning with pride and opposed arid intellectualism to simple piety. And in Cavalca’s own period Dante viewed this same opposition with sympathy, for in *Inferno* XXVI he damned Guido da Montefeltro for his syllogistic speech and handed him over to the devil, who said mockingly, “Perhaps you did not think I was a logician.” Within the Dominican order, although learning was supposed to be subordinated to preaching, according to the maxim “First the bow is bent in study, then the arrow is shot in preaching,” Cavalca’s criticisms in his various treatises suggest that nonetheless there were those who preferred to stay as much as possible in the ivory tower.

108 “Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae? quid haereticis et christianis? Nostra institutio de porticu Solomonis est qui et ipse tradiderat Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quaerendum.” (What therefore has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What has the Academy to do with the Church? What do heretics have to do with Christians? Our teaching is from the porch of Solomon who had himself handed down that the Lord was to be sought in simplicity of heart; chap. 7:9–12). Tertullian, *Traité de la prescription contre les hérétiques*, ed. and trans. R. F. Refoulé and P. de Labriolle, Sources Chrétiennes 46 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957), p. 98.

109 “Surgunt indocti et caelum rapiunt et nos cum doctrinis nostris ecce ubi volutamur in carne et sanguine.”
The simple and the humble were to draw whatever utility they could from the *Dialogues*, and the wise and lettered were to blame him for its shortcomings. Fearing that the Gregorian model he had alleged earlier in the prologue would not shield him sufficiently from his critics, Cavalca then went on to give another explanation for having persisted in his translations, one based on a typological reading of the building of the tabernacle recounted in Exodus. Although the vulgate text in Exodus 35 emphasized that all members of the Israelite community—men, women, and princes—contributed voluntarily to the task of building the tabernacle, Cavalca represented the chapter as stating that everyone was obliged to contribute according to his station. He thus introduced an element of compulsion that was missing in the Bible. He then switched registers and explained the Christian understanding of the tabernacle story of Exodus for his simple readers. The tabernacle was the holy church of the faithful, for the building of which everyone had to do whatever good he could. The wise and the lettered were to offer great things from the riches of their wisdom and create subtle books. Cavalca did not identify the people who would benefit from these books, but since they were to be written in Latin—there was no discourse of subtle books in the vernacular at the time he was writing, subtlety being an attribute of Latin—the simple and humble people for whom Cavalca was translating would not be able to make use of them. Any utility they might have—and Cavalca was silent on this topic—would be to other *litterati*.

Although Cavalca’s typological reading of the tabernacle produced a model of the Church that appeared to be inclusive and thus carved out a space for him and his intended audience, he ended the prologue on a negative note. Its final sentences are shot through with a profound sense of his alienation from his more learned critics. Cavalca urged them
to offer great things and subtle books as befitted their great learning. He, however, could not know how to craft such books on account of the poverty of his virtue and knowledge. The only things that he could offer in contrast were rough things in place of their great things and commonplaces as opposed to their subtleties. That Cavalca should end on such a note, with its undertones of embitteredness and feelings of deep inferiority, is telling. It suggests that his sense of amour-propre had been severely wounded by criticisms of his previous translation. He was able to survive these attacks because of his deep-seated commitment to his pastoral mission to all sections of society and his fear that he would be found wanting at the Last Judgment. From an eschatological perspective the past and continuing judgments of his more educated colleagues, although scarifying, were tribulations to be endured. The fear of facing his maker with few accomplishments, an insufficient return on his talents, motivated him to persist in the additional work he had undertaken as a translator to round out his mission as a preacher.

Omissions in Translations

This account suggests that Cavalca’s problems began when he enumerated his principle of omission in the prologue to the Epistola and that it was the backlash to this new way of translation that led him to address his critics and harden his stance in the Dialogues prologue, where he insisted that abbreviation was not just permitted but a duty. The strident tones of this prologue suggest that he felt under attack but held his ground, while still feeling the need to justify his approach. In order to test this statement, it is useful to look at two other prologues to works that are closely related in terms of subject and place, and another prologue to a vernacular translation from the French kingdom. The first is the Franciscan Giovanni Campulu’s prologue to his own translation of
Gregory's *Dialogues*, produced for the queen of Sicily before 1321. The second is the prologue to the vernacular translation of the Roman historian Sallust, produced by Cavalca’s colleague and academic superior Bartolommeo da San Concordio for a lay audience. The first allows us to compare how another translator close to Cavalca’s time dealt with translating the same text and how someone from his own convent of Saint Catherine understood the process of translating from Latin into the vernacular for laity. The third prologue is Jean de Meun’s preface to his translation of Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy* (*Consolatio Philosophiae*), done for King Philip IV of France.

*The Sicilian Translation of the Dialogues*

Giovanni Campulu’s prologue contains a wealth of information about his translation. It is divided into two parts, each beginning with an invocation to God. In the first part he begins by identifying himself and his patron and requests his readers to pray for the queen and her family. He then discusses his method of translation. In the second part he raises four questions concerning the Latin source—Who was its author? What was his name? What was the substance of the book? Why was it written?—and then answered each in turn. I will examine the section in the first part in which Fra Giovanni discusses his own approach to translation:

Lu intendimento de chesta opera è di ricontare la intencione de sancto Gregorio papa in lo libro che ssi clama Dialago; e dato che eo non dica per vulgaro gli proprii parole, zo che illo dice per lectera, tamen sforzarome de dicere complitamente, quanto eo poteraio, la intencione sua sopra la cosa de che illo parlla. Et imperciò che sancto Gregorio in alcune parte de chisto libro parla de cose molto suctile serrà bisogno che dove illo non mecte exemplo per lo quale
Fra Giovanni began by affirming that his was not a word-for-word translation but rather was made according to the sensum ad sensum principle. The purpose of his work was to set down Gregory’s intention or meaning in the Dialogues. We observe the heavy expectation to translate closely and to follow the word order of the original text, for Giovanni states that he will not put down in the vernacular Gregorys’s own words in Latin. He will, nevertheless, force himself to say completely, as much as he is able, Gregory’s understanding concerning the matters of which he speaks. Giovanni shared with Cavalca a concern to set down the substance of an author in the vernacular without having to set down the author’s words. Where they differed, however, was in the way in which they went about doing this. Fra Giovanni use of the word complitamente tells us that he took an expansive approach to the task at hand. To be sure, he was discussing Gregory’s meaning or intencione, but his concern was to express as fully or completely as possible what Gregory had written. There is no suggestion here that any sentence of Gregory ought to be left out. Omission was therefore not among the imaginative possibilities in his approach to translating Gregory’s text.

Giovanni also mentioned the problem posed by subtlety. In various places Gregory was laconic, so that his meaning was not always clear. Giovanni’s acknowledgment of this was a standard topos used by translators from Latin into the vernacular, and their solution to the problem was to use as many words in the vernacular as were required to express the meaning that was contained in or implied by the Latin word or phrase. Boccaccio, in his translation of Livy, had felt the need to apologize for

---

110 Libru de lu dyalagu di Sanctu Gregoriu, ed. , p. 3.
adding so many extra words in the vernacular that were not present in the source for fear of misrepresenting the author even as he was explaining the meaning of the text. As had Boccaccio, so too did Giovanni turn to a policy of addition where he feared that his lay auditors would not understand all that was implied. Thus where Gregory had not provided examples to illustrate his meaning and there was a risk that he would not be understood, Giovanni intervened by adding examples as well as explanations so that Gregory’s meaning would be made clear and manifest to all.

The Translation of Sallust at the Convent of Saint Catherine

Cavalca was not the only translator at the Pisan Domenican convent of Saint Catherine. His senior colleague Bartolommeo da San Concordio composed works in Latin, such as the *Documenta Antiquorum*, a florilegium of wisdom literature taken from the ancient pagan writers, the Bible, and patristic texts, which he then translated himself into the vernacular. He also translated two books of Sallust, the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, a task undertaken at the request of Nero Cambi of Florence. It has a prologue in which Bartolommeo first talks about the two books and then discusses the problems of translating from Latin:

E l’uno e l’atro di questi libri è scritto per lettera molto sottilmente, sicchè gli uomini volgari non ne possono trarre utilità nè avere diletto. Onde io, sopra ciò pregato, si mi brigherò di recarlo al volgare, benchè malagevolmente far si possa per la gravezza del libro e perchè le parole e il modo volgare non rispondono in tutto alla lettera;anzi conviene ispesse fiate d’una parola per lettera dirne più in volgare, e non saranno però così proprie. Anche alle fiate si conviene uscir alquanto delle parole per isponere la sentenzia e per poter parlare più chiaro ed
aperto. Dunque, questo modo secondo il mio potere tenendo, io comincerò dal proemio che Sallustio fece al Catilinario: e dice così.\textsuperscript{111}

Bartolommeo, a preacher just like Cavalca, was a Friar with humanistic interests in the pagan Latin classics. He had studied at Bologna and done advanced training in Paris before returning to Pisa to direct the educational training of the friars in the convent studium. He was therefore one of the grandi litterati of the sort Cavalca mentioned in the Dialogues prologue who had advanced degrees and composed works in Latin. Since he translated his own florilegium and the two books of Livy rather than works of Christian spirituality, Bartolommeo felt, unlike Cavalca, that part of his metier was to supply laypeople with the wisdom of the ancients. He began his prologue by quoting Sallust on the usefulness of history, discussed the contents of the two books, and pointed out that the Catilinario preceded the Giugurtino in order of composition, even though it described events that came later. He too touched upon the problem of Latin’s subtlety in Sallust’s writings, which prevented laypeople from finding either utility or pleasure in it. These are very different reasons from the eschatological considerations provided by Cavalca in his prologues. For Bartolommeo utility was located in the secular world of the present time rather than in the Christian afterlife, unlike in Cavalca’s Augustinian worldview, in which utility and pleasure lay in the heavenly city.

Having been asked by Nero Cambi of Florence, Bartolommeo made the effort to translate the two books from the Latin. This was not easy to do for two reasons. The seriousness of the books impeded their translation, as did the fact that vernacular words and modes of expression did not correspond to the inflected language of Latin. One required more words in the vernacular to express a succinct Latin phrase and therefore
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added words that were not provided by the author. Bartolommeo saw this as a misrepresentation of Sallust. The translator added words of his own to those of the author but presented the translation as being the work of the author. This approach had a whiff of adulteration at best or intellectual dishonesty at worst. To be sure, Bartolommeo was facing problems inherent in translating from an inflected language into an uninflected language. But there were worse problems the translator had to face. He had to depart somewhat from the words—“si conviene uscir alquanto delle parole”—in order to speak more clearly and openly. That Bartolommeo saw this is a problem implies that he felt the translator ought to stick as closely as possible to the author’s words. In his model of translation praxis there was little freedom to depart from either the structure or the style of the source. The problem with this model was that it would not produce a fluent vernacular text. Some deviations from the Latin were necessary for the translation to be readable in a language with different rules of syntax, but even these additions were to be deplored and publicly apologized for since they did not represent the author’s words but rather those of the translator, whose primary loyalty was to Sallust and not to Nero Cambi’s comprehension of the text. For this reason, there was no room for omission. The translator had to represent Sallust as closely and accurately as possible. If Bartolommeo worried about adding his own words in the vernacular that might then be attributed to Sallust, his loyalty to the author meant that as a fidus interpres he most certainly was not going to leave out any of Sallust’s words. This is a very different conception of translation from Cavalca’s.

Was he one of Cavalca’s critics? Bartolommeo’s commitment to a faithful representation of the source text may indeed have led him to criticize Cavalca’s pastoral
methods. He certainly fits the description of the learned *literatus* with an advanced education who composed works in Latin. We are fortunate to be able to compare his translation of a Latin sentence with that of Cavalca’s. As mentioned earlier, he had translated his florilegium of wisdom literature, the *Liber de documentis antiquorum*, at the request of the Florentine layman Geri Spini.\(^1\) In the first book under the first section, *On Bodily Beauty*, the third item is taken from Jerome’s letter to Eustochium: “Gli disonesti occhi non sanno considerare la vera bellezza dell’anima ma pur quella de’corpi.” This is an almost literal translation of the second sentence of the Latin text.\(^2\) Bartolommeo takes the antecedent subject—“disonesti occhi”—from the previous sentence. The closeness of his translations suggests that he would have translated the previous sentence as “ma altrimenti vedono gli disonesti occhi [che non sanno...]” We know what a close translation—of the sort that would have met with Bartolommeo’s approval—looks like, for Ser Nicolò di Berto translated the two sentences as follows: “Ma altrementi veggiono gli occhi impudici e quali non sanno considerare la bellezza dell’anima ma si de’corpi.”\(^3\) Cavalca’s translation sounds better, for it explicitly provides the implied contrast to the “inpudici oculi”: “Altramente veggono li occhi impudichi, e altramente gli puri, e onesti. Perchè gl’impudichi non sanno mirare la

---

\(^1\) The initial rubric reads, “Comincia il libro degli ammaestramenti degli antichi compilato e fatto e volgarezzato dal savio frate e maestro frate Bartolommeo da s. Concordio pisano dell’ordin de’ frati predicatori al nobile e savio cavaliere messer Geri degli Spini da Firenze.” The 1856 edition is digitized at [http://www.classiticaliani.it/trecento/ammaestramenti.htm](http://www.classiticaliani.it/trecento/ammaestramenti.htm). Geri Spini appears in the Decameron on the sixth day in the second novella.


\(^3\) *Epistola di S. Girolamo ad Eustochio volgarizzamento antico secondo la lezione di un codice della biblioteca municipale di Genova*, ed. I. G. Isola, Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie Inedite o Rare dal Secolo XIII al XVII 110 (Bologna: Gaetano Romagnoli, 1869), p. 111.
bellezza dell' anima, ma pur quella degli corpi”. The underlined words were added by Cavalca to sharpen the distinction that Jerome was drawing in order to eliminate any possible confusion in the lay reader’s mind.

Jean de Meun’s Prologue to Boethius’s Consolation of Philosophy

In the prologue to his translation of Boethius, Jean addressed his royal patron, who he claims knows Latin. Since it is much easier to understand French than Latin, he translated the text so the king’s comprehension would be more complete. Jean informs us that he did not follow the Latin text very closely at the royal command, but rather tried to set down the meaning of the author plainly. The suspicion that Jean’s words, albeit addressed to the king, are actually addressed to other clerics who might criticize his translation, is strengthened by an address to others besides the king who would see the book and disparage his divergence from the words of the author:

A ta royal majesté … je Jehan de Meun … envoie ore Boece de Consolacion que j’ai translaté de latin en francois. Ja soit ce que tu entendes bien le latin, mais toutevoies est de moult plus legiers a entendre le francois que le latin. Et por ce que tu me deis—lequel dit je tieng pour commandement—que je preisse plainly la sentence de l’auteur sens trop ensuivre les paroles du latin, je l’ai fait a mon petit pooir si coma ta debonnairete le me commanda. Or pri touz ceulz qui cest livre verront, s’il leur semble en aucuns lieus que je me sois trop eslongnies des paroles de l’aucteur ou que je aie mis aucuns fois plus de paroles que li aucteur n’i met ou aucune fois mains que il me le pardoignent. Car se je eusse espous mot a mot le latin par le francois li livres fust trop occurs aus gens lais et li cleris neis moienement letre ne peussent pas legierement entendre le latin par le francois (my emphasis).116

115 This would have been a faithful translation of “aliter inpudici uident oculi aliter puri pudicique quia non norunt animae pulchritudinem considerare sed corporum.” But this is not what Jerome wrote.
There are a number of factors here in common with the Italian prologues we have looked at that suggest there was a similar clerical mentality when it came to translating from Latin to the various European vernaculars. First was the expectation that the translator would stick very closely to the text. Jean’s statement that he was simply following Philip’s orders to translate the sense resonates with Cavalca’s statements to that effect but is in fact addressed to other clerics who would compare the French translation to the Latin source and possibly criticize it. The king knew his own instructions to Jean and presumably did not need to be reminded of them. The second expectation was that these translations for laypeople were also being read by clerics who would criticize deviations from the source. The appeal to these people for forgiveness for having distanced himself from the author’s words makes sense in this context, since laypeople did not have the linguistic capabilities to judge the translation on this basis. Jean had also taken the same approach as Cavalca in that he had in places abbreviated the Latin and in others expanded the vernacular. His request for forgiveness tells us that the “gotcha” clerics were expecting him to follow the source as closely as possible. Taken to an extreme, such an expectation would demand a word-for-word translation to maximize fidelity to the source. Jean’s reasons for not doing this are revealing. It was not just that laypeople would not be able to make sense of a word-for-word translation but that clerics who did not have the highest level of Latin would not be able to reconstruct the Latin text on the basis of the French translation. Jean did not expand on what exactly he meant by this, but he seems to have assumed that some clerics were using translations in order to understand the Latin text. Since a word-for-word translation would not be clear in French, they would presumably not be able to use it as a crutch for handling the Latin text. If this
was one use of translations, one can understand why clerics objected to translations that
did not follow the word order while yet remaining sensum ad sensum translations.

IV) The Prologue to the Life of the Fathers

The prologue to the the *Vita dei santi padri* (*VSP*), Cavalca’s vernacular version
of the *Liber vitas patrum* collection of desert literature from late antique Egypt, poses
certain problems that are related to the unusual and early popularity of the translation and
its reception history. It was also Cavalca’s most ambitious project, for its four books
contained texts assembled from a variety of sources. There are almost two hundred
surviving manuscripts that contain all or part of the translation. The bulk of these
manuscripts are in the Florentine dialect, but a small number preserve the text in the
Pisano-Lucchese of western Tuscany. Since this was Cavalca’s native dialect, these
manuscripts come closer to his original version. Unfortunately, none of these contains the
prologue, so scholars have had to depend on the early Florentine manuscripts for its text.
Carlo Delcorno in his recent edition used the prologue in RN (Rome, BNC VE MS
1189), a luxury Florentine manuscript probably from the 1330s, and the text in RC
(Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense MS 422), the only fourteenth-century manuscript in
Pisano-Lucchese to preserve all four books of the *VSP*, as the bases for his reconstruction
of the prologue and text of the original version.

There is a fourteenth-century manuscript, however, that contains a fuller version
of the prologue and that is, I believe, the best witness to the original. This is Oxford
Bodleian Library MS Canoniciano It. 264 (manuscript O in Delcorno’s classification),
which contains the first two books of the translation. Written in a dialect that shows Venetian usages (\textit{cuane} instead of \textit{giovanni} and \textit{dixe} instead of \textit{dice}), it contains a section on translation practices and an address to critics that is missing from the prologue in RN but which has clear resonances with the \textit{Dialogues} prologue. Delcorno must have concluded from the fact that the beginning of the O prologue is identical to that of RN that it was identical in all its parts. My transcription of the entire O prologue shows that this is not the case. I have divided the prologue into four sections indicated by the single red and two blue paragraph markers in RN in the block of text following the decorated initial \textit{I} at the beginning. The prologue in O has a historiated initial \textit{I} with Saint Jerome and the lion but does not have indications of any internal divisions. For ease of comparison I have divided it at the same places as it is divided in RN. The prologue occupies two columns on fol. 1r and one column on fol. 1va. The missing section appears at the end of part III.

The two prologues are each translations from Pisano-Lucchese into Florentine and Venetian respectively, a fact noted explicitly in RN, where we read at the top the rubric: “Incomincia lo prolagho del vita patrum traslatato in nostro uolgare fiorentino.” Thus both reflect a lost or undiscovered copy of a Pisano-Lucchese manuscript that contained the prologue. The prologue in O is to be preferred not simply because it contains the text missing in RN but also because it corrects certain errors and has better descriptions of the contents of the four books in section II.

There are a number of reasons to suppose that it was the last of Cavalca’s four translations. As noted earlier, Cavalca’s four prologues fall into two groups based on

\footnote{117 For a description of O, see Delcorno, \textit{La Tradizione delle “Vite dei santi padre, ”} pp. 319–21.}
structural similarities. The Atti and the Epistola prologues both began by evoking the requests made by pious lay readers for a translation. If we follow the theme of Cavalca’s approach to translation, we observe that he began by only permitting himself additional words in the vernacular to explain the Latin text of the biblical book. In the Epistola he felt confident enough to omit those passages in Jerome’s text that he felt were beyond the capability of laypeople who had not been trained in theology. This approach, in which he both added to and subtracted from the Latin source, must have led to fairly severe criticism from his better-educated colleagues. Although this is speculative, it seems the best explanation for the defensive and aggrieved tones of the Dialogues prologue, in which he addressed both his target audience and his critics. Cavalca was probably reassured by the success of the translation of the Dialogues and was feeling more confident in his approach—a “pastoral translation” of Latin devotional texts—for the tone of the O prologue to the VSP is calmer and the references to his critics much less shrill. This change suggests that the VSP followed the Dialogues and was thus the last of his four translations.

The VSP prologue is discursive in a way that sets it apart from those of the Atti and the Epistola and brings it closer to that of the Dialogues. Just as the last began with an appeal to an authority, in that case Saint Paul, the VSP prologue began by evoking Gregory: “Jn perçio che chomo scriue san gregorio molti se moueno a ben fare plu per exempli cha per parole.”118 It has not been noticed so far that this is a quotation from Gregory’s Dialogues that Cavalca adapted slightly. In the prologue to this work, Gregory’s interlocutor, the deacon Peter, asks him for stories of holy men and says, “Et

118 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Canoniciano Italiano 264, fol. 1ra.
sunt nonnulli quos ad amorem patriae caelestis plus exempla quam predicamenta succendunt.”¹¹⁹ Gregory, by putting these words into Peter’s mouth, wished to underline the efficacy of stories that illustrated a moral point over discourses on the same. The fact that Cavalca quoted from the Dialogues at the beginning of this prologue is not in itself proof that the VSP was translated later, for he could certainly have read the Dialogo and had it in his mind long before he thought of translating it into the vernacular. In the Dialogo, however, he had translated the passage very precisely as follows: “E sono molti liquali ad amore della patria cielestiale piu si muouono per exempli che per parole.”¹²⁰ As a preacher, this phrase in the Dialogues would have stayed in his mind as uniquely relevant to his mission. When he wrote the VSP prologue, he obviously did not consult a Latin manuscript of Gregory’s text, since his quotation does not correspond to the source. Had he done so, he would have rendered it the way he had in his own earlier translation. The variation is best explained if we conclude that he was depending instead on his memory of this key homiletic concept of Gregory’s and that he had been conditioned by his own previous translation of the phrase. If one were to object by saying that there was really only one obvious way to translate this phrase, and that we cannot make chronological deductions based on variations, a glance at Fra Giovanni Campulu da Messina’s Sicilian translation shows that there were other possibilities: “et multi persone so che ssi actaino a la via de Dio plu per exemplo de bona vita ca per magistramento de

¹¹⁹ Grégoire le Grand, Dialogues, p. 16. >
¹²⁰ Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, MS 1315, fol. 71va.
bone parole.” It is better to assume that the more accurate translation was the earlier one and that the later variant was the residue of the former in Cavalca’s mind.

Besides the quotation, there is another reason to believe that the VSP collection was the last of Cavalca’s four translations: it was the most ambitious in terms of size. We can observe a correlation between Cavalca’s increasing confidence in his abilities as a translator and the size of his translation projects. The Dialogues marked a leap forward from the Atti and the Epistola, and the VSP was in turn quite a bit bigger than the Dialogues. Besides the size, because the VSP was a collection with porous boundaries, there was never a vulgate edition, so to speak, of its constituent texts. Thus Cavalca had to assemble and translate texts from various manuscripts in order to create the Vita dei santi padri. There is no surviving single Latin manuscript that contains all the texts that he translated, if indeed such had ever existed. This project therefore required a good deal of planning and thought before he could commence translating diverse texts to create what is in effect a vernacular miscellany of very large proportions. This was not the kind of project that a novice translator would undertake. Rather, it was a project that only a translator very confident in his vision and abilities would tackle.

Cavalca’s increasing confidence is visible in the prologue to the VSP. Following the divisions of RN, the first section provides a rationale for translating hagiography, for choosing the Vitas patrum collection, and for the intended audience. The second section describes the contents of each of the four books. The third section explains his method of translation, and the fourth and last section outlines the ways in which Cavalca has made

his work easy to use for his readers. In the second section, O corrects misreadings in RN, and in the third section O contains an important passage missing from RN and the rest of the manuscript tradition.

In the first section Cavalca’s misremembering of Pope Gregory’s dictum on the usefulness of exempla was both significant and telling. The deacon Peter had mentioned that they were good for kindling a love of heaven. Such an interpretation was entirely consistent with the monastic audience for which the Dialogues were written, for this was a goal of the contemplative reading practices, or lectio, of monks. In Cavalca’s retelling of Gregory, the usefulness of exempla was transferred from the sphere of contemplation in the monastery to the sphere of an active life in the world. He thus replaced loving heaven with doing good in the world. This tells us that Cavalca had not intended to provide laypeople with monastic texts in order to turn Pisa into a city of contemplatives. Rather, he thought that these texts would help his lay readers to remain in the world but to be guided by and, more importantly, to act according to monastic norms and virtues.

In the following sentence of the Dialogues Peter explained how exempla functioned. Hearing the stories of the fathers had a double advantage for the listener, for his love of the future life was kindled by a comparison with his predecessors. It was also deflating in a salutory way. When someone who considered himself to be something or someone recognized the superior deeds of others, he was humbled. 122 Cavalca also evoked this model in his prologue, albeit in a transformed way, by introducing the image of a mirror and removing the reference to self-humiliation in order to present the utility of

122 “Fit uero plerumque in audientis animo duplex adiutorium in exemplis patrum, quia et ad amoremuenturae uiae ex praecedentium comparatione accenditur, et iam si se esse aliquid aestimat, dum de aliis meliora cognouerit, humiliatur.” Gregory, Dialogues, p. 16.
reading hagiography in a homely, domestic, positive way that would be appealing to his lay readers: “conço sia che la uita de li santi homeni sia una uiua leçion Quelo santo gregorio medesmo dixe e quasi uno spechio doue lomo se puo considerare e spechiare e per questo muodo la sua uita emendare e driçare.” Once again Cavalca replaced the Latin reference to the future life with a focus on the present. He did the same with the explicit reference to the past. The monastic reader’s attention was suspended between memories of his predecessors and the life to come. Cavalca emphasized the present by describing the fathers as “living lessons.” He then used a homely image: their lives were a mirror in which the reader was able to “consider himself and see himself reflected, and then correct and straighten his life.” Cavalca obviously shared Gregory’s assumption that reading about the saints was necessarily a dialetical process in which the reader continuously compared himself with the saints who were the object of his reading. Cavalca was clearly aware that, unlike Gregory, who was writing for a monastic audience, presenting the examples of the fathers as deflationary reading was, for a lay audience, like trying to catch flies with vinegar rather than honey. He therefore omitted the precise reference to the benefits of self-humiliation and spoke in more general and positive terms of self-improvement. Here too the variation from the Latin source suggests that Cavalca relied on his memory and offered the gist of the Gregorian passage, for in the Dialogues he translated the passage closely.123

123 “Et parmi che seguitti dopio aucto in dell animo dell uditore delli exenpli de santi padri cioe che in prima se n acciende ad amore di uirtu e della uita cielestiale e anche se si riputaua alchuna cosa chonosciendo maggiori e miglior uirtu in degli altri si ssi humilia.” Riccardiano 1315, fol.71va. Note that the underlined words are absent in the Latin. By placing them before “uita cielestiale,” Cavalca first provided his lay readers with a spiritual goal that was more relevant to their station; only then did he mention the heavenly life. This was not the tack taken by Giovanni Campulu, whose changes and expansions clarified that reading about miracles (rather than the exempla in the Latin) attacked the vice of pride: “Et de chisti miraculi—dice Pietro—se nde nasseno duy beni: l’unu e che chille che li audeno si se
After noting Gregory’s functionalist view of the effects of hagiographical readings, Cavalca then explained his choice of works to translate and the audience for whom he was translating:

Considerando io sopra tuti li libri che io mai trouasse Quelo libro deuotissimo che se clama uita patrum contiene belissimi exempli et excelenti de la perfecta uita di santi antigi padri li quali antigamente fo luxe del mondo Et io lo ho reduto in olgare chomo de soto se contiene aço che non solamente li aleterati ma eçiantio le persone seculare e sença gramadega lo possano intendere e trarne qualche utilitade.124

Unlike the Dialogues prologue, where Cavalca simply stated that the Dialogues were singularly useful among devout books, here he gave the reasons why the Vitas patrum was a most devout book.125 Unlike modern Italians, Cavalca was generally sparing in his use of the superlative. His use of devoutissimo is therefore noteworthy. Why was this “a most devout book” or indeed “the most devout book”? The answer lay in its contents. More than any other book, it was a treasure trove of the most beautiful and excellent examples of the perfected lives of the ancient holy fathers who had in olden days been the light of the world. Cavalca’s use of antigamente (RN has ueramente) underscores his desire to turn to the most venerable texts of Christian monasticism and to move

inflammano allo amore de vita eterna; l’altro bene si e che se alcuna persona si crede essere molto santa e per chesta credenzenza si livasse in alcuna superbia, quando udisse e canoscesse altro che fo plu sancto de se,avesse materia de humiliarese.” Libru de lu dyalagu, p. 9.

124 O, fol. 1ra.

125 From the early to the late Middle Ages, the collection was known as Vita patrum, Vitae patrum, Vitas patrum liber vitae patrum, and Liber vitae patrum/vitaspatrum. For a selection of references arranged chronologically, see Appendix 2 to Pascal Bertrand’s dissertation, available online at http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/dissertations/2006-0221-200251/anhang2.pdf. No discernible change over time is visible in Bertrand’s list. In his prologue to his Liber vitae patrum, Gregory of Tours states that according to the ancient grammarians vita had no plural. The vitas in Liber vitae patrum is an archaic genitive singular, as in paterfamilias. Dominican authors such as Jacopo da Varazze, Stephen of Bourbon, and William Peraldus all used the plural in expressions such as ex vitis patrum or legitur in vitis patrum. Since Cavalca read their works, his choice of the singular sets him apart. In the vernacular, too, he always uses the singular vita dei santi padri and never vite dei santi padri. Curiously, the first rubric in RN uses the masculine del instead of the feminine della: “Incomincia lo prolagho del vita patrum.” RN, fol. 1ra.
geographically south and east from Italy to Egypt and chronologically backward from the age of Gregory to the fourth century. Egypt was believed to have been the birthplace of Christian monasticism, the land of Saint Anthony, Saint Paul the Hermit, and the desert fathers who succeeded them. The memory of the light they had shed had been preserved in stories of many different genres, stories that had been translated into Latin and made the crossing to the lands on the northern shores of the Mediterranean where, in a process still to be traced, they coagulated into a collection of porous boundaries known as the Liber vitas patrum. In the sixth century, early monastic rules, such as that of Saint Benedict, had recommended them as salutary reading for monks because they were stories of their monastic forefathers. It was therefore primarily in monasteries that the Vitas patrum was read, copied and preserved, and disseminated to other ecclesiastical libraries.

Cavalca’s decision to translate these stories, as opposed to other more recent monastic collections rich in exempla, such as the Dialogue of Miracles of Caesarius of Heisterbach or the Carolingian Diadema Monachorum of Smaragdus (d. 825 A.D.) of Saint Mihiel,\(^\text{126}\) suggests that his was a “back to basics” approach in which he wished to go to the very beginning, the fons et origo, of the monastic tradition. He translated the VSP into the vernacular so that these stories would not be confined to the textual communities of those literate in Latin but would move outward so that even secular people without Latin could understand them and draw utility from them. Here we observe, in Cavalca’s reasons for translating, the notion of a kind of translatio studii—

\(^{126}\) This was translated into Italian and brought up to date by the addition of post-Carolingian materials (such as references to Saint Francis) sometime in the fourteenth century. See Corona de' Monaci: Teso del buon secolo della lingua compilato da un Monaco degli angeli ora per la prima volta pubblicato, ed. Casimiro Stolfi (Prato: Tipographia Guasti, 1862).
transfer of knowledge from one people to another—as a desirable process, an idea that was absent in the earlier prologues.\textsuperscript{127} In them he made it clear that he had either responded to a request to translate, in the case of Acts and Jerome’s letter to Eustochium, or felt that a text such as the Dialogues would be useful for laypeople and hence translated it of his own accord. In the manner of his phrasing of the VSP prologue there is a new sense that these texts ought not to remain the privileged monopoly of Latinate clerics but should also be shared with laypersons.

Was it the criticism he had received for his translations that alienated him from his colleagues and made him feel like an outsider? The prologue to the Dialogues had already indicated such an alienation and a sense of solidarity with the semplici. This reaction is part of the story but not all of it. Whatever the impetus, it was probably not class solidarity. Although it is possible to read Cavalca’s biographical entry in the convent chronicle in terms of a Marxist identification with the poorer classes, it is probably more useful to seek an explanation in his mission as a preacher and in his ecclesiology. We know from the chronicle that Cavalca was an indefatigable preacher to the poor, the sick, and the imprisoned. We also know from the Dialogues prologue, in which he explained that the tabernacle signified the holy church of the faithful to which everyone had to contribute, that he had an abiding sense of the entire Christian community. It was this sense of Christian solidarity that seems to have inoculated him against the superior and occasionally contemptuous attitudes of literate clerics toward the illiterati who were subordinate to them. Although Cavalca himself was not from a particularly humble background—his family were notaries in Vico and were therefore

literate—this sense of concern must have been rooted in his abiding sense of his pastoral duties to all sections of Pisan society. Indeed, the many critiques of the clerical hierarchy that are scattered throughout his treatises are almost always related to failures in fulfilling the duties of pastoral care. Yet the fact that he included these in vernacular treatises written for lay audiences is significant, for it tells us that he perhaps did not feel a sense of group solidarity with his fellow clerics but rather made common cause with his pastoral flock.

The second part of the prologue contains a description of the contents of the various books. The readings in O are more accurate than those in RN, which provides additional support for the view that O is closer to the original prologue. For the modern reader, this section is disappointing in that it focuses mainly on the authorship of the texts according to the beliefs current in Cavalca’s time, with only a tantalizing glimpse of how Cavalca felt these stories were useful:

E douemo sapere che lo predito libro se diuide in quatro parti. La prima scrisse e translatoe sancto Jeronimo e contiene quasi pur exenpli de uertu. La secunda laquale se chiama paradixo scrisse e translato [fol. 1rb] uno sanctissimo munago lo quale auea nome Eraclio. La terça compite çuane munego de ierusalem secondo quelo che pare auegna che molte altre istorie sia in questo libro compilade da certi altri deuoti homeni. La quarta contiene non solamente istorie ma eçiandio sententie e diti notabeli dalquanti sancti padri.

Book I contains Jerome’s Life of Paul the First Hermit, Athanasius’s Life of Anthony, Jerome’s Life of Hilarion, and Rufinus’s translation of the History of the Monks in Egypt. There was a tradition attributing the translation of various *Vitas patrum* texts to Jerome, and Cavalca may have believed this attribution, for he was not aware that Evagrius had translated the Life of Anthony or that Rufinus was the translator of the
History of the Monks in Egypt What is clear is that Cavalca took Jerome’s claim for Paul’s precedence over Anthony at face value. Although Jerome had called his biography the *Vita Pauli Monachi* in the list of his own writings in his entry on himself in *De Viris Inlustribus*, his collective biography of ecclesiastical writers, in the work itself he had argued that it was Paul rather than Anthony who had been the first to go into the desert. As a result, the work became known as the *Vita Sancti Pauli Primi Heremitae*. Cavalca must also have encountered the Latin text in this way, for the first rubric at the end of the prologue in O reads, “Chomençasse adoncha la uita de san polo primo heremita” (fol. 1va). His statement that Jerome wrote and translated the works in Book I shows greater historical awareness than the scribe of manuscript L, whose preface leads one to conclude that he attributed all the works listed to Jerome. Cavalca at least distinguished between Jerome as author and Jerome as translator.

How did he wish his readers to understand these texts? The prologue gives us only a glimpse of his thinking on this subject. These stories were “exenpli de uertu.” One wishes he had been less laconic about his mental categories for these texts. The semantic field of *vertu* ranged from virtue to miracle in fourteenth-century Italy. Since Cavalca used the word *miracolo* for miracle in his other writings, and since Jerome’s *Life... Hieronymus und Gennadius: De viris inlustribus*, ed. Carl Albrecht Bernoulli (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1895), p. 56. Digitized at http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.FIG:002250026.

129 The tenth-century manuscript at Corpus Christi College, University of Cambridge (MS 389), written at Saint Augustine’s, Canterbury, and containing the Lives of Paul and Saint Guthlac, the English hermit, lists the title in this way in a fourteenth-century hand on fol. 1r. See http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/zoom_view.do?ms_no=389&page=1R.

130 The *Vitas patrum* manuscript from the Franciscan convent of Santa Croce in Florence, Florence Laurenziana, MS Pluteo 20, Dext. 5 (henceforth L), begins “Incipit prefatio Jeronimi de vita sanctorum patrum heremitarum (f3ra).” After the preface on fol. 3rb we read, “Explicit prefatio in nomine dei incipiant capitula. vita sancti pauli primi monachi et heremita. vita sancti antonii monachi. vita hylarionis monachi. vita captivi monachi. vita iohannis monachi. vita apollonii monachi.” These last two are the first two Lives from the *History of the Monks in Egypt*.

131 Given as “exempli di uirtudi” in RN.
of Paul has no accounts of any miracles performed, it seems likely that Cavalca felt that what these different texts had in common—longer male biographies in the case of Jerome and Athanasius, and shorter biographies of men and women cast in the form of a travel account for the History of the Monks in Egypt—were models of virtuous behavior.

Book II consisted of a single text, the *Paradisus Heraclidis*, which was the earliest version of the Lausiac History of Palladius.\(^\text{132}\) This text circulated independently of the interpolated longer versions of the Lausiac History (which contained materials from the History of the Monks in Egypt). In the list of books at Peterborough Abbey contained in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 163 (S.C. 2016) we find separate listings for manuscripts called *Vite Patrum* and *Paradisus*, suggesting that these circulated independently in Anglo-Saxon England. There are two surviving manuscripts of the *Paradisus* from this period.\(^\text{133}\) Cavalca believed that this text had been written and translated (“scrie e traslato”) by Heraclius, and the reading *Eraclio* in the prologue is clearly better than the reading *Eradio* in RN. This means that the error was either already present in the exemplar from which RN was copied or that the *c* and *l* were written so closely together that the scribe of RN mistook them for the letter *d*. However, since the ascender in *d* was not usually written with a vertical stroke, as is the case today, but rather with a stroke that curved to the left, this seems unlikely. The error was probably


already present in the exemplar used to copy RN. Although RC listed the chapter titles for books I and II in sequence in O, in RN we find only the chapter titles for book I following the prologue. At the end of book I, on fol. 80ra, we find the list of chapter titles for book II preceded by the following rubric: “Incominciano i capitoli della seconda parte de uita patrum Lauale si chiama paradiso. Scripta et compilata da Eraclio Monacho.” Here Eraclius is the author and compiler of the work but not its translator. At the end of book II, on fol. 115va, we read the same formula but with information about the dedicatee Lausus: “Compiesi la seconda parte della uita patrum Laqual si chiama paradiso. Scripta et compilata da Eraclio monacho ad lauso preposto dell onperadore. deo gratias. Incominciasi la regola di sancto pachomio Laqual fu data dal angelo et redocta in uulgare et abbreuiata.”

What is one to make of this discrepancy between the description in the prologue of book II and the wording of the incipit and explicit in O? One possibility is that Cavalca was the chief editor of a team of translators and wrote the prologue but did not translate the Paradisus himself. I think this answer, pace Delcorno, is to be rejected, for the different books all bear the hallmarks of Cavalca’s “pastoral” method of translation. And it seems most unlikely that someone who never became a lector would have had the authority to direct such an equipe. Even if that had been the case, it also seems improbable that he would have been able to train his translators to deviate from the traditional methods of translating Latin texts and embrace his system of carefully considered omissions and expansions, a method that had obviously led to severe

criticisms, as the prologue to the *Dialogues* reveals. The other explanation is that the size of the project meant that it took Cavalca a long time to finish and that he wrote the prologue once he had finished the translation. The copying of the different books, however, began at an earlier stage. As Delcorno has noted, there are twenty-two manuscripts containing all four books, eighteen manuscripts containing the first two books, thirteen with the last two, six each of the first three books, and ten of book IV alone.\(^\text{135}\) The presence of the prologue in only six of the thirteen surviving fourteenth-century manuscripts can therefore be explained by their having been copied once Cavalca had composed the prologue. The discrepancy between the *traslato* in the prologue and *compilato* in the incipt and explicit to book II in O probably resulted in the following way. For Cavalca, the authors of books I and II were Jerome and Heraclius, respectively. While writing the section of the prologue in which he described the contents of each of the four books into which he had divided his translation, he wrote that Jerome had written and translated the first book. The phrase “scrisse e traslato” being fresh in his mind, he reused it when describing Heraclius in the very next sentence.\(^\text{136}\) When he was translating the *Paradisus* for book II, however, he had a Latin manuscript of the text at hand and either translated both its incipit and explicit or provided an explicit that repeated the information of the incipit if the Latin manuscript was missing an explicit. Cavalca knew in his mind what the contents of the four books were, and the discrepancy between the description in the prologue and the incipit of the book is best explained as a simple *lapsus memoriae*.


\(^{136}\) A stylistic vulgarism into which this writer is too apt to fall.
Book III contains the *Verba Seniorum* (Sayings of the Elders), or the Latin translation of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*. These were Greek texts that drew on the Coptic sayings of the fathers and existed in an alphabetical form as well as a systematic version in which the sayings were grouped under twenty-one thematic headings. The systematic version was translated into Latin in the sixth century, both in the northwestern Iberian peninsula by Martin of Braga and Paschasius of Dume, and in Rome by the deacon Pelagius and subdeacon John, both of whom, it is believed, eventually became popes. The transmission of the Latin *Verba Seniorum* is very complicated owing to the mixing and contamination of the different translations. The Latin manuscript used by Cavalca was indeed such a contaminated text, as Delcorno’s research has shown.

Returning to the prologue, the first thing to note is that Cavalca alerts his readers to the uncertainty of authorship for his third book. He says that it was considered by some that the compiler was John, a monk in Jerusalem. It is not clear to what extent Cavalca was aware that these texts had originally been translated from Greek. His use of *compilare* without any mention of translating suggests that he believed that these texts were penned in Latin. At this point we find divergent readings in RN and O. Here, too, the reading in O (on the right in the following excerpts) is better than the reading in RN:

La terça compylo Johannj monaco di jerusalem Secondo ke pare ad alcuni *Et questa contiene storie et deci notabili di molti sancti padri*

La terça compite çuane munego de jerusalem secondo quelo che pare

avegna ke molte altre storie sieno in questo libro compylate da certi altri deuoti santi huomini

auegna che molte altre istorie sia in questo libro compilade da certi altri deuoti homeni

---

137 Pelagius I and John III.
The italicized text is missing in O. Although it could have been in the exemplar used by
the copyist of O, Cavalca did not mention the contents of the *Paradisus* when he
described book II. The reading in O for book III is therefore more consistent with the
prior description of book II. On the other hand, Cavalca did mention the contents of book
I—“e contiene quasi pur exenpli de uertu”—after mentioning Jerome as the author and
translator. The italicized text, particularly the mention of “decti notabili,” is in fact a good
description of the contents. Nevertheless, the additional text in RN interrupts the flow of
the sentence, the thrust of which was to argue that while some people ascribed authorship
to a single person, the monk John of Jerusalem, Cavalca wanted his readers to know that
there were many accounts in his book III that were written by other devout men.

What may have happened was a kind of *saut du même au même* on the part of a
scribe in the RN line of manuscripts. The description of the contents of book IV contains
a very similar phrase that is present in O but missing in RN:

La quarta contiene pur ystorie compylate
da diuersi santi padri.  

La quarta parte contiene non solamente
*istorie ma eçiandio sententie e diti notabeli
dalquanti sancti padri.*

The two phrases are not identical but are very close. The scribe of RN or its exemplar
copied a phrase from the following line pertaining to book IV and inserted it in the
middle of the description of book III. Moving to the next line he recognized his error and,
rather than repeating the phrase in the very next sentence, he simply omitted it, leaving
the description of book IV in RN truncated. The reading in O fits the contents of book IV
better than that of RN, for it recognizes the variety of genres in the last book. In the
prologue Cavalca used the term *istoria* for a narrative biographical account of a holy man or woman. The other genres that appear in the prologue are *exempli*, or exempla; the *sententie*, or judgments; and the *detti*, or sayings of the fathers. Book IV contains narratives of these other genres scattered among the biographical *istorie*. Thus in RC we find exempla such as the eucharistic miracle of a priest’s vision confirming transubstantiation (chapter 48) and an exemplum of the patience of a holy woman (chapter 64). In addition, chapters 57–64 appear under the rubric “Dell’abate Cassiano e d’alquanti altri padri” and fall under the category of “sententie e diti notabeli.” Thus the reading in O gives a better sense that the contents of the book are not limited to the *istorie* but also include other genres. Finally the word *alquanti*, as evident in the rubric just cited, is one that appears frequently in RC. Its use in the prologue is consistent with Cavalca’s usage, since RC is the only fourteenth-century manuscript in Pisano-Lucchese to contain all four books. The truncated reading in RN informs the reader that the *istorie* were compiled by different holy fathers. It does not convey the variety of genres in the book. The reading in O conveys both the multiplicity of genre and their provenance from various holy men.

*Section III of the Prologue—Methods of Translation*

In the third section of the prologue, Cavalca provided an exposition of his principles of translation. He began with a justification of the principle that had exercised his critics the most—that of omission. Jerome, Heraclius, and John were all very learned men, literate in Latin, and were monks writing for other monks. They therefore appended prologues and used Latin that was very strange or uncommon and set down with much subtlety:
Ma percio che li predicisti sancto Jeronimo Eraclio E çouane chomo homeni molto intendentni et aletterati fexe li suoi prologi scriuando el predito libro ad altri monachi literalmente in lo principio darquante istorie et usano latini molto extranei e sotilmente ditadi.

We note here the same themes of understanding, learnedness, and subtlety that Cavalca associated with writers of Latin texts in the prologue to the Dialogues. There he had urged his learned critics to produce libri sottili and to allow him to produce vernacular translations of devotional works for simple people. It is a mark of Cavalca’s increased confidence in his method of “pastoral translation” that he permitted himself to make judgments about the Latin used by particular authors rather than discussing the problems of translation as inhering in an unvarying Latin language. Thus his use of the plural latini indicated his awareness of the linguistic differences in the Latin used by his three authors, but it was his judgment that their Latin was very strange or uncommon or even bizarre—“molto extraneo”—that is noteworthy here. Such a judgment is absent in the earlier prologues, and its presence here shows that Cavlaca had overcome the wounds to his self-esteem, so visible in the Dialogues prologue, and reached a place of strength from which he could criticize on stylistic grounds the authors of the most venerable works of monastic spirituality.

Cavalca was making an argument based on intended audiences. Authors taking audiences into account will shape their works accordingly. It is not surprising that highly educated monks who were writing to other monks—“scriuando el predito libro ad altri monachi”—would make use of strange Latin phrases. They were writing for other members of the same club. There is a real sense here of an outsider observing an in-group and making sense of its oddities—Cavalca as a linguistic anthropologist, so to speak. But
all of this was preparation for justifying the practice that stuck in the craw of his learned brethren—his policy of omission: “Aduncha considerando io che questo volgare non fa se non per homeni simplici e non literadi o preso questo stilo simplice lassando li prologi prediti et algune altre sotigliece et colori rethorici li quali a questo fatto non me pare necessarij.” Cavalca’s argument here is that the audience for his translation comprised simple folk who could not read Latin. It was inappropriate when bringing texts across a great divide of education and cultural capital to leave the stylistic complexities of Latin texts in their vernacular translations. Thus the very style had to change and complexities had to be omitted. Style had to match the level of understanding of the intended audience.

In their blind respect for the Latin texts, Cavalca’s critics had not taken audience into account. Accustomed to writing in a certain way in Latin for those who understood it, their loyalties to the source text combined with the tradition of the fidus interpres in such a way that they were unsympathetic to an approach to translation that privileged audience comprehension above all other factors.

Cavalca was arguing for a policy not just of omission but of a stylistic transformation. For this reason he did not just leave out the prologues. He used a simple style, omitting various subtleties and rhetorical flourishes that would confuse his readers and act as a barrier to comprehension. They did not appear to him at all necessary for the task at hand. His statement appears on its face to be a simple methodological statement. This impression is reinforced by the structure of his sentence. The objects of the verb lassando are the aforementioned prologues, other subtleties, and rhetorical colors or flourishes. However, this created a rather misleading impression. It was one thing to omit a prologue but quite another to do as Cavalca did and put aside two other things that were
not discrete units like prologues, which could be easily elided. Removing the subtleties and rhetorical flourishes involved, in actual practice, rewriting the text. The seemingly simple statement covered up a radical intervention in those parts of the text that he deemed stylistically complex in a way that was unsuitable and inappropriate for his audience.

The tone of this section is calmer and much more confident than Cavalca’s tone in the prologue of the Dialogo. There the argument that the translator was not just permitted to abbreviate but actually had a duty to do so was presented in the aggrieved and slightly petulant tones of someone who was debating a point with an obdurate opponent. But even in that prologue Cavalca presented his case as resulting from the great differences between Latin and the vernacular. To be sure, the case was put forth in the context of making Latin works available to simple people, but the argument was still presented in terms of the problems that must be overcome when moving from one language to another. In the VSP prologue Cavalca subordinated the linguistic problems and presented the challenge in human terms. The great problem to be overcome was not the technical one of language and vocabulary but the cultural gap between people of differing levels of education. The texts were not just moving from one language to another but were also moving from one group of people with vast cultural capital to another group of people who were comparatively impoverished. The translator had to take this gap into account during translation. Texts produced by monks for monks should therefore not be translated in toto as though textual integrity were a higher good than textual comprehension in the vernacular. By putting the people of his audience first, Cavalca asserted that translated texts had to be presented in a simple style for simple people and that it was the
translator’s duty not just to translate the text but to transform it so that it met its audience at their level and not at the level of its original composition.

Having presented his theory of translation, Cavalca discussed what he actually did. He had translated into the vernacular the essence or substance of the book as clearly and as usefully as he knew how:

Abbo dunque rechato in uolghare la sententia de libro piu chiaramente et piu utilmente chio saputo. Et impero io ho reduto la sentença del libro plu clara et utillemente che io o saputo.

What is striking about this sentence is that there is no more mention of word order and the problems that it causes for a translator. He had begun his discussion of translation practice in the Dialogo prologue by talking about the challenge he faced with Gregory’s Latin. which was “tal modo dettato che no mi pare di poter seguitare al tutto lorde della lettera.” This had led to an enumeration of the difficulties of translating from Latin and had ended in his statement that he had not followed the word order but had instead put down the meaning and understanding of the book as best he could: “e non seguitando al tutto lorde delle parole ma llo meglio che possa ponendo almeno la sententia ello intendimento del libro.” In the VSP prologue Cavalca focused on the essential meaning, the *sententia*, of the book. Discussing the word order was a paradigm that only applied when one’s primary loyalty was to the Latin text. In the new paradigm of pastoral translation, concerns over word order were irrelevant. What was relevant was presenting the substance of the text in a form and style that was appropriate for its new audience. Clarity and usefulness had replaced the old concern over word order. These two concepts necessitated reworking the texts so that these qualities would shine through.
Of the two, the meaning of clarity was not so problematic. A complicated Latin sentence could be translated in a way that simplified it so that the meaning was clear in the vernacular. But what did Cavalca mean when he said that he had translated into the vernacular as usefully as he could? This adverbial usage was not in any way clear. Did he mean that anything translated for the utility of his lay audience was translated usefully? Or, as the adverbial usage would suggest, was there something in the actual way in which he translated that was useful. Could he have translated simply but not usefully? Would the end result still have utility? The answer to these questions is yes. Although Cavalca did not elaborate on these points, the chapter on his translation of the Life of Marina shows that to translate usefully was to translate according to the values stressed by preachers in their sermons, even when these were not present in the text being translated. For example, preachers expounded on virtues such as humility and patience that combated the vices of pride and anger. Throughout his translation Cavalca added adverbs such as *humilemente* and *patientemente*, which were absent in the Latin originals. In the Dominican homiletic world, usefulness was always understood in its eschatological context. To translate usefully, as opposed to translating something useful, therefore, was to translate in a way that promoted those virtues and behaviors that led to heavenly rewards. This impulse, in which he produced translations that were consonant with the values expressed in his sermons, lay at the heart of Cavalca’s pastoral method of translation.

The prologue as it appears in RN is the basis of all subsequent editions. It has not been noticed that it is truncated at this point and that there is a continuing section present in O:
Cavalca knew that his latest translation would also have its critics, and he addressed them, as was the case in the Dialogo prologue. Just as the method of translation he expounded here was much less defensive than that described in the Dialogo, here too the tone of his address to his critics is muted. We are observing a Cavalca who believed in the validity of his new approach and had the strength of mind and maturity not to let the critics upset him. This prologue therefore marks the final step of Cavalca’s development as a translator. He was going to put the simple people and their needs first and translate according to their requirements rather than according to an exaggerated fidelity to the Latin source and its word order. The latter may have pleased
his critics, but the translation would have done nothing to bridge the cultural gap between highly educated Latinate clerics and their lay pastoral subordinates.

Cavalca’s address to his critics acknowledged a shortcoming in his translation, but this deficiency was a failure to meet his own standards and not theirs. He simply admitted that in his attempt to translate clearly and usefully he did not believe that he had known how to do this perfectly. He did, however, know how to translate into the vernacular without changing the substance of the text. This remark was made with a quiet confidence that belied all of the changes to the Latin that such an approach necessitated. Given this ability of his, honed by the experience of translating the *Epistola* and the *Dialogo*, Cavalca decided that he ought to go ahead and translate in a simple way—“semplicemente”—for the utility of the devout folks who had been the audience of his previous translations.

If we were to rely only on RN we would conclude that this translation arose from Cavalca’s ideological commitment to a *translatio studii*, and that the *VSP*, like the *Dialogo*, which came into being from Cavalca’s desire to be useful to his flock, therefore was the result of Cavalca’s own initiative. But he did not embark on the project of his own accord. We read in O that devout folk had been urging him to translate the work. This was likely because the sermons used *exempla* from the *Vitas patrum* collection quite frequently. Since homiletic tools such as *exempla* collections (for example, the vast and still only partially edited *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus* by Stephen of Bourbon) and legendaries (such as the *Legenda Aurea*) had a greater representation of desert lore. It would appear, then, that of the four translations only the *Dialogo* was not
translated in response to an external request. It sprang, as we have seen, out of Cavalca’s sense that his pastoral efforts were insufficient to avail him at the Last Judgment.

It is also only from O that we find out something about the reception and circulation of Cavalca’s works. We know that the *Atti* and the *Epistola* were produced when Cavalca responded to pious requests for translations. The prologues of these and of the *Dialogo* are silent, however, about the circulation of these texts. We find a precious reference to circulation in O. Cavalca was responding to a demand from certain devout people who had beseeched him, “as well as many others into whose hands the work would fall.” The wording suggests that he was aware that his work would travel in circles beyond the nucleus of pious folks who initially requested the translation. He therefore translated not just for the utility of those who had asked him to do so but also for the utility of strangers who would encounter his work. Why might he have expected that others would read his translation? This statement most likely resulted from his observation of the success of his prior translations. Indeed, his increasing confidence in his pastoral method of translation probably came from the fact that he had seen for himself that they were, so to speak, selling like hotcakes. It was the success of his translations among the laity that confirmed him in his belief that he was on the right track, and that he had found a new way of translation to which laypeople were responding. His observations therefore confirmed his earlier intuition that, just as sermons had to be adapted to the audience’s level and expectations, so too did translations have to incorporate this homiletic insight to be effective at reaching their target audience.
Observing the needs of his congregation, Cavalca decided that since he could translate without changing the essence, he ought to do so. This was particularly true since he did not anticipate that those who were more learned in Latin than he was—“non uelando che altri plu leteradi di me liquali auiet miauo volgariçare di me se ne fia uoiudo intremerete”—and who would have known how to translate better than he could, stepping forward to fill these gaps. This too is a repetition of a sentiment he had expressed in the Dialogo prologue—“Et se auessi trouato alchuno piu sofficiente di me che in cio si fosse uoluto affatichare non sarei ardito di metterci mano ma non trouandolo abo fatto lo meglio che sso.” There was a demand for translations that the most learned clerics were not condescending to meet, and thus, in the absence of those who were better qualified doing such work, Cavalca was stepping in to fill the gap.

Such statements were part of the topoi of humility deployed by medieval writers in their prologues. Cavalca’s statements were both sincere and patently false. It was probably true that his colleagues in the convent of Saint Catherine and at the cathedral chapter of Pisa were not interested in translating Christian devotional texts into the vernacular. For example, his colleague Bartolommeo da San Concordio, who, as mentioned earlier, had studied theology at Bologna and done advanced work in Paris and was the director of the studium at Sanit Catherine, composed works in Latin and translated classical authors such as Sallust rather than Christian authors. Cavalca’s statement that others could have translated better than he was clearly a sop to his critics, but it was insincere, for he felt that his pastoral translations, which met the audience at their level, were better than those that stuck closer to the Latin text. Cavalca could certainly have produced such translations; indeed, it would have been easier for him to
produce a faithful translation that his critics would not have objected to than it was to produce a pastoral translation, which involved considering what to change, what to omit, and what to add for pastoral purposes in order to produce a work that was also at a stylistically lower register than the original. By comparison, the faithful translation could be produced somewhat mechanically, for the only problems to confront were the linguistic problems involved in going from Latin to the vernacular.

After providing his reasons for having stepped in as a translator and describing his method of translation, Cavalca addressed his critics, but in calm tones that suggested that he would no longer be wounded by their criticisms. He agreed with those who might be displeased by the work and who might say that it could have been done better. He said, disarmingly, that they were telling the truth, that he, however, could not do it better, and he said that he would be delighted if someone else were to achieve a better translation. The defensive tones of the Dialogo prologue, in which he urged the humble and the simple to take whatever utility they could find and asked the learned to criticize it as they pleased, are missing here. What we find instead is a Cavalca who is confident in the value of his own work and mature enough to insist that the translation was worth doing despite its shortcomings, which he also recognized as such.

By this point Cavalca had learned not to let his critics get under his skin. And so, turning away from them, he addressed the very people for whom he was writing. He asked those who, disregarding his rough speech, might gain fruit from his work by looking at the examples and judgments of the saints to pray to God to forgive his errors—not just those present in the work before them but also others that were more serious and for which he was more fearful: “Aqueli che ne prendera fruto non curandosse del mio
grosso favelare reguarderrano ali esempli e sentencie deli infrascriti santi prego che pregano dio pre me che me perdoni”. These sentiments are not to be found in the earlier prologues, but they are present in the prologue of the Specchio di Croce, the devotional treatise that scholars believe was the first of nine such works that followed his four translations. In discussing his method of translating in a simple way, Cavalca chose to “farlo chosi simplicemente per utilitade.” In the Specchio prologue we find “in sua utilita procedo semplicemente.” Cavalca’s statement about his style almost implied that his rough speech, or “grosso favelare,” was a precondition for being able to draw fruit from his work. He thus opposed or at least subordinated beauty of style to utility. This hierarchical relationship reappears in the Specchio prologue, where we find a similar construction: “curandomi piu di dire utile che di dire bello.” Cavalca would rather say something useful than say it beautifully. His appeal to those who might benefit from his book to pray to God on his behalf is absent in the earlier prologues but present in the Specchio prologue, where we read: “E priego quelli i quali per quest’opera sentiranno alcun frutto che prieghino Iddio che perdoni alla mia presunzione.” Thus the text in O that is missing in RN should be assigned to Cavalca, and the prologue as it appears in the former should be considered the best witness to the prologue as Cavalca penned it.

The User-Friendly Vernacular Manuscript

In the fourth and final part of the prologue Cavalca enumerated the ways in which he had made his translation easy for his readers to use and handle and understand. The most intimidating thing for a lay reader picking up a manuscript book was to leaf through and find long uninterrupted blocks of text. Even if he or she was able to read the text because it was in the vernacular rather than in Latin, such a mise en page was off-putting
and constituted a psychological barrier to reading the book. Books had to present a face that would make readers wish to read them. Cavalca’s solution was subdivision:

Et impero che li libri ben distinti e capitoladi piu uolentiera se leçe e meio se intende ho reduto in certi capitoli tute queste leçende che me parsse essere tropo grande aço che la longeça de quele non çenerasse tedio.

Books that were clearly divided into distinct sections and provided with chapter titles were less intimidating and made the reader more likely to begin reading.\textsuperscript{139} The benefits were twofold. Not only did the divisions remove the psychological obstacle posed by unbroken text but they also aided the reader’s comprehension. As noted earlier, in the discussion of the table of contents in the \textit{Atti} prologue, chapter titles conditioned the reader’s understanding of the text that followed and allowed the author to ensure that certain preferred interpretations were presented to the reader. We have noted that the nineteenth-century editor of Ser Nicolò’s translation of Jerome’s letter to Eustochium was so impressed by the chapter titles in the \textit{Epistola} that he used them for his edition of the other translator’s work. If chapter titles aided in comprehension, the division of certain longer hagiographical narratives into shorter narratives prevented tedium and increased the ease of reading. This may have been common sense to Cavalca, but it is also possible that he was influenced by the techniques of the \textit{sermo modernus}, which involved division and subdivision. Whatever the source of his decision, it was an unusual one. Ser Nicolò’s translation of Jerome’s letter in a single block of text was the more common practice. But these translators were, unlike Cavalca, keeping the text in mind, rather than the audience, so it is not surprising that if the Latin text had no divisions, then

\textsuperscript{139} See Leofranc Holford-Strevens and Amiel D Vardi, \textit{The Worlds of Aulus Gellius} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), vol. 1, p. 155, for tables of content and divisions as organizing tools for the reader.
neither did their vernacular renderings. To describe the effect of chapter divisions on the reader, Cavalca used a striking image: “che chomo dixe uno santo Chosi se recrea e conforta lanimo del letor dela fin del capitolo chomo lo corpo de uiandante stancho se recrea delo albergo al qual el çonçe.” Cavalca compared the process of reading a book to undertaking a fatiguing journey. The reader’s mind was refreshed and comforted by reaching the end of a chapter, just as the traveler’s tired body was refreshed when he reached the inn. Such an image was far removed from the slow, ruminative process of the monastic lectio. Vernacular reading, from Cavalca’s point of view, was fatiguing business, and he wanted to provide as many rest stops as possible along the way. We note here Cavalca’s acute attention to the psychology of the lay reader. The person who might be put off by a long story would read the same number of words without complaining if the story was divided into shorter chapters; each chapter read would feel like an accomplishment. Textual divisions also permitted busy lay readers to put down their reading at the end of a chapter and take it up again without losing their place. It was for this reason that Cavalca provided a list of chapter titles at the end of the prologue: “Chi uuol adoncha leçieramente trouare alguna cosa in questo libro si debia guardare al numero deli infrascriti capitoli.” The key word here is the adverb leçieramente. The prologue ends with the expectation of interrupted reading and consultative reading. Cavalca did not expect them to pick up the VSP and read it through in one sitting. He wished to make it easy for his readers to find a particular place in their manuscript copies. To do so, all they had to do was consult the list of chapters, which were numbered, and then leaf through the manuscript until they found the number of the chapter they were seeking. Cavalca’s more learned colleague Bartolommeo da San Concordio, who
translated the two books on the Catilinian conspiracy and the Jugurthine war from Latin into Tuscan for laypeople, did not provide a list of numbered chapter titles at the end of his brief prologue. His readers would have had to go through the entire manuscript in order to find what they were looking for, a process that was much more time consuming.
Chapter 2: The Pastoral Translation of the Life of Saint Marina

The story of Saint Marina was probably written in Greek in the fifth or sixth century A.D. It was translated into many different languages—Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Arabic. In 1905 Clugnet tried to make sense of this story by assembling various versions of the Life. He concluded that the Latin represented the oldest version from a Greek original that has subsequently been lost. Marcel Richard printed a Greek version of the Life on which the other eastern translations depend and called it the *Vita antiqua*. He claimed that the translation into Latin occurred at the time of the crusades. This is too late, as the earliest version printed by Clugnet comes from a ninth-century manuscript—Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Latin 2328 (fols. 118v–120r). He also does not engage in any substantial way with Clugnet’s claim that the Latin version must be the earliest since it is the simplest. This is a convincing argument. Richard’s *Vita antiqua* informs us that Marina’s father’s name was Eugenios. It seems likely that his name was added in a subsequent revision of the original Greek version to fill in details the metaphrastic hagiographer thought were necessary.

Since we do not have the manuscripts that Cavalca used in his translations, I have transcribed the Life from four manuscripts, two from Italy and two from northern Europe. The earliest is a twelfth-century manuscript from England, Cambridge, Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS Typ 194. The second is a fourteenth century manuscript from Naples, New York, Morgan Library, MS M.626. The third and fourth are of particular interest because they are of Mendicant provenance and have been identified by Carlo Delcorno as being close to manuscripts Cavalca used for his translations of books I and III. These are Florence, BNC, Conventi Soppressi J.7.11 (from
the Dominican convent of San Marco in Florence) and Florence, BML, Plut 20 Dex. 5 (from the Franciscan convent of Santa Croce). Of these, the Florentine BNC manuscript seemed the best candidate, since it is of Dominican provenance. However, there were discrepancies between certain details in Cavalca’s translation and the corresponding details in the manuscript. The distance of the monastery from the city in Italian is given as thirty-seven miles. In the Latin it is thirty-two, and the number is spelled out rather than written in numerals. There would be no reason for Cavalca to change the distance. In addition, the manuscript does not mention that the man was loved by the abbot because he was faithful, but this is present in the Italian. When I looked through Clugnet’s list of manuscripts (he printed three texts and listed variations) I found one twelfth-century manuscript that showed the distance as thirty-seven miles (also spelled out). This is Paris, BN, Latin 2843, which falls into family B whose text was represented by Paris, BN, Latin 10840 (eleventh century). Based on his list of variations from Latin 2843, I reconstructed the text of 10840. Morgan M.626 falls into the same family, so I am using this as my base text rather than the Dominican manuscript. Morgan M.626 comes from fourteenth-century Naples and thus represents an Italian example from Clugnet’s family B. The fact that the distance of the monastery is thirty-two rather than thirty-seven miles does not strike me as an insurmountable problem. It is the closest Italian example I have found to the version Cavalca used.

The first chapter sets the stage and introduces the characters—the father, his daughter, and the abbot. We read that a layman had an only child, a daughter. Wishing to become a monk, he sent his child off to live with a relative and entered a monastery. Having entered, he was so obedient to the rule of the monastery that he became the
abbot’s favorite. After some time, however, he began to think about his only daughter and became very sad. The abbot noticed this and asked the man what was the matter. The man replied that he was saddened by thoughts of his only son whom he had left behind at a tender age in the city. The abbot, not wanting to lose the man, told him to go fetch the boy. The man changed the girl’s name from Marina to Marinus, passed her off as a boy, and had her taught to read. Then when she was fourteen, he took over her religious education, warned her not to reveal her sex and to watch out for the devil lest he trip her up and father and daughter be damned.

When we look at the vernacular text in Rome, Casanatense 422, we find that there are both expansions and omissions in comparison with the Latin text in Florence, BNC, Conv. Sopp J.7.11. Let us go through these line by line. In the Latin, we read: “There was a certain layman who had only a small daughter.”140 The sentence is very compact and tells us only that a man had a daughter. It reveals nothing more about the structure of the family but contents itself with establishing a paternal relation to the small girl. In the vernacular we read: “A layman, his wife having died, was left with a tiny little daughter of his.”141 We note here that there has been an amplification of details concerning the man’s family. We learn first of all that the man had been married, that he had a wife and that she had died. This adds a good deal of emotional texture to his situation compared to the Latin, which simply presents the two characters in a neutral way without attempting to engage the sympathy of the reader. The vernacular elicits an affective response by placing the parental relationship in the context of a family and also as a consequence of a

140 “Erat quidam secularis habens unicam filiam parvulam” (fol. 192rb).
141 “Un omo seculare rimanendo, morta la moglie, chon una sua figliuola picchola” (fol 94b).

142
tragedy. The man has lost his wife and the child has lost its mother. It is as a result of this loss that this nuclear family has been reduced to two.

In addition, the nature of the relationship between father and daughter is made more personal by the use of diminutives and possessive adjectives. Thus the “small daughter” becomes the “tiny little daughter of his.” By presenting the daughter as very small, *figluola picchola*, the sense of loss of the mother is heightened. The use of *sua* produces a sense of closeness between the father and child missing in the Latin. A reader who is simply presented with information in the Latin version begins the vernacular tale feeling sympathy for both the man and the child. This in turn creates a sense of identification with the characters, who have been rendered more human. Finally, the vernacular presentation has important implications that are absent in the late antique text and point to changes in social attitudes toward family as well as toward sanctity. The introduction of the deceased wife implies that the daughter was the product of the sacramental bond of a marital relationship and not the result of fornication, a sexual liaison between the man and some unnamed, unknown woman. This version of the story emphasizes the marital bond as the proper context for procreation. This has the additional consequence that the child is explicitly presented as legitimate, which in turn speaks to fourteenth-century concerns about the appropriate profile for sanctity, a concern that is not really discernible in the Latin Life.

Apart from the imperatives of changing hagiographical standards, it is also possible that this emphasis on childbearing in the context of marriage is related to the contemporary problem of abandoned children in late medieval Pisa. These were overwhelmingly children born out of wedlock, and Tuscan cities dealt with the problem
by creating foundling hospitals where such infants could be left anonymously. There were at least two such charitable organizations that were active and indeed merged during Cavalca’s lifetime. These received the support of Archbishop Ruggieri degli Ubaldini in 1295 and Archbishop Simone Saltarelli in 1323. Since the Dominicans in Pisa worked closely with their archbishop, they would certainly have known of his efforts on behalf of these hospitals and very likely also been involved in encouraging the laity to support them.

Having filled out the picture of the man’s family and the nature of his bond with the child, the redactor describes the man’s desire to become a monk and his entry into the monastery. In the Latin we read that the man, “wishing to be converted commended her to a certain relation of his and entered a monastery thirty-two miles distant from his city.” The vernacular translates this as “wishing to leave the world to do penance commended this little girl of his to a relation and entered a monastery thirty-seven miles distant from his city.” In late antiquity, the verb *convertere* (to convert) described a decision to become a monk and to embrace a life that was entirely dedicated to God. Such a life was considered to be superior to other ways of living in the world or the saeculum. The decision to become a monk involved, at least at the theoretical level, a rupture of all worldly ties, including family, that distracted from a focus on God. For this reason, the Latin text presents the man’s decision to become a monk first and then

---

142 “Ipse vero converti cupiens, commendavit eam cuidam parenti suo, et abiit ad monasterium quod triginta duobus milibus a civitate distabat” (fol. 192rb).
143 “[V]olendo lasciare lo mondo a fare penetentia, raccomandandone questa’ sua figliuola ad un suo parente; e introe nuno monasterio dilungi dalla citta trenta sette miglia” (fol. 94rb). The manuscripts I have consulted—Morgan M.626 (xiv), Florence, ML Plut 20 dex. 5 (xv), Paris, Mazarine 1734 (xiv)—all show thirty-two. However, Paris, BN Latin 2843b (xii) has “triginta et septem” as the distance between the monastery and the city. See Clugnet, *Vie et Office de Sainte Marine*, p. 19.
144 Alice-Mary Talbot, *The Byzantine Family and the Monastery*. 
the consequence of this decision—the sending away of the child to a relation. This is presented in a matter-of-fact way with no attempt to limn the emotional ramifications of this decision to bring to an end an already shrunken nuclear family.

The vernacular text does two things. First, it explains for the lay reader the meaning of conversion, something that is not necessary for a monastic audience. It then raises the emotional temperature by the use of demonstrative and possessive adjectives. Cavalca could have translated “cupiens converti” as “volendo essere convertito,” but this would have meant preserving the technical term as a calk in the vernacular. Instead he glosses the term to explain two themes that are central to monasticism—a flight from the world and the performance of penance for sin. In this respect he explains the technical vocabulary of the hagiographical text in the same way that a preacher explains the pericope, the biblical text that is discussed in a sermon. But the manner in which Cavalca glosses the term conversion allows him to narrow the gap between monastic and lay forms of spirituality. If conversion is understood simply as a decision to enter a monastery, then the lay reader will understand what it means primarily in terms of a separation from the world with which he or she is familiar. Such a move hampers a sense of identification with monastic spirituality, which consequently remains a thing apart. But if monasticism is explained in the thematic terms of a flight from the world to do penance, then these notions have applicability, albeit of a different sort, with the laity.

In the first case, a flight from the world can involve a physical removal from the usual patterns of life. But it can also be understood as an attitude toward the world that can be emulated by those who, for both financial and personal reasons, are unable to enter a monastery. From a monastic point of view, this is obviously a second-best choice.
But for laypeople living in a world where monastic spirituality is still at the top of the hierarchy, one possibility is to bring monastic attitudes into lay life. This notion of the *contemptus mundi* can be observed appearing in lay devotional life in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in northern Europe as well as in Italy. Thus changing notions about the possibilities of salvation eroded the monastic monopoly and presented the possibility of salvation outside a monastic context. Instead of a sharp division between the monastery and the saeculum, in which the former is characterized by a contempt for and flight from the world and the latter is assumed to embrace the world and its sins, we see a continuum of attitudes of variable intensity among both professed religious and laypeople.

In the case of the penitential life, we observe a similar process at work in the high and late Middle Ages. The notion of penance embraces many aspects, but at its core it consists of both a profound awareness of sin and a conscious decision to change one’s life to live in a way that is less sinful. This new and reformed way of living in penance allowed one to counteract the effects of sin and thus cleanse the soul. The development of monasticism in the West is the story of an institution that both claimed a monopoly over salvation as well as presented itself as the best setting for the performance of penance. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries we see a lay appropriation of penance as a way of life. Of course laypeople had performed penitential acts to expiate particular sins, so it was not an alien concept. What was new then was the idea that laypeople could work out their salvation not by occasional acts of penance but by living a life that was continuously penitential while remaining in the *saeculum*. This is reflected in the rise of lay confraternities—religious associations of pious people who prayed together and performed works of charity—in rural and urban Italy.
By glossing rather than using *conversion* as a calk of a Latin term in the vernacular, we observe Cavalca adapting a monastic model for his lay readers. This is not to argue that he is an innovator, for the lay penitential movement preceded him. What sets him apart is not the fact that he produces his translation in the context of this movement but that the manner of translation is completely intelligible in this particular context. He thus supports and encourages this monasticization of lay spirituality by adapting those elements that are specifically monastic and rendering them in more general terms that make them available to laity in a manner that is useful and relevant to them.

His use of demonstrative and possessive adjectives shows him raising the emotional stakes in a way that laypeople can identify with, while at the same time producing an affective response that the translator of the original Greek Life into Latin did not attempt. This translator simply informs us that the man wishing to become a monk sent her (his daughter) to a relation. Cavalca renders “her” as “tiny little daughter of his.” In so doing he heightens the emotional drama around the separation of the father from his daughter. This heightening of emotion presents the drama of conversion from the lay rather than the monastic point of view. Monks, at least in theory, were supposed to embrace a life devoted to Christ by sundering their ties to their families of birth. In Luke 14:26–30 we read:

> If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not carry his cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple. For which of you having a mind to build a tower, doth not first sit
down, and reckon the charges that are necessary, whether he have wherewithal to
finish it: Lest, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that
see it begin to mock him, Saying: This man began to build, and was not able to
finish.

The assumption was that only by such a complete renunciation would it be possible to
begin the work of following Christ. The principal impediment in following Christ was the
strength of ties to the family, as the proliferation of kinship terms pertaining to the
nuclear family makes clear. Whether or not all monks achieved such a renunciation in
practice cannot be examined here. Suffice it to say that this renunciation was an ideal that
was taken for granted by monks. For this reason, the Latin text, which was produced for a
monastic audience, presents the consequence of monastic conversion—the necessity to
send the daughter away and thus shatter the only family she knows—in such a matter-of-
fact way. What we observe here is Cavalca’s ability to step into a layperson’s shoes and
imagine such a rupture from a point of view that valorizes the family. This rupture is
presented in terms of an emotional set of values that lay readers who lived in families
could identify with and which they rated highly. A literal translation would have
presented monastic values that subordinated the birth family to the monastic family in a
way that laypeople would have found alien. As a result, they would not have been able to
identify with them.

Once the man had entered the monastery, we read that he “took such pains to
obey the regular [life] that he was loved by the abbot above all others.” 145 We read in the

145 “Qui obedire regulari ita operam dedit ut ab abbate preceteris diligeretur” (fol. 192rb). The identical
phrase is found in the Franciscan Vita patrum manuscript from Santa Croce, that is, Florence, ML Plut 20.
dex 5. Other manuscripts show a slightly different reading. Morgan M.626 reads, “Et ingressus ad
monasterium perficiebat omne opus quod erat monasterij ita ut ab abbas (sic) eius amplius eum quam
ceteros qui in monasterio erant diligeret eo quod fidelis esset et obediens” (fol. 129rb). This reading
appears with slight variations in Paris, Mazarine MS 1734 (fol. 130vb) and in the following Paris, BN Latin
manuscripts examined by Clugnet: 2328 (ix), 10840 (xi), 5296 (xiii), which omits “eo quod fidelis esset et
vernacular that the man “conducted himself so well and so faithfully that the abbot loved him almost more than the others.” This is an odd way to translate the Latin description of the man’s life under a monastic rule. Cavalca seems to have suppressed mentioning both the rule and obedience. The variant reading does not mention the rule—“having entered the monastery he completed every job of the monastery such that he was loved by the abbot more than the others who were in the monastery since he was faithful and obedient”—but it does mention a number of monastic duties, and it explicitly describes the man as both faithful and obedient. What could be the reason for Cavalca’s omissions? It looks as though he considers these details as working at cross-purposes to his own intention of telling a story that has more universal appeal and with which his lay audience can identify. The details in the Latin version enmesh the story rather too firmly in a monastic setting and an alien way of life marked by duties and obedience. This is not to say that laypeople were not familiar with either duties or obedience, but they did enjoy a certain freedom of action in the domestic sphere. By describing the man’s life in the more general terms of good behavior rather than obedience to a monastic rule, Cavalca presents the former layman as someone his lay readers can still identify with even after his monastic conversion.

We find, however, that to follow Jesus’s words in Luke 14 is not so easy. We read in the Latin: “It happened that after some time the man began to miss his only daughter and began to be saddened and tormented.” The vernacular version raises the emotional stakes in two different ways. In it we read: “Now it happened that after some time,
remembering this little daughter of his and how he had left her, he began to be sad and was very melancholy.” 148 As before, the vernacular makes use of diminutives and demonstratives. The Latin mentions “his only daughter,” but the vernacular makes her “this little daughter of his.” The use of the word or (now) at the beginning lends it a conversational tone in which Cavalca, as the narrator, addresses his audience as one who is telling them a story and brings a certain immediacy to the account being related. This is continued by the use of the demonstrative, which creates a sense of intimacy between the narrator and his audience. Having reached out, as it were, to his audience and thus reduced the distance between himself and them, he appeals to their emotions. He gains their sympathy for the girl by emphasizing yet again how small she is. The effect of this repetition on the reader is cumulative.

In addition, Cavalca makes the psychological turmoil of the man much more realistic by introducing a feeling of guilt to the sense of regret that is already implied in the Latin text. Cavalca mentions that the man is saddened not just by the memory of his daughter but also by the memory of the manner in which he left her 149 to be cared for by a relation when he decided to become a monk. This is an attitude completely at odds with the “hate” that the follower of Christ is supposed to feel for his family of birth. From the monastic point of view, the decision to convert is irrevocable and subsequent regrets are severely discouraged for they reveal a lack of sincere and heartfelt commitment. Thus in Luke 9:62 Jesus says, “Jesus said to him: No man putting his hand to the plough, and

---

148 “Or avenne che, dipo alcun tempo, ricchordandosi di questa sua figliuola, e chome l’avea lassata, incominciosi a contrastare e stava molto malanchonico” (fol. 94rb).
149 This phrase does not appear in Florence, BML Plut 20 dex 5 (which has famule instead of filie). Other manuscripts refer to the man’s memory of the love of his daughter. In New York, Morgan M.626, we read “ut recordaretur caritatis filie sue et cepit contrastare atque affligi intra se” (fol. 129rb). In Paris, Mazarine 1734, we read caritatem instead of caritatis (fol. 130vb). The Latin manuscripts examined by Clugnet all follow one of these two readings. Not one mentions the manner in which he left his daughter.
looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.” Whether or not monks actually lived up to this ideal of a perfect renunciation of family is not at issue here. What is pertinent is that it was an ideal, and it is for this reason that the Latin hagiographical text does not explore in any depth the trauma caused by such a separation. The monastic point of view has always insisted that the contemplative life dedicated to God, the choice of Mary rather than Martha, was superior to the active life of the clergy, and that both were superior to the lay estate. But Cavalca is committed to narrating his story in a way that pays considerable attention to his audience’s expectations and experiences. For such an audience the decision by a father to abandon his child without remorse—even if this were a commendable act of renunciation from the monastic point of view—would be a heartless decision, one that they would find difficult if not impossible to understand. By presenting the father as feeling both guilt and remorse, Cavalca is acknowledging the lay point of view that the abandonment of family, even if it is to fulfill a personal religious calling, is devastating for those left behind and indeed ought to have psychological repercussions for the person committing such an act.

In his ability to see the drama of conversion from the point of view of both the laity and the professed monk, Cavalca reflects the spirituality of the new preaching orders of the thirteenth century, which combined an active pastoral mission with a commitment to contemplative activity. The former had characterized bishops and the secular clergy; the latter was the raison d’etre of monks. The Dominicans consciously combined elements of both worlds in their mission, and works of the monastic spirituality of the desert formed part of their core readings. Thus we read in the Golden Legend that Saint Dominic, who was a regular canon, “devoted himself day and night to reading and
prayer, ceaselessly beseeching God to deign to give him the grace to spend himself
totally for the salvation of his neighbor. He also studiously read the book of the
Conferences of the Fathers and advanced to a high degree of perfection.”150 In his
translation, we find Cavalca mediating between the values of the monastery and those of
the saeculum. Aware of the gap between these two worlds, we observe him modulating
and toning down the harshness of monastic values so that his lay readers will not be
alienated by them.

A comparison of his version with translations into other European vernaculars
shows how differently Cavalca approached the activity of translation. In the thirteenth-
century French prose translation in Paris, BN Français 1038, we read: “Now some time
after his conversion he began to remember his daughter and was morose and very sad.”151
Paris, BN Français 422, also from the thirteenth century, is a very slight variation.152 In
the fourteenth-century Alemannic version, we read: “After a long time a melancholy set
upon this brother and he became sad about his daughter.”153 The Middle Dutch
translation by Petrus Naghel, from the Carthusian house at Herne in southern Belgium,
also from the fourteenth century, has the following: “And then after some time he

151 “Ore auoit une piece apres ce qui fu renduz qui li commenca a remembrer de sa fille si fu moult amese
et mout triste.” Clugnet, p. 151.
152 “Ore auint une piece apres cou quil se fu rendus quil li commenca a souuenir de sa fille si fu molt tristes
153 “Diesen bruder begunde nach langen tzyten jamern vnd wart vmb sin tochter trurig.” Ulla Williams ed.,
Henceforth Alemannischen VP.
remembered the love that he had felt for his daughter and began to become sad and to hurt within himself.”

In the late fifteenth century, vernacular translations were published in French, Spanish, and Middle English. The French and Spanish translations appear to have used incunable editions of the Latin text. In the 1486/7 Lyons text, we read: “After he had been there a long time there came often to his memory the remembrance of his daughter, such that he was very melancholy.” In the 1498 Salamanca edition, which merely updates the spelling in Gonzalo Garcia de Santa Maria’s translation published in Zaragoza 1486–91, we read: “It happened after some time had passed that he remembered the love of his daughter and he began to become sad.” Caxton’s translation into Middle English from the French reads: “After that he hadd be the re a longe space of tyme he ofte remembryd his doughter insucheweyse that he becam alle melancolyus.” In these other cases, we find the translations follow the source text very closely. This results in a vernacular rendition of a monastic text with no attempt made to bridge the gap between the assumptions of the source text and the expectations and


155 According to the British Library’s Incunabula Short Title Catalogue (ISTC), the five French incunable editions are as follows: (1) Paris: Jean du Pré, 8 June 1486; (2) Lyon: Nicolaus Philippi and Jean du Pré, 15 Jan 1486/7; (3) Paris: Antoine Vérard, 15 October 1492; (4) Paris: Jean du Pré, 8 June 1494; and (5) Paris: Antoine Vérard, 15 October 1495. The three Spanish incunable editions are: (1) Zaragosa: Paul Hurus, about 1486–91; (2) Seville: Compañeros alemanes [Johann Pegnitzer, Magnus Herbst, and Thomas Glockner], about 1493; and (3) Salamanca: Printer of Nebrisensis, Gramática, 24 October 1498. William Caxton’s translation of the 1486 Lyons French version was published after his death by Wynkyn de Worde at Westminster before 21 August 1495.

156 “Apres quil eut este la par long espace de temps luy venoit souvente fois a memoire la souuenance de sa fille tellement quil en estoit fort melencolieux” (fol. 60ra, accessed online on Gallica at the BN Paris).

157 “[E] acaescio acabo de algun d<e> tiempo que se recordo del amor de su hija. E comenzó de entristecer e affligir se consigo” (fol. 56va; New York, Hispanic Society, Las Vidas de Los Sanctos Religiosos, 1498)

158 1495 copy at British Library, accessed via Early English Texts Online.
knowledge of the vernacular readers. In contrast to these, Cavalca attempts to step into
the shoes of his lay public and to look at the text from their point of view. His translation
is therefore not a *verbum ad verbum* translation but rather a *sensum ad sensum*
translation, broadly defined. His aim is not just to render into the vernacular a Latin text
that can be read but also to create a hybrid genre that will capture the reader’s attention as
well as address any cultural deficits that might impede a comprehension of both the text
and the context of the source.

The man moped for many days and the abbot, noticing his sadness, asks him what
is the matter, urges the man to tell him what is wrong, and assures him that God will give
him help.\(^\text{159}\) In the vernacular we find Cavalca translating using phrase suppression, the
rhetorical method of *amplificatio* in which pairs of words, in this case possessive
adjectives and adverbs, are used to expand the semantic field of a single Latin word. In so
doing he amplifies the abbot’s concern and creates a much warmer, intimate, familial
setting for the conversation while at the same time introducing an element of hierarchy:
“Observing which the abbot called him and said, ‘Now what is the matter my brother?
Tell me safely and God the consoler will be able to give you advice and consolation
through me.’”\(^\text{160}\) Cavalca has suppressed the phrase “cum per multos dies hoc faceret,”
perhaps because this temporal detail is of less interest to him than presenting the abbot as
a kindly father to the man.\(^\text{161}\) This detail is also omitted in the thirteenth-century and

---

\(^\text{159}\) “Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret, abbas eius hoc perspexit et ait ei: Quid habes, frater, quod sic tristi animo am\[b\]ulas? Dic mihi, et deus qui consolatur omnes, dabit tibi auxilium” (fol. 192rb).

\(^\text{160}\) “Or che ai tu, fratello mio? dimmelo sighuramente e dio consolatore tri potio (*sic*) dar consillio e consalattione per me” (fol. 94rb).

\(^\text{161}\) The phrase is present in BML, Plut 20. dex 5, Morgan M.626, Mazarine 1734, as well as the other Latin manuscripts assembled by Clugnet.
incunable prose French translations, 162 and in the Alemannic translation: “The abbot became aware of this and said to him, ‘Why are you so sad?” 163 It is, however, included in the fourteenth-century Middle Dutch 164 translation by Petrus Naghel and the fifteenth-century Spanish one by Gonzalo Garcia de Santa Maria. 165 Cavalca uses amplification to create a tone of intimacy and familiarity. Thus in the Latin the abbot simply says to him (ait ei), but Cavalca translates this as “called him and said to him.” The duplication of the verb increases the interaction between the abbot and the man. In the Latin the abbot addresses the man as frater. Cavalca’s abbot addresses him as “my brother,” which reduces the distance between them. Cavalca’s addition of the adverb sighuramente, or safely, to the abbot’s command to tell him what ails him once again presents the abbot as a loving father who reassures the man that he can speak freely and confidentially to him. He uses amplification to describe God’s help. In the Latin, the abbot tells the man that God will give him help. In the vernacular, God will give both advice as well as consolation, which renders the divinity more benevolent and closer.

162 Paris, BN Français 1038 simply tells us that the man was sad and that the abbot, noticing this, asked him what was the matter: “si fu moult amesese et mout triste, si que li abes sen apercut et li demanda quil auoit.” Clugnet, p. 150. Paris, BN Français 422 has “…molt tristes et molt dolans si que li abes sen aperchut et li demanda quil auoit et dist.” Clugnet, p. 153. The 1486 incunable has a different reading: “The abbot, seeing his spirits changed and that he was not at all as happy as was his custom, asked him the reason for his sadness” (Labbe voyant son courage mue et quil nestoit point si ioyeux comme il auoit acoiustume luy demanda la cause de sa tristesse), Lyon 1486, fol. 60ra. Cf. Paris, BN Français 22911 (xv), which has this reading and is reproduced in Clugnet, p. 163. I would read miue rather than mine, as n and u are often substituted. I have not been able to examine 22911, but I suspect it is either copied from the incunable or the manuscript source of the incunable, which would be quite exciting.


164 “Ende doe hi vele daghe dus droeve was so mercte dabt ende seide hem. Brueed wat heefstu dattu dus droeve gaes? Segghet mi, ende God die alle liedie vertroost gheve di helpe” (And when he for many days was this sad, the abbot noticed it and said to him. Brother what ails you that you go about so sadly? Tell me and God who consoles everyone will give you help), G. Claessens, p. 174.

165 “E haziendo lo muchos dias vio le atribulado el abad et dixo le. Que has que vas tan triste. di me lo e dios que todos consuela te ayudara” (And doing this for many days, the abbot saw him troubled and said to him. What ails you that you go so sadly? Tell me and God who consoles everyone will help you). New York, Hispanic Society, Zaragoza 1498, fol. 56va.
Cavalca introduces a note of hierarchy when he makes the abbot tell the man that God’s help to him will be mediated by the abbot (*per me*). This little phrase is not present in any of the Latin manuscripts examined either by me or by Clugnet. Nor does it appear in any of the other vernacular versions I have seen. This suggests that Cavalca felt a certain anxiety at the notion that God’s will could be made known directly to the man. In addition, the Latin version indicates no uncertainty about God’s help to the man. There we read: “And God, who is the helper of all, will give you help.” But as translated into the vernacular by Cavalca, we find a certain diffidence about this certainty. Here we read: “God the consoler will be able to give advice and consolation through me.” On the one hand, we find that God’s concern for each person is emphasized by amplification. The Latin assures that God will give help. In the vernacular translation God will provide both advice as well as consolation. This has the effect of making divine action much more personal. The notion of God as everyone’s consoler is abstract. This change from a definitive statement—God will help you—to one that amplifies divine help but removes God’s direct assistance emphasizes God’s capacity to help but in a mediated way—God will be able to advice and console you through me—revealing a clerical anxiety concerning attempts by laypersons to approach the Godhead directly. That is to say, it seems to come down against mystical tendencies. This is not to argue that the Dominicans did not recognize that some people had mystical experiences—the experience in Germany in this period bears that out—but rather that Cavalca did not encourage this strand in Christian spirituality. Concern about the dangers inherent in the attempt to reach God via contemplation was not peculiar to Cavalca, but rather seems to have been present within the Dominican order in general. In the Life of Jordan of
Saxony, which forms the fourth part of the *Liber vitas fratrum*, an account of the order and its beginnings assembled by Gerard of Frachet around 1260 at the order of the Master General Humbert of Romans, we read of a devout friar from Faenza. The story is worth quoting in its entirety:

A devout brother of Faenza, near Bologna, in his great eagerness for contemplation, set about to discover what God is, and came at last to such a state of mind that he doubted of his very belief in the existence of God. On mentioning his state to the prior and brethren, they convinced him of this great truth by various kinds of arguments, and showed how he ought to believe: for all this he could not entirely rid his mind of the ever-recurring delusion that perhaps there was no God at all. The prior of the house happening to go to Bologna, where blessed Jordan was staying at the time, told him of this man’s temptation and trouble of mind, upon which the Master replied: “Go home, father prior, and tell him from me that he believes it as firmly as I do.” Returning home, the prior had scarcely given Master Jordan’s message before the brother cried out, as if recovering from a trance or ecstasy: “I do indeed believe most firmly in God’s existence.” And so by the power of God’s words the brother was delivered from that blasphemous temptation.

We note here that the eager contemplative in question was not a layman but a friar. His attempts to reach and understand the Godhead led him not to a divine encounter but rather to atheism. However, this is not the point of the story. The main purpose of the story is the healing of the friar’s atheism by the intervention of Jordan. It is nevertheless revealing of a certain attitude toward contemplative life and its attendant dangers. The fact that it was a friar in a convent who experienced such doubts underscores the dangers of contemplative practice. That the friar was described as devout points out the potential problems of contemplation combined with enthusiasm, even when the former is pursued in a safe place such as the convent. As a Dominican at a renowned convent like the one at Pisa, Cavalca would certainly have known the *Liber vitas fratrum* and thus been familiar with this tale. Writing as he was, for laypeople, we can understand better the way in
which he inflects his translation. He wishes to discourage any attempts to communicate with God directly with the expectation that God will communicate back. This is not true of prayer, which is unidirectional.

Another factor that explains this diffidence was the Johannine legacy of “Believe not every spirit.” The activity of the devil in the world was seen as constant, and he often disguised himself as a good angel. This concern with the discretio spirituum, or the discretion of spirits, is present everywhere in the Vitas patrum collection and is also present in the order’s own hagiography. In the Life of Jordan we read two stories of the attempts of the devil to deceive Jordan. In the first story, the devil disguises himself as a monk and convinces the infirm Jordan that he ought to increase his ascetic practice and do without a bed and meat.

Believing him in all simplicity, the servant of Christ refrained for several days from using any dispensations, but soon from want of these very helps his sickness so increased and he became so weak that he was brought to the verge of the grave. Then our Lord made know to him that it was the devil who had cajoled him under the garb of a monk, from envious spleen of his holy life and the success which attended his preaching.

In the second story, Jordan is ill but has learned his lesson about the discretion of spirits. We read that,

While prostrate from fever and suffering from a burning thirst, as is common in fever cases, suddenly there stood before him a youth in the guise of an attendant, bearing in one hand a flagon of wine, and a goblet in the other, and thus greeted him: “See here, Master, I have brought you some excellent wine to drink; taste it, for it can do you no harm.” Fearing lest it might be only an artifice of the devil, as was indeed the case, Master Jordan commended himself to God, and then making over the youth the sign of the cross, cried out: “Avaunt, Satan, with all your lies and deceits,” whereat the figure vanished.
If the devil attacked and was able to fool the Master General of the Dominican order, a holy man with training in spiritual combat, then we can better understand Cavalca’s concern to discourage laypeople from any kind of mystical communion with God lest the devil take advantage of their enthusiasm and naivety in spiritual combat. Indeed, one of his treatises, the *Trattato delle Trenta Stoltizie*, is devoted to the thirty errors to which people are prone when in spiritual combat with the devil. This concern with the devil increased in the high and late Middle Ages, as Alain Boureau has argued. Cavalca’s treatise and the change in his translation from unmediated to mediated communication with God are responses to this diabolization during the Middle Ages. The large number of errors—thirty—reflects his great concern about the ease with which the battle with the devil can be lost. The change, which is both characteristic and telling, reflects his extreme caution in providing laypeople with models that might encourage mystical communication with God.

When the man hears this, he throws himself crying at the abbot’s feet and tells him he has a son whom he left in the city and about whom he is sad. In the Latin text we read: “I have an only son in the city whom I left when he was small and when I remember him I am afflicted on his account.” The Florentine manuscript has a slightly different version of somewhat greater emotional intensity: “…whom I left when he was small and remembering his infancy I am greatly afflicted.” In this case, the youthfulness of the child is repeated and the sorrow the man feels is intensified by the use of very. Cavalca’s translation gives a different emotional slant, for it focuses on the man’s guilt at having ruptured the family: “I have a son in the city and when I remember how I left him,

---

I cannot do other than be pained about this and think about it.” The Latin narrates the man’s emotions in a linear fashion, which gives the impression of a rational explanation. In Cavalca’s rendition, the tortured syntax and the feelings of guilt are much more effective at sketching the disturbed emotional state of the man. The Latin explains the sadness the man feels when he misses the child. There is no suggestion, however, of guilt at what has happened. Cavalca depicts the man obsessing over the manner in which he abandoned the child. It is this feeling of a dereliction of paternal duty that is emphasized in the vernacular but that is missing in the Latin. The Latin text shows a logical unfolding of thoughts in sequence. The man left a small child, remembers him, and is consequently worried about him. Cavalca’s proliferation of negatives—“non posso far ch’io non me ne doglia”—presents this emotional turbulence as the only possible or appropriate reaction under the circumstance. Once again, we see him presenting the story from the point of view of his lay audience and not from the monastic viewpoint, which sees conversion as the greatest good since it leads to the salvation of the soul. The man presented by Cavalca is much more believably human than the man sketched in the Latin text. The latter is by no means unfeeling, but he is not deeply conflicted and feeling guilty about his actions.

The man did not wish to tell the abbot that the child was a girl. This is reported plainly in the Latin but is expanded in the vernacular: “He did not wish to tell the abbot that it was a girl and not a boy and so he said it was a son and not a daughter.” The single noun girl in the Latin has been replaced by four terms—boy, girl, son, daughter. This multiplication of kinship terms emphasizes that the man’s emotional turmoil is at heart a family drama.
The abbot, being ignorant of the situation, did not want to lose the man, as he had become necessary in the monastery. In his translation Cavalca brings the family drama to center stage: “The abbot, seeing that the man was unhappy and appeared to be wishing to leave to look after this son or daughter, considering that he was very useful in the monastery, said to him.” The Latin text has the abbot as the subject of the sentence and the man as the object of his concern. In the vernacular, the sentence begins with the abbot but then goes on to describe the emotional state of the man and his wish to go so that he may look after his child. Cavalca has made the man’s family the real subject of the sentence.

The abbot tells the man that if he loves his son, he should go and bring him back to the monastery to be with him. Cavalca clarifies the abbot’s instruction in his translation. The abbot tells the man to bring back the son and that he, the abbot, will receive him as a monk. This makes the status of the son within the monastery clear to the lay reader, who might be familiar with the different and usually lower status of the conversus, a lay affiliate of the monastery. It is possible that here Cavalca is paying attention to the class concerns of his readers and reassuring them that the man’s child will enjoy the same social status as the father. In the German version, the abbot tells the man to “go to him and have him here by you” (Ganck nach jme vnd habe jne hie by dir; Williams, p. 359). The French version is similar: “Son, he said, go and bring your son and let him be received with you” (Fiuz dist il alez si amenez uostre fiuz et soit receuz auec uous; Clugnet, p. 151). Petrus Naghel, in his Middle Dutch version, says: “If you love it [the child], so go and bring it here and let it be with you” (Minstuut, so gaet ende bringhet hier ende het si met di; Naghel, p. 174). Gonzalo Garcia de Santa Maria says the
same in Spanish: “If you love him so much, go and bring him here and let him be with you” (Si tanto le amas ve e trae le aca e este contigo).

The man went and brought back his daughter, changed her clothes and her name from Marina to Marinus, and had her taught to read and write within the monastery. In his translation, Cavalca characteristically expands the *her* in the Latin (*adduxit eam*) to “this his daughter.” He also emphasizes the man’s agency in perpetrating the fraud: “Then he went and changed the clothes of this his daughter and had her received as male, and gave him the name brother Marinus and had him taught to read.” The use of the demonstrative along with the kinship term daughter amplifies and humanizes the Latin pronoun *her* (*eam*).

We also note that Cavalca omits the following sentence, in which we find out that none of the brothers knew that the child was a girl and that they called her Marinus. By this omission, Cavalca turns a narrative that assumes the point of view of the monastery into a narrative that focuses on the man’s actions. Once again we find the man and his daughter elbowing the abbot and the monks to the sidelines and occupying center stage. In the Latin, it is the monks who did not know that Marinus was a girl, and they were the ones who called her Marinus. They remain the subject of the sentences. Yet in the vernacular, they have disappeared entirely. Cavalca transfers their agency to the man. Their lack of awareness is transformed into the man’s actions. He is the one who had her received as a boy. In the Latin, they are the ones who called her Marinus (obviously following the father’s lead), but in the vernacular he is the one who gives her the name Marinus. At every step, the man is the center of Cavalca’s narrative. Whereas the late antique hagiographer presented a story by monks and for monks, in Cavalca’s hands, it
has become a human story in a monastic setting. This change in emphasis is so
pronounced that occasionally the monastery recedes entirely from the picture.

The Life then leaps forward an unspecified number of years. Marinus is now
fourteen years old, and her father takes over her religious education. The Latin describes
this simply as teaching her the way of the Lord, “viam domini.” Cavalca amplifies this by
translating it as “the commandments of God and the way of Christ.” In a monastery, the
way of the Lord can mean many things, ranging from participation in the liturgy to
contemplative activity. Cavalca defines this in ways that would be clearer to a lay reader.
Yet there is still a certain level of ambiguity. It is very likely that he is referring to the
Ten Commandments, as this was stressed by the Church in the catechetical function of
preachers as appropriate for preaching to laity. Besides the Decalogue, preachers were
encouraged to include discussions of vices and virtues in their sermons, but the
Decalogue was usually listed first. The way of Christ is the *imitatio Christi*, or the
imitation of Christ. Christ is presented as the best model for humanity to emulate. Indeed,
in his treatise, the *Specchio di croce*, or the *Mirror of the Cross*, Cavalca uses the image
of the crucified Christ as a master teaching in a chair: “Cristo in croce e come maestro in
cattedra.” The German version does not gloss *viam domini*: “When she was fourteen
years old, then her father taught her the way of the Lord” (Nu wart sie viertzehen jare
alte, do leret sie jre vater gottes wege). Petrus Naghel also follows his Latin exemplar
closely, for the Dutch reads: “Ende doe si XIII jaer out was, so begonste hare haer vader
te leerne Ons Heren wech.” The thirteenth-century French translation skips this sentence,
but the 1486 Lyons print edition has the following variant: “In which state she remained
until the age of fourteen years and she was sufficiently instructed both in letters and the
way of salvation” (Auquel estat elle fut leans iusques en laage de .xiii. ans. et y fut
souffisamment instruite: tant en lettres que autrement a la voye de salut). This version by
an unknown French translator does not follow literally any Latin Life of Marina that I
have been able to find. But like the earlier translations, it does not explain exactly what
the “way of salvation” means.

The father then launches into a speech in which he warns his daughter to keep her
secret till her death and to be mindful of the plots of the devil lest she be seduced by him.
Cavalca turns this into indirect speech, but at the same time he explains what keeping the
secret means: “He admonished her most of all that no one should know that she was a
woman until her death and that she should watch out for the plots of the devil.” The
omission of the phrase “lest you be seduced by him” suggests a certain reticence or
cyness concerning sexual matters. In the deserts of late antique Egypt, control of lust
was a great concern, and its perceived dangers are reflected in hagiography, which did
not hesitate to use vocabulary pertaining to sex and sexuality. Since the phrase “lest you
be seduced by him” appears in all the versions of the Life I have examined, Cavalca’s
omission may reflect either prudery on his part or a reluctance to portray Marina as
someone who might be susceptible to seduction. That is, he would prefer to emphasize
other qualities in this saint rather than to present her as someone who might feel sexual
temptation and yet be able to exercise self-control in this matter.

The father’s reason for warning his daughter about the plots of the devil is his fear
that through such a seduction the whole monastery may be destroyed as a result of their
deception and that both of them would receive eternal damnation in the sight of Christ
and his angels. This is entirely omitted by Cavalca but is translated in the other
vernacular versions of the Life. The thirteenth-century translation, BN Français 1038, turns this direct address into indirect speech. Besides having the man urge his daughter never to tell anyone that she is a woman, the translator takes a different approach to the plots of the devil. He too avoids the expression “lest you be seduced by him” and instead explains that the devil troubled men and women the more, the better they were: “Et quant uint au xiiij. an si li dist ses peres quelle gardast quelle ne deist mie quelle fust fame ainz pensant de bien feire et se gardast des aguez au deables qui plus uolentiers engingnoit lome et la fame come plus sont bon,” In the incunable edition this is turned into an exhortation to preserve her virginity: “Her father spoke strongly that virginity was a fine estate and very pleasing to God and urged her very affectionately to keep it and to be cautious and wise to preserve herself from the plots of the enemy and to never let it be known that she is a woman” (Son dit pere luy remonstra fort que virginité estoit vng bel estat et moult agreable a dieu: en la priant tres affectuesement de la bien garder. et quelle feust caute et sage de se preseruer des las de lenemy et quelle ne se fist iamais congnoistre estre femme). This version that stresses virginity is present only in the French. The German version preserves the direct address and follows the Latin very closely, including the warning not to be seduced by the devil: “and be careful that the devil not seduce you and this holy monastery be destroyed by us” (vnd hute das dich der tuffel nit betriege vnd diesz heilig closter von vns betrubet werde). The Dutch version also has the father warning her about being seduced by the devil but turns passive constructions into active speech and also expands “monastery” to “the work of this monastery” in the father’s speech: “that he not seduce you and that we do not destroy the work of this holy monastery” (dat hi di niet en bedrieghe, dat wi die heilighe werke van
desen cloostere niet en breken). The Spanish version does not mention seduction but has the father simply warning her not to let the devil deceive her lest the monastery be lost because of them: “E guarda te de las assechancas del diablo que no te engane e que este sancto monasterio se pierda por causa nuestra.” Here we see the same reticence in the use of sexual vocabulary present in Cavalca’s rendering.

Why did Cavalca not translate the section about the destruction of the monastery and the damnation of father and daughter in the sight of Christ and his angels? This is a curious omission. One possibility is that this passage was missing in the text he had in his hands. There are two other possibilities that are worth considering. The first is that once again he is downplaying the monastic setting by focusing on the drama and its central characters—the father and the daughter. Not surprisingly, the Latin text, monastic in provenance, is concerned with the possibility of scandal and the destruction of the monastery. The focus on the Last Judgment is also at the forefront of the monastic mind. It would be a mistake, however, to see this as more of a monastic than a mendicant concern. The catechetical focus after 1215 included the pains of hell and the rewards of heaven along with the Decalogue and the vices and virtues as suitable subjects for preaching. It is regrettable that none of Cavalca’s sermons have survived so that we can scrutinize them for the presence or absence of eschatological and apocalyptic themes. The presence of the Last Judgment in the four manuscripts I have consulted, and in all of the manuscripts consulted by Clugnet, along with its presence in other vernacular versions of the Life suggests that its absence in the Italian is a conscious omission of Cavalca’s.
It may be that he felt that fear was not the best motivator for correct action. This is an ethical stance that finds support in his *Specchio di Croce*. Cavalca argues that we should identify with the crucified Christ out of a disinterested love for him and not out of consideration of eschatological consequences:

But there is no doubt that the perfect one even if s/he could escape hell and gain paradise enjoying the world, considering Christ’s passion would prefer rather to be with him on the cross out of love of him. And who out of this love leaves the world and takes on tribulation is the perfect son and brother of Christ. Who instead does this out of fear of hell or desire for heaven is a slave and mercenary because he does not look except to his own benefit even when he does good.  

Here Cavalca reveals that the foundation of his ethical system is intentionality. Thus an action that is good but which springs from self-interest is morally inferior to disinterested action that springs from the love of Christ alone. The last sentence of the father’s speech appears as follows in most manuscripts: “And he told him many other things every single day about the kingdom of God” (Et alia multa dicebat ei per singulos dies de regno dei). Florence, BNC Conv. Sopp. J.7.11, of Dominican provenance, has a slight variation that omits mention of the kingdom of God: “These and many other things he taught her without stopping every single day” (Hec et alia multa since cessatione per singulos dies docebat eam). Cavalca tells us “thus continuously this man her father admonished her about devotional matters” (e chosi continuamente questo suo padre l’amonia di chose devote). The semantic field of “devotional matters” certainly encompasses the kingdom of God, but it lacks the specificity of “kingdom of God.” Assuming it was present in the

---

original, this is consistent with Cavalca’s emphasis on piety based on a disinterested love of Christ rather than a desire for heaven. The German version speaks of “our Lord”: “And he taught her many other things about our Lord” (vnd leret sie anders viel von vnserm herren). The Dutch text follows the Latin closely: “And daily he taught her many other things about the kingdom of God” (Ende dagheleec leerde hi hare vele ander dincs vanden rke Gods). The Old French version informs us of the saint’s reception of her father’s advice: “The father admonished her much about such matters and she placed in her heart what he said to her. She was very brave and very eager to do good (Assez lamonesta li peres de maintes choses et elle mist en son cuer ce que len li disoit. si fu moult preuz et moult ardant de bien feire). The 1486 Lyons printed French version omits this sentence. The Spanish translation also renders the Latin faithfully: “e enseñava le cadaldia otras cosas muchas del reyno de dios.”

The next stage of the saint’s life is marked by her father’s death. BNC Conv Sopp. J.7.11 gives her age as eighteen (decem et octo), whereas Cavalca has seventeen. This is the second detail—along with the distance of the monastery from the city being thirty-two miles as opposed to Cavalca’s thirty-seven—that supports the conclusion that Cavalca did not use this version when he was translating. There is simply no reason why Cavalca would have changed her age. Morgan M.626, Houghton Typ 194, Mazarine 1734, as well as Clugnet’s three representative manuscripts—Paris, BN Latin 2328 (ninth century), 10840 (eleventh century), 5296 (thirteenth century)—all have seventeen (decem et septem). Of the eight other manuscripts Clugnet collated, only one, BN Latin 5306 (fourteenth century) shows a variant reading of sixteen (sexdecim). The Franciscan Vitas patrum manuscript Florence, BML Plut 20 dex 5, which is textually very close to BNC
Conv Sopp J711, also has eighteen as her age when her father died. In referring to this event Cavalca employs a euphemism along with the demonstrative pronoun: “this her father passed from this life” (questo suo padre passo di questa vita). The German follows the Latin closely: “Her father died” (da starb jr vatter; Williams, p. 359). Petrus Naghel does the same in Dutch: “so sterf haere vader.” The two thirteenth-century French translators of BN Français 1038 and 422 change the order of the sentence: “The father he died when she was seventeen” (Les peres li mourut quant elle ost .xvij. anz; 1038) and “Her father died when she was fifteen” (Ses peres li morut quant ele ot .xv. ans; 422). Since her age is fifteen in the latter, we can assume that this was the age in the Latin manuscript used by the translator. BN Français 23117 (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) has: “When the maiden was seventeen her father died” (Quant la puce lle ot .xvii. ans son pere morut). The fifteenth-century manuscript BN Français 22911, which may be the manuscript used for the French vernacular Lyons incunable edition of 1486, also uses a euphemistic expansion: “When she was seventeen her father passed from life out of this world” (Elle aiant la age de XVII ans son pere ala de vie a trespasement; Clugnet, p. 163). The Spanish incunable edition of 1498 avoids euphemism: “E como fuesse de diez y siete años murio su padre” (fol. 56va). Caxton’s Middle English translation of the French print edition reduces the euphemism but keeps the expansion: “She comen to the age of xvii yere her fader deyed and departed out of the world.” Of all these translations Cavalca’s is the one that captures the quality of spoken speech. The use of the demonstrative pronoun renders the tone more intimate and conversational. The euphemism also has the effect of making the afterlife present, for the use of the verb “to pass” (passare) necessarily implies another destination whereas “to die” (morire) implies
mainly an ending. This is consistent with Cavalca’s profession, that of preaching. Unlike monks, for whom life’s focus was the afterlife, laypeople needed to be reminded of the Church’s message that Christians were wayfarers or pilgrims in this world. Thus Cavalca presents the father’s death as a step in a journey, reminding his readers to think of their existence in eschatological and not just earthly time.

After her father’s death, Marina remained in her father’s cell. The manuscripts display quite a bit of variety at this point. The ninth-century manuscript BN Latin 2328 tells us that “She observed in all matters the teaching of her father” (observabat in omnibus doctrina patris sui; Clugnet, p. 5). This is omitted in BN Latin 10840, BN Latin 5296, and Mazarine 1734 but is included in Houghton Typ 194 (twelfth century), Morgan M.626 (doctrinis instead of doctrina), and the two mendicant manuscripts. These last two use precepta (orders/commandments) instead of doctrina: “She observed all of his commandments” (observavit omnia precepta eius). Cavalca’s translation is ambiguous for he uses a double expansion: “She observed the commandments and his teaching” (oservava li comandamenti e lla dottrina sua). Cavalca is fond of expanding by using binary constructions. But his use of comandamenti makes one wonder whether he was checking variants of the Life in more than one manuscript. If this was the case, then his choice of comandamenti rather than precetii to translate precepta is worth noticing, for the main association a lay reader would make with comandamenti would be with the Decalogue. If Cavalca was not incorporating variant readings of the Latin Life into his translation, then he amplified the father’s doctrina, or teaching, which is left vague and unspecified in the Latin, to include a concrete program of behavior with which laypeople could identify. The Ten Commandments were part of the catechetical program of the
friars in their sermons, and the laity would have heard these discussed by many a preacher. The German version is unusual in that it seems to reflect a variant reading in the Latin textual tradition: “And she kept his teaching with good things” (vnd behielt sin lere mit guten dingen). Whatever the Latin original may have been, the translation does not try to specify what the teaching was and remains at the level of generality. The Dutch translation follows Mazarine 1734, in which this phrase is missing, and therefore omits any mention of her father’s teaching. The Old French BN Français 1038 and 422, which must have had a similar Latin source, also omit this. BN Français 23117 mentions that she remembered well the teachings of her father: “et bien li souuint des enseignemens son pere.” This reading is followed by BN Français 413. In BN Français 22911, the phrase is omitted. This likely reflects the absence of the phrase in the incunable editions of the Latin text. The Lyons edition of the Latin Vitas patrum in 1483–87 omits the phrase, as does its influential predecessor, the 1478 Nuremberg edition. The Spanish edition, similarly based on a Latin incunable text, makes no mention, nor does Caxton, who translates from the French printed edition.

Whether or not the Latin manuscripts mention her father’s teaching, they all mention that she was obedient, so that she was loved by the abbot and the brethren. There is some variation here as well. BNC Conv. Sopp. J.7.11 mentions that each of the brethren loved her greatly: “Et ita erat obediens omnibus fratribus ut ab abbate et cunctis monachis valde diligeretur.” None of the manuscripts I have examined or that are mentioned by Clugnet discuss any other quality besides her obedience. Cavalca, however, amplifies this to form a binary that include general virtuousness: “And so obedient and virtuous was she that the abbot and everyone else loved her singularly” (e si hobediente e
virtuoso era, che ilabate e tutti lamavano singularmente). This expansion is missing in the other translations. In the German we read: “She was so obedient to her abbot that she was dear to him and all his monks” (vnd was gehorsam jrem abte also das sie jme vnd allen sinen monchen lieb was). The Dutch version is similar: “And she was in all matters so obedient in the monastery that the abbot and all the others loved her” (ende si was in allen dinghen ghehoersam inder cloester, so datse dabdt ende alle dandere mindden). The French versions show amplifications of a different sort. In BN Français 1038, which was a translation prepared for Blanche of Navarre, Countess of Champagne, we read that “she was so very obedient and so sweet and so debonair that everyone loved her like their own hearts” (Si fu moult obedienz et si douce et si debonneires que tuit lamoient ausuit come leur cuers). This thirteenth-century translation is clearly influenced by the milieu of the court as well as the tradition of French hagiographical romances, as the characteristic use of the adjectives sweet and debonair reveal. This reading also appears, with a slight change in word order, in BN Français 422. BN Français 22911, which was likely prepared for the wider audience of the print edition, only stresses her obedience: “She was very obedient to the abbot and to all in the monastery such that she was marvelously loved by the abbot and all the monks thinking always that she was a man” (elle se rendit fort obeissante a labbe et a tous ceulx du monastere tellement quelle estoit meueilleusement aimee de labbe et de tous les religieux cuidans tousiour s que ce fust vng homme). This is in turn translated closely by Caxton: “After, she becam m oche obeyssaunt to th’abbot and to alle them of the monastery in suche wyse that she was merueyllously loued of th’abbot and of all the relgyous, wenynge allewaye that she hadde be a man.” Unlike the French, the Spanish sticks close to the Latin: “And she was very
obedient to all in the monastery such that by the abbot and by everyone she was much loved” (e era muy obediente a todos los del monasterio tanto que de su abad e de todos era muy amada). In the case of Cavalca, we observe once again a homiletic connection to his expansions. Preachers were expected to discuss both the vices and the virtues in their sermons. By adding *virtuous* to *obedient*, Cavalca presents qualities of behavior that the laity are to emulate and an ethical standard to aspire to. The translation thus reinforces the ethical messages the reader would have heard in sermons.

The Life now moves away from the interior of the monastery to the outside world. We read that the monastery had a pair of oxen and a cart that were used to bring necessities from a market town by the sea three miles away. There is some variation between the manuscripts, caused by confusion emanating from the earliest translation of the Greek Life. In or near the market town there was an inn and an innkeeper. The Greek word for innkeeper is *pandox*, and the earliest translator simply brought this word as a calk into his Latin translation, probably because he did not know the Greek word and therefore did not know to translate it as *tabernarius*. Someone thought that this was a proper name belonging to the innkeeper. Cavalca used a manuscript that contained this error. In any case, the Latin Life mentions the market and the the monks who went for supplies without explanation, for the economic functioning of a monastery would not have required clarification for a monastic reader: “The monastery had a pair of oxen and a cart for the sea was close by where there was a market three miles distant from the monastery. And the monks would go and bring back things necessary for the monastery” (Habebat autem monasterium par boum et carrum, quia vicinum erat mare, ubi erat emporium tribus milibus distans a monasterio; et ibant monachi, et que necessaria erant
deferent in monasterio; BNC Conv Sopp. J.7.11). Cavalca, on the other hand, fearing confusion in the mind of his lay reader and setting up the plot like a good novelist, discusses the inn at some length as well as the innkeeper: “Now this monastery had a pair of oxen and a cart with which the abbot would often send monks to the sea, which was nearby, three miles away. There was the home of a good man named Pandocci where the monks could return with the cart and collect the things necessary for the monastery because it was there that one displayed the wood and merchandise that arrived by sea” (Or avea questo monasterio un paio di buoi col carro, quol quale spesse volte l’ abate mandava alcun monacho a mare, che v’ era presso a tre miglia, e quine era un ridutto d’ un buon omo ch’ avea nome Pandocci, dove li monacci potevano tornare chor caro regavano le chose necessarie per lo monasterio, perche quine si sposavano li legni e le mercatantiei che venivano per mare). There are a number of changes worth noticing. First, the tone is markedly more conversational, starting with the “now” that introduces the sentence. This creates the feeling that this is not just a narrative to be read but also a narrator to be heard. The abbot is introduced as the person who sends the monks. This is not present in the Latin, where we read that “the monks used to go.” This change from an amorphous group to a single character makes the story more vivid and has the effect of focusing the action on someone the reader has already met earlier in the story. The innkeeper is introduced as a “good man,” and his house becomes crucial to the unfolding of the story. In the Latin text, it is assumed that the monks picked up the goods at the market and brought them back. In Cavalca’s telling, the market town recedes into the background, and he transfers the economic transactions that one would have expected to take place there to the innkeeper’s house by making this the place
where the goods were displayed. In such a situation the monks have no choice but to
go to the innkeeper’s house. This version of the story reveals the novelistic traits
employed by Cavalca and shows him rearranging the story to maximize the dramatic
possibilities and to ensure that his readers are not confused as to why the monks were
going to someone’s house. The German version follows the source text closely: “The
cloister had a cart and oxen with which the monks used to bring back from the sea
what they needed, since it was close by the monastery” (Nu hatt das closter eynen
karren vnd rinder domit furten die bruder von dem mere des sie bedorfften, wann es
was nahe by dem closter). The Dutch specifies that the monks got the goods in the
market town: “And the monastery had two oxen and a cart for there was a town near
by where the market was. And the monks went there and brought back what was
needed in the monastery” (Ende de clooster hadde II ossen ende een kerre want daer
was een stat bi daer de marct was. Ende die monneke ghingehen daer ende haelden des
de clooster noot was). The Spanish is similar: “And there was in the monastery a pair
of oxen and a cart since the sea was nearby one league distant where there was a port
where merchandise was handled. And the monks used to go and bring back the things
necessary in the monastery” (E auia enel monesterio vn par de bueyes: e vn carro porque
tenia cerca la mar a vna legua donde estaua el puerto: e trato de las mercadurias e los
monges yuan e trayan las cosas necessarias al monesterio). The early French versions are
similar. BN Français 1038 mentions neither the abbot nor the monks: “Now the
monastery had two oxen and a cart, which they took to the sea that was nearby and
brought back from there what was needed in the monastery” (Or auoit en labaie .ij. bues
et .j. char si le menoient uers la mer qui pres leur estoit et aportoient diluec ce don’t il
auoit mestier en labaie). BN Français 422 offers a slight variation and mentions the monks but not the abbot: “Or auoit en cele abeie .ij. bues et .j. cars si le menoient li frereuers le mer et apertoient illuec cou que mestiers lor estoit.” BN Français 23117 mentions neither the abbot nor the monks but specifies a port where purchases were made: “En celle abaie auoit vn char car la mer estoit illec pres a .ij. lieues ou il auoit grant port la ou il aloient acheter ce que mester leur estoit.” BN Français 22911, which is the loosest French translation, mentions the monks but not the abbot: “The said monastery had two oxen and a little cart used by the monks to go seek their necessities at the sea which was close by two or three leagues or thereabouts” (Audit monastere auoit deux beufz et vng petit chariot seruant aux religieux pour aler querir leurs necessities a la mer qui estoit prochaine deulx de trois lieues ou enuiron). The Lyon 1486 incunable has the same reading as BN Français 22911 and is followed very closely by Caxton in his Middle English translation: “The sayd monastery hadde .ii. oxen and a lytyll carte seruynge for the religious for to fetche their necessytees at the see, whyche was by theime a thre myle of.” Caxton simply removes the uncertainty regarding the precise distance of the sea from the monastery, revealing that while his translation followed the French very closely, he did not feel bound to translate every word in the text. Thus Cavalca’s choices in making the abbot the subject of the sentence, dropping any mention of the port or the market, and making the inn the place of exchange are not followed by any of the other translators. We observe him here approaching the plot as a novelist. Conscious that the Latin text indicates that the sea was not far away, he wished to ensure that the monks had a plausible reason for visiting the inn.
Having introduced the outside world with which the monastery had regular contact, the plot advances so that Marinus too comes in contact with it. There is some variation in the Latin textual tradition, for we read that one day the abbot asked her why she did not go with the monks to help them. Her response, “You did not order, father” (Tu non iussisti pater), is present in the eleventh-century manuscript Paris BN Latin 10840 (Clugnet B) but is not the version found in most other manuscripts. The earliest text cited (Clugnet A), the ninth-century Paris BN Latin 2328, emphasizes Marinus’s obedience: “As you have ordered, father, so will I do” (Vt iussisti, pater, ita facio et ego). A variant of this is found in Clugnet’s text C (BN Latin 5296) from the thirteenth century: “I will do as you have ordered, father” (Ego faciam sicut iussisti). A laconic form of this response, which emphasizes her obedience to a lesser degree, is found in Morgan M.626, Mazarine 1734, and the two mendicant manuscripts: “You have ordered, father” (Iussisti, pater).

In all versions of the Latin, the abbot’s question and Marinus’s reply are in direct speech. Cavalca maintains the direct address for the abbot but turns her reply into indirect discourse and expands the laconic Latin: “And she replied humbly that she was ready to go there willingly” (E quelli humilemente rispuose ch’era apparecchiato d’andarvi volentieri). Why did Cavalca choose to translate the text this way? His use of two adverbs—humbly and willingly—suggest that he was turning this unlikely saint’s life into a model of behavior to be emulated by his readers. Before we explore this issue further, we should compare the Italian with translations into other languages.

The German translator uses indirect speech for both the question and the reply: “One day the abbot told Marinus to go with the brothers to the sea. Brother Marinus did
This translator is not concerned to describe how Marinus acted. It is sufficient for him to indicate that Marinus responded. The sense of obeying an order present even in the short form of her reply in the Latin—\textit{iussisti pater}—is absent here. Petrus Naghel, in his Dutch translation, preserves the direct discourse: “‘Brother Marijn, and why do you not go with the brothers and help them?’ And he replied, ‘Father, you have ordered’” (‘Brueder Marijn, waeromme en gadi metten bruederen niet ende helpt hen?’ Ende hi antwoordde: ‘Vader, heeftuut bevolen’). The Spanish translator also preserves the direct discourse for her reply: “And she replied, ‘Father, I will do as you have ordered me’” (E ella respuso: ‘Padre, yo fare lo que me mandaes’). The translator of BN Français 1038 used a Latin text closer to Clugnet B, for we learn that the reason why Marinus had not helped the other monks was that she had not been ordered to do so by the abbot. Like Cavalca, the translator uses a combination of direct and indirect speech for the question and the reply. Unlike Cavalca, he puts the abbot’s question into indirect speech but keeps Marinus’s response in direct speech: “…and he replied, ‘Good sire, you never ordered me to’” (…et il respondi, ‘Biau sire uous ne le mauiez mie quemande’). The translator of BN Français 23117 expands Marinus’s reply in a way that answers the question and establishes his obedience: “And he replied to him, ‘because it was never ordered to me and now that you order it I will do it’” (Et il lui respondit: ‘pource quil ne li auoit mie commande et puis que vous le commandez ie le ferai’). In BN Français 22911, as well as in the Lyons incunable printing of 1486, the translator turns the question and the reply into indirect speech and emphasizes Marinus’s obedience in his reply: “Marin who was very obedient immediately went there” (Marin qui estoit fort obeissant incontinent y ala).
Caxton translates this word for word: “Maryn whiche was moche obeissaunt wente incontynent thyder.”

In these versions, to the extent that the translator deals with the manner of Marinus’s reply to the abbot, it is obedience rather than any other quality that is emphasized. Humility is not mentioned in the Latin or in any other translation and is thus unique to Cavalca. The quality of Marinus’s obedience, so prized in the monastic context, is not only relegated by Cavalca to second place but it is also inferred rather than stated explicitly. In the Italian we read that Marinus was ready to go there willingly. One can conclude from this that Marinus was therefore obedient, but the vocabulary of responding to an order has been removed. Cavalca could easily have chosen the adverb obediently (obedientemente) to modify her reply had he wished to bring out this aspect of her response while keeping the indirect discourse. It appears that he did not feel that this monastic virtue would resonate with his lay readers, for this is now the second instance where he has relegated it to the second tier. At the beginning of the story we read that the father was loved by the abbot because he completed all the assigned monastic tasks and was both faithful and obedient. In his translation, Cavalca mentioned his faithfulness but omitted his obedience.

By presenting the saint as responding humbly, Cavalca turned the saint’s behavior into a model for those outside the monastery. Humility was a virtue that applied to monks and laypeople alike. But why did Cavalca wish to emphasize this virtue? The answer probably lies in the nexus of the homiletic context of Cavalca’s activities as a translator and the scholastic context of the Dominican schools. We know that the encyclopedic treatment of vices and virtues by the thirteenth-century Dominican William Peraldus
became hugely popular both within Dominican circles and outside among all religious. We also know that Cavalca read this work, for he translated the section on sins of the tongue along with various additions and expansions from Latin into Tuscan as a devotional treatise called the *Pungilingua*. The medieval homiletic tradition produced far more works on vices than on virtues, and indeed, Peraldus himself produced his *Summa vitiorum* before turning to the *Summa virtutum*. In his work on vices, for each of the seven deadly sins and the eighth sin of the tongue, Peraldus analyzed the varieties of each vice before providing remedies along with numerous *exempla* that could be used by preachers. Although the ordering of sins varied across time as well as by author, the traditional monastic order began with pride, which was followed by avarice, lust, anger, gluttony, envy, and sloth. Even when the order was changed by a particular author, pride was often considered the root of all evil as well as the sin particularly associated with Satan. Peraldus changes this order in his treatise, but in his long section on pride, humility is frequently mentioned as a remedy. In his treatment of virtues, Peraldus concentrated on the four cardinal and three theological virtues rather than producing a work that was meant to be used as a practical handbook to fight the vices enumerated in the *Summa vitiorum*. The need for such a treatment that could be used by preachers was met by works such as the *Summa virtutum de remediis anime*, also known as *Postquam* from its incipit. In this work as well, humility is the main remedy for the sin of pride. Although there is no evidence that Cavalca knew *Postquam*, his reading of Peraldus, his vocation as a preacher, and his practical orientation make it likely that in his sermons he would have responded to his duties to preach on vices and virtues by discussing the practical “remedial” virtues as well as the more abstract cardinal and theological virtues.
Besides the sources just named, Cavalca would have been familiar with the works of Humbert of Romans, fifth Master General of the Friars Preacher. In his treatise *On The Formation of Preachers*, he has a number of chapters on humility. Thus the addition of this adverb in Cavalca’s translation does not occur by chance. Rather, it is a virtue that was emphasized in Dominican writings that Cavalca would have known intimately.

This conversation with the abbot marks a new stage in the saint’s life—contact with the world outside the monastery. Until this point Marinus has remained within the monastery for a number of years; the length of time is imprecise. We should imagine that it is at least seven years, for we know that the father entered the monastery when the child was small, and we will find out that Marinus is now past the age of puberty. Although the Latin does not give age-related terms such as *infans, puer, or adulescens*, these divisions marked periods of roughly seven years. Thus *pueritia* began at age seven and the next stage, *adulescentia*, at fourteen.\(^{168}\) If we assume that the man’s decision to become a monk was precipitated by the death of his wife and the child was very small—say four or five—Marinus had been in the monastery for about ten years at this point. We read that she began to go with the cart and that if it became too late to return to the monastery he remained in the innkeeper’s house along with the other monks. In this section, which simply sketches the situation and lacks any sort of dramatic potential, Cavalca’s translation follows the Latin of Morgan M.626 fairly closely. He does, however, introduce the section with the word *Or*, which strengthens his voice as a narrator and adds an element of oral narrative missing in the Latin.

---

Having been introduced to the innkeeper’s house, we now meet its inhabitants and the drama begins. The innkeeper had a virgin daughter. A knight entered the inn and had sex with her and she became pregnant. The Latin is matter of fact about these events, although the devil is blamed for the situation. Cavalca assumes a storyteller’s voice, thus introducing a novelistic form of narrative. He reorders the sentences so that it is clear that the pregnancy occurs as a result of the devil’s action. He expands the Latin using euphemism and emphasizes the covertness of the knight’s entry and introduces the vocabulary of sin. The Latin in Morgan M.626 is as follows: “Pandox autem habebat filiam uirginem. Contigit autem ut per insidias dyaboli et inimici ingressus miles concuberet cum ea et concepit de milite illo” (The innkeeper had a virgin daughter. It happened, however, through the plots of the devil and the enemy that a knight entered, had sex with her, and she conceived from that knight). The Italian reads as follows: “Or avenne in quel tenpo, per operattion del nimicho, ch un chavalieri amando una figliuola vergine di questo Pandoci, intro a llei ochultamente e peccho co llei, sich ella rimase gravida” (Now it so happened at that time that through the operation of the enemy that a knight loved a virgin daughter of this innkeeper, gained access to her secretly, and sinned with her such that she remained pregnant).

Once again Cavalca interrupts the story line with Or, so that the reader hears his voice as the narrator, and adds “at that time” to emphasize that he is telling a story. In the Latin the first people discussed are the innkeeper and his daughter. Cavalca brings the devil into the foreground, making him the key instigator of the drama that is about to follow. This likely reflects the diabolization during the Middle Ages noted by Alain Boureau and shows how late antique hagiography was transformed to fit the different
cultural milieu in the fourteenth century. Cavalca softens the frankness of the Latin sexual vocabulary by the use of euphemism. The Latin *concubuit*, which means to go to bed with, is moderated by Cavalca, who introduces the expression “was loved by” to describe the knight’s congress with the daughter. This euphemism has two different roots. Preachers were reluctant to speak frankly with laity about sexual matters for fear of offending cultural norms and also for fear of introducing sexual ideas with which laypeople in the audience might not already be familiar. The second basis for introducing the word *love* rather than another euphemism may perhaps come from the genres of the novella and the medieval romance. Thus Dante in canto V of the Inferno mentions a kiss and describes Paolo as *amante* (a lover) but then leaves the subsequent sexual activity by Paolo and Francesca to the reader’s imagination: “That day we read no further.” For the monastic reader the important point was the sexual activity that resulted in the pregnancy. There is no attempt to delineate the emotional relationship between the knight and the innkeeper’s daughter. The two people had sex and the girl became pregnant.

The hagiographer here is drawing a contrast between the attitudes to sex and childrearing in the monastic and lay worlds. Marina’s father had warned her to watch out for the plots of the devil. Since the devil was seen as the source of temptations of all kinds, but particularly of sexual temptation, his exhortation to her to be mindful of the plots of the devil was also an encouragement for her to preserve her virginity. Sexual relations were considered as defiling and sullying the purity of the body created by God.\(^{169}\) We observe a contrast between the monastery, in which virginity is prized and the father exhorts his child to maintain it, and the outside world, in which the parents

---

\(^{169}\) Peter Brown, *Body and Society*
have not exhorted their daughter to preserve her virginity at least until marriage. Here the silence of the text prevents us from being certain that no such conversation took place, but the hagiographer seems to impute to the parents of the girl at least some negligence. Had the hagiographer wished, he could have used the word *stupravit* or *violavit* (raped) to describe the sexual congress between the knight and the girl, but he uses *concubuit* instead. *Concubere*, to go to bed with, implies some level of consent between the two people involves. *Stuprare*, to rape, on the other hand, implies that the sex was not consensual.

Cavalca’s use of the adverb *ochultamente* (secretly) is not found in the Latin in any of the manuscripts I consulted, nor is it in the manuscripts examined by Clugnet. Not only does this choice reflect Cavalca’s interest in the manner in which actions are done but it also raises the dramatic level of the text. The reader encountering this adverb has his or her interest piqued and wonders what this might mean. His choice of word reinforces the notion that the actions are morally suspect precisely because of the secrecy. Actions performed openly show that the actors do not consider them wrong and that they are licit.

Along with focusing on the secret nature of the assignation, Cavalca states explicitly that the knight “sinned” with her. For a monastic reader the prestige of the ideal of virginity meant that any form of sexual activity involved a degradation of the body’s purity and was therefore sinful. The Church recognized, nevertheless, that laypeople had sexually active lives and attempted to regulate this activity into licit and illicit forms. Licit sex was permitted only to those who were married and even there only at specified times in the liturgical calendar. The prestige of sexual renunciation was such that devout
laypeople were also encouraged to abstain from sex even within matrimony, as Dyan Elliott’s work on spiritual marriage has shown.\textsuperscript{170} We observed earlier that Cavalca added information about the man’s dead wife, information missing in the Latin text. Besides filling out the man’s family situation it also had the effect of rendering Marina legitimate by showing that she was born within wedlock. Here the contrast between the two families—Marina’s and the innkeeper’s—is once again underscored. Marina’s birth was legitimate and not tainted with sin. In the case of the innkeeper’s daughter, the devil, sex, sin, and its consequences swirl together explicitly in a manner that is absent in the Latin text.

To be sure, the monastic reader would have understood that the two were guilty of fornication, and it is perhaps for this reason that the Latin text can afford to be laconic. In a lay context, however, in which sexual activity was permitted in certain contexts, it was important for clerics to distinguish extramarital sinful sex or fornication from permissible sex within marriage. For this reason, Cavalca makes the sinful nature of their meeting explicit. In the Latin we read that the knight went to bed with the innkeeper’s daughter and she conceived by him. The two clauses are joined by \textit{et} (and), which connects the two statements but does not present the second clause as a punitive consequence of the first. In Cavalca’s translation the link between sin and punishment is underlined by the use of a result clause: “He sinned with her such that she remained pregnant.”

In the German translation these elements are missing. We read “Der wirt hatt ein jonge tochter, die wart von eym ritter heymlich eins kindes swanger” (The innkeeper had a young daughter who was secretly pregnant with a child by a knight; Williams, p.\textsuperscript{170}}
359). Here the translator has removed all mention of the devil as the instigator of the pregnancy, for he simply wished to move quickly to the false accusation that lies in wait for the saint. His technique of paraphrase is the very opposite of Cavalca’s *amplificatio*. The absence of a prologue prevents us from knowing precisely the intended audience for this translation. If it was undertaken for professed female religious then there might be less need for using the translation as a vehicle for reinforcing the Church’s message of the correct sexual behavior of laypeople.

The Middle Dutch translation employs neither paraphrase nor amplification but stays close to the Latin text as found in Paris, Mazarine 1734, even following the Latin syntax: “Contigit autem per insidias inimici vt pandox ille haberet filiam virginem. ad quam ingressus miles concubuit cum ea: et concepit puella de illo milite” (It so happened through the plots of the enemy that that innkeeper had a virgin daughter to whom having gained access a knight went to bed with her and the girl conceived from that knight). Petrus Naghel has the following: “Ende het gheviel, bi sduvels bedrieghenne, dat die weert hadde een dochter ende een riddere lach bi hare, ende si droech kint vanden riddere” (And it happened through the devil’s snares, that the innkeeper had a daughter and a knight lay with her and she had a child from the knight).

The French translations show a variety of approaches. In the case of BN Français 1038, which was prepared for a courtly milieu, we find both paraphrase and a close reading of the text. There is no mention of the devil as the instigator of their sexual relations. “Then brother Marins went there with the others; and it was their custom that if they could not return that they stayed with a *preudome* [gentleman] whose name was Pandos. This Pandos had a daughter who was very beautiful and very gentle. A knight so
loved her and came to her and the young girl conceived” (Puis y ala freres Marines auerc les autres et tieux estoit leur coutume que sil ne poioient reuenir quil demorascent chez j. preudome qui auoit non Pandos. Jcil Pandos auoit une fille moult belle et mot gente, si lama j. cheualiers et uint a lui et la demoiselle concut). Here we find that the courtly audience of the translation has affected the translator’s choices. It is clear that he was using a Latin text that was similar to Cavalca’s in that it mistakenly identified the word pandox as a proper name. It is interesting that this translator describes Pandox by using the term preudome, a word that emanates from a courtly and chivalric context. Cavalca describes the man as a buon omo (good man). How is one to explain this similarity? One possibility is that the Latin text they used also described the man, but that this was not included in the manuscripts examined by Clugnet or myself. Another possibility is that both the French translator and Cavalca felt the need to translate according to the conventions of the secular literature with which their lay audience was familiar and with which they were perhaps also in competition. Thus all men would be given this honorific as a matter of course.

BN Français 23117 has a slightly different reading, one that mentions the devil as the cause of the trouble: “In this port there was a man named Pandoches and brother Marines, who often went to the port, when it was too late used to stay the night with the other monks in the house of this Pendoches. Pandoches had a maiden daughter and it happened by the instigation/urging of the devil that a knight stayed in the house and came with her and she conceived” (A ce port auoit .j. home qui auoit non Pandoches et freres Marins qui aloit souvent au port quant il estoit trop tart si demoroit auec les autres moignes le soir en la maison de ce Pendoches. Pandoches auoit vne fille pucelle et auint
par lamonestement du diable que vns cheualiers reperoit en la maison et vint auce lui et concut; Clugnet, p. 157). The translator of this manuscript appears to have produced a faithful and close rendering of the Latin of his manuscript and has not inflected it with courtly vocabulary. Thus Pandox is simply described as a man (i.e., home) rather than as a gentleman (preudome). The translator does not resort either to paraphrase or to euphemism. There is no mention of the knight loving the daughter of the innkeeper, which both the translator of BN Français 1038 and Cavalca had included, albeit for slightly different reasons (in the first case, to place sexual activity in the context of an existing emotional relationship following the well-established genre of chivalric romance, and in Cavalca’s case, to follow the custom that preachers did not speak frankly about sex when talking to laypeople.) It could be argued that the choice of translating cocubere (to go to bed with) as “he came with her” is the opposite of euphemism in that it introduces the vocabulary of orgasm in the vernacular in a way that is absent in the Latin texts.

The fifteenth-century manuscript BN Français 413 follows BN Français 23117, with minor variations. Where the former described their sexual union as he “came with her,” this translator reverts to euphemism by using the expression “he was with her and she conceived” (fut auceques lui et concut). This tendency is taken in another direction in BN Français 22911. Since the rubric indicates that it follows a Latin text, beginning “Fuit frater quidam, chapter XLIII,” it seems likely that it is translating an incunable edition of the Latin text. In this version, after telling the reader that Marin and the other monks would stay in the inn of a man named Pandox, the translator describes the circumstances in which Pandox’s daughter and the knight get together: “And it so happened that the daughter of the aforesaid Pandoux was greatly enchanted by the deeds of a man of war”
(Et aduint que la fille dicelui Pandoux fut fort enchantee du fait dun homme de guere; Clugnet, p. 164). Here the devil as instigator is absent. A relationship between the two is implied and the daughter—not explicitly presented as a maiden—is shown to be fascinated by the accounts of the man’s achievements on the battlefield, which in turn implies conversations between the two. Agency is given to the female in this case, whereas in the Latin of the manuscripts it is given to the knight. This agency is presented in the context of an existing emotional relationship. Shakespeare, some time later, presents a similar situation when Desdemona recounts that it was Othello’s telling of his stories of war that made her fall in love with him.

In the second French print edition (Lyon 1486), after the explanation as to why Marin and the monks occasionally stayed in Pandoux’s inn when it was too late to return to the monastery, we read the following: “And it happened that the daughter of this Pandoux was then pregnant on account of a man of war” (Et aduint que la fille diceluy pandoux fut lors ensainte du fait dun home de guerre; fol. 60rb). Here too there is no mention of the devil and the focus is entirely on the girl. The Latin text made both parties the subject of verbs—the knight who went to bed with the girl and the girl who then conceived. This translator reduces the knight to a mere accessory, removes the devil as instigator, and thus presents a girl who was seduced and became pregnant. Since I have not found any Latin text of which this could be a literal translation, it is likely that this is a paraphrase reflecting the attitudes of the translator.

In the third Spanish edition (Salamanca 1498), we find a close translation of the Latin without use of paraphrase: “And Pandocio had a young daughter to whom a knight gained access, and tempted by the devil he slept with her and she conceived from him” (e
tenia pandocio vna fija moca ala qual entro vn cauallero e tentado por el diablo dormio con ella e concibio del; fol. 56vb). Here agency is granted to the knight, and he is the person who is instigated by the devil into sexual activity. The girl is not blamed, but the absence of the vocabulary of rape suggests that there was some level of consent. The translator does not qualify the knight’s actions with adverbs, nor does he introduce the vocabulary of sin. He thus eschews both paraphrase and amplification.

Caxton’s Middle English translation does not follow the French print edition as closely as it does in other places, but it does convey the sense. The French edition reads: “Now, it is to be noted that on the way there was a man named Pandoux in whose house the said Marin like the others stayed occasionally in the lodging rooms when there was not sufficient time to return to the monastery. And it happened that the daughter of the said Pandoux was then pregnant on account of a man of war” (Or est il a noter que sur le chemin y auoit vng home nomme pandoux en lostel duquel iceluy marin come les autres demouroit aucune ffois au giste quant il nauoit point heure suffisante pour retourner au monastere. Et aduint que la fille di celuy pandoux fut alors ensainte du fait dun home de guerre). Caxton makes some small changes in the first sentence but generally conveys the sense. In the second sentence he follows the French very closely: “Now, it is to be noted, that on the waye there was a man named Paudoux in whos house the sayd Maryn otherwyle abode all nyght wyth his other brethren whan it was soo late that they myght not retorne to the monastery. And hit happed that the doughter of the sayd Paudoux was wyth chylde goten by a man of warre.” Caxton’s changes in the first sentence—where he does not follow the French as closely as was customary for him—perhaps reveal an anxiety to make explicit what the French text leaves implicit and occasionally
ambiguous. He seems concerned to increase the drama of the situation and to protect the
saint from any possible charge of imprudent behavior. He does this by adding details not
present in the French. Thus he specifies the circumstances of Maryn’s sojourns at the inn.
He adds that Maryn stayed “alle nyght,” a detail that is implied but nonetheless missing
in the French. This raises the tension in the narrative, for nighttime not only provides
opportunity for clandestine sexual activity for the daughter and the knight but also
provides plausibility for her future false accusation of rape against Maryn. Caxton
balances this potential exposure to calumny by specifying that Maryn was part of a
group. The French text is unclear on this point. The abbot had only demanded to know
why Maryn did not go to get victuals like the other monks: “Vne fois labbe en lappellant
marin luy demanda pourquoy il naloit aucune ffois come les autres religieux querir les
viures pour le couvent.” This left open the possibility that the monks went singly, but it
seems not to have bothered Caxton, who translated come very literally as “lyke as.” In the
following sentence we read in the French that Maryn stayed in the inn occasionally, like
the other monks: “marin come les autres demouroit.” If the monks went singly, this could
mean that Maryn too stayed at the inn on his own. This could potentially call into
question the saint’s prudence and good judgment and strengthen the false accusation of
the innkeeper’s daughter. In order to avoid this interpretation Caxton departs from the
French and mistranslates come as “wyth.” He also adds “his brethern.”

These changes transform what could be read as a solitary activity into a group
activity. Why might Caxton have done this? It seems possible that the impulse was a
protective one. By insisting that Maryn stayed in the inn as part of a group, he reduces the
plausibility of the accusation against the saint, for Maryn’s freedom of action would be
limited by the presence of others. Finally, the French simply said that the monks stayed in
the monastery when there was not enough time to return—“quant il nauoit point heure
suffisante pour retourner.” This phrase is not anchored in any particular time of day.
Caxton’s rendering—“when it was soo late that they myght not retorne”—sets the action
quite clearly in the evening. Caxton thus emphasizes and makes explicit what was only
implicit in the French text—the fact that the monks stayed in the inn during the night and
not during the day.

When the parents notice their daughter’s pregnancy they browbeat her to ascertain
the father’s identity. Morgan M.626 has the following: “And when it had become known
to her parents, they began to afflict the girl saying, ‘Tell us from which man you
conceived.’ She replied to them, ‘From that monk who is called Marinus who stayed here
with the cart. He was the one who forced me and I conceived’” (Et dum cognitum fuis set
parentibus eius ceperunt affligere puellam dicentes. Dic nobis de quo concepisti viro?
Respondit eis. De monacho illo qui marinus dicitur qui hic cum carro mansit ipse me
obpressit et concepi). The reading in Florence, BNC Conv Sopp J.7.11 adds frequenter
between hic and cum carro.

As has been noted before, Cavalca amplifies kinship terms wherever possible in
his translation. He also turns the parents’ questioning from direct to indirect speech, thus
rendering more dramatic the daughter’s answer, in which she falsely accuses Marinus of
rape. In this case, Cavalca preserves the direct speech. In his translation we read: “And
becoming aware of this fact after some time, the father and the mother began to afflict her
a lot and asked her by whom she was pregnant. And she, instigated by the devil, replied,
‘That monk whose name is brother Marinus, he who stayed here with the cart many
nights forced me and I am pregnant by him’” (E avedendosi de questo fatto di po alchum
tenpo lo padre e lla madre inchomincionolla molto ad affriggere di dimandalla di chui era
gravida; e quella, istigata dal dimonio rispuose: Quel monacho ch a nome frate Marino,
In quale ci e aberghato col carro piu notti mi sforsoe e di lui son gravida). Cavalca
expands parentibus (parents) into father and mother, thus emphasizing the family drama
that ensues once her pregnancy has become obvious. The expansion makes sense given
the lay audience for whom he was translating.

Cavalca presents the daughter’s response as having been “instigated by the devil.”
This is missing in the Latin text of Morgan M.626, BNC Conv Sopp. J711, Mazarine
1734, and the manuscripts examined by Clugnet. Cavalca’s mention of the devil at this
point once again reflects not only the diabolization in the late Middle Ages remarked on
previously, but also the preachers’ notion that all sin was diabolical in origin. Thus the
original sexual sin of fornication was associated with the devil in the text. Here the sin of
false speech has also been presented with a diabolical etiology. In his influential treatise
on sins, William Peraldus added an eighth deadly sin—the sins of speech—at the end of
his treatment of the canonical seven deadly sins. Cavalca translated this section, called
De peccato linguae, from Latin into Italian and circulated it as a devotional treatise called
the Pungilingua. That he chose this section over all others indicates that he thought sins
of speech were particularly dangerous and that he was alert to them. Since sin was
inseparable from the devil, we should perhaps not be surprised that he diabolizes and thus
renders sinful her false accusation.

The German translation uses indirect speech, some amplification, and paraphrase
for this entire section. We read: “And when her father and mother asked for a long time,
she [said] she had the child from Marino the monk” (vnd seit jrem vater vnd jr muter nach langer frage, sie het das kint von Marino dem bruder). Like Cavalca, the translator probably amplifies the Latin *parentibus* (this cannot be confirmed without examining the base manuscript) as “father and mother” but converts all direct speech into paraphrased indirect speech. He also removes the language of rape present in the Latin text, perhaps to spare the feelings of a lay or female audience of readers and hearers.

Petrus Naghel, in his Middle Dutch translation, follows the Latin in Mazarine 1734 fairly closely. Like Cavalca and the German translator, he too expands *parentibus* into “father and mother”: “And when the father and mother knew they called her and said, ‘Tell us from whom you are carrying a child.’ And she replied, ‘From the monk that one calls brother Marijn, who stayed here frequently with the cart. He raped me and I was left carrying a child’” (Ende doet vader ende moeder wisten so quelden si dmeisen ende seiden, “Sech ons van wien dattu kint draghes.” Ende si andwoordde, “Van dien monnec die men heet brueder Marijn, die hier dicwile metter kerren bleven es. hi vercrachte mi ende ic bleef kint draghende”). Naghel follows the Latin text very closely and preserves the direct speech where it appears. There are only a couple of places where he expands the Latin. He turns *parentibus* into “father and mother.” He also turns *conceive* into “carrying a child.” In both cases, the changes are consistent with a narrow view of a *sensum ad sensum* translation. It is also possible that there were not always Middle Dutch equivalents for every Latin word. In the fourteenth century this vernacular was poorer in vocabulary than the Latin. There does not seem to be any impulse to change the dramatic or emotional tone of the Latin source. Naghel tries to bring the reader as close to it as he
possibly can, which is why he does not use the techniques of the Alemannic reader—
paraphrase and turning direct into indirect speech.

The French translation in Paris, BN Français 1038 shows readings that vary from
the Latin text in the manuscripts I have surveyed. Here we read: “Not long after, it
became obvious to him [more likely the father rather than the knight, which is the
antecedent noun in the previous sentence] that she was pregnant. Her parents came to her
and asked her whose it was. She was beaten and injured because she did not want to say
anything. Later she said that brother Marins had tricked her and impregnated her by
force” (Ne demora guieres quil parut bien a lui quelle estoit grosse, si uinstrent a lui si
parent et li demanderent de qui cestoit. Bastue fu et lesdengiee171 ainois quelle ne
uousist riens dire. Apres si dist que ce frere Marins lauoit enguigniee172 et engroissiee a
force). The translator turned everything into indirect speech but intensified the level of
drama by raising the level of violence compared to the Latin. Affligere can mean to annoy
or to afflict, but the precise level of the threat is unclear. The Latin presents us with a
situation in which the parents are putting pressure on their daughter by asking who the
father was. The daughter finally falsely accuses Marin. Here the translator resolves the
vagueness of affligere by telling us explictly that she was beaten and injured and also that
she did not want to reveal the father’s identity. Her resistance, unmentioned in Latin, is
mentioned in the French to heighten the drama. Finally, as a result of the brutal treatment
she receives at the hands of her parents, she makes the false accusation. The reader is

Godefroy, entry for “Laidangier,” in Dictionnaire de l’ancienne langue française.

172 For this meaning of enguigner cf. the Dit de l’espervier in Baudouin van den Abeele, La fauconnerie
dans les lettres françaises du XIIe au XIVe siècle. (Turnhout: Brepols, c2009) p. 173 n. 121
much more conscious of the passage of time in the French text than in the Latin, which is considerably more compressed. Thus we are aware of a number of steps—first the father’s knowledge of the pregnancy, then the arrival of her parents wanting to know the paternity, the daughter’s resistance and the violent reaction of her parents in order to break her silence, and finally the accusation. The false accusation becomes the culmination of a long process. This has the effect of explaining the circumstances of the false accusation—the girl feared the continuation of her parents’ violence—without, of course, excusing the lie. The translator does not explain why the girl accuses Marinus instead of the knight, so the reader is still left wondering about her motives. The French translator’s concern seems to be more with heightening the drama than with providing hamartiological explanations for the girl’s false accusation.

In response to the accusation the parents immediately go to the abbot and say to him, “Look, lord abbot, what your monk Marinus has done, how he has deceived our daughter.” The direct speech is found not only in Morgan M.626 but also in Mazarine 1734, Conv Sopp J711 and the manuscripts checked by Clugnet. Cavalca, however, turns this into indirect speech using paraphrase, although he does expand parentes into “mother and father”: “Having heard which thing, the father and the mother went to the abbot to complain about this fact” (La qual chosa udendo lo padre e lla madre, andonsene all’ abate a far lamento di questo fatto). The paraphrase also removes the respectful address present in the interaction between the parents and the abbot. Thus Cavalca’s version has the effect of flattening somewhat the social hierarchy that clearly subordinates the lay parents to the abbot in the Latin text. The assumptions of monastic superiority are
removed by Cavalca, whose rendition has more of the effect of a conversation between equals.

Like Cavalca, the German translator also uses indirect speech along with some paraphrase. He too expands *parentes* but uses “the innkeeper and his wife: rather than “father and mother,” and he also removes the hierarchical form of address when they address the abbot: “The innkeeper and his wife complained to the abbot how brother Marinus had betrayed their daughter” (Der wirt vnd sin wip clagten dem abte, wie bruder Marinus jr tochter hett betrogen).

Petrus Naghel preserves the structure of the Latin text, including the direct speech. Although he is usually a close translator, he too expands *parentes* to “father and mother.” With this exception, he sticks to the Latin syntax while translating, even preserving the present tense that lends vividness to the Latin text: “And immediately went the father and the mother to the monastery and say to the abbot. ‘Look here, lord abbot, what Marinus your monk has done, how he has betrayed our daughter’” (Ende thant ghinghen vader ende moeder ten clooster weert ende seident den abdt. “Sich here, her abdt, wat Marinus, dijn monec, ghedaen heeft, hoe hi onse dochter bedroghen heeft). The variation of tenses in the Latin reflected in Mazarine 1734 (and Morgan M.626) is preserved by Naghel. Conv Sopp J711 has the past tense *dixerunt* but still keeps the direct form of address.

The French translator of BN Français 1038 takes a freer approach in his translation. Here we read: “Immediately the parents went to the abbot whose monk Marins was and they said to the abbot, ‘Handsome sire, now it is a beautiful thing that
brother Marins your monk has impregnated our daughter”” (Isnelement sen alerent li parent a labeie don’t frere Marins estoit, et disent al abe: “Biau sire est ce ore bele cose que frere Marin uostre moine a engroiscie nostre fille”). The translator uses both irony and a colloquialism, as one might say in English, “This is a pretty kettle of fish.” The courtly milieu of the translator is reflected in the addition of the adjectives biau and belle to their address. Here the hierarchy of address is not simply maintained but is also amplified. The effectiveness of the translation is heightened by the contrast between the courtly language at the beginning of the address and the frankness of the sexual accusation, which is also absent in the Latin. The latter uses euphemism and employs decipere (to deceive) to describe the pregnancy. The reader is thus confronted with two registers—courtly and brutal—in the parents’ speech as well as irony, since the pregnancy is described as a belle chose (beautiful thing). This French translation transforms the Latin and pushes it in two different directions thus oscillating between these two registers.

The wording of BN Français 422 follows this reading as well. In BN Français 23117, we find a less courtly and more literal translation of the Latin: “Right away her parents went to the abbey and said to the abbot, ‘Lord abbot, now you can see how your brother has deceived our daughter’” (Tout maintenant sen alerent si parent a labaye et dirent a labbe. “Sires abes or pouez veoir comme vostre frere a nostre fille engignie). This translator uses some expansion as well as paraphrase. Thus he translates ecce (behold) as “now you can see,” but he appears to omit the phrase “what he has done” in recounting the accusation. He too preserves the direct speech. BN Français 413, a
fifteenth-century manuscript, appears to be a copy of 422 for it contains the identical reading.

BN Français 22911, also from the fifteenth century, uses paraphrase and indirect speech. Here we read: “The father therefore accompanied by his relations went to the abbot and told him the story at which the abbot was greatly astonished” (Le père doncque accompagne de ses parens vint à labbe et lui raconta le cas dont labbe fut moult emerueille). The translator subordinates the drama of the accusation to the emotion felt by the abbot at hearing such a tale. The choice of the word *marvelous* underlines both the fantastic nature of the accusation in the abbot’s mind as well as the fantastic nature of the story in the reader’s mind. The holiness of Marinus is only implied but not mentioned specifically as was the case in Cavalca’s Italian version. This translator draws attention to the abbot and his reaction, whereas Cavalca is more interested in constructing the saintly quality of the monk. Thus even though the subject of the sentence is the abbot, Cavalca adds a clause about Marinus. This is something the French translator does not do. The same reading is found in the 1486 incunable version.

Caxton follows the reading in the 1486 incunable and BN Fr. 22911 closely but translates *parens* as “friends” rather than as “relations”: “The fader thenn, accompanied wyth hys frendes, cam to the abbot and recounted to him þhe caas. Whereof th’abbot was gretely admerueyld.”

Despite the availability of the Latin text in both manuscript and print editions, the closeness to the French text suggests that Caxton did not also consult a Latin version.
when he translated the *Vitas patrum* from the French, as was the case with his translation of the Golden Legend, where he used both a French translation and a Latin manuscript.

The Spanish version of the story, like the Dutch, preserves the combination of direct and indirect speech of the Latin source: “And then the father and the mother went to the monastery and said to the abbot, ‘Look here Lord abbot what your monk Marinus has done, how he has deceived our daughter’” (E luego el padre e la madre fueron al monasterio. e dixieron al abad. Catad aqui senor abad. que ha fecho tu monge marino como ha enganado nuestra fija). Like the others, this translator expands *parentes* but otherwise sticks closely to the Latin text.

Once the parents have made their complaint the Latin text turns to the abbot’s reaction. This is presented in direct speech, and there is some variation between the manuscripts. Both Paris, Mazarine 1734 and Florence, BN Conv Sopp J711 follow the same reading: ”Wait. Let us see if the things you say are manifest” (Dicit eis abbas Sinite videamus si manifesta sunt que dicitis). Morgan M.626 has a slightly variant reading: “Let us see if the things you say are true” (Dicit eis abbas. Videamus si uera sunt que dicitis). Cavalca turns this into indirect speech and describes the abbot’s surprise and disbelief: “Which thing the abbot not being able to believe, considering the holiness of Marinus, [he] replied to them that he wanted to know from him [i.e., Marinus] in their presence if this deed was true” (La qual chosa 1’ abate non potendo credere, considerando la santita di Marino, rispuose loro ch’ ei voleta saper da lui in lor presentia se questo fatto era vero).
Cavalca’s rendering of the direct speech of the Latin into indirect speech involves a number of changes that reflect both his own concerns as well as readings prevalent among the Dominicans in the fourteenth century. These concerns include the theme of sanctity as well as the broader concerns with accusations, particularly false accusations that the preachers had to deal with as they moved beyond the duties of preaching and hearing confessions to involvement with civic urban matters such as peacemaking and the settlement of disputes. In the Latin text, the abbot is presented as a dispassionate judge who does not rush to conclusions. We get little information about his emotional make-up and what his feelings about the monk Marinus might be. He is neutral on this point, and the Latin does not reveal whether or not he found the accusation credible. If he felt any surprise, he kept it private. Cavalca’s abbot, on the other hand, feels great surprise when the accusation is made. Rather than presenting him as neutral, Cavalca presents him as unable to believe the accusation. Up to this point in the text Marinus has been presented primarily as obedient, first to his birth father and then to his abbot and his fellow monks. But obedience is not the same as holiness. To the first virtue, Cavalca adds holiness in order to explain the abbot’s surprise. This notion of sanctity implies at the most basic level a special relationship between Marinus and God, which sets him apart from the others in the monastery. In presenting the abbot as surprised by the accusation, we observe Cavalca building the case for sainthood in a slow and subtle way that is cumulative. This concern reflects Cavalca’s commitment to presenting the cult of saints in a way that was consonant with late medieval rather than late antique clerical expectations. The late antique context was less concerned with filling in biographical details and report cards on behavior and was more concerned with eliciting the
admiration of the monastic reader at the power of God. But the contested nature of sanctity in the high and late Middle Ages meant that in the age of confessors the entire life of the saint had to be free of blemishes. Thus the holiness of the saint had to be obvious or manifest over a long period.

In Cavalca’s translation the abbot’s suprise and disbelief creates precisely this impression. In converting the abbot’s laconically expressed wish to find out more information into indirect speech, Cavalca expands the Latin and paints a portrait of the abbot’s psychological make-up. He is no longer impersonal, controlled, and studiedly neutral—only waiting to make a decision once all the facts are in. Cavalca humanizes the abbot by making him express surprise at hearing the accusation. He also presents a picture of Marinus as someone who was not just obedient but also holy.

In addition to presenting the reader with a psychological portrait of the abbot and adding holiness to Marinus’s virtue of obedience, Cavalca’s translation shows that the abbot is concerned with procedural matters in the face of this charge. He wants to ask Marinus in the presence of the innkeeper and his wife about the accusation. Now the abbot could certainly have dismissed the parents and told them that he would look into the matter and get back to them. Cavalca’s abbot does not do this and Cavalca is at pains to establish that accuser and accused face each other in front of the abbot. Why would he choose to do this? The answer probably lies in the increasing involvement of the Dominicans in settling disputes and in peacemaking, for which they had to follow legal procedures.
It is noteworthy in this regard to examine a summary of the Marina story that appears as an exemplum in a collection assembled by the Dominican Arnold of Liège called the *Alphabetum Narrationum* (*AN*). This was particularly popular among preachers in Italy, and we know that Cavalca himself made use of it, for it is the source of many exempla in his vernacular treatises. The *AN* ultimately descends from the Dominican Stephen of Bourbon’s massive compilation of exempla known as the *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus* (left incomplete when he died in 1261). This was organized according to the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. Its unwieldy size and its method of organization made it difficult to use, and it was soon excerpted into smaller exempla collections often organized alphabetically by rubric. These include the *Promptuarium exemplorum* by Martinus Polonus, O.P. (d. 1278), the *De Dono Timoris sive Tractatus de Habundancia Exemplorum* by Humbert of Romans, OP (d. 1277), who became Master General of the Dominicans, and the *Tabula exemplorum adaptacionum ad omnem materiam in sermonibus secundum ordinem alphabeti ordinata*, compiled in France in the second half of the thirteenth century.

The story of Marina did not appear either in the first part, which deals with the gift of fear, or in the third part of Stephen of Bourbon’s collection, which discusses the gift of wisdom and penance. In his prologue to the entire treatise Stephen associates this with “things to be done as is penance and its parts which remove man from the evil of fault and move him up and, with the working of the gift of wisdom, carry him towards the good and ‘in the middle of a depraved and perverse nation’ make him act well” (*Tertia pars, de dono scientie, est de rebus agendis, ut est pententia et partes eius, que hominem a malo culpa extrahunt et ad bonum promouent et prouehunt, et in medio praue...*)
et peruerse nationis, operante dono scientie, bene conuersari faciunt; CCCM CXIV, I, p. 8). Thus the Marina stories appear in the broader context of penance and conversion. This penitential focus is clarified in the first chapter of the third part: “The third part of this work concerns those things which pertain to the gift of wisdom through which in man true penance is effected and had” (Tertia pars huius operis est de eis que pertinent ad donum sciente, per quod in homine efficitur uera penitentia et habetur; CCCM CXIVB, p. 3). This third section is further divided into eight tituli—on penance in general (1), contrition (2–3), confession (4), satisfaction (5–7), and perseverance (8; CCCM CXIVB, p. xviii). The fifth chapter of the first titulus deals with what penance should be and should not be. The seventh quality (after faithful, humble, quick, true, hard and harsh, groaning and bitter) is “private and secret,” and it is here that the life of Marina is brought forward as an example, even though she is not named explicitly: “Of such penance there are two examples in the *Lives of the Fathers*. The first is when the holy fathers found in the desert, after her death, one who dressed as a man in the monastic habit and led for a long time an arduous and secret life.” The editors of the treatise believe that this is probably an allusion to the Life of Marina. They are mistaken, however, for the Marina story takes place in a monastery and not in the wilderness, and while she kept her female identity a secret, her penance was performed in public, first outside the gates of the monastery and then within the monastery in sight of all the monks. Since the Tractatus has not been edited in its entirety it is possible that the Life of Marina appears elsewhere.

The absence of the Marina story from the first part of Stephen’s treatise likely explains its absence from the shorter excerpted version made by Humbert of Romans, since his treatise only excerpted exempla from the first section on the gift of fear. For the
same reason it is missing from the *Tabula exemplorum*, which organized the exempla under alphabetical rubrics rather than the thematic organization of Stephen’s and earlier Cistercian exempla collections, such as the *Dialogus Miraculorum* of Caesarius of Heisterbach. However, it is its presence in the early fourteenth-century *AN* that helps explain why Cavalca made his seemingly idiosyncratic choices.

The edition of Arnold of Liège’s treatise is currently in preparation, and I am grateful to Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu for providing me with the relevant page proof of the Latin text. However, the fifteenth-century Middle English translation called the *Alphaet of Tales* kept the Latin rubrics and translated the exempla. Here we see that the Marina story appears as the thirty-second exemplum under the rubric *Accusatio frequenter est falsa* (Accusation is frequently false; *Alphaet of Tales*, p. 22). This is the last of five exempla relating to accusations. The first relates to the devil as scribe:

“Accusacio. Accusat demon peccatores et scribit peccata eorum” (Accusation. The demon accuses sinners and writes their sins; *Alphaet of Tales*, p. 21). This rubric is followed by an exemplum from Bede and is the thirtieth exemplum in the translation. The second, third, and fourth rubrics refer the reader to other entries but do not provide exempla. They are *Accusat Angelus* (*Infra ffideiussor*), *Accusat demon* (*infra demon*), *Accusant sancti* (*infra episcopus ii*) (*Alphaet of Tales*, p. 22). The next rubric, *Accusare fratrem non expedit semper* (To accuse a fellow monk is not always useful), provides an exemplum from the *Vitas patrum* in which even making true accusations of another’s sins is discouraged, as God will then broadcast one’s own sins! The presence of five rubrics relating to accusation suggests that this was a theme that preoccupied preachers in their sermons. It is also worth noting that of the five rubrics, only two provide exempla, one
relating to the lack of utility of true accusations and the other underlining the frequency of false accusations. This homiletic hermeneutic provides us with the key to Cavalca’s translation. It shows that his translation choices were conditioned by the technical aids for preachers, in this case the *Alphabetum Narrationum*, which provided him with interpretative frameworks for the stories that appeared in exempla form in these collections.

Is Cavalca’s translation supported by readings in other Latin manuscripts? The answer is no. Neither the three principal manuscripts (Morgan M.626, Mazarine 1734, BNC Conv Sopp. J.7.11) that I am using nor the three representative manuscripts from the BN in Paris (Clugnet A, B, C) show significant variation at this point. What is the situation among the other vernacular transcripts?

The Alemannic translation both summarizes the Latin and turns it into reported speech. The conversation with the abbot is reported, but the abbot’s response to the parents is omitted: “The innkeeper and his wife complained to the abbot how brother Marinus had tricked their daughter” (Der wirt vnd sin wip clagten dem abte, wie bruder Marinus jr tochter hett betrogen; p. 359). Since the abbot’s reply in response to the accusation is omitted, the translator did not consider this as germane to the story he was translating.

Petrus Naghel in his Dutch translation follows the Latin rather than omitting and summarizing. He does, however, turn the direct speech of the parents’ complaint into indirect speech. The abbot’s reply is left, as in the Latin, in reported speech. Faithful to the Latin exemplar (Mazarine 1734), the abbot counsels collecting information: “Wait, let
us see whether it is true what you say” (Ontbeidt, lates ons sien oft waer es dat ghi segt; p. 176). The Middle Dutch version, like the Alemannic, is not inflected toward a particular interpretation.

The Spanish translation too both summarizes and uses reported speech. In response to the parents’ complaint, which is in direct speech, the abbot’s response is in indirect speech: “the abbot told them to wait” (dixo les el abad que dezis; fol. 56vb). The abbot’s concern about establishing whether the accusation was true is elided.

The translator of BN Fr. 1038 keeps the direct speech of the parents’ complaint and the abbot’s response: “The abbot replied to them, ‘Now suffer me and we will see whether this be true’” (Or uous soufrez si uerrons se ce est uoirs). The translator makes the abbot respond in the chivalric language of courtesy. Where the Latin simply says “Wait”, this abbot uses the expression “suffer me,” which is a politer way of saying, “Please wait while I find out what has happened.” BN Fr. 422 offers a small and insignificant variation of this reading. BN Fr. 23117 takes a different approach in that its translator also limns the abbot’s psychological response to the accusation. He too keeps the direct speech of both the parents and the abbot: “‘Lord abbot, now you can see how your brother has deceived our daughter.’ Then said the abbot grieving a lot, ‘‘Wait and let us see whether this be true’” (Sires abes or pouez uoier comme vostre frere a nostre fille engignie. Lors dist li abbes moult dolens: “Lessiez et veons se ce est voir). This translator avoids the courtly inflections of Fr. 1038 but adds his own touches which establish the abbot’s response. The translator of Fr. 2291 summarizes and turns into indirect speech the accusation and the response but also provides us with information on the abbot’s surprise. Unlike Cavalca, he does not give reasons for the surprise and thus
does not use this occasion to condition the reader’s response to Marinus’s holiness: “The father then accompanied by his relations came to the abbot and told him the case of which the abbot marveled greatly” (Le pere doncque accompagne de ses parens vint a labbe et lui raconta le cas dont labbe fut moult esmerueille). This is also the reading in the incunable edition of Lyons 1486 (fol. 60rb), except the spelling of the words is slightly different (might this provide a clue as to the priority of BN Fr. 2291 over the incunable?). The reading here employs some of the techniques also used by Cavalca. We notice the expansion of kinship terms. Cavalca expands parentes in the Latin to “father and mother.” This translator drops the mother from the picture but introduces other relations. Rather than a married couple we find here an aggrieved man and relatives who seek justice on behalf of a clan rather than just a nuclear family. The use of the expression “moult esmerueille” effectively conveys the abbot’s great astonishment. This raises the dramatic quality of the interaction but does not build the case for sanctity.

In Caxton’s Middle English translation we find some slight changes. By translating parens as “friends” rather than “relations,” Caxton gives us a group of people tied to the innkeeper by bonds of affection rather than the family clan of the French version. Other than making this change, he follows the French closely but inventively. In his translation of the abbot’s response—“Whereof th’abbot was gretely admerueylled” (fol. 72va)—he coins a word that does not seem to have appeared so far in Middle English. This is admerueylled, his translation of emerueille. The Middle English dictionary provides amervereilled as the pluperfect from of amervele along with the variants amervell(l)ed and amarved. These forms had been in use since the middle of the fourteenth century, but the point to note is that the variation in spelling begins after the
amer. The dictionary provides three meanings. For the first meaning—“filled with wonder or admiration”—the following examples are given. Thus a psalter from around 1350 uses *ameruailed*. Another work from 1378 uses *a-meruailed*. Lydgate, in his narrative of the Fall of Troy of about 1425, uses *ameruayled*. The translation of the *Book of Margery Kemp* uses *a-merueyled*. Closer to Caxton’s time, Osbert Bokenham in his hagiographical collection of saints’ Lives of about 1447 uses *ameruayled*. The translation of the Life of Saint Katherine of about 1450 has *amerueyled*. The book of Tundale, circa 1500, has *amerveld*.

The second meaning—astonished, surprised—is illustrated by the following examples: *amerueiled* (c. 1330), *amervaylyd* (c. 1450), *amerueylde* (c. 1425) and *amervelled* (c. 1450). The third meaning—bewildered—is illustrated by *amerueilid*, an example from Lydgate (c. 1439). None of these examples uses Caxton’s *admerueylled*.

What explains this curious formation? Here it appears that the stylistic tendency to use Latinate forms or aureation might explain Caxton’s coinage. Thus he was probably thinking of a close Latin word that began with *ad*, such as *admirabilis*. This tendency to use Latinate forms is a characteristic of fifteenth-century English literature. In Caxton’s case, the tendency was ingrained enough that despite the past criticism of his word borrowings in his translations, he changed accepted Middle English words to give them a Latinate appearance. It also shows that he did not also consult a Latin version of the story either in manuscript or in a printed version.

Having heard the accusation, the abbot summons Marinus and asks him about the matter at hand. The Latin versions all use direct speech for the abbot’s question. Morgan M.626 has the following: “And he ordered him summoned. When he had come his abbot
said to him, ‘Brother Marinus. Did you really commit this crime against their daughter?’”

(Et iussit eum uocari. Quo ueniente dixit ad eum abbas suus. frater marine. Vere tu scelus hoc operatus es in filiam istorum). Florence, BNC, Conv Sopp J.7.11 and Paris, Mazarine 1734 omit the first sentence but provide insignificant variations of the rest. Cavalca turns everything into indirect speech: “And having brother Marinus called and he asked him whether it was true that he had forced the daughter of those people” (E facciendosi chiamar frate Marino e dimandolo s era vero ch’ elli avesse sforsata la figliuola di choloro). Cavalca’s choices to turn direct into indirect speech are not random occurrences. He tends to restrict direct speech to the saint, so that it is her voice that is heard. For this reason the abbot’s reply to the parents and his questioning of Marinus are turned into reported speech. It is interesting to note that there is a reversal here in the sexual frankness of the vocabulary. The Latin is coy and refers only to this crime, whereas Cavalca’s abbot asks Marinus whether he had forced or raped the daughter.

Unlike Cavalca, the translator of the Middle High German version preserves the direct speech: “Thereupon the abbot sent for the brother and said, ‘Marinus, have you committed the great sin with their daughter?’” (Da sandte der abte nach dem bruder vnd sprach, “Marine, hast du mit jr tochter die gros sonde getan?”). Here we note the use of sexual euphemism—the great sin—rather than the neutral crime of the Latin text. The great sin here probably refers to fornication and the loss of the monk’s chastity rather than the fact of rape. This is a translation that reflects the values of the cloister rather than that of the saeculum. This is not to suggest that rape was not considered a serious crime by monks, but rather that this translator focused on the loss of chastity in the monk rather than the rape of the girl. Cavalca’s abbot explicitly focuses on the girl and asks the
question that lay parents would ask. For them, whether the girl was raped would have
been more important than whether a monk was guilty of fornication.

Petrus Naghel, in his Middle Dutch translation, avoids both these tendencies and
follows the Latin of Mazarine 1734—“Et veniente eo dicit ei abbas eius Frater marine. tu
hoc scelus operatus es in filia eorum?—closely: “Ende doe Marijn quam, so sedie hem
dabt: Brueder Marijn, hebstu dese mesdaet ghedaen met haerre dochter?” (And when
Marijn came then the abbot said to him, “Brother Marijn, have you done this crime with
their daughter?). We note that Naghel is a *fidus interpres* who makes very small changes.
He translates *veniente eo* as “when Marijn came” rather than as “when he came,” so there
is no possible confusion in the mind of the reader. He also uses *doe…so* (when…then) to
balance the temporal clause with the main clause. Naghel’s translation reproduces the
careful, controlled abbot of the Latin text without inflecting the translation either to lay or
to late medieval monastic values.

In response to the abbot’s question, Marinus remains silent for a long time,
groans, and replies, “Father, I have sinned.” At this point the manuscripts show different
readings beyond this terse admission. The ninth-century manuscript, Clugnet A, has the
most expansive additions: “I will do penance. For I have committed a grave sin. Pray for
me.” The eleventh-century manuscript, Clugnet B, has a slight variation: “I will do
penance for this sin. Pray for me.” Clugnet B represents the second family of
manuscripts, which is the most numerous, containing seven of the eleven manuscripts
dating from the eleventh to the fifteenth century. This is the reading, albeit with a
different preposition *de* rather than *ex*, in Florentine Conventi Soppressi, which is dated
to the fourteenth or fifteenth century. Morgan M.626, however, follows Clugnet A. This
reading is also found in Paris, BN Lat 5306, dated to the fourteenth century, showing that some manuscripts in the fourteenth century followed the earliest, briefer reading. Moving into the age of print, the second edition from Brussels in 1476, the first printed *Vitas patrum* to contain the Life of Marina, reflects Clugnet B, and is in turn representative of the most common reading, at least in northern Europe.

In Cavalca’s translation we read, “and hearing these things brother Marinus thought a lot and moaned and did not excuse himself but began to cry and said, “Father I have sinned, I am prepared for penance.” We see how Cavalca sets the stage for this dramatic confrontation. In the first place he expands the text, which allows him to draw out the interval between the abbot’s question and the monk’s reply. In the film version, Cavalca would have a long still focusing on Marinus’s face, thus emphasizing the internal drama. The natural response for anyone facing a false accusation of a crime would be to show that it is impossible for the accused to have carried it out. Marinus, however, cannot tell the truth for that would lead to expulsion from the monastery. Cavalca wishes to emphasize this and also to make another theological point. By not excusing himself, Marinus provides a model of patient behavior that provides rewards in the afterlife. In Matthew 5:11 we read: “Blessed are ye when they shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all that is evil against you, untruly, for my sake.” This passage from the beatitudes provides a model that is counterintuitive. Most people in such a situation will respond with indignation and try to clear themselves from the accusation of wrongdoing. They see the false accusation as a wrong done to them. But according to the Gospel, when someone is doing God’s work, the accusation is to be accepted and not countered, for voluntary suffering is a good in and of itself. Telling the truth may provide a temporal
benefit, but it also removes the much greater eschatological reward. This is made clear in the next verse, 5:12: “Be glad and rejoice for your reward is very great in heaven. For so they persecuted the prophets that were before you.” The verbal phrase “non si schusoe” was not added by chance merely to underline and heighten the drama. Cavalca has the beatitudes in the back of his mind, and he presents Marinus’s reaction as informed by and consistent with the beatitudes.

When Cavalca informs his reader that Marinus did not excuse himself and that he cried, was this reading one that he could have found in a Latin manuscript? The answer appears to be no. Morgan M.626 has: “Stans ille diutius excogitans intra semetipsum et ingemiscens dixit.” The other Italian manuscript, Florence J711, has a slight variant: “Stans vero diutius cogitavit intra se et ingemiscens dixit.” Among the Parisian manuscripts, Mazarine 1734 has the same reading except for dicit instead of dixit. Concerning the BNP manuscripts, Clugnet A (2328, ninth century) reads: “At ille stans diutius cogitabat intra se et ingemiscens dixit.” The second manuscript in this series, 5306 (fourteenth century), shows no variation. Clugnet B (10840, eleventh century) reads: “Stans vero diutius cepit cogitare intra se et ingemiscens dixit.” The six other manuscripts in this series show minor variations: E (5345, twelfth century) has cogitavit for cepit cogitare; F (5573, twelfth century) has cogitans for cepit cogitare; G (5666, twelfth century) has cogitavit; H (2843b, twelfth century) has “Stans ille diutius excogitans intra semetipsum et ingemiscens dixit.” Since H is the only manuscript that lists the distance of the monastery as thirty-seven units, I am particularly attentive to its readings. I (12612, thirteenth century) and J (5367, fourteenth century) show no variations, and K (17632, fifteenth century) has cogitavit for cepit cogitare. Among the
incunables, the 1476 Brussels edition follows Mazarine 1734 fairly closely: “Stans vero diucius cogitavit intra se et ingemiscens dixit.” This examination of the textual tradition in manuscripts ranging from the ninth to the fifteenth century and in the first printed edition to contain the Life suggests that the Latin Marinus only thinks for a long time and groans before speaking. It is Cavalca’s Marinus who does not excuse himself and who begins to cry before finally responding to his abbot.

The main differences between Cavalca’s Marino and the Latin Marinus is that the former does not excuse himself and that he began to cry before replying to the abbot. Let us take a look at the other vernacular translations to see how they represent this point.

The German translator has the following: “Marinus considered these things in his heart for a long time and said, ‘I have sinned. Pray for me’” (Marinus trachtet et in sinem hertzen lange vnd sprach: “Ich hab gesondet. Bete uber mich”). This translator had a manuscript that must have run something like this: “Stans vero diutius cogitavit intra se et dixit. Peccavi pater. Ora pro me.” Either the manuscript omitted the reference to Marinus’s groaning and his willingness to do penance or the translator simply left these out. There is no reference either to excusing himself or to tears.

Petrus Naghel in his Dutch translation has the following: “And she stood standing and thought long within herself. And she said sighing, ‘Father I have sinned. I will gladly do penance for this sin. Pray for me’” (Ende si bleef staende ende peisde langhe in haer selven. Ende seide versuchtende: “Vader, ic hebbe ghesundecht. Ic sal gherne de penitencie doen van deser sonde. Bidt over mi”). Since Naghel appears to have used Mazarine 1734, let us look at the Latin there: “Stans vero diutius cogitauit intra se et
ingemiscens dicit Pater peccau penitentiam ago huic peccato: ora pro me.” This is a very close translation and thus it is no surprise that there is no reference to excuses or to tears.

François 1038 (thirteenth century) not only turns the abbot’s question into indirect speech but also changes it slightly. Instead of asking Marinus directly whether he had committed the crime against their daughter, he is asked by the abbot whether he had done what he had been accused of: “Freres Marins fu apelez et li abes li demanda sil auoit ce feit que len li metoit sus.” Marinus’s reaction here is similar to that in Cavalca’s translation: “He was silent for a long time and began to groan and to sigh and to say all in tears to the abbot, ‘Good father, I have sinned. I will do penance for it and do thou pray for me’” (Il estut mout longuement et comenca a gemir et a souspirer et dire tout emplorant a labe: Biau pere ie ai pechie. Ie en ferai la penitence et uous priereiz pour moi). This translator, too, wished to expand the dramatic potential of the scene, for he expands the groaning of the Latin to groaning and sighing. Like Cavalca, he adds tears to the monk’s reaction. Was this an expansion of the translator or did he find it in the Latin? The manuscript tradition shows the monk standing for a long time and only uses a single verb to describe the sound he makes—*ingemiscens*, or groaning. This translator expands the auditory range of the monk’s reaction. The addition of tears, while significant, is perhaps to be seen as the culmination of his emotional reaction and a detail that has been added to increase the dramatic intensity rather than to make a theological point. MS 422 (thirteenth century) also follows this but with some confusion at the beginning of the sentence, as though the copyist had missed a few words about Marinus’s long silence. MS 23117 (thirteenth or fourteenth century) is an independent translation. Here the translator omits the description of the reaction and makes the monk reply immediately to
the abbot’s question, without providing any sense of the psychological conflict present in
the Latin text: “Brother Marin said, ‘I have sinned. I will do penance for my sin. Do thou
pray for me’” (Frere Marin dist: “Iai peche si ferai penitance de mon pechie priez pour
moi”). MS 413 (fifteenth century) follows 23117, albeit with changed spelling, but coyly
changes deflorance to desloyaute in the abbot’s question to the monk. It appears that 413
is copying 23117 with slight changes. 22911 (fifteenth century) is a third independent
translation, most likely from a printed Latin version, since it not only gives the Latin
incipit but also the chapter number: “De sainte Marine. Et se commence en Latin Fuit
frater quidam, chapitre XLIII.” Here the abbot’s question is in indirect speech: “Sy
envoya querir le religieux Marin et lui demanda sil auoit commis celui enorme crime.”
The reply is totally different from that in the earlier French translations: “Marin began to
cry and said, Father abbot, I have sinned gravely, which displeases me greatly. I beseech
you to impose on me a penance that you see pertaining to the correction of my grave
offense” (Marin se prit a plorer et dist: Pere abbe iay griefuement peche dont il me
desplait fort sy vous suplie que men charges penitance telle que veires apertenir a la
corection de ma griefue offense). Precisely this reading, with variant spellings, is present
in the 1486 Lyon edition.173 One gets a sense here of the didactic impulse behind the
translation to emphasize the correct sequence of heartfelt penance—contrition marked by
tears rather than by groans and sighs, a clear admission of guilt and of the pain this guilt
causes the sinner, the appeal to the higher authority for an appropriate penance that fits the
particular circumstance, and the idea that this imposed penance will correct the particular

173 I need to check if this reading is present in an incunable edition, but I suspect that this translator is also
using the pastoral method of translation that Cavalca used.
sin. In the Latin manuscript tradition only Marinus’s willingness to do penance is emphasized. Who would decide what form the penance would take was left out.

In this French translation a correct form of confession is modeled in which each element of an entire penitential theory is made explicit. Someone reading this who may not have had clear ideas on how penance works will find a theory of penance that clarifies the intellectual structure undergirding what he or she may have known in practice. The different elements in the sequence are brought into relation with each other. This translation also makes explicit the hierarchy involved in the imposition of penance. The decisions concerning the choice of penance are explicitly taken out of the hands of the penitent and placed in the hands of the clerical superior, in this case the abbot. The translator explicitly minimizes the agency of the penitent by making the monk ask the abbot to choose the appropriate penance. He wishes to emphasize the subordinate position of the penitent vis-à-vis the ecclesiastical superior. All of this is only implicit in the Latin manuscript tradition and would not need to be made explicit for a monastic audience.

Since we know that Caxton depended on a French printed edition, we can use this as the source text to examine his version in Middle English. This is chapter LXI in his Vitas patrum. Caxton follows the French fairly closely but not word for word. We read: “And sente anone for Maryn and demaunded of hym yf he hadde commysed thys grete synne. Maryn began to wepe and sayd, ‘Fader abbot, I haue gretely synned the whyche dyspleasyth me sore wherefore I praye you that ye wyll charge me wyth penaunce suche as ye shall thynke to be apperteynynge to the correccyon of my grete offense.’” In the first sentence Caxton drops the word religieux, which modifies Marin in the French, even
though he has used relygyous before to translate the false accusation ("ce auoit fait Marin le religieux" is translated as "Maryn the relygyous hadde doon it"). The other change is that he translates crime as synne. Since Caxton is careful to translate word for word wherever possible, these changes catch our attention. It is possible that the same impulse that drove Cavalca to reduce the number of times the word monk and monastery appeared in his translation also animated Caxton. In both cases an awareness of the lay audience led them to reduce the recurrence of those details that might hamper the lay reader’s identification with the story. Cavalca and Caxton both try to anchor the text less firmly in its original monastic setting so as to make the moral of the story more generally applicable. The use of synne to translate the French crime is curious. Might Caxton have been also consulting a Latin text either in manuscript or in print along with the Lyon French edition? The Brussels 1476 Latin Vitae patrum edition has scelus. Each of the eleven manuscripts consulted by Clugnet has scelus at this point in the text. Since Caxton could have used the same word in English, synne appears to be a conscious choice of his to emphasize that this is not just a civil offense but rather an offense against God.

Moving now to the Spanish version, we find the abbot asking Marinus: "'Brother Marinus, have you dishonored the daughter of these people?' And standing for a long time and thinking within himself he said sighing, ‘Father I have sinned and would like to do penance for my guilt. In addition I ask you that you pray to God for me so that I can complete it’" (Fray marino has tu deshonrrado la fija de estos. e estando mucho entre si e pensando: e suspirando dixo: padre yo he peccado e quiero fazer penitencia por esta culpa mas ruego te que fagas oracion a dios por me que la pueda acabar). Unlike Caxton, Gonzalo Garcia de Santa Maria’s version does not always stick to the Latin. Here, for
example, he refers not to a crime against the girl, as is the case in the Latin, but rather to its subsequent effect, the loss of her honor. In so doing, he reflects the contemporary values of late fifteenth-century Spain and thus makes the translation share the values of his lay readers. He also explains the request for prayer. The Latin manuscript tradition simply says, “Pray for me,” as does the 1476 Brussels edition. Gonzalo explains that the abbot should pray to God so that Marinus can complete his penance. This emphasizes two things. It underlines the importance of God’s grace over the penitent’s own will. If the sinner chose to sin out of his own free will, the penitential system that allows him to be reconciled is still part of God’s grace. The ability to do penance should not be ascribed to the sinner’s own agency. Of course, the sinner must chose to repent and to correct the fault, but only this decision can be ascribed to the free will of the sinner. The process of correction is still dependent on God. Gonzalo is not simply making a theological point about the nature of penance. He is also looking forward proleptically to a point later in the story when the abbot reacts to the news of Marinus’s death soon after his readmission to the monastery. At that point the abbot will interpret the early death and incomplete penance as a sign of God’s dissatisfaction. The expansion here reveals Gonzalo’s theological concern about the need for God’s help to do penance and also a dramatic concern to prepare the ground so the abbot can interpret Marinus’s death as a sign that he is damned.

This overview of the German, Dutch, French, Middle English, and Spanish translations of this point in the Latin establishes two things. It suggests that Cavalca’s claim that Marinus did not excuse himself is his own editorial intervention, for it appears neither in the Latin manuscript or incunable tradition nor in any of these other vernacular
translations. This is part of Cavalca’s program of emphasizing the saint’s behavior as a model for emulation. As for Marinus’s tears, these appear neither in the Latin manuscript and incunable tradition nor in the German, Dutch, or Spanish translations. The tears do appear in some but not all of the French translations and are carried from there into Caxton’s Middle English *Vitas patrum*. I have suggested that in the case of Français 1038 the translator added tears primarily for dramatic rather than for theological purposes. The Latin Marinus simply sighs. This translator makes Marin sigh and groan and finally cry. The expansion of a single verb into a ternary means that the translator is ratcheting up the tension in the accusation scene and milking it for all it is worth. The translator of Français 23117 omits Marinus’s reaction entirely. The fifteenth-century translator of Français 22911 omitted the groans but kept the tears. Since this translator was likely using a printed Latin edition, as suggested by the rubric—“De sainte Marine. Et se commence en Latin Fuit frater quidam, chapitre xliii”—it is possible that he may also have had access to Français 1038 and that this particular element caught his attention. If this was the case, we are still left with the problem of why he did not translate the lines in which Marinus stands for a long time pondering his response to the false accusation. One could argue that he was less interested in enhancing the drama inherent in the accusation by drawing it out and that he kept the tears so as to make a theological point of underscoring the monk’s contrition.

In Cavalca’s case, we can look to his other writings for clues as to why he presents Marinus as beginning to cry. As a Dominican in a convent with an excellent library, Cavalca would have been familiar with a range of writings on the gift of tears and their theological significance. At the very least he was aware of Cassian’s views in the
Collations and Gregory’s views on tears in chapter 35 of Book III of his Dialogues, a text that Cavalca would have used to draw exempla for his preaching, and one that he himself translated into the vernacular. But it is in the Specchio di croce, as in all his works written for a lay audience, that we find a discussion on tears. Chapter 43 of this treatise discusses the third beatitude. Cavalca’s translation of Matthew 5:4—Beati qui lugent quoniam ipsi consolabuntur” (Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted)—is itself revealing. He translates it as “Blessed are they that weep for they shall be comforted” (Beati quelli che piangono perocche sarano consolati; Specchio, p. 344), changing mourning to its external sign, weeping.

In the third book of his Dialogues, Pope Gregory discusses both compunction and the power of tears, as well as the close relation between the two. In section 33, Gregory relates the story of Eleutherius, a recently deceased abbot. His disciples told Gregory that he was able to resuscitate a corpse by praying and that he was a man of such purity and compunction that his tears could obtain much from God.174 Gregory thus creates a nexus between prayer, purity, compunction, and tears. In a way this is a meditation on prayer and its components. For Gregory, prayer per se is not necessarily efficacious. It must be accompanied by certain conditions. By “purity,” here Gregory means the absence of vice. This is the minimum requirement. To reach this stage is the goal of the ascetic program of monks involving the training of body, mind, and heart. Compunction is a psychological state involving awareness of one’s sins. It is the third and final element, tears, that make prayer efficacious. Without this wet flow, Gregory implies, spilled in an

attitude of humility and simplicity, purity and compunction are but arid prerequisites of an effective petition to the almighty. Gregory begins by relating a story about Eleutherius concerning a boy possessed by a devil and who lives in a female monastery where Gregory was forced to take shelter. The nuns urge him to take the boy back so that they are spared his nocturnal screams. In Eleutherius’s monastery the boy is not tormented, which leads him to the prideful assumption that the monks are more powerful spiritually than the nuns. The devil immediately attacks the boy, and it requires the fervent and humble prayers of Eleutherius along with his monks to finally exorcise the youth.

The reaction and questions of Gregory’s interlocutor, the novice Peter, are a device that permits Gregory to sum up the most important point of the story that has just been related and to create a bridge to the next section. Peter’s response shows that the point of the story is that God permitted the diabolical possession to teach Eleutherius a lesson and to restrain his pride and vainglory. This is why the exorcism required the combined effort of abbot and monks. Gregory’s response confirms Peter’s diagnosis of the sin of pride and explains that the weight of the miracle required that it be shared among the group.

Having related a story that was told to him by others, Gregory moves to his own direct and personal experience of the holy man. Gregory’s purpose here is to recuperate Eleutherius’s reputation of holiness, and he explicitly tells us that the story illustrates the power of his prayer.175 He recounts a time when Eleutherius visited his monastery and when Gregory was so ill that he was not able to fast on Easter Sunday, a day, he says, when even children fast. In his sorrow, he turned to Eleutherius, about whom he

175 “E di quantà virtù fosse l’orazione sua in me medesimo l’ho provato.” Ibid., p. 212.
remembered the story of the boy possessed by the devil who was cured by him praying together with his monks. Gregory took Eleutherius into the chapel and asked him humbly to pray to God that he might be given the strength to fast. Eleutherius agreed and “After a short, sincere, and tearful prayer, he again left the chapel. But just as I heard him say the blessing at the conclusion of his prayer, strength returned to my weakened body, and my mind was relieved of all worry over food or sickness.”

In the remainder of the section Gregory relates his astonishment at his recovery and at its completeness. He ends by concluding from his own personal experience that the other stories concerning Eleutherius “were also true, though I was not present to witness them.”

It would appear, then, that the function of this story was to bolster the truth claims of Gregory’s narrative in general and to establish firmly the holiness of Eleutherius as witnessed by the power of his prayer. Peter’s response at this juncture takes the modern reader somewhat by surprise: “You called him a man of unusual compunction. What, then, is the power of tears? I should like to know more about this subject. And would you also explain the various kinds of compunction?” It turns out that the second story hinges around the adjective tearful, which modified the prayer of Eleutherius. Chapter 34 began with an assertion of the power of his tears, but the story of the possessed boy did not take up this theme. Rather, it took up the theme of purity and how easily it can be lost through pride in the effectiveness of one’s own prayers and spiritual power. It was Eleutherius’s tears accompanying his prayer that made it both powerful and efficacious in the eyes of God. But the importance of this detail is not emphasized in the account. The reader who stops at the end of the story is guided by Gregory’s explicit framework for the tale, that
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177 Ibid., p. 173.
is, it is a story about the power of Eleutherius’s prayer. Coming immediately after the story of the possessed boy, the reader is conditioned to attribute Gregory’s cure to the absence of pride on this occasion and not to the presence of tears. Eleutherius has learned his lesson and has learned to maintain humility and thus keep himself in a state of purity.

That Cavalca understood this is shown by subtle changes in syntax in his translation of the *Dialogues*. First of all, where the source text has Gregory asking Eleutherius humbly, in Cavalca’s version it is Eleutherius who prays while crying humbly.\footnote{\textit{Ch’entrammo nella chiesa, umilmente piangendo si pose in orazione; e stato che fu una certa ora, usci fuori e alla voce della sua benedizione lo mio stomaco sentì tanta virtu, che subitamente mi usci di mente il cibo.”} Ibid.} Cavalca transfers the adverb to emphasize the fact that Eleutherius was weeping. His attention to tears is also visible in his translation of Peter’s response to this new story. Aware that the last sentence in a paragraph or section is more likely to be retained in the reader’s memory and is therefore a privileged locus for carrying meaning, Cavalca changes the order of Peter’s words: “Since you said that this holy man had great compunction, I pray you to tell me how many types of compunction there are and the power of tears.”\footnote{“Perocchè dicesti, che questo sant’uomo era di grande compunzione, pregoti, che mi dichi, quanti sono gli modi della compunzione, e la virtude delle lacrime.” Ibid., p. 213.} This may not seem terribly significant, but Cavalca will generally follow the syntax of his source when there is nothing at stake. His changes are never fortuitous or accidental but always volitional. In Gregory’s text, Peter’s reaction has a certain symmetry, which is appropriate to its function as a linking device between two sections. In the first part he looks back to what has been related and responds—in this case by providing the hermeneutic key needed to understand the story of Eleutherius. The second looks forward to the next section on compunction. By reversing the order and creating a chiastic structure, Cavalca interrupts the narrative flow to the next section with
a retrospective look at the story of Gregory’s healing. Where Gregory framed it as an
illustration of the power of prayer in general, Cavalca underlined the crucial component
that made prayer effective—the presence and power of tears in the sight of God.

In chapter 34, Gregory does not discuss any stories of miracles or holy men but has
instead a theoretical treatment of compunction in which tears play a central role. This
connection is strengthened in Cavalca’s translation. According to Gregory there are many
different types corresponding to different faults. Compunction, then, is the awareness in
the soul of its own faults and the sadness it feels in contemplating these, a sadness that
must be the psychological precursor to corrective action: “There are many different types
of compunction, because every kind of fault causes regret in a repentant soul.”180 Once
the soul feels this regret, the tears follow. To support this point, Gregory has an
allegorical/typological reading of the prophet Jeremiah in Lamentations 3:48: “For this
reading, Jeremias, speaking in the name of contrite sinners, says, ‘My eye has run down
with streams of water.’”181 In translating this passage, Cavalca elides the notion of regret,
which in Gregory precedes the flow of tears. In his rendition, compunction is not the
feeling of regret, it is the soul weeping over its faults. Thus what is a psychological state
in Gregory is transformed by Cavalca into the effect of that state: “Compunction is
divided into many types when each fault is wept over by penitents.”182 Gregory then goes
on to divide compunction into two main types—the compunction of fear and the
compunction of love. The second follows the first. The contemplation of its sins causes
the soul to shed tears of fear when it considers eternal punishment. When this fear

181 The vulgate reads: “Divisiones aquarum deduxit oculus meus in contritione filiae populi mei.” Gregory
leaves out the phrase “for the destruction of the daughter of my people.”
182 “La compunzione si divide in molte specie, quando ciascuna colpa si piange da’ penitenti.” Bottari, p.
213.
“subsides through prolonged sorrow and penance, a feeling of security emerges from an assurance of forgiveness and the soul begins to burn with a love for heavenly joys. Now the same person, who wept out of fear of punishment sheds abundant tears because his entrance into the kingdom of heaven is being delayed.”\textsuperscript{183} This theory emphasizes the fundamentally optimistic nature of penance, for it reconciles the sinner to God and converts damnation into salvation.

Gregory finds support for this interpretation in Joshua 15:18–19. Axa, daughter of Caleb, sits on an ass and sighs as she is about to leave for her husband’s house. When asked why she is sighing, she asks for a blessing and also for land that is watered to supplement her dowry of southern and dry land. Her father then gave her upper and nether watery ground. For Gregory, Axa signifies the soul, and the ass on which she sits the body with its irrational movements: “Just as she begged her father with a sigh for pools of water, so must we with deep groans obtain from our creator the grace of tears.”\textsuperscript{184} Gregory then lists the kinds of people who have received southern and dry land. They speak out for justice, defend the oppressed, succor the needy, and profess their faith ardently. These are all good things in and of themselves, but they “still do not have the grace of tears.” Good works resulting from human agency are necessary but ultimately insufficient to wipe clean the stain caused by sin: “It is of utmost importance, however, that those who are zealous for good works and devote much time to performing them should also weep over their past sins, either through fear of eternal punishment or through longing for God’s kingdom.”\textsuperscript{185} For Gregory, good works and sin will always be

\textsuperscript{184} Ibid., p. 174.
\textsuperscript{185} Ibid.
in imbalance. The land in the Negev, the southern lands, are dry and therefore barren. It requires pools of water to become fruitful. Similarly, the aridity caused by sin can only be overcome by the gift or the grace of tears. Tears are therefore powerful and can immediately overcome the problem caused by the incommensurability of sin and good works. The two pools, Gregory explains, correspond to the two types of compunction: “The soul receives the upper pools when it weeps because of its longing for heaven; it receives the lower pools when the fear of hell causes it to break forth.”\textsuperscript{186} In this complex metaphor, Gregory closely associates compunction with pools that come in turn as a result of tears. The pools are not the tears themselves but the consequence of tears.

Axa’s request for pools of water to supplement her dowry of arid lands would seem to be akin to the soul asking for the gift of tears. This would suggest an analogy between the pools and the tears. But the analogy ends up being a little stretched at the end of the section, when Gregory says they correspond to the two kinds of compunction. The soul receives the upper and lower pools when it weeps out of love or out of fear. This means that tears precede and indeed precipitate the gift of compunction and not the other way around. It is in response to tears shed that the gifts of lower and higher compunction are received.

Gregory was not the only source of Cavalca’s thinking on tears. In chapter 43 of the \textit{Specchio di croce}, Cavalca discourses on the third beatitude. We have already noted that he translates \textit{beati qui lugent} not as “blessed are they that mourn” but as “blessed are they that weep.” For Cavalca, this beatitude is appropriately third after poverty and meekness, for it is only when the soul rids itself of material goods and of its attachment to

\begin{footnote}{\textsuperscript{186} Ibid., p. 175.}
\end{footnote}
these through the first and second beatitudes and made meek that it is able to see itself clearly and weeps for its state. He then adds that not all weeping is worthy of consolation and establishes a hierarchy of good, bad, and indifferent weeping. Good weeping in turn is of three types—of contrition, of compassion, and of devotion. Tears of contrition are spilled over an awareness of one’s sins. Cavalca quotes and glosses Psalm 6:7: “Natare faciam tota nocte lectulum meum” (Every night I will wash my bed). He explains that “every night” stands for every sin and that the bed stands for one’s conscience. Thus the meaning of the psalm is that the contrite sinner bewails every sin upon his conscience.

Here Cavalca distinguishes between two types of tears of contrition, only one of which is meritorious. This is when the repentant soul weeps when it considers the offense to God because offending God is the worst thing possible. With such tears, the sinner returns to grace and peace with God as happened with Saint Peter and the Magdalene. Tears resulting from illness, particularly when the patient is near death, are often mistaken for contrition by bystanders. These tears are not considered meritorious, since the sinner weeps out of concern for himself either through the pain of the present illness or the fear of the future pains of hell. The problem of tears on the deathbed seems to be a concern of Cavalca’s, for he provides both an authority and an exemplum. He quotes Augustine’s uncertainty about embracing penance in extremis—“He who turns to penance at the point of death whether he goes surely, I am not sure”—by which he shows
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187 “Spogliata dunque l’anima delle cose terrene e dell’amore di quelle per la prima e seconda beatitudine, è fatta mansueta; per la terza comincia a vedere lo stato suo, e piange.” Specchio, p. 344.
188 “Io laverò per ciascuna notte cioè per ciascuno peccato, ‘il letto mio’ cioè la mia coscienza.” Ibid.
189 “Perrochè l’offesa di Dio è la peggiore cosa che sia.” Specchio, p. 346.
that he is very doubtful.\textsuperscript{190} The exemplum concerns someone who wept a great deal at death and subsequently appeared to a friend and revealed that he was damned. The friend was astonished, since he had showed great contrition at the end and wept a great deal. He replied, “I wept not out of contrition nor for pain of the offense to God but out of tenderness toward myself for I saw myself dying and for fear of Hell.”\textsuperscript{191} Cavalca supplies two further examples from the Bible of people who did not find mercy although they sought it with tears. These were Esau and Antioch.

This pairing of Esau and Antioch is noteworthy, for the light it sheds on Cavalca’s sources. In his introduction to the \textit{Specchio di croce}, Tito Sante Centi, a Dominican, tries to deal with the surprising absence of Aquinas from the numerous authorities named in the treatise.\textsuperscript{192} He concludes that Aquinas was a polarizing figure within the order and that this is why Cavalca prefers saints such as Gregory or Bernard. Yet precisely the pairing of Esau and Antiochus is found in the section on sacraments of Aquinas’s \textit{Summa Theologica}. In part III, question 86, Aquinas considers the effect of penance as regards the pardon of mortal sin. In the first article he asks “whether all sins are taken away by penance.” As is customary, he states the case against the belief that penance washes away all sins, the case for the belief, and finally his own resolution. In objection 1, we read: “It would seem that not all sins are taken away by Penance. For the Apostle says (Heb. xii. 17) that Esau \textit{found no place of repentance, although with tears he had sought it}, which a gloss explains as meaning that \textit{he found no place of pardon and blessing through penance}: and it is related (2 Machab. ix. 13) of Antiochus, that \textit{this wicked man prayed to}

\textsuperscript{190} “Di questi tali dice santo Agostino: ‘Chi torna a penitenza nell’articolo della morte, s’egli ne va sicuro, io non ne sono sicuro’ per la quale parola mostra che molto ne dubiti.” Ibid.
\textsuperscript{191} “Rispose: ‘Io piansi non per contrizione, né per dolore dell’offesa di Dio, ma per tenerezza di me medesimo, che mi vedeva morire, e per paura dell’inferno.’” Ibid.
\textsuperscript{192} Tito Sante Centi, ed., \textit{Specchio di Croce}, p. 20.
the Lord, of Whom he was not to obtain mercy. Therefore it does not seem that all sins are taken away by Penance.” It is very likely that Cavalca would have been familiar with the Summa and that the library of Saint Catherine’s would have had a copy. Of the Summa, he would certainly have been familiar with the section on penance, and that this was the source of his two examples of figures whose tears proved ineffective. Cavalca, it would appear, made silent use of the Summa Theologica.

The second kind of useful tears are those shed out of compassion for another’s miseries, particularly if they are spiritual miseries. In this category fall the tears of Jeremiah weeping over the death of his people (Jeremiah 9:1)\(^{193}\) and Job’s compassionate tears over those who are afflicted (Job 30:25).\(^{194}\) Such weeping “merits consolation, for through compassion one feels one’s neighbor’s affliction and particularly Christ’s passion.”\(^{195}\) Cavalca does not provide examples from the Christian era for this kind of tears, but he finds support for this category in Saint Paul’s letter to the Corinthians stating that those who partake of suffering will also partake of consolation.\(^{196}\) The third kind of useful tears are those of devotion, “when man weeps for desire of paradise or from the tedium of the world.”\(^{197}\) Again he provides no examples but explains that these are the tears mentioned in Psalm 41 where the soul longs to see the face of God.\(^{198}\)

\(^{193}\) Cavalca does not translate every word in the verse: “Who will give [water to my head, and] a fountain of tears to my eyes? and I will weep [day and night] for the slain of [the daughter of] my people.”

\(^{194}\) “I wept heretofore for him that was afflicted, and my soul had compassion on the poor.”

\(^{195}\) “Questo pianto merita consolazione; perocchè per compassione sente afflizione del prossimo; e specialmente quando l’uomo piange la passione di Gesù Cristo.” Specchio, p. 346.

\(^{196}\) 2 Corinthians 1:7: “knowing that as you are partakers of the sufferings, so shall you be also of the consolation.”

\(^{197}\) “È uno altro pianto di devozione quando l’uomo piange per desiderio del paradiso e per tedium del mondo.” Specchio, p. 348.

\(^{198}\) Psalm 41:3-4: “...when shall I come and appear before the face of God? My tears have been my bread day and night.”
In chapter 20 of his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, Aquinas identifies only two kinds of tears—“tears of compunction to wash away sins…and tears of devotion from a desire for heavenly things.” The context is the discovery of Christ’s empty tomb and the Magdalene’s tears. According to Aquinas, she displayed both kinds of tears—“copious tears of compunction at the time of her conversion…and abundant tears of devotion over the passion and resurrection of Christ.” In Aquinas, this twofold explanation centers entirely on the individual. In the first case, self-scrutiny results in tears of sorrow over one’s own sins, and in the second case, tears spring from love of Christ.

Why might Cavalca have wished to change the categories of the most illustrious member of his order? At first glance, this seems temerarious and foolhardy, given that he was not even a lector in his own convent. The explanation must lie in the different audiences of the two treatises. Aquinas was writing in Latin for clerics. Cavalca was writing in the vernacular for laypeople. His writings are therefore more social and pastoral in their attempts to create bonds between people. Thus while he agrees with Aquinas in giving contrition—the crucial first step for one’s own salvation—pride of place, his concern for neighbor leads him to Bernard of Clairvaux, whom he quotes as follows: “Through tears of contrition he finds a hope of pardon, which gives him great joy; in tears of compassion he finds the happiness of charity or love, which one feels
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200 Ibid.
loving one’s neighbor; in tears of devotion he finds the kindling of the fervor of holy desire and a hope of arriving at that good, desiring which he weeps.”

Unlike Aquinas, Cavalca places tears shed over the passion of Christ in the category of compassionate rather than devotional tears. For him, the individual, the neighbor, and Christ form a triad in which a compassionate response to the neighbor deepens a compassionate identification with Christ’s suffering. This in turn makes one more sensitive to the neighbor’s condition. By placing them as the two significant points of one’s emotional compass, Cavalca encourages an identification of Christ with the neighbor. In succoring the neighbour, one is in fact succoring Christ. It is not surprising, then, that Bernard’s analysis found favor with Calvaca, for in it compassionate weeping for neighbor is the way to feel the joy of charity, the highest Pauline virtue.

Having discussed the three kinds of beneficial weeping, Cavalca turns briefly to useless and indifferent weeping. Useless weeping results from the loss of money or some other temporal good. Such tears are not consoled and indeed are cause for damnation to Hell, where the tears will never end. Indifferent tears are spilled when one has a tender and compassionate nature and weeps easily and immediately. So long as it is not against God, it is neither good nor bad and merits neither consolation nor damnation.

Given Cavalca’s interest in the gift of tears, it is not surprising that he makes Marinus weep in response to the abbot’s question. What kind of tears might these be? In the context of the false accusation, we can rule out both damnable and indifferent
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201 “Per questi pianti è l’uomo consolato in questa vita per alcuno modo come dice santo Bernardo: nel pianto della contrizione trova una fiducia da essergli perdonato, per la quale ha grande allegrezza; nel pianto della compassione trova una letizia di carità, che si sente amare il prossimo; nel pianto della divozione trova uno accendimento di fervore di santo desiderio, ed una speranza di pervenire a quello bene, il quale desiderando, piange.” *Specchio di croce*, p. 348.
weeping. Among the three types of useful tears, two would seem to apply—tears of contrition and tears of devotion. Until this point in the story, Marinus has been an exemplary monk whose obedience and virtuous conduct were such that the entire monastic community loved him. If this was the case, what sins might Marinus have on his conscience to be contrite about? We are confronted with a phenomenon alien to the modern reader. This is the enormous, almost crushing sense of sinfulness before God that weighed on the conscience of even the good Christian. This was particularly true of monks. Indeed, the entire monastic way of life was founded on the assumption that only a complete withdrawal from the world and a fulltime commitment to prayer and contemplation within the context of a penitential way of life provided an assurance of salvation. This is not to say that in late antiquity the notion that laypeople could be saved was absent, but the general assumption was that the weight of sin was such that most people would not be saved. Within the monastic world, however, there was a cautious optimism that this way of life would lead to salvation provided that the monk had made a genuine effort to fight against the sinful impulses of the body. In the case of Marina, the modern reader might wonder, “What does she have to be contrite about? She has no sins on her conscience.” But a saint could nevertheless feel a sense of contrition over unexpiated sins whether of omission or of commission to the point that might, from a certain point of view, be categorized as scrupulosity. Thus from Cavalca’s point of view these could well be tears of contrition.

They are not likely to be tears of compassion, for in this case the afflicted person is the saint herself and not someone else. Nor are we told explicitly in the Life that the

saint’s piety was either Christo-mimetic or Christo-centric in any way. So this category of useful tears can be ruled out. This leaves tears of devotion, the third type of efficacious tears. For Cavalca, these are shed from a strong desire for heaven and a sense of tedium or disgust with the world. He quotes Gregory on Psalm 41 as saying: “The soul that desires to see God feeds on tears and in crying waxes in desire.”203 This model could apply to Marinus, but the better fit is Saint Bernard’s definition of devotional tears, in which the tears intensify both the desire for heaven and the hope of reaching it. For Marinus at this stage, the false accusation provides an opportunity to take on additional suffering and thus remain obedient to her father’s command not to reveal her secret. Marinus’s tears could also reflect her increased determination to stay the course in spite of the unjust punishment and expulsion from the monastery.

We know that tears were a powerful category for Cavalca. But this by itself does not explain why he should make Marinus cry. Tears were not absent from late antique hagiography in general or from the Vitas patrum collection in particular. One story from the latter is that of Pelagia the Penitent. Like Thais and Mary of Egypt, she was a reformed prostitute who later became a penitent. In her Life we read of the bishop Nonus’s tears, the tears of those who hear his sermon, and of course Pelagia’s tears. But while in the equally late antique Latin Marinus remains dry eyed, in the late medieval Tuscan Marinus weeps. Cavalca’s lachrymose saint does not simply provide a model of contrition that supports the expectations of fourteenth-century friars, she/he also reflects the climate of increased guilt described by Jean Delumeau and Thomas Tentler as characterizing the late Middle Ages. The widespread belief in purgatory, the growth of

chantry chapels, and the rise of indulgences all speak to an increasing concern and fear over the postmortem fate of the soul. The Scrovegni chapel in Padua was commissioned by Enrico Scrovegni and decorated by Giotto as an expiatory offering to God for the sins of moneylending. In such an atmosphere even the saint must be shown to be manifestly less confident of her own salvation. As a preaching friar, Cavalca was a participant in this system and a purveyor of fear. For those who were not theologically sophisticated and not aware of how powerful a solvent of sin were the tears of a contrite sinner, the tears of Marinus might reflect instead the anxiety over salvation and the fear of damnation. These would be the tears of compunction corresponding to the lower pools given to Axa by her father Caleb in Gregory’s reading of this incident in Joshua 15. The problem with the late antique Marinus in fourteenth-century Pisa was precisely its atmosphere of general optimism and confidence. By making the saint cry in response to the false accusation, Cavalca portrayed a saint who could be read as insecure and fearful despite a lifetime of chastity and spotless living within the monastery. This was a portrait in touch with the general anxiety of the times, one less anachronistic than the dry-eyed saint of the Latin Life. Cavalca had produced a saint whose anxiety was manifested in tears and immediately recognizable, for it was consistent with the anxious messages preached from the pulpit. This anxiety about salvation was visible in the fresco of the *Triumph of Death* in the Camposanto, the monumental cemetery next to the cathedral of Pisa. There are many more damned souls depicted being carried off by demons than there are saved souls being taken to heaven in the arms of angels.
When the abbot heard these words, he was moved to anger and ordered that Marinus be beaten and struck down. Mention of the severe physical punishment goes back to the earliest manuscript, Clugnet A (ninth century), which uses two verbs that connote beating—contundere and adfligere. The second also carries the notion of being struck to the ground or dashed against something by the force of the blow. Clugnet D, the other manuscript in the first series, also has this reading. Clugnet C (thirteenth century), the sole manuscript in the third series, replaces the two verbs denoting striking with the verb flagellare (to whip). Clugnet B (eleventh century) has the same reading as Clugnet A. The seven other variants in this second series all preserve both verbs, though they show some insignificant variation between eum and eam. Mazarine 1734 (fourteenth century) also has both verbs, as does the 1476 Brussels edition. It is therefore rather surprising that the two Florentine Vitas patrum manuscripts omit mention of this physical punishment. Since Cavalca translation includes both these verbs, this is additional proof that he used another manuscript for the Life of Marina.

Cavalca translates this sentence as follows: “Then the angry abbot, truly believing that he was guilty, had him severely beaten and struck down and said to him.” This additional explanation about the abbot’s motivation reveals to us that Cavalca was concerned that the lay reader might judge the abbot’s harsh response as hasty and precipitous. He is worried about preserving the good reputation of monasticism as an institution worthy of support by the laity and wants to make sure that it is not presented as a place of harsh punishment administered capriciously and unjustly. This concern for

204 “Ad iracundiam autem commotus abbas eius iussit eam contundi et affligi et ait illi.”
205 “[E]t iussitque eam flagellari.” Clugnet, p. 368.
206 “Allor l’abbate irato, credendo veramente che lli fusse in corpora, fecelo duramente battere e affliger e disseli.”
the image of monasticism can perhaps be tied to Cavalca’s own biography. As a member of a friary with close connections to the archbishopric of Pisa, he would have been aware of the various ecclesiastical institutions in the archdiocese of Pisa and their dependence on the laity for financial support. He himself was responsible for the founding of a convent for former prostitutes and undertook the annual *questua*, or fund-raising effort, on behalf of these women. He had personal experience of the challenges involved in getting the laity to open their purses to support the church and its institutions. He would have been sensitive to the image of the church among laypeople and probably aware of anticlerical and antifraternal sentiments circulating within Italian society. The depictions of hypocrisy and sexual incontinence among clerics, monks, and nuns in Boccaccio’s *Decameron*, which dates from around 1350, did not spring out of nowhere. In Cavalca’s own lifetime, the circulation of Dante’s *Comedy*, which contained some harsh critiques of clerics and the institutional church, gave these sentiments a respect that had to be dealt with. We cannot know for certain that Cavalca had read Dante, but it seems very likely, particularly as the poet is thought to have visited Pisa between 1312 and 1316 during his exile from Florence. The fresco of the *Last Judgment* in the Camposanto shows clear awareness of the *Comedy* and is an early witness to the reception of the poem in the visual arts. The Inferno was also the subject of a scholarly Latin commentary as early as 1324 by the Bolognese Ser Graziolo de’ Bambaglioli. This was followed by other commentaries, including that of the Carmelite Guido of Pisa, whose enormous work is dated between 1326 and 1350. A manuscript of this commentary, MS Codex 597 of the Musee Condée at Chantilly, was illuminated by Francesco Traini, who was the artist responsible for the first fresco painted in the Camposanto, the *Crucifixion*. The early
commentary tradition and the visual depictions show the respect that was accorded to this text among the educated clerical elite of Pisa during the 1320s and 1330s, when Cavalca was producing his translations and devotional treatises.

A monk or some other clerical reader of the Latin text would not have needed an explanation for the abbot’s behavior. He had asked Marinus a perfectly clear question: “Did you commit this crime against their daughter?” Marinus, not wishing to reveal his sex, replies ambiguously, “I have sinned.” The statement was true, for no Christian could believe himself to be entirely free from sin. This would certainly have been the understanding of a monk reading the story. The reply is true, but it is also misleading, for the abbot takes it to mean that Marinus is confirming that he had committed the crime of impregnating the innkeeper’s daughter. This terse reply is the entirety of Marinus’s response in Morgan M.626. This is not, however, the fuller reply in Clugnet A (ninth century): “I have sinned father. I will do penance. For I have committed a grave crime. Pray for me.”

Clugnet D (fourteenth century) substitutes *sin* for “a grave crime.” Clugnet C (thirteenth century) makes Marinus say, “I have sinned father, I will do penance. And on account of this sin, pray for me.”

Clugnet B (eleventh century), which represents the most common reading, ties in Marinus’s penance to the sin that he is confessing: “I have sinned father. I will do penance for this sin. Pray for me.” The other manuscripts in this second series show minor variations. Clugnet E (twelfth century) has *de* instead of *ex*; Clugnet F (twelfth century) has *pro* instead of *ex* and omits the request that the abbot pray for him; Clugnet

---

207 “Peccavi, pater; penitentiam ago. Feci enim graue scelus. Ora pro me.” Clugnet, p. 362.
209 “Peccavi pater, penitentiam ago, et pro hoc peccato ora pro me.”
G (twelfth century) has *huius peccati* instead of *ex hoc peccato*; Clugnet H (twelfth century), like Morgan M.626, only has the admission of having sinned and says nothing about penance; Clugnet I (thirteenth century) and J (fourteenth century) show no variation, and K (fifteenth century), like F, has *pro* instead of *ex*. The 1476 Brussels incunable has “peccavi pater ago huic peccato penitentiam ora pro me”. The 1477 Cologne edition has “Peccavi pater, penitenciam ago huic peccato ora pro me”. The 1478 Nuremberg Koberger edition introduced a variation not found in any manuscripts I consulted: “I have sinned my father, I will do penance for this sin. But I ask you intercede on my behalf with God so that I can complete this [penance].”²¹¹ The same reading appears in the 1478–79 Ulm Zainer edition. This variation in the manuscript and incunable tradition reveals a pattern of omission and expansion. Since the earliest surviving manuscript from the ninth century has a confession of having sinned, a willingness to do penance, admission of a crime, and a request for prayer, the terse readings of Morgan M.626 (fourteenth century) and Clugnet H (twelfth century), which only have the confession of sin, probably go back to a faulty scribe in the twelfth century who accidentally left out the other three elements. It is unlikely that this omission was anything other than accidental, for penance was at the heart of the monastic way of life. The shift from *scelus* (crime) in Clugnet A, with its connotations of offenses against secular authority and public law, to *peccatum* (sin), with its connotation of offense against God, likely reflects the monastic milieu in which this story was copied.

When we compare Clugnet A (ninth century) and Clugnet B (eleventh century) we see a slight but significant shift. The four elements in A were admission of sin,

²¹¹ “Peccavi pater mi, penitentiam ago pro hoc peccato, sed queso te intercede pro me ad deum ut hanc perficere possim.” Fol. 64ra, image 149.
pence, crime, and prayer. These appear as two related pairs of verbs. The general admission of sin and a general willingness to do penance are balanced by a specific admission of an unnamed crime and a request for prayer for this crime. When the abbot asks, “Have you committed this crime...?” and Marinus replies, “I have committed a crime,” he is still speaking in generalities, for he could have said, “I have committed this crime,” using a demonstrative adjective. Such a phrasing would have been actively misleading as a response to the abbot’s direct query, and it is likely that the Greek text, which has not survived, reflected this ambiguity. The challenge for the hagiographer was to make the saint answer the specific question without revealing her female identity. For this reason the saint’s reply must be ambiguously worded so that it reflects a truth without being an active lie. The use of the word *scelus* in her reply picks up the same word in the abbot’s question. This makes her reply appear to answer the abbot’s question; when Marinus says, “I have committed a serious crime,” she could in fact be referring to the fact of her dressing as a man. Cross-dressing was condemned in Deuteronomy 22:5: “A woman shall not be clothed with man’s apparel, neither shall a man use woman’s apparel for he that doth these things is abominable before God.” By replying in this way, Marinus could respond to the abbot’s question by asserting her own guilt of a crime about which she has not been asked. She thus asserts a truth, which is unrelated to the abbot’s question.

In Clugnet B, the word *crime* has been changed to “this sin,” and the third verb relating to crime (*fecit*) has been dropped: “Peccavi pater penitentiam ago ex hoc peccato ora pro me.” Here *penitentiam* is joined to *hoc peccato*, so that the reply becomes a general admission of having sinned, a willingness to do penance for a particular sin, and a
request for prayer. This is a more actively misleading reply, for the use of the demonstrative ajective *hoc* picks up the *hoc* of the abbot’s question and makes it appear that Marinus is answering the specific question put to him. It also ties the penance to the specific sin against the innkeeper’s daughter rather than to general, unspecified sins. Once this shift has occured, the changes imposed in the incunable tradition make more sense. The general prayer for a sinner now becomes a prayer with a specific purpose. Having asserted his willingness to do penance for the sin of which he has been accused, Marinus beseeches the abbot to pray to God to allow him to complete his penance. Since this reading is not found in any of the early manuscripts or indeed in the incunables, it is probably an editorial intervention of the *castigator* of the Koberger edition that looks forward proleptically to the point in the text when the abbot interprets Marinus’s early death, after readmission into the monastery, as a sign that he did not deserve to complete his penance.

*Marinus’s penance outside the monastery*

After having Marinus whipped and beaten, the abbot threw him out of the monastery. The Latin text informs us that Marina never told anyone her secret but lay on the ground outside the gates of the monastery doing penance as though she had sinned. She survived for three years by begging for a daily mouthful of bread from the brethren entering the monastery.\(^{212}\)

Cavalca makes three changes in his translation. These changes are not present in any of Clugnet’s manuscripts, the two Florentine manuscripts, the Houghton manuscript,

\(^{212}\) Appendix 2.2, p 370.
or the Mazarine manuscripts. Nor are these in any of the incunable editions. This means that the Latin text was reasonably stable at this point and that Cavalca’s variations were indeed his own. By way of introducing the saint’s reaction to the expulsion Cavalca adds that she “humbly sustained everything.”213 This is the second time he used this adverb—the first occurrence was to describe her assent to the abbot’s orders that she go with the other monks to get supplies.214 The use of this adverb, missing in the Latin, allows him to use Marina to model the virtue of humility for his lay readers as well as to underscore the notion that the greater the degree of unjust suffering in this world, the greater the eschatological reward in the next one. The second change he imposes is that he makes the saint weep while she is lying on the ground. As noted earlier, these are the tears of compunction that are part of the profile for sanctity in the later Middle Ages. In the Life of Umiliana de’ Cerchi she is so bothered by her lack of tears that she smears lime on her eyes to force them.

The third change was to moderate the saint’s asceticism, lest this inedia be emulated by the laity. In the Latin we read not only that she survived on a single mouthful of bread a day but that she did this for a period of three years. In Cavalca’s retelling, she lived on alms that she received at the door.215 Not only did he remove the precision in the source, which would have evoked admiration in the monastic reader, but he actively made it vaguer. By saying that she lived on the alms that she received at the door rather than a precise “mouthful,” he created the impression that the saint’s daily intake of food had not been dramatically reduced. The reader would think that there

---

213 “[E] ella humilemente sostenne ogni cosa.” Appendix 2.4, p. 388.
214 Appendix 2.4 p. 387.
might have been some reduction, but not that she was eating barely enough to stay alive. Cavalca did not want his lay readers to try to emulate this aspect of Marina’s story, only the virtue of humility.

The fifteenth-century translator of the Life of Marina in Oxford, Bodleian MS Canonciano Italiano It. 259 made no such changes in his translation:

depresente frate Marino vsi del monestiero ma non manifesto maj ad alcuno el misterio suo Ma stete fora dela porta del monestiero iazendo in tera et afligendose et fazendo asprisima penitencia chomo se lauese comeso quel pecato et da i frati che vsiua et intraua domandaua per elimosena uno morselo de pane et cusi perseuero in quela penitencia tre annj non se Spartando dale porte del monestiero.  

Indeed, he focused attention on the penance by describing it as asprisima and on its difficulty by describing her stay in front of the monastery gates as perseverance, where the Latin simply states that she did not leave for three years.

The German translator, too, did not introduce Cavalca’s changes, although he did describe her penance as hard, and he did not specify the quantity of bread she sought:
“darvmb seit die maget jre heymlich nymand vnd lage vor der porte des closters off der erde jn herter busse, als ob sie gros sönde hett begangen vnd bate die brüder brotes, da sie usz vnd jne fur sie gingen. Also lage sie druwe jare vor dem closter.”  
Petrus Naghel followed the Latin closely, but he too did not specify the quantity of bread and used masculine pronouns: “Maer Marijn en seide noyt niemenne sine heimelecheit. Ende hi ghinc ute ende hi viel vore de poorte vanden cloostere. Ende hi lach op de eerde ende quelde hem in penitencien, als ofte hi de sonde ghedaen hadde. Ende dese Marina bad

\[216\] fol. 151v.  
\[217\] AVP, p. 360.
vanden bruederen die ute ende in ghinghen, datmen hare ene aelmoesenne broots gave.
Dit dede si III jaer ende ghinc niet van vore den den clooster.”

The French editions show tendencies toward glossing the Latin. Thus MS 1038 tells us “il souffri tout en bonne pacience. Si remest a la porte et quant aucuns passoit par illec si li prioit pordieu qui li aportat .i. poi de pain.” A similar reading appears in MS Français 422. MS Français 23117 explained that she did not want anyone to know that she was a woman: “et sainte Marine ne voult onques reconnoistre que elle fust fame, ainz sen ala et se mist a la porte de labaie et fist illec sa penitence.”

The 1486 French printed edition wished to raise the stakes compared to these three medieval translations. It has Marina doing penance for four rather than three years and also has her suffer insults from passersby:

Labbe tant courrouce que plus ne le pouuoit estre le chassa hors du monastere deuant lequel sans y rentrer elle fut par lespace de quatre ans couchant dessoubz la porte sur la terre nue: faisant illec austere penitence du peche quelle nauoit pas commis Et quant les freres aloyent en prouision pour le conuent elle leur demandoit du pain pour lamour de dieu. laquelle penitence elle continua par lespace de quatre ans. durant lesquelz elle souffrit et endura non pas seulement grandes indigences mais aussi plusieurs opprobres: tant des parens et amys de la fille qui lauoit enchargee dudit cas come dautres gens illec suruenans: qui l'appelloient papelart et ypocrîte.

This translator also wished to emphasize the degree of her asceticism, for not only is the length of her penance increased from three to four years, but this figure appears twice.

Her penance is qualified as austere, and her suffering is heightened by her inedia and

---

218 Naghel, p. 176.
219 Clugnet, p. 151.
220 Clugnet, p. 157.
221 Lyon 1486; see Appendix 2.5, p. 395.
worsened by the insults of the friends and family of the innkeeper’s daughter. The
translator wished to milk the situation for all the drama of which it was capable.

Caxton’s Middle English translation follows the French closely but expands the
reader’s sympathy for the saint by explaining that the girl had lied. He thus glosses “la
fille qui lauoit enchargee dudit cas”: “in whych tyme she endured not oonly grete
indigences but also many rebukes annd shames as well of the parentes and frendes of the
daughter which hadde leyde to hym þe sayd cas, as of other folk thyder comynge whyche
called her paperlard and ypocryte.”

These oddities were clearly the result of the French translator’s wish to heighten
the drama. The other translation done from a printed Latin incunable shows no such
deviations. In Gonzalo Garcia de Santa Maria’s Castilian translation, Marina does
penance for four years. This suggests that there was an incunable printing with this
figure. An examination of these editions shows that while the 1476 Brussels and the 1477
Cologne editions had three years, following the tradition of the medieval manuscripts, the
1478 Nuremberg Koberger edition changed this number to four. In any case, Gonzalo did
not try to raise the stakes in the same way but was content to follow the printed incunable
text:

e ella no confesso a hombre del mundo su secreto: mas fue e lanzo se ante las
puertas del monesterio. E yazia sobre la tierra atormentando se con penitencia
como si ella lo houiesse cometido e pedia a los frayles que entrauan que le diessen
vn bocado de pan. E faziendo esto quatro años no se partio delas puertas del
monesterio.”

222 Fol. 61va.
223 Salamanca 1498, fol. 57ra. Appendix 2.6 p. 401.
He retains the description of the small amount of food—a mouthful—in his translation and also underlines her commitment to keeping her secret by expanding “nulli unquam confessa est to no confesso a hombre del mundo rather than no confesso a ninguno.”

*Marina raises the child*

After three years of penance we move to the next stage of the Life. At this point, the child of the innkeeper’s daughter had been weaned, and the innkeeper’s wife brought the boy to Marinus and asked him to take care of his son. Marinus took up the child as if it were his own and, we are told somewhat implausibly, nourished both the child and himself on the daily mouthful of bread for another two years.\(^{224}\) Here, too, an examination of the Latin manuscript and incunable tradition shows that the text was stable with no significant variations.

Compared to the Latin source, Cavalca’s translation deviates by sketching the character of both the girl and her mother so that the hostility of the reader toward them can be sharpened and they become recognizable persons rather than the cardboard cutouts of the Latin text, who are devoid of personality. Thus where the Latin simply states “pandocis uero filia peperit filium masculum et ablactauit eum et adduxit eum mater puellae ad marinum,” Cavalca’s rendering not only gives a sense of the passing of time, but it also makes sure that the reader feels the appropriate condemnation of the girl by referring to her as a wretch: “E venedo l tempo del parto di quella misera, partuiritte un figliulo maschio.”\(^{225}\) In addition, he describes the manner in which the mother spoke

\(^{224}\) Appendix 2.2, p. 370.

\(^{225}\) Appendix 2.4, p. 389.
when she handed over the boy to Marinus as full of pride: “e dissel con grande orghoglio.”

Why did Cavalca do this? It was not simply to imbue the characters with a sense of personality. He also wished to contrast the mother’s sin of pride, a quality that frankly does not make much sense, with the humility of the saint. The Latin simply has her taking up the boy as though it were her own son and feeding him from the same daily mouthful of bread for two years. Although the text does not spell this out, the implication is that the bulk of the bread was given to the child, which meant that the saint’s own intake of food must have dwindled almost to nothing. This would have been clear to the monastic reader, who would have admired the selflessness and the tremendous asceticism of the saint. As was the case in describing Marinus’s three years of penance, Cavalca removes the precision of the Latin and the length of time, for this kind of asceticism was not appropriate for his lay readers to attempt to emulate. He uses precisely the same strategy he employed previously. He adds the adverb humbly to describe her behavior, and discusses her nourishment in vague terms that remove all notions of extreme ascetic denial: “E quella lo ricevette humilemente e di quella limosina ch avea alla porta lo notrichoe.”226 This creates the illusion of sufficiency not just for the growing child but also for her. In so doing, he kept the focus on the saint rather than on the child. A layperson reading a literal translation might be distracted by concerns for the child’s nourishment and might also feel hostility for the monks, who could not be concerned enough about the child at the door to make sure that it was properly fed. By being vague

226 Ibid.
about her nutrition, Cavalca also presented the monks in a more compassionate light and averted any potential hostility the lay reader might feel toward their lack of compassion.

The German translator does not try to flesh out the personalities of the girl and her mother. He uses indirect speech to describe the child being sent to Marinus and omits mention of the mother. He does, however, make her take up the child lovingly rather than humbly and feed him on the alms (rather than the mouthful) she received daily: “Das kint enpfienge die maget lieblich vnd zohe es mit dem almusen zwey jare vor der porte.”

Petrus Naghel, following the Latin text very closely, has the mother bring the boy to Marinus and hand him over: “Bruer Marijn, sich, voedde dijn kint.” He too, however, deviates somewhat from the Latin by referring not to a mouthful of bread but to the vaguer “alms of bread” (“datmen hare ene aelmoesenne broots gave”) when she was ejected from the monastery.

The medieval French translations do not limn the portraits of the girl and her mother. MS Français 1038 and 422 both refer to alms rather than the single mouthful, thus mitigating her asceticism. MS 23117 refers to “un piece de pain.” All three discuss the length of time. The 1486 Lyon translation, after following the Latin in describing the weaning and the handing over of the boy by his grandmother, deviates somewhat from the 1478 Koberger Latin edition in describing Marinus’ reaction. We read that she took up the boy benignly and fed him on what was given to him for the honor of God. This translator wished to emphasize the theological resonance of almsgiving and at the same time not draw too much attention to her asceticism: “Elle le receut benignement. et durant

---

227 AVP, p. 360.
228 Naghel, p. 176.
deux ans elle le nourrit doulcement de ce quon luy donnoit pour lonneur de dieu.”

One oddity of this translation is that it has the girl rather than her mother bring the boy to Marinus. Caxton follows this reading without introducing any changes. Gonzalo also appears to have missed the words *mater puellae*, for he has the girl bring the child to Marinus. This suggests that both of these were using a printed edition that lacked these words, but I have not been able to track down this edition. However, Gonzalo, who also has the girl bring the boy to the saint, does not use an adverb to describe how the saint took up the child. This suggests that this was an addition of the French translator and that they both used the same Latin edition (prior to 1486) in which the phrase was missing. The Spanish is as follows:

\[
\text{e la fija de pandocio pario vn fijo: e crio le: e truxo le consigo y puso le delante del monesterio: e deziale: ahe fray marino cria tu fijo: e dexo le ende: e fue se: e esta santa virgen recibiendo le como propio fijo: de aquel çatico de pan que le dauan los que entrauan en el monesterio: mantenia el fijo ageno: e esto fizo otros dos años.}
\]

Gonzalo makes no attempt to soften the asceticism of the text and thus uses the word *çatico* (sliver) to describe her nourishment. Of all the translators, he sets the greatest store in fidelity to the original.

The fifteenth-century Italian translations, while lacking Cavalca’s rendering, nonetheless show some variety of their own. Canon. It. 259 has the innkeeper bring the child to the saint and preserves the asceticism of the Latin text:

\[
\text{Quela fiola de pandochio parturj vno fiollo elqual deslatato fo portato per pandochio al monesterio elqual lo presente a frate Marino dizendo tuo figlio}
\]

\[229\] Appendix 2.5, p. 395.
\[230\] One of the twelfth-century manuscripts, BN Lat. 5573, omits the words *mater puellae*. Clugent, p. 373.
\[231\] Appendix 2.6, p. 401.
nodrigalo como saj sancta Marino rezeue quel fiolo chome sel fose suo et de quel poco pane che ogni di li ueniua dato da quelj che intrauanno et insiuano del monestiero el nudrigaua con gran pacienza do annj.232

In Magliabecchiana XXXVIII.66, not only is it the girl who brings her child to Marinus, but she explains that it is now his turn to look after it:

La figla di pandocchio parturi uno fanciullo maschio e alcuno tempo lo lacto e poi lo porto a marino e disse frate marino tu sai che questo fanciullo e tuo io non intendo di piu notricarelo e percio tello do e notricalo tu come a te piace ella benignamente lo riceuecte e tenealo con seche e di quella fecta del pane che riceuea da frati notricaua laltrui figluolo e cosi fece tre anni.233

In both these cases, the translators do not attempt to flesh out the other characters or to tone down the asceticism of the saint. They do, however, round out the character of the saint. In the first case, we are told that she nourished the child with great patience, and in the second case, we read that she received the child benignly. They were not interested in drawing a sharp contrast between the saint and the innkeeper’s family by using the preacher’s schema of virtues (humility) and vices (pride) in the way that Cavalca did.

Marina’s Re-entry into the Monastery

The brethren observed this and after two years were moved to pity, and by their importunings forced the abbot to readmit Marinus to the monastery to do official penance. The abbot called Marinus and told him that he would be readmitted and that as penance for his sin he would have to do all the cleaning—toilets, shoes, general sweeping—in the monastery. Marinus entered and did all these things cheerfully.234

232 Fol. 152r
233 Fol. 121r
234 See Appendix 2.2, p. 372
Cavalca’s rendering of the feelings of the brethren reveals how the values of the pulpit infused his approach to translation. There is a great divergence between the Latin and his text. A look at the manuscript and the incunable tradition shows the text to be stable at this point: “Postmodum uidentes eam fratres misericordia conpuncti ingressi sunt ad abbatem rogare eum ceperunt ut eum recipi eret in penitentia in monasterium dicentes abbati.”

Here the emphasis is on the sense of pity felt by the monks for Marinus. There is no great sense either of the time that has elapsed or of what it was precisely that made them change their minds. Since the virtues Cavalca wished to stress were absent from the text, he simply added them into a narrative that created the sense of a story unfolding over time:

Esendo stato chosie alquanti anni con molta patientia e humilta, alquanti frati del ditto monasterio, considerando la sua penitentia grande e humilita, commossi a ppietade, se n’ andonno dinanssi all’ abate e dissenoli.

In this version, one has a much greater sense of the passage of time. There is the explicit mention of a number of years as opposed to the vaguer expression “after some time” (*postmodum*), whose length is undefined. This has the effect of stretching out the temporal sense so that the focus is shifted from the moment when the monks feel pity to the long period during which the saint had displayed the qualities of patience, humility, and performed great penance. Cavalca makes explicit for his lay audience precisely what it was that went into the change of heart felt by the monks. He did so in terms that they would understand and in terms of a model that they themselves could follow in their own penitential practices.

---

235 Appendix 2.2, p. 372.
236 Appendix 2.4, p. 389
The importance of the virtue of humility, which combated the vice of pride, “superbia radix omnium malorum,” was so great that Cavalca mentioned it twice. Coupled with the use of *humilemente*, it reinforced the sense that the salient virtue of the saint was her humility. This, rather than asceticism, was a quality that laypeople could be encouraged to emulate without any dangerous repercussions. In second place was patience, which in turn combated the vice of ire. Their appearance in proximity to each other is a reflection of the influence of Peraldus, who in his treatment of the vices grouped pride, anger, and envy together as sins against one’s neighbor. The contrary virtues to extirpate the first two were humility and patience.

There is nothing similar to this in either the German or the Dutch translation. Of the French translations considered, MS Français 23117 refers to her patience as the reason why the monks felt mercy. The translator of the French incunable also mentions both qualities but pays equal attention to the feelings of the monks and the abbot:

Les religieux voyans sa grande pacience et humilite meuz dune grande pitie et compassion supplierent a labbe quil luy pleust en preferant misericorde a rigueur de iustice rappeller (sic) frere marin: ce quil ne vouloit aucunement faire. ayant tousiours contre luy merueilleuse indignacion a cause dudit cas.\(^{237}\)

This translator also raises the emotional quotient, but it does not appear that his emphases are linked to homiletic schemes in the way that Cavalca’s are. Caxton follows the French text without making any alterations. Gonzalo, as usual, follows the Latin closely. The two fifteenth-century Italian translations also do not show Cavalca’s changes.

When the monks spoke to the abbot, they pointed out that Marinus had stayed for five years at the gate without leaving and that the abbot should receive him in penance:

\(^{237}\) Appendix 2.5, p. 395.
“Suscipe eum in penitentia sicut dominus noster ihesus Christus precepit.” This sentence is stable in both the manuscript and incunable tradition. Cavalca expands this in a way that emphasizes that penance that follows self-humiliation and the recognition of guilt will be met with a merciful response. Once again Cavalca shows his lay readers the intermediate steps of the internal processes that the Latin text had elided: “unde ti preghiamo poich’ elli e tanto humiliato e cognosce cosi bem la sua corpa, che tu li facci misericordia, segondoche Cristo fa e comanda di fare al peccatore che ssi humili e chognosce.”

Thus the abbot’s relation to Marinus in Cavalca’s account is made to stand in for the relation between the confessor and the lay penitent in the confessional. The proper attitude for the penitent is one of self-abasement coupled with a clear-eyed self-scrutiny and a full confession of faults. When these elements are all present, mercy prevails. Thus Cavalca emphasizes the positive, indeed optimistic, aspects of the late medieval penitential system. Such a glossing of the Latin text is absent in the German and the Dutch translations, as well as in the two French translations found in MSS Français 1038 and 422. Français 23117 bizarrely has the monks quoting from the Sermon on the Mount but attributes the words quoted to the Apostle Paul. In this case, however, their rhetoric is aimed at convincing the abbot to show mercy by quoting Scripture rather than presenting a model of the workings of the penitential system. This is absent in the 1486 French incunable translation and, consequently, also in Caxton. It is also absent in Gonzalo’s Castilian translation. The later Italian translations also do not take this opportunity to model the confessional. Canon. It 259 summarizes the conversation in indirect speech, as does Magliabechiana XXXVIII.66.

\[238\] Appendix 2.4, p. 390.
In the abbot’s speech, in which he enjoined penance upon Marinus, the Latin text simply made the connection between sin (having a child out of wedlock) and the necessity of penance: “unde oportet te penitere—graue enim peccatum fecisti.”\textsuperscript{239} This is reported with minor variations in the manuscripts and incunables, none of which change the meaning. Cavalca used his translation, once again, to drive home the constituent parts of the erasure of sin in the penitential system—self-knowledge and recognition of guilt as well as voluntary suffering in order to receive mercy and remove the consequences of sin:

Cogniosce la corpora tua e pensati che si gram peccato e scandallo ai fatto che bizogno e che, se tu ne voi misericordia, facci grave penetentia.\textsuperscript{240}

Cavalca presented harsh penance as the prerequisite for mercy, but the ambiguous way in which he talks about penance verges on the principle of ex opere operato, whereby mercy is seen as the guaranteed outcome of performing penance. Cavalca was certainly aware that God’s grace could not be taken for granted, but he was not interested in presenting the penitential system and God’s mercy as subject to the possibility of caprice that is the corollary of a belief in God’s absolute freedom. The ambiguity allowed him to present penance in a way that was most likely to be psychologically appealing to his lay readers even if a theologian might quibble at the implied guarantee of mercy. Such a presentation is not found in any of the other vernacular translations. The German elides any mention of the sin and only talks of hard penance: “Das must du hertiglich büszen.” The Dutch follows the Latin. The French translation in MS 1038 does not explicitly use the vocabulary of penance but rather refers to always being in a state of great humility: “Si pensez de bien feire, et soiez toriourz mes en grant humilite.”\textsuperscript{241} This reading is taken

\textsuperscript{239} Appendix 2.2, p. 371.
\textsuperscript{240} Appendix 2.4, p. 395.
\textsuperscript{241} Clugnet, p. 152.
up in MS Français 422. MS Français 23117 follows the Latin at first in linking Marina’s sin and the need for penance but then has an addition about the utility of penance that goes considerably beyond Cavalca: “car par penitence faite gaaigne on le regne du ciel et le salut de lame, car il est ecrit que Dieu et li angle ont greignon ioie dun pecheur qui se conuertit que de iiijxx et xix iustes que nont mestier de penitance et ailleurs dist on que Dieu sesoist plust de lame du desespere que de celle qui onques ne fu perdue.” The translator of Lyons 1486 did not link sin and penance in the same way as the Latin text. He was more concerned with depicting a harsh punishment to increase our sympathy for the saint. Thus the abbot readmitted Marinus and the child, but they were to be treated as strangers in the monastery. Nor was Marinus allowed to speak to the other monks. Where Cavalca used the opportunity to instill the components of and the correct sequence of the parts of penance, this translator wished to emphasize the saint’s patience by ratcheting up the unjust punishments inflicted on her. This was the picture that Caxton presented to his Middle English readers. Gonzalo’s Castilian translation follows the Latin in linking the necessity of penance to her grave sin.

*Marina’s Death*

Marinus performed all the tasks assigned to her with a cheerful demeanor but died soon after. When informed, the abbot interpreted this early death as a sign that the sin was so great as to not merit penance. He therefore instructed the monks to bury Marinus far away from the monastery. When they were about to wash the body in preparation for burial, they saw that it was a woman’s body and were astonished and alarmed at having

\footnotesize

242 Clugnet, p. 158.
243 Appendix 2.5, p. 295.
244 Appendix 2.6, p. 401
inflicted such harsh treatment on her. Urged for the third time by the monks, the abbot came to look and upon lifting the shroud saw that Marinus was a woman. Overcome with remorse and fearing divine retribution for the unjust punishment, the abbot begged the saint for forgiveness and ordered that her body be placed in the church.

In this section, Cavalca made a number of small changes that rendered the Latin text more familiar to a lay reader in the vernacular than a literal translation would have been. Thus, for instance, the death of the saint in the Latin text was described so: "Contigit autem eam intra paucos dies dormire in domino." Cavalca added a homely expression that the layperson would have been familiar with: "infra poghi di, chome piacque a Dio passoe di questa vita." This phrase, which at its root referred to the inscrutable workings of a divine providence, was part of the common speech of fourteenth-century Tuscany. Thus Villani, in the seventh book of his Chronicle, refers to the loss by Pisa in a battle with Genoa: "Alla fine, come piacque a dio, i Genovesi furono vincitori e’ Pisani furono sconfitti." By using this phrase, Cavalca not only stopped any speculation as to why the saint met an early death, but he also used a current expression that was part of the reader’s normal spoken speech. The phrase also emphasized God’s continuous action in the world, even if the divine reason could not always be understood by humans.

This sense of personalizing the divinity is also visible in the way Cavalca translated the abbot’s interpretation of Marinus’s death. The abbot said to the monks, "Videte quale peccatum fuit quia nec penitentiam agere meruit." Already in late

---

245 Appendix 2.4, p. 391.
246 Appendix 2.2, p. 372.
antiquity such a notion, to the extent that it was ever particularly current, was dubious at best, for it implied that there were sins of such magnitude that they were not susceptible to penance. The Lives of reformed prostitutes, such as Pelagia the Penitent, Thais, Mary the Niece of Abraham, and sexually incontinent women such as Mary of Egypt, all showed that no matter what their past, sincere penance could wipe the slates clean. Cavalca was well familiar with these other stories from the *Vitas partum*, and these were all companion texts that he translated and assembled in book IV of the *VSP*. For this reason, he was loath to translate the Latin literally, since it conveyed a message radically at odds with the understanding of penance promulgated in the late medieval pulpit. For this reason, Cavalca translated the sentence in an ambiguous way that shifted the reason for the incomplete penance from the magnitude of the sin to God’s inscrutable will: “Or vedete che si gram peccato a stato quel di costui che dio noll a volsuto ricevere a penetentia.” This formulation preserved some of the sense of the Latin but subordinated it to the notion that penance, the chance to make amends, was a boon, a freely given gift from God. It is also possible that the wording of the phrase—“dio noll a volsuto ricevere a penetentia” —referred to an intertext hovering in the background. This was Psalm 116:15: “Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.” Cavalca’s choice can be contrasted with that of the literal translator of Magliabechiana XXXVIII.66: “uedete frati che grande pechhato fece che non merito di fare la penitentia.”

---

247 Ibid.
248 Fol. 121r
The abbot then gave instructions for Marinus to be buried far from the monastery:

“Sed tamen iste lavate eum et sepelite eum longe a monasterio.” Cavalca’s translation softens the profile of the abbot by making the decision to give the sinful monk burial an act of mercy. He also makes it clear to the lay reader, in a way that the Magliabecchiana translator did not, that the point at issue was not so much the distance from the monastery but rather the physical and symbolic separation of Marinus from the other dead monks in the monastic graveyard. Compare “ma tuctauolta andate gouernatelo e lauatelo e sopellitelo dilungi dal monistero” in the former with Cavalca’s “Tuttavia andate e per misericordia lo sopellite, ma non colli altri frati e dilungi dal monestero.” The incomplete penance meant that Marinus could not be part of the community of other deceased monks who had not died in a state of sin. Thus he translated not just between languages but between the world of monks and the world of the laity. Cavalca’s translation explains monastic customs and practices that would otherwise be mysterious.

This concern to explain an unfamiliar world is also seen in the way he translates the manner of discovery of the saint’s sex. The Latin reads, “Euntes autem fratres dum uellent lauare eum agnouerunt quia femina erat.” The Magliabecchiana translator renders this “andarono li frati e uolendolo lauare conobbero che era femmina.” The problem with this is that it does not explain where the brethren were going and why they wished to wash the body. Such confusions are avoided by the explanatory information Cavalca provided: “Et andando li frati per soppellillo, volendolo in prima lavare secondo l

---

249 Appendix 2.2, p. 372. The manuscript tradition shows some confusion at this point. Besides lavate, others have levate.
250 Magliabecchiana fol. 121r and Appendix 2.4, p. 391 for Cavalca.
251 Magliabecchiana fol. 121r.
uzansa, trovono ch’ era femmina.”\textsuperscript{252} This translation makes it clear that washing the body prior to burial was a monastic custom.

Similarly, Cavalca’s translation of the monks’ reaction at the discovery, when they shouted and beat their chests, was not simply a function of their astonishment at the discovery of the saint’s way of life and penance but rather more self-serving. The Latin was frankly coy on this point: “et ceperunt omnes uociferare et et tunde[n]tes pectora sua clamabant et dicentes quia talis conuersatio et penitentia sancta inuenta est in ea cuius nullus cognouit misterium et sic ab eis afflicta fuisset.”\textsuperscript{253} This gives the impression that their reaction was at discovering her great secret and her ability to keep her peace despite what they inflicted on her. Cavalca would have none of this, for he turns the coy passive voice of the Latin into the active voice in his translation: “e tutti incomincionno a piangere e a picchiarsi il petto per le niurie e afflitioni che fatte li aveano; e dicieano chotal conversattione e penetentia non f u mai trovata.”\textsuperscript{254} He makes it clear that their reaction was not primarily one of astonishment at her great patience but rather of fear of the impending punishment that would befall them for all the injuries and afflictions they had visited on the saint. Only then does he add their surprise at her way of life and her penance. Thus Cavalca reordered the narrative so that the reactions of the monks were rendered emotionally comprehensible to the lay reader.

After the abbot had been informed and implored the saint not to take revenge on him for actions he took in ignorance of her situation, he ordered the saint’s body to be placed within the church. Cavalca added that he did this “per devotton della gente.” This phrase reflects

\textsuperscript{252} Appendix 2.4, p. 391.
\textsuperscript{253} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{254} Ibid.
Cavalca’s own devotion to the cult of saints, as well as his belief that saints were a common
good belonging to all Christians. It was the abbot’s duty, therefore, to showcase this example of
God’s activity in the world so that all could pay appropriate honor. Churchmen such as the
abbot were therefore supposed to be impresarios of sanctity wherever they came across it.

Sanctity had its corollary concerns about its authenticity. As Pope Gregory had noted,
God could channel miracles through the unjust. *In vivo* miracles were therefore not sufficient to
prove sanctity in the way that postmortem miracles were. The remainder of the Life wraps up
the story of the innkeeper’s daughter, who was possessed by a devil. She came to the
monastery and confessed: “Puella autem arrepta a demonio uenit ad monasterium et
confitebatur crimen quod ei admisserat et de quo concepisset.” Cavalca translated this
in a way that reminded the reader of the sinfulness of the girl and emphasized the
importance of the body of the saint: “E a quella iniqua giovana che llavea infamata e
ditto ch’ era grvida di frate Marino, introe lo demonio addosso e venne al corpo di
Santa Marina, e gridando confessava la sua corpa e chome l’ avea infamato a torto.”
The identity of the father of the child was less important to Cavalca than the
admission that the girl had defamed the saint. Cavalca’s translation was inflected by a
Dominican exempla collection assembled by Arnold of Liège called the *Alphabetum
Narracionum*. The story of Marina is included there under the rubric “Accusacio
frequenter est falsa.” Therefore correcting the false accusation was much more
important than finding out the identity of the soldier.

255 Appendix 2.4, p. 387.
256 Ibid.
Once the reputation of the saint had been restored by the girl’s confession at the body of the saint, the healing miracle that would prove Marina’s sanctity could take place. The Latin simply stated that she was exorcised on the seventh day after Marina’s death: “Septimo quoque die repausationis marine in domino ibi intra oratorium predicta calumniatrix femina liberata est a demonio.”

Here the locus of healing is the oratory. Cavalca’s translation emphasized that the exorcism took place at the body of the saint and not just in the church building. He also added a didactic gloss: “e l septimo giorno dopo la morte di Santa Marina, ad dimostrare dio la sua santità, questa inde-moniata fu libberata al corpo e al sepolcro suo.”

He wanted to make sure that laypeople understood the theological functioning of the cult of saints. The miracle came from God, but the dead body of the saint was its channel.

The occurrence of postmortem miracles was a constitutive proof of sanctity. Cavalca wanted to ensure that the readers understood the correct significance of the miracle as well as its relationship to sanctity. The Magliabechiana translator did not try to make his translation also function as a tutorial in the workings of sanctity. He simply translated the Latin: “la femmina che diede la infamia dicendo che era pregna di lei fu presa dal dimonio e uenne ala chiesa e confessaua lo peccato e dicea di cui auea conceputo. Il vij di dopo la morte di santa marina fu menata quella femmina indemoniata che la falsamente accuso e fu liberata dal demonio.”

The reader of this translator would certainly follow the narrative but would not have a correct understanding of the broader issues of sanctity at play in her world.

---

257 Appendix 2.2, p. 375
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259 fol. 121v.
Cavalca’s translation of the *Liber vitas patrum*, the *Vita dei Santi Padri*, has often been described as a “free translation.” This is technically correct in that it is not a literal or a word-to-word translation. But describing it as free is also shorthand for saying that while one recognizes that it does not follow the Latin, one really has no idea by what rules Cavalca translated. It turns out that the absence of the particular manuscripts he used was not an insurmountable obstacle in analyzing his *methodus interpretandi*. The exploration of the manuscript and incunable edition showed that the text was reasonably stable and that the differences between any particular Latin text and Cavalca’s translation were much greater than the differences between different Latin texts of the Life. The comparison with translations of the Life of Marina into other vernaculars confirmed that the variations of the Latin text were small, for the sources that were used could be reconstructed and shown to be recognizably close to the surviving manuscripts. It also showed that other translators inflected their translations in different ways.

This analysis of the differences between the Latin text and Cavalca’s translation has shown that there was a reason for each of his omissions and expansions. His was a very carefully considered and crafted “pastoral translation.” By this I mean that the translation had to do many different kinds of work that a close translation did not do. The faithful translation aimed at reproducing the source text in the target language as accurately and efficiently as possible. The pastoral translation, on the other hand, aimed instead at ensuring lay comprehension of the unfamiliar world of the source text as well as providing models of behavior that would shape the piety of the reader along the lines promulgated by the preachers from their pulpits. In order to accomplish this Cavalca had
to learn to craft a narrative that would be familiar-sounding to his lay readers. He therefore produced a translation that not only maximized the points of contact between the readers’ experiences and the source text, thus reducing its alterity to the extent that he could, but that also sounded like a human voice speaking. This was surely an important factor in the great popularity of the translation, for it would have held the attention of those who heard it read aloud.

This analysis can also be used to address the question of whether or not Cavalca had assistants helping him with the translation. I believe that this was not the case. The occasional errors pointed out by Delcorno could easily have been made by one man committed to translating a collection of ample dimensions and who used manuscripts that sometimes contradicted each other. The pastoral translation strikes me as so idiosyncratic that it must be personal. This method of translation would be hard to teach, particularly since it involved going against the entire tradition of medieval translations. A comparison of the Latin sources with his translations in the different books should show easily whether the method of translation in the Life of Marina was also evident elsewhere.

Cavalca was a committed and consummate preacher. Trained from an early part of his career in the various artes predicandi, particularly that of Humbert of Romans, he learned to pay particular attention to shaping his message so that it would reach his audience. He approached translation in the same way. If one considers a translator as standing between the text and the audience, the medieval tradition had the translator face the text and keep the audience to his back. Cavalca turned this completely around. His loyalty was not to the source but to his lay audience’s comprehension of it. He therefore felt at ease turning around and facing them. We should not be surprised at the enthusiastic
reception this approach met with, for he was trying to meet his audience at their level, not at the level of the texts he was translating. His success crowded out subsequent translations of the same texts. To the best of my knowledge, none of the fifteenth-century *Vitas patrum* translations made it into print. The early modern editors recognized the superior quality of Cavalca’s pastoral translation and, to the extent that they were aware of the newer translations, ignored them in their decisions about what to print. This is why the VSP had twenty incunable editions and thirty-eight sixteenth-century editions. As a result, Cavalca was still being printed and read two centuries after his death.
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Chapter 3: Cavalca and the Life of Onuphrius

This chapter will establish and analyse Domenico Cavalca’s contribution to the cult of the Egyptian hermit saint Onuphrius. There has been much confusion about his association with this cult and whether or not he was the translator of a vernacular Italian Life of Onuphrius. It will examine three edited versions of this Life, one in Florentine and two in Sicilian, and argue that the unedited version of the Life in the Biblioteca Casanatense 422 (RC) should be attributed to Cavalca and should henceforth be included in the *Vita dei Santi Padri* (VSP). A transcription of this Life is provided as appendix 3.1 to this chapter.

*The Coptic and Greek Lives of Onuphrius*\(^\text{260}\)

Like the majority of the Lives in the *Liber vitas patrum* collection, that of Onuphrius was translated from Greek into Latin. There is some uncertainty as to whether the original version was composed in Greek or Coptic, but both take the form of a travel narrative by a monk named Paphnutius who left his monastery to go into the Egyptian desert to seek out the company of ascetics. The Life is structured in three parts—his departure from his monastery and his journey through the desert, his encounter with Onuphrius, and his return to Egypt after the death of the saint.

The Coptic Life survives in two manuscripts. The first, London, British Library, Oriental 7027 was published and translated by E. A. Wallis Budge.\(^\text{261}\) Tim Vivian has produced an emended translation of this text, as well as a translation of the Life as it


appears in the second manuscript, which is in the Morgan Library. The two manuscripts are dated to AD 1005 and AD 889–90, respectively.

The Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca (BHG) lists eight different versions of the Life by Paphnutius, later versions by Philotheus and Nicholas of Sinai, a homily by Theophanes Cerameus, and three songs by Manuel Phila. Of these, BHG 1379 appears to be the original version, as it is the fullest account of the story and closest to the Coptic Life. In addition, there are two shorter forms of the story. One omits most of the first part of the journey and jumps from Paphnutius’s departure from his monastery straight to the encounter with Onuphrius (BHG 1379e, 1379g). The second omits the first and third parts, concentrating entirely on the encounter with Onuphrius (BHG 1378, 1379m).

An Argument for the Priority of the Coptic Life

In his entry in the Bibliotheca Sanctorum, Joseph-Marie Sauget wondered whether the Life was originally composed in Greek, despite the widespread diffusion of this version. He pointed out the need to clarify the relationship between the Greek versions and those in Coptic, Ge’ez, Armenian, and Arabic. The assumption seems to be that the greater popularity of the Greek Life must be the result of it being the language of the original

---


264 BHG 1378, 1379, 1379c, 1379d, 1379e, 1379f, 1379g, and the fragment 1379k. BHG, pp. 155–157.

265 BHG 1380, 1381, 1382, 1382c. BHG, pp. 157–158.

266 Fagnoni, Volgarizzamenti, p. 29. She notes the absence of any critical editions of the various Greek versions.

267 Ibid., p. 30. Fagnoni notes of the latter that it is not necessarily an epitome of the longest version (n. 19).

recension. I am not in a position to clarify all these relationships, but a curiosity in the Latin tradition suggests that the Coptic was prior to the Greek.

There are two places in the manuscripts translated by Tim Vivian where a date is mentioned—the initial rubric and within the text at the scene of the saint’s death. The rubrics vary slightly, but both refer to the 16th of the Egyptian month of Paone. Morgan MS M.580 has the following:

The Life and Monastic Practice and Ascetical Habits of the Holy Abba Onnophrius the Anchorite who Wandered in the Desert on Account of God, Resting Himself from his Labors on the Sixteenth of Paone. He ascended to Christ Jesus, who Loved Him. In the Peace of God, Amen.269

The rubric of the manuscript in the British Library is less discursive but also includes the date:

The Life and Ascetic Practice of Our Holy Father Abba Onnophrius the Anchorite who was Glorious in Every Way and who Ended his Life on the Sixteenth of Paone in the Peace of God. Bless us. Amen.270

Within the Life, at the point when Onuphrius dies, in both the Morgan and the BL manuscripts, we read, “Now that day was the sixteenth of Paone.”271 The absence of editions of the Greek versions of the Life hampers a more precise exploration of this theme. It is clear, nevertheless, that there were some Greek manuscripts that mentioned the date of the saint’s death and that others left this out. Thus the Greek manuscript from the library of the Dukes of Bavaria, published in Latin translation in the Acta Sanctorum, does not mention this date.272 The date of 11 June is present in BHG 1379h, but it appears

269 Vivian, Life, p. 101
270 Vivian, Histories, p. 145.
271 Vivian, Life, p. 105; Vivian, Histories, p. 158.
272 Cols. 527B–533A. I relied on the Bollandist Conrad Janning’s Latin translation provided in columns 527E–532A.
to be an interpolation in the manuscript, for Halkin puts it in square brackets. In the sixteenth century, Bishop Aloysius Lipomanus (1500–1559) translated the Life into Latin from a metaphrastic Greek manuscript and published it along with the Lives of many other saints. His work as a hagiographical editor was taken up by the Carthusian Laurentius Surius (1522–1578) and republished. In both these editions we read the following: “Ecce enim hodierno die perficio meam administrationem, & abeo in requiem meam vsque in seculum. Erat autem dies sextus quidem decimus Pauen, nonus autem Iunij mensis apud Romanos.” Here the saint’s voice switches to that of the narrator Paphnutius, who interjects with the date. In the fourteenth-century Neapolitan manuscript Morgan M.626 we read: “Ecce enim hodie exeo de hoc ergastulo corporis e uado in requiem meam. Et est dies sextisdecimus mensis paiun qui est dies undecima iunii apud romanos.”

---

273 François Halkin, “Un récit du Moine Paphnuce concernant Saint Onuphre,” in Halkin, ed., Hagiographica Inedita Decem, Corpus Christianorurn. Series Graeca 21 (Turnhout: Brepols; Leuven: University Press, 1989), pp. 77–89. This is based on a twelfth-century manuscript from the Pantocrator monastery at Mount Athos. I am grateful to Nick Marinides for confirming the date in the text. On p. 87 we read, “Ekoimethe de ho hosios pater hemon Onouphrio s mensi Ionio 11” (And our holy father Onuphrius fell asleep on 11 June).

274 Aloysius Lipomanus, Sanctorum priscorum vitae (Venice, 1551–1560). Henceforth Priscorum. The Life appears in volume 6 (Rome, 1558), pp. 53–58, digitized on Google Books. It appears in the month of June but without a date. The metaphrastic origin is noted in the title of this volume: Tomus Sextus Vitarum Sanctorum Priscorum Patrum Quae Instante R.P.D. Aloysio Lipomano, Episcopo VeronensiNunc Primum Ex Simeone Metaphraste Graeco Auctore Latinae Factae Sunt, Ac Per Eundem In Unum Volumen Collectae Cum Solitis Scholis Adversus Praesentium Haereticorum Delirationes. The Bollandists note that the entire Greek Life is contained in Bibliotheca Caesarea, Cod. 34, and that it coincides with the Lipomanus/Surius Latin translation. See AASS col. 520A. Some of the Greek Lives in volume 7 were translated for Lipomanus by Guglielmo Sirleto from manuscripts originally at the abbey of Grottaferrata and which were transferred to the Vatican Library in 1615. See Enrica Follieri, “Niccolò Balducci Traduttore della ‘Vita Nili,’” Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata, n.s. 45 (1991): 263–290.


276 Lipomanus, Priscorum, vol. 6, p. 56; Surius, De probatis, vol. 3, p. 597.

277 New York, Morgan Library, M.626, fol. 87vb.
The presence of the Coptic date in the first place followed by the equivalent date in the Roman calendar was therefore present in the Greek manuscripts used by both the medieval translator and Lipomanus. The order of the dates is significant, as is the explanatory way in which the Roman date is provided. The assumption seems to have been that the readers of the Greek text would not be familiar with the Egyptian calendar and therefore the Roman equivalent must be made clear. In the context of late antique Egypt, Greek speakers used the Egyptian calendar and not the Roman, even as they made use of both Greek and Coptic languages in their daily life—a phenomenon recorded by administrative documents such as the papyri. They were multilingual but not multicalendrical.

The simplest explanation for the presence of the Coptic date in the Greek manuscripts, and consequently in the Latin ones, is that the Life was translated from Coptic into Greek for a broader non-Egyptian Greek-speaking audience. The translator therefore translated the date as it appeared in the Coptic Life and then added the Roman equivalent. Had the audience been Greek speakers within Egypt, this addendum would not have been necessary, since they only used the Egyptian calendar. Given that there were many more Greek speakers in the Eastern Mediterranean than Coptic speakers, this probably explains the wider diffusion of the Greek Life. If, on the other hand, we assume that the Life was translated from Greek into Coptic we run into two problems. The first of these is the calendrical issue discussed above. A Greek-speaking Egyptian would only refer to the Coptic calendar and not the Roman, and a non-Egyptian Greek speaker would

---

278 For multilingualism in Egypt, see the essays in Arietta Papaconstantinou, ed., The Multilingual Experience in Egypt from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010).

279 If, however, a Greek manuscript with only the Coptic date were to be found, then this would suggest that the Life had been written in a Coptic milieu. The dating alone would not support the priority of either the Greek or the Coptic rescension.
not use the Coptic calendar. If, however, we imagine that the hagiographer was a cosmopolitan Egyptian who composed in Greek but considered his target audience to be not just his fellow Greek speakers in Egypt but also the broader oecumene of the eastern Mediterranean, then the absence of the Roman dating in the Coptic manuscripts would still need to be explained. We would then have to assume that the translator into Coptic simply omitted the Roman date as irrelevant to his Coptic audience. This is certainly possible, but the simplest explanation—though not necessarily the correct one—is that the Life was composed in Coptic and subsequently translated into Greek.

The Latin Lives of Onuphrius

Anna Maria Fagnoni notes that only the version by Paphnutius was translated from Greek into Latin.\(^{280}\) There are two different translations. BHL 6334a is presumably the older and includes all three parts of the *Peregrinatio Paphnutii* but lacks a modern edition.\(^{281}\) I therefore provide my transcription of the Life from New York, Morgan Library, MS M.626 in appendix 3.2.\(^{282}\) The Bollandist *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Manuscripta (BHLms)* database lists two manuscripts, of which the older is written in Beneventan script and dated 1076–1125.\(^{283}\) Another version, BHL 6334, which ends with the saint’s death, is a partial copy of 6334a. *BHLms* lists nine copies.\(^{284}\) The second

\(^{280}\) Fagnoni, *Volgarizzamenti*, p. 30

\(^{281}\) *Ibid.* I have not been able to see the preliminary edition in Ileana Bartoli Grecchi’s thesis, *Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta della “Vita” di s. Onofrio* (tesi di laurea discussa presso la Facoltà di Lettere dell’Università degli Studi di Milano, a.a. 1975–76, relatore Alberto Grilli, typescript), pp. 45–99. Fagnoni, *Volgarizzamenti*, p. 31, n. 20. This is based on four manuscripts. However, the BHL number for three of these is 6334 and not 6334a, and the fourth is 6334b. It is probably a preliminary edition of BHL 6334 and not of BHL 6334a *pace* Fagnoni. She was working on a critical edition but so far has not completed it.

\(^{282}\) Appendix 3.2, p. 410. I am grateful to William Voelkle for providing me a CD-ROM of this manuscript and to Anna Maria Fagnoni for categorizing this manuscript as BHL 6334a in an e-mail to me.

\(^{283}\) This is Rome, Vallicelliana, MS VIII. The Life appears on fols. 29v–38r.

\(^{284}\) Fagnoni, *Volgarizzamenti*, p. 31 n. 20. The two earliest manuscripts are both dated between 1076 and 1125. These are Rome Casanatense MS 1408 and Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS 2. Both are in
translation, BHL 6336, focuses primarily on the encounter with Onuphrius, the second part of the Peregrinatio.\footnote{Although Fagnoni claims it focuses exclusively on the second part—“comprende esclusivamente la parte su Onofrio” \textit{Volgarizzamenti}, p. 31)—it includes details from the first part subsequent to Paphnutius’s departure from the monastery.} This is the edition produced by Heribert Rosweyde and reproduced in the \textit{Patrologia Latina}.\footnote{PL 73, cols. 211–20. The PL reproduces the third edition (Antwerp, 1628) of Rosweyde’s \textit{Vitae Patrum sive Historiae Eremeticae Decem Libri}.} Besides these, there are epitomes of the \textit{peregrinatio}: BHL 6335 and 6337.\footnote{For editions, see Fagnoni, \textit{Volgarizzamenti}, p. 31 nn. 23 and 24.} Finally, BHL 6338 substitutes the birth and infancy of the saint for the first part of the peregrinatio and then continues with the encounter with Onuphrius and Paphnutius’s return from Egypt. There is no Greek equivalent for this last redaction. As is the case with the Greek versions, there are no critical editions of the Latin recensions of the Life of Onuphrius.

\textit{The Date and Location of the Latin Translations}

In his article on a rhymed French Life of Onuphrius, J. J. Soons proposed that the cult had come to the West during the time of the crusades, arriving first in Sicily and then passing through Italy to the rest of Latin Christendom.\footnote{J. J. Soons, “La vie de saint Onuphre,” \textit{Neophilologus} 24, no. 3 (1939), pp. 161–178, at p. 162.} This notion is repeated by Martiniano Roncaglia in his entry on the saint in the \textit{Enciclopedia Cattolica} and more recently by Roland Stieglecker.\footnote{Martiniano Roncaglia, “Onofrio,” s.v., \textit{Enciclopedia Cattolica}, vol. 9 (Vatican City: Ente per l’Enciclopedia Cattolica e per il Libro Cattolico, 1952), pp. 134–135. Roland Stieglecker, \textit{Die Renaissance eines Heiligen: Sebastian Brant und Onuphrius Eremita}, Gratia: Bamberger Schriften zur Renaissanceforschung 37 (Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 2001), p. 190.} The dating can, however, be pushed back earlier by an examination of the manuscripts, the earliest of which are written in Beneventan script and associated with the great southern Italian abbey of Monte Cassino.
ONUPHRIUS AND MONTE CASSINO

Monte Cassino MS 143 is one of the “magnificent series of eleven eleventh-century Passionaria still preserved at the abbey.”

Strictly speaking, it is a legendary rather than a passionary, since the former is a type of hagiographical manuscript that includes the Lives of both martyrs and confessors. It contains an epitome of the Life categorized as BHL 6335. This manuscript was dated to the eleventh century by E. A. Lowe and to the middle of that century by Virginia Brown in her list of hands in the second edition. Francis Newton noted from the ex-libris “Sancti benedicti de clia” that it was probably a product of the dependency of the mother house and that it likely dates from the beginning of Abbot Desiderius’s long reign (1058–1087).

More recently, Giulia Orofino has tied this manuscript to four other manuscripts from Monte Cassino—these are MSS 79 and 80 (Gregory’s Moralia in Job), 345 (Rufinus’s translation of Origen’s homilies), and 52 (John Cassian’s Conferences)—based on similarities in handwriting, textual organization, and above all the decoration of the initials. She too dates all five manuscripts to the middle of the eleventh century but suggests that the quality of decoration implies that all five were produced in the scriptorium of the mother house.

---


292 Newton, Scriptorium, p. 361.

MS 52² also bears an ex-libris from Clia.²⁹⁴ MS 52 is a composite manuscript consisting of three different codicological entities bound together. The second unit consists of Cassian’s *Conferences* written in a single hand bound between two much shorter miscellanies.²⁹⁵ It is not certain when the three parts were bound together, but it is only the second manuscript—52²—that bears the ex-libris mark. Five hundred fourteen folios long, it forms the overwhelming bulk of the 544 folio composite manuscript. It also is closely related thematically to the contents of MS 143, and it is not surprising, although no one has noticed this, that they both bear the ex-libris of the dependent priory. For MS 143 is a manuscript of the *Liber vitas patrum* collection of desert literature.

In it the Life and Miracle of Onuphrius is followed by the Life of Anthony, Jerome’s Life of Hilarion, the second chapter of the *Verba Seniorum* (mistakenly attributed to Jerome), the *History of the Monks in Egypt*, as well as a number of other texts translated by Cavalca in book IV of his *VSP*. These include Jerome’s Life of Malchus, the Life of Abraham, the Life of Fursey, the Life of Macarius, and those of Thais, Mary of Egypt, Marina, and Euphrosyna. In addition, there are other Lives, such as those of Melania the Younger and Evagrius the Deacon, and works by Dorotheus of Gaza, John Chrysostom, etc. The bulk of the manuscript consists of the venerable texts of Egyptian monasticism as well as other works by eastern authors translated from Greek rather than monastic works composed originally in Latin in the early Middle Ages and the Carolingian period. Thus we find one of the earliest translations into Latin of a portion of the *Scala Paradisi* of John Climacus, much earlier than that of Angelo

²⁹⁵ 52² is a miscellany of three texts in different hands and occupies fols. 1–30. It is dated to the first half of the eleventh century. See Orofino, *Codici Decorati III*, 52², dated to the middle of the eleventh century, occupies fols. 31–544. 52³, dated to the first half of the eleventh century, is a miscellany of three texts in a single hand. It occupies fols. 545–562.
Similarly, the manuscript contains the earliest translation into Latin of the sixth-century Abbot Dorotheus of Gaza, the Theophilus Legend in the translation of Paul, deacon of Naples, from the third quarter of the ninth century, the Life of Saba in its longer version, the Life of Saint Dositeus, and the oldest Latin version of Gerontius’s Life of Saint Melania. A manuscript containing the oldest Latin translations of multiple Greek texts suggests not only that there was a marked interest in eastern monasticism at Monte Cassino in the first half of the eleventh century, but also that the knowledge of Greek was so limited as to require Latin translations.

Why did these two manuscripts bear the ex-libris of the priory of San Benedetto di Clia? An examination of the Rule of Saint Benedict can help answer this question. Chapter 42 (“Ut post conpletorium nemo loquatur”) impresses on the monks the need for absolute silence in the evening hours after Compline:

Omni tempore silentium debent studere monachi, maxime tamen nocturnis horis. Et ideo omni tempore, sive ieiunii sive prandii: si tempus fuerit prandii, mox surrexerint a cena, sedeant omnes in unum, et legat unus Collationes vel Vitae Patrum aut certe alius quod ædificet audientes, non autem Epitapheum aut Regum, quia infirmis intellectibus non erit utile illa hora hanc Scripturam audire, aliis vero horis legantur. Si autem ieiunii dies fuerit, dicta Vespera, parvo intervallo mox accedant ad lectionem Collationum, ut diximus. Et lectis quattuor aut quinque foliis vel quantum hora permittit, omnibus in unum occurrentibus per hanc moram

---


297 The version in Greek is still at Monte Cassino. This is MS 431 from the end of the tenth century. See Enrica Follieri, “Due Codici Greci gia Casinesi Oggi alla Vaticana,” in Palaeographica, Diplomatica et Archivistica: Studi in Onore di Giulio Battelli, Storia e letteratura 139–140 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1979), vol. 1, pp. 159–221. See p. 173 n. 59 for its connection to MS 143. For a description of MS 431, see Patrizia Danella, I codici greci conservati nell’Archivio di Montecassino (Montecassino: Pubblicazioni Cassinesi, 1999), pp. 39–44.
lectionis, si qui forte in adsignato sibi commisso fuit occupatus, omnes ergo in unum positi conpleant, et exeuntes a Conpletorius nulla sit licentia denuo cuiquam loqui aliquid. Quod si inventus fuerit quisquam praevericarre hanc taciturnitatis regulam, gravi vindictæ subiaceat, excepto si necessitas hospitum supervenerit aut forte abbas alicui aliquid iussisset. Quod tamen et ipsud cum summa gravitate et moderatione honestissima fiat.

Besides citing the need for all monks to be present for Compline and for strict silence to be observed afterward, Benedict enjoins the monks to listen to daily edifying readings either after dinner or after Vespers on a fasting day. He spelled out the two most important texts but did not restrict the monks to these alone. These were Cassian’s *Conferences* and the *Vitas Patrum*.

In chapter 73, the last chapter in the Rule, Benedict discussed the usefulness of three kinds of books in providing good models for monks seeking perfection. Besides the books of the Bible, the teachings of the Holy Catholic Fathers showed how to get to the Creator. Although Benedict did not specify which these were, alongside these he mentioned the *Conferences*, the *Institutes*, and the *Vitas Patrum* along with the Rule of Saint Basil as providing salvific models. These were shame-making readings, in that the monk recognized the distance that separated him from the models in these texts. The shame that he felt would spur him to change himself for the better:

Ceterum ad perfectionem conversationis qui festinat, sunt doctrinæ sanctorum Patrum, quarum observatio perducat hominem ad celsitudinem perfectionis. Quæ enim pagina aut qui sermo divine auctoritatis Veteris ac Novi Testamenti non est rectissima norma vitae humanæ? Aut quis liber sanctorum catholicorum Patrum

---

298 In the most important commentary on the Rule, that of the Carolingian abbot Smaragus of St. Mihiel (c. AD 770–c. AD 826), written after AD 817, he explained what Benedict left unsaid: “he is understood to have been speaking about the homilies of the Fathers, in which we find written plenty of things to edify the hearers.” Idem, *Commentary on the Rule of Saint Benedict*, trans. David Barry (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2007), p. 425. The commentary formerly thought to be by Paul the Deacon, monk of Monte Cassino, is now ascribed to Hildemar of Civate, around AD 850. There is no discussion of the recommended readings in Hildemar’s commentary.

---
hoc non resonat ut recto cursu perveniamus ad Creatorem nostrum? Necnon et Collationes Patrum et Instituta et Vitas eorum, sed et regula sancti Patris nostri Basilii, quid aliud sunt nisi bene viventium et obediendium monachorum instrumenta virtutum? Nobis autem desidiosis et male viventibus atque neglegentibus rubor confusionis est.

In chapter 42 the daily reading was described as edifying. At the end of the Rule, Benedict explained that these were guidebooks showing the path to heaven. A comparison of the edifying readings and the salvific readings shows that only the Conferences and the Vitas Patrum were common to both. We are now in a better position to explain why only two of the five manuscripts that Giulia Orofino identified as closely related ended up at San Benedetto di Clia.

The Priory of San Benedetto di Clia

This priory was probably founded sometime in the early 1020s. There appears to be some confusion as to which abbot made the final decision to found the priory. In the Chronicle of the abbey, written by Leo Marsicanus, the notice about the priory appears at the end of his account of Atenolf’s abbacy (1011–1022), but Leo attributed the building to a monk named Adam who became custos of the mother house under Abbot Desiderius:

Hic Adam quod domnus Leo magister suus una secum inchoaverat, in monte proximo qui Carie adiacet, Clia vocabulo cellam in honore sancti Benedicti construxit necnon et in Cominensi territorio iuxta Melfam fluvium ecclesiam sancti Nazarii, presbytero quodam cui iure hereditario pertinebat sibi concedente, ad usus et necessitates obedientie sue adquisivit, easque nonnullis terrarum possessionibus emptis, diversisque ecclesiasticis ornamentis atque codicibus sufficienter ditavit.
According to Herbert Bloch, this contradicts a notice in the Register that it was built according to Abbot Theobald’s wishes.\(^{299}\) Although Leo was librarian and archivist of the great abbey, he was writing about events that took place before he was born. Therefore if there is an apparent conflict between the Chronicle and the documents in the Register, we should privilege the Register, unless one suspects that the charters are forged. The fact that Leo mentions the founding of the priory at the end of his discussion of Atenolf’s reign, and not in the early part of Theobald’s reign, should not make us assign the founding of the priory to Atenolf.\(^{300}\)

According to Leccisotti’s summaries of the contents of documents in the Register, the first gift of land to the church of San Benedetto di Clia took place in 1006 when Dodatus of Atina gave two pieces of land.\(^{301}\) Bloch suggests that this was a copy or a forgery, and that in conversation with Leccisotti the latter told him that it should be assigned to the 1030s, when a notary named Pietro was active. Bloch also asserts that San Benedetto di Clia did not exist in 1006, but he does not inform us how he knows this or when it was indeed founded.\(^{302}\)

In the absence of stronger evidence that the charter was indeed forged—it was not obviously a copy or a forgery to Leccisotti—we should allow for the possibility that there was a church of some sort that received the gift of Dodatus. This church did not become a priory until a later date. In 1030, John of Saint Germanus offered gifts of land, a barrel,

---


\(^{300}\) As does Giulia Orofino, *Codici Decorati*, vol. 3, p. 12.


\(^{302}\) *MCMA*, p. 312. Bloch says the date (1006, ottobre 7, ind. X., a. VI. Pandolfo, Atina) is in total disorder and belongs in the thirties because the notary was Pietro and there was a notary of that name in the 1030s. I cannot speak to the first, but Pietro is a common enough name that there could have been a notary of that name in 1006.
and some tools in “the monastery of San Benedetto di Clia, which the venerable abbot Lord Theobald had commanded built in Clia.”

We should note the following. There was now a monastery at San Benedetto di Clia, which was the main legal entity receiving gifts. It was a new foundation that came into existence by the wish of Abbot Theobald. The foundation was already in existence in June 1030. Since Theobald reigned from June 1022 to June 1035, the new foundation came into existence between 1022 and 1030.

The first mention of the monk Adam in the registers came in January 1034 when Datus and Dominic sold land to “John, monk and prior of San Benedetto di Clia, cell of San Benedetto di Montecassino, and to Lord Adam, custos of the church of San Benedetto under the regime of Lord Topbaldo, abbot.” Here the language of the charter reflects the vocabulary of the Chronicle. Although it is probably an error to ascribe consistency to charters in this period and to see developments based simply on a comparison of the language, one cannot help the impression that the fledgling priory had come into its own between 1030 and 1034. In 1030 the donor John simply offered land to the new monastery. In 1034 Datus and Dominic sold land to John the prior of the cell and to Adam custos of the mother house. However, on the very same day the same notary Pietro witnessed another sale: “Iurus the son, inhabitant of Chieti, sells to John the monk and prior, with his advocate Genzo, who rules San Benedetto di Clia, cell of San

---

Benedetto of Montecassino, a piece of land.”

Here we come across the prior and his advocate rather than the prior and the *custos* of the mother house. The priory is still identified as a cell of Montecassino. In May of that year the priest Bono “offered to the monastery of San Benedetto di Clia, cell of San Benedetto di Montecassino, where the abbot is the venerable Lord Theobald, a [piece of] land.” This too was notarized by Pietro. In December 1034 “the priest Hildebrand and his advocate sold to John monk and prior of San Benedetto di Clia and to Adam monk and *custos* of San Benedetto di Montecassino, and their advocates, under the rule of abbot Lord Theobald, two pieces of land.” On December 1035, Cresso “offered to the church of San Benedetto di Clia a piece of land.”

Although the language of the last charter is indeed similar to that of 1006, the lack of consistency in the language of the charters should warn us against drawing conclusions about the internal development of the priory and its personnel, for this last charter is laconic both about the administrators of the priory and its relationship to the mother house. The same notary used many different words—*monasterio, cella, chiesa*—to describe the priory, and he did not always use the same formula in every charter. We can conclude only that the surviving charters indicate that the priory had been built by 1030

---

305 Ibid., p. 53, item 1897: “Ioro figlio, abitante di Chieti, vende a Giovanni monaco e preposito, con il suo avvocato Genzo, che regge S. Benedetto di Clia, cella di S. Benedetto di Montecassino, una pezza di terra…”

306 Ibid., p. 53, item 1898: “Il prete Bono, abitante di Atina, offre al monastero di S. Benedetto di Clia, cella di S. Benedetto di Montecassino, ove è abate il venerabile don Teobaldo, una terra…”

307 Ibid., pp 53–54, item 1899: “Il prete Ildeprando…insieme con l’avvocato, vende a Giovanni monaco e preposito di S. Benedetto di Clia e ad Adamo monaco e custode di S. Benedetto di Montecassino, con i loro avvocati, sotto il governo dell’abate don Teobaldo, due pezze di terra…”

308 Ibid., p. 54, item 1900: “Cresso, abitante di Atina, offre alla chiesa di S. Benedetto di Clia una pezza di terra…”
and that 1034 was the year in which there were the largest number—four—of land acquisitions.

Of these, only two charters mention the *custos* Adam. The absence of his name from the other two charters does not, of course, mean that he was not involved. Overseeing the creation of the new priory could easily have been one of the duties assigned to him by Theobald. Leo Marsicanus was therefore not off the mark when he said in the Chronicle that Adam “Clia vocabulo cellam in honore S. Benedicti construxit.” It is most unlikely that the *custos* was the founder of the priory. The final decision to create the priory must have been taken by Abbot Theobald, who then assigned the task of bringing the project to completion to his *custos* Adam. Adam was, therefore, simply the agent, *pace* Bloch, of Abbot Theobald.

It is clear that regardless of Leo’s placement of the notice in the Chronicle toward the end of his section on Atenolf, the priory was a project of Abbot Theobald, and one that saw completion during his reign, with Adam acting as his agent in this matter. Adam was also given the responsibility of supplying the priory—and that of the church of Saint Nazarius (granted to Adam by an unnamed priest)—with land, furnishings, and books. We must now turn to this last item. The Rule of Benedict makes very clear the importance of books for the monastic way of life. It was not possible for a monastic house to follow the Rule without these. And as we have seen, the two books that were given pride of place among the edifying texts for daily reading were Cassian’s *Conferences* and the *Vitas Patrum* collection. The most plausible conclusion we can draw from the ex-libris marks of Saint Benedetto di Clia in MSS 52² and 143 is that these were sent there when the new priory was founded so that the monks in that dependency could
adhere to the Rule. Their dating should therefore be pushed back from the middle of the eleventh century to the period 1022 to 1030. They most probably left the abbey at the time that the new foundation received its first monks.

*Abbot Theobald’s Book List*

There is additional evidence tying the production of these books to Theobald’s abbacy. As Francis Newton has shown, we are in the fortunate position of seeing Leo the chronicler at work, for we have an original document that he used for his description of Theobald’s contributions to improve Monte Cassino. In the Chronicle 2.53 we read that these included liturgical furnishings and adornments, such as silver crosses, bells, relic coverings, and altar facings; buildings, such as two additional small chapels; high walls with two towers; and finally books: “Codices quoque nonnullos quorum hic maxima paupertas usque ad id temporis erat describi precepit quorum nomina indicamus. Augustini de civitate dei partem secundam. Eiusdem de trinitate. Item eiusdem super psalmos divisum in duo volumina. Gregorii Omelias XL. primam partem moralium.”

Newton has shown that Leo used two almost identical book lists at the ends of two manuscripts of Augustine’s *De civitate dei* XI–XXII (MS 28) and *Ennarationes in Psalms* I–LXIX (MS 57). I reproduce here Newton’s transcription of the list from MS 28:

> In nomine domini iesu christi anno dominice incarnationis M.XXIII. Indictione VI. Anno videlicet ordinationissue secundo. Domnus theobaldus reverentissimus abbas, hunc librum de civitate dei, aedito a sancto augustino aepiscopo in hac aecclesia sancti Benedicti, ubi sacratissimum corpus eius humatus est, scribere praecepit cum alios [corr. to aliis] XX [erasure of other numerals?] codices [corr. to codicibus later]. Hi sunt. In primis, omelia [corr. to homelia] quadraginta. Pars
I have argued above that MSS 52\(^2\) and 143 were produced for use at the opening of the new priory of San Benedetto di Clia. As Giulia Orofino has shown, these two manuscripts form part of a group of five that are closely related. Of these five, MS 79 contains the first part of Gregory’s *Moralia*, which is precisely the *pars prima moralium* of this list. In the past, MS 73 has been identified as the manuscript corresponding to this reference in the list, since its association with Theobald is confirmed by a portrait of the abbot presenting the book to Saint Benedict.\(^{310}\) However, if my dating of MSS 52\(^2\) and 143 is correct, then MS 79 could also be a candidate for the *pars prima moralium*. In his description of MS 80, the companion volume to 79 copied by the same scribe and containing the remainder of the *Moralia*, Newton says, “This MS is certainly Desiderian, but it remains true that normally frequent use of such abbreviations is a sign of late Desiderian or Oderisian date. Dating cannot rest on abbreviations alone, or upon a single page of a MS.\(^{311}\)” Redating MSS 79 and 80 to the early Theobaldan scriptorium would require modifying Newton’s theory of a sharp change in scribal practice under Desiderius.

In his book Newton does not discuss MS 345, and he considers MS 52 pre-Desiderian, for he marks it with an asterisk in his index. MS 143 lacks the asterisk, but in his description of the plate he dates it to the opening of Desiderius’s rule, despite mentioning that the script is dominated by the Old Angle, shows some reform in word

\(^{309}\) Newton, Scriptorum, p. 20. The text of the list in MS 57 is printed by Giulia Orofino (see n. 53), and there the figure is XXII.


\(^{311}\) Newton, *Scriptorium*, p. 330.
separation, and uses the older Beneventan period (one point and a comma). The absence of any explicit mention of the other four manuscripts is not conclusive, for there were at least twenty-two other manuscripts that were left unnamed in the list. Since eighteen books are named, this list was never meant to be exhaustive. It only included a partial selection of the Fathers, hymnaries, and books on history, geography, liturgy, law, and church order. One can imagine the Theobaldan scriptorium as humming with scribal activity, since this list attests to at least thirty-eight and perhaps as many as forty books produced in the second year of Theobald’s abbacy.

In his discussion of Leo as chronicler, Newton interpreted Leo’s account of book production under Theobald (“Codices quoque nonnullos … describi praecepit quorum nomina indicamus”) as dispassionate: “This statement is certainly to be taken as precisely factual; there is no indication whatsoever that Leo wished to glorify the abbots of his own century by denigrating their predecessors.” This is actually not the case. The reader of the Chronicle is left with the impression that Leo’s account provided the sum total of scriptorial activity under Theobald. Newton noted that Leo had found Jerome’s martyrology and noticed that it had not been included in the list at the end of MS 28. This, of course, is evidence that Leo was a diligent researcher with a methodical mind who imposed order on the list. What Newton has not noticed is that Leo had left out two very important pieces of information in the list. There is no mention in the Chronicle of

---

312 Ibid., p. 361.
313 If there were indeed erasures. This seems likely, as plate 76 shows that there was enough room for the word *codices* to follow the number XX and still not extend into the right margin beyond the word *aedito* in the sixth line of the list. There is an alternative explanation to erasures. If the ungrammatical scribe was not sure of the exact number of unlisted books but knew that it was in the twenties, he could have left room to fill in the correct number at a later point after completing his list of titles. The scribe appears to have done precisely this, for in MS 57 the number is XXII.
the phrase “cum aliis XX codicibus.” In effect, he reported only 51 percent of the list if we assume there were twenty-two unidentified books and we add the martyrology to the eighteen books in the list. The second omission is even more serious. The compiler of the list made it clear in his dating that the list was written down in the second year of Theobald’s abbacy. This can mean either that this was the scriptorial production for a single year, which would be astonishing but not impossible, or that it was a list of books written since he became abbot of Monte Cassino two years previously. If the first case, it would mean that the scriptorium was producing forty books a year. If the second, the rate falls to twenty. Theobald was a captive of the princes of Capua for the last five years of his life, but that still left nine years when he was at Monte Cassino and had the resources to acquire church furnishings, embark on a building program, and have books copied. This means that reliance on the Chronicle has led scholars to considerably underreport the production of Theobald’s scriptorium.

Using the Bollandist database *BHLms* we find some support at least for the dating by examining the manuscript tradition. In BHL 6334, of the nine listed manuscripts, the two earliest are dated 1076–1125. Both are hagiographical manuscripts in Beneventan script: Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MS 1408, and Benevento, Biblioteca Capitulare, MS II. The latter is a hagiographical dictionary for the monastic office from 12 June to 10 August. This manuscript is therefore particularly important, for it appears to be the

---


317 Ibid., p. 122.
earliest witness to a liturgical commemoration of the saint in the West (12 June, in this manuscript). Absent from the Carolingian martyrology of Usuard, Onuphrius was only added to it in G. Molano’s edition of 1568 for 11 June. In 1586 Cesare Baronio placed him in the *Martyrologium Romanum* for 12 June.

The manuscript is mutilated at the beginning, for the Life, which is the first entry in the manuscript, begins at the point where Paphnutius draws the outline of the grave. A comparison of the explicit, which is part of the angel’s speech to Paphnutius after Onuphrius’s death, with the corresponding section in BHL 6334a is instructive. In the latter we read: “et dirigat te in viam pacis”. This wording is identical with that in the Benevento manuscript (except it has the more correct *dirigat* instead of *diriget*). What follows is not “Amen,” but rather “Hec dicens angelus domini recessit ad [sic] me. Exiens autem inde cepi viam contra heremum ambulare antecedente me ille uir qui prius michi apparuit.” We are therefore at the point at which the third part—Paphnutius’s return from the desert—begins. The presence of the “Amen” suggests that the Life in BHL 6334a was too long and that the third part contained too many extraneous details about Paphnutius rather than Onuphrius for use in a liturgical commemoration of the latter. Since the incipits for the two versions are identical, it seems likely that BHL 6334...
was created to fulfill a liturgical need for a shorter version. This was done by ending the Life with the angel’s blessing to Paphnutius and adding the word *Amen*. The third oldest manuscript, dated 1101–1200, is Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MS 1104, also in Beneventan script.

*BHLms* lists two manuscripts for BHL 6334a, the long version of the Life comprising all three parts of the *peregrinatio*. The older, Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, MS VIII, dated 1076–1125, is also in Beneventan script. This is a hagiographical manuscript, a passionary, containing the Lives of about forty saints. The second, dated 1401–1450, Vatican City, B.A.V., Vat. lat. 07672, is a manuscript with a focus on hermits. It consists of the *Liber exhortationum diversorum sanctorum patrum anchoritarum et heremitarum de profectu monachorum*, followed by the Life of Onuphrius and the *Legenda S. Antonii abbatis*. To this should be added New York, one would have greater certainty on this point if there existed editions of both 6334a and 6334, so that one could compare the two and confirm that 6334 simply copies 6334a to the point where the angel leaves after Onuphrius’s death.

The manuscript consists of six fascicles combined into a single codex and is described at Manus online: [http://manus.iccu.sbn.it/opac_SchedaScheda.php?ID=16174](http://manus.iccu.sbn.it/opac_SchedaScheda.php?ID=16174). See also Albert Poncelet, *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecarum Romanarum praeter quam Vaticanae*, Subsidia Hagiographica 9 (Bruxelles, 1909), pp. 251–254. The *Life* takes up the entire fifth fascicle and is incomplete. A search for the explicit at fol. 91vb (“et videt omnem gloriam sanctorum”) in my transcription shows that this was part of the saint’s discussion of the effects of the angelic communion well before his death. If the explicit appears at the very bottom of fol. 91vb, then it is possible either that the Life continued onto the following quire in the codex that housed the original fascicle or that it was never completed and the quire with the incomplete Life was bound with the other five fascicles into the present codex. The latter is perhaps more likely.

The Life occupies fols. 29v–38r. See Poncelet, *op. cit.* (n. 329 above), pp. 329–333, at p. 330, and Anna Maria Giorgetti Vichi and Sergio Mottironi, *Catalogo dei Manoscritti della Biblioteca Vallicelliana*, Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione 1, Indici e Cataloghi, n.s., 7 (Rome: Istituto poligrafico dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, 1961), pp. 145–151. Poncelet matches the incipit to BHL 6335 rather than 6334a, but the difference between the two is that the former has “quadam vero die dum essem” instead of “quadam die cum essem.” The desinit he provides matches that of Morgan M.626, except that this manuscript has “vita eternam” rather than “vita eterna.”

Morgan Library, MS M626, an illuminated manuscript from Naples from the second half of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{326}

The Location of the Translation

The fact that the three earliest manuscripts of BHL 6334 and 6334a are written in Beneventan script and are from the late eleventh century suggests that the translation took place in southern Italy. Fagnoni claims that the characteristics of the language go back much earlier than the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{327} This matter cannot be settled without further research, but the manuscript evidence shows that there was an interest in the hermit saint among Latin clerics in the south of Italy. This is not surprising, as this was the part of Italy where cultural contacts with the Greek-speaking eastern Mediterranean were the strongest. As Walter Berschin notes, in the late ninth and early tenth century Naples emerged as a center for literary culture, and “the Neapolitan translators’ school served, almost without exception, the cult of the saints.”\textsuperscript{328} It was in Naples that a deacon named Paul translated into Latin the Life of Saint Mary of Egypt, a text with which the Life of Onuphrius shares a number of thematic affinities. We therefore do not have to rely on the movements of crusaders as vectors for the transmission of the cult of Onuphrius. From the eight century onward Greek monasticism was a strong presence at Rome, with significant translators such as Anastasius Bibliothecarius working there, and in the later

\textsuperscript{326} For a description, see http://corsair.morganlibrary.org/msdescr/BBM0626.htm.
\textsuperscript{327} “Le caratteristiche della lingua rinviano a un’epoca ben più remota.” Fagnoni, \textit{Volgarizzamenti}, p. 30. She does not provide any philological basis for this claim in her article.
centuries the locus of translations from Greek into Latin moved southward. In the tenth century the Dukes of Campania patronized hagiographical translations.\textsuperscript{329}

\textit{Italy and the Interest in Onuphrius}

If Italy was the birthplace of the Latin Life of Onuphrius, it was also the land that had the most sustained interest in him. Working on the somewhat crude assumption that local and national libraries generally contain manuscripts of national rather than international provenance and thus reflect local scriptorial activity, an analysis of the hagiographic dossier of Onuphrius,\textsuperscript{330} constructed using the Bollandist \textit{BHLms} online database,\textsuperscript{331} reveals that the hagiographical interest in Onuphrius was primarily an Italian affair in the period before the advent of print. The following table shows the BHL number, the number of manuscripts catalogued by the Bollandists prior to 1998 (the date of creation of \textit{BHLms}), and the number in Italian libraries.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
BHL number & Number of mss. per & Number in Italian libraries \\
\hline
6334 & 9 & 9 \\
\hline
6334a & 3 & 3\textsuperscript{332} \\
\hline
6334b & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
6335 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{329} Ibid., p. 171.
\textsuperscript{330} \url{http://bhlms.flr.ucl.ac.be/Nquerysaintrubrique.cfm?code_dossier=Onuphrius&rubrique=Onuphrius\%20e rem\%20in\%20Aegypto}.
\textsuperscript{331} For BHLms, see \textit{Analecta Bollandiana} 116 (1998), pp. 250–252.
\textsuperscript{332} I have included New York, Morgan Library, MS M.626.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Italian Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6335b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6335c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6336</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6336b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6337</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6337d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6338</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (^{333})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6338a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6338b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6338d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onuphrius Textus (s.n.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-five of the twenty-eight manuscripts are in Italian libraries or of Italian provenance. \(^{334}\) This is 89 percent of the manuscripts in the Bollandist database used by BHLms. \(^{335}\)

---

333 I have included Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, MS Aa 96.
334 I have counted New York, Morgan MS M.626 as Italian but not Fulda HLB, MS Aa96.
335 This is the “Légendiers” database created by Michel Trigalet and François De Vriendt with the help of Paul Bertrand and Bénédicte Leigrain under the direction of Guy Philippart. [http://bhlms.fltr.ucl.ac.be/](http://bhlms.fltr.ucl.ac.be/).
The first part describes a sudden crisis that Paphnutius experienced when he began to doubt the salvific efficacy of the coenobitic life, with all the comfort provided by the mutual support among the brethren. He therefore decided to go on a journey to seek out the desert solitaries to observe their physically and psychologically harsher eremitic way of life. Having entered the desert, he saw a cave with a shut door. Calling out and receiving no reply, he entered and saw an old man praying. When he touched the man’s feet, however, the body fell to the ground, and Paphnutius realized that the man had been long dead. Similarly, when he touched the hermit’s garment, made of palm leaves, it crumbled to dust. Paphnutius prayed all night long, and when morning came he divided his habit, wrapped the man in it, and buried him with many prayers while imploring his forgiveness.

He continued his journey for three days and found another cave with a palm tree bearing fruit and a stream of water. In the evening he saw an old man returning with a herd of buffalos. This turned out to be the ascetic Timothy, who also had left his monastery to become a hermit. After living as a hermit and working with his hands in a way that allowed him to give charity to the many who sought him out, he met a woman who claimed she also wished to embrace the ascetic way of life. He brought her to his cave and soon succumbed to sexual temptation. After sixteen months, the thought of the Last Judgment pushed him to abandon the sinful life he had taken up, and he fled into the desert until he came to the cave with the fructiferous palm tree and the stream. After thirty years of prayers and combat with the devil, he was cured of temptation by an angel who removed the putridity from his heart, an indication that his sin of fornication had been forgiven. When Paphnutius asked him whether he could stay with him, Timothy
replied that he would not be able to withstand the temptations of the demons, blessed him, and sent him on his way.

The final section of the first part describes Paphnutius’s own experience of God’s grace when his food ran out. This happened twice. The first time he was simply infused with strength when he felt faint. This allowed him to carry on for four more days, at the end of which he lay down and was close to death. An angel in the form of a very tall man placed his hand on his arm, which gave him the strength to travel for four more days without food. When his strength gave out he prayed, and the man returned and restored his strength. This time, he did not leave him, and the two traveled together for seventeen more days before the encounter with Onuphrius.

This forms the second and central part of Paphnutius’s travel narrative. The sight of Onuphrius initially fills him with fear, for he looks more like a wild beast than a man. His hair was immensely long, white as snow, and covered his body, which was naked except for leaves around his genitals. Paphnutius was so terrified at this sight that he ran up a rocky hill to escape being devoured. But the old man shouted his greeting and reassured him that he was not an evil spirit. Paphnutius descended and sought his blessing as well as his history. Onuphrius, too, had once been a monk. After meditating on the prophet Elijah and John the Baptist, he was moved to ask his brethren whether desert-dwellers were more meritorious in God’s eyes. The answer given to Onuphrius reprises and expands considerably that given to Paphnutius when he asked a similar question at the beginning of the narrative. Onuphrius then decided to go into the desert and live among them. When he left the monastery and entered the desert a column of fire appeared in front of him. Terrified by this, he thought of returning, but the column spoke
to him, saying that he was his guardian angel and then leading him to a cave inhabited by a very old man. This man greeted Onuphrius by name and began to teach him the ways of the solitaries. After some time, he then led him to the place in the desert that had been appointed for Onuphrius and where he lived for the next thirty years. An angel brought him bread and water, and the wild plants growing there were transformed by God’s grace so that they tasted sweeter than honey in his mouth, after a long struggle to master his bodily impulses and after he had placed all his hope in God. The angel brought him communion every Saturday and Sunday, which satisfied both his hunger and thirst, removed all pain, and fortified him against temptation. They then walked to his cave where after prayers the angel brought a loaf of bread. After praying the whole night, Paphnutius noticed that the old man’s face was very pale, and he became frightened. Onuphrius explained that he would die shortly and that Paphnutius had been sent to perform his burial rites. When the latter asks if he can stay on in the desert instead of returning to his monastery, Onuphrius denies him permission, saying that it is Paphnutius’s duty to bear witness and to preach the story of Onuphrius’s life among the monks and people of Egypt. He added that God would remit the sins of any who remembered him in their prayers or made an offering or succored the poor in his name or wrote his Life down.

Onuphrius then prayed to God and blessed Paphnutius, who then observed the death of the saint and the arrival of Christ and his angels to escort his soul to paradise. Afterwards Paphnutius regained his senses, and while he was wondering how he would dig the grave without any tools, two lions appeared and made obeisance to the saint’s body, approaching it with their heads bowed. He then marked the outline of the grave
with his sticks, and the lions, using their paws, made a hole in the ground. Once again Paphnutius divided his garment, wrapped the saint’s body in it, and gave it proper burial. The lions returned home, and the cave collapsed and the palm tree died, thus reinforcing the message that Paphnutius should not stay. His guardian angel then appeared to accompany him on his return journey.

The third part of the narrative describes Paphnutius’s return to the inhabited world. After four days of travel, he came to a beautiful house in a high place. There he met an old man who greeted him by name and recognized him as the one who buried Onuphrius. He was joined by three other elders. These four were dressed in palm leaves and had lived for sixty years in the desert as solitaries without seeing anyone else. They came together every Saturday for the Sunday vigil. They prayed together and found that five freshly-baked loaves had appeared miraculously. Once again Paphnutius’s request that he be allowed to stay with them was denied, and they told him to go to Egypt to bear testimony to the life of Onuphrius. Paphnutius set off once again. After traveling sixty-six miles he found a cave, a fountain, and trees bearing many kinds of fruit. Here he met four youths dressed in sheepskins who told him the story of how they had left their city six years previously, met a solitary who became their teacher and lived with them for a year, and how they had lived on fruit and neither tasted bread nor seen anyone until his arrival. Paphnutius stayed with them for a week and experienced for himself the eucharistic delivery by the angel. Afterward, he returned to Scete and told the brethren what he had seen and heard. They then wrote it down in a book, so that the memory of the saint would be preserved.

---

This is a detail missing from some of the Latin versions.


_Saint Nilus and Monte Cassino_

It is the argument of this section that the translation of the Greek Life of Onuphrius occurred in the circle of Saint Nilus and his Basilian monks when they settled at Monte Cassino in the late ninth century after fleeing the Saracen incursions in southern Italy.

I will first discuss the Byzantine cult of Onuphrius and show that it was present in Italy long before the crusades. Then I will discuss briefly the eremitic tradition in the south of Italy and Nilus’s own experiences. Finally, I will discuss certain unnoticed textual resonances between the Life of Onuphrius and the Life of Nilus, on the one hand, and the brief discussion of the meeting between Nilus and Adalbert of Prague in the Life of the latter.

_The Egyptian Cult of Onuphrius_

The earliest evidence for a cult dedicated to Onuphrius comes from Coptic Egypt. Papyri from the sixth and seventh centuries show that there were churches dedicated to him at Lycopolis (modern day Asyut). An eighth-century fresco from the ancient monastery of Apa Jeremias at Saqqara shows a naked man with long hair and a beard down to his feet with three standing nimbed figures to his left and a smaller man touching the feet of the third and fourth figures. Since the original inscription above the naked man was lost, it was thought to be either Macarius or Onuphrius. However, since the surviving Coptic inscriptions are above each of the four standing figures, and the one above the

---

338 On this monastery, see Cáecilia Wietheger, _Das Jeremias-Kloster zu Saqqara unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Inschriften_ (Altenberge, Germany: Oros, 1992).
339 G. Kaster, “Onuphrius,” in _Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie_, vol. 8 (Rome: Herder, 1976), cols. 84–88, at col. 84. The two are difficult to separate iconographically.
The palm tree is an important part of the story of the hermit, for it provided his nourishment, and this figure is therefore likely to be Onuphrius. It is not an element in the Life of Macarius the Great, who plaited baskets to earn his living. In addition, there is a Coptic inscription on a limestone fragment in this monastery that mentions Onuphrius. The name following his in this inscription is Macarius the Younger. This is additional confirmation that Onuphrius was also venerated in this monastery. Another inscription memorializes a member of the monastery named after the saint who died on 24 July 772. This tells us that the cult of Onuphrius had been well enough established by this date for someone either to have taken the name of the saint upon his profession as a monk (if such was the practice then) or to have been born with that name.

The late tenth-century fresco from the repainting of the second (eighth-century) cathedral at Faras, former capital of Nobatia in the area of Nubia, shows Onuphrius


343 “O God, O Good One...[On]nophris...who went to his rest on the thirtieth day of Epiphi...from Diocletian 488.” See “Coptic Inscriptions” (as above, n. 85), p. 65, inscription no. 213. Note 2 converts the date from the regnal year to 24 July 772.
covered with his own hair and with the date palm that nourished him, according to the
legend. Here the figure of Onuphrius was painted over an earlier image of a holy man.
Above the saint, an inscription in Greek identifies the figure as “The holy father
Onophrius, the just anchorite.” It is not clear whether the earlier figure was that of the
same saint, and which had suffered damage, or whether Onuphrius was a replacement in
the repainting of the cathedral in the last quarter of the tenth century. Given that Faras
lay north of the second cataract of the Nile in Lower Nubia, which was contiguous with
Upper Egypt beyond the Nile’s first cataract, it seems likely that the cult of Onuphrius
was introduced to Nubia from Egypt. Thus we should not be surprised that the earliest
extant depictions of our saint are in the regions bordering Upper Egypt, for it was here
that the saint was believed to have lived.

The Byzantine Cult of Onophrius

The reasons for the spread of the cult outside Egypt are not clear. It seems very
likely that the cult of Onuphrius in Egypt predated the cult in Constantinople, since Egypt
was the land of his birth. It was there, rather than in the Byzantine capital, that it first
found textual, liturgical, and architectural expression. In Constantinople there were two
churches honoring him, but the locations and the dates for these are uncertain. In
addition, the church of Saint Akindinos claimed to have the head of the saint, since the

344 See Kazimierz Michałowski, Faras: Die Kathedrale aus dem Wüstensand (Zürich: Benzinger, 1967),
pp. 152–153, for a description of the wall painting of the saint.
345 For a survey of these paintings, see Derek A. Welsby, The Medieval Kingdoms of Nubia: Pagans,
346 A point made by Tito Orlandi in his entry on the saint in Encyclopedia of the Early Church, vol. 2 (New
thirteenth-century monk Anthony of Novgorod mentioned having seen it in his Pilgrim’s Book.  

If the cult came into existence on the periphery of the empire, it established a firm liturgical foothold in Constantinople, for the saint is given pride of place as the first entry on 12 June in the earliest known recension (H*) of the Synaxarion of Constantinople. Since this recension is dated between 945 and 959 and reflected cults that had been consolidated over time, the cult of Onuphrius must have moved out of Egypt and north to the Byzantine capital sometime during the seventh century, that is, after the earliest papyri from Lycopolis and very likely before the arrival of Arab armies severed Egypt from the Byzantine empire and interrupted relations between Constantinople and the Nile Valley.

The next step involved not just the consolidation of the cult in the Queen City but its subsequent spread within the Byzantine Commonwealth. It is in this context that the cult would have arrived in southern Italy. During the reign of emperor Leo III (717–41), the southern dioceses of Calabria and the Terra d’Otranto were incorporated into the Patriarchate of Constantinople and divided into three provinces under Leo VI (886–

---


This occurred in the wake of the consolidation of Byzantine rule under the governor Nikephoras Phocas. It is therefore not surprising that four of the manuscripts of the C* recension of the Synaxarion of Constantinople, which are manuscripts of Italian provenance, are from Apulia and Lucania. Andrea Luzzi has noted the conservative nature of the liturgy in Byzantine Italy, given that the adoptions of cults into the Synaxarion at Constantinople in the popular recension M* do not seem to have circulated back to Italy. Rather, the Italian manuscripts reflected the early versions of the Synaxarion. Of the seven recensions identified by Delehaye, besides C* with thirteen surviving manuscripts, two others (B* with 5 mss. and F with 2 mss.) also circulated in Italy.

Although the earliest surviving manuscripts are from the eleventh century, it seems likely that the Byzantine provinces of Italy, which were ecclesiastically part of the Patriarchate since the eighth century, would have followed the lead, liturgically speaking, of the capital. And since the formation of the Synaxarion did not introduce a sharp rupture into Byzantine liturgical practice, it seems likely that the cult of Onuphrius was...
celebrated liturgically in the century preceding the formation of the Synaxarion, both at Constantinople and in the rest of the empire. In Luzzi’s article on the earliest recension (H*), in addition to Onuphrius, the following saints were commemorated on 12 June: Antonina, John, Zeno and Trifilius, and Julian. Of these, only Onuphrius and Antonina are present in all five manuscripts. A glance at the table shows that many saints are not represented in all five. This suggests that those who were enjoyed more firmly established cults across the Byzantine empire. Since Onuphrius is in the place of honor for 12 June in all recensions of the Synaxarion, we can be reasonably confident that by the early tenth century the cult of Onuphrius existed in Constantinople as well as in southern Italy.

Traces of this are not hard to find. However, there was a Basilian abbey named Sant’Onofrio near Monteleone in the diocese of Mileto in southern Calabria close to the Tyrrhenian Sea. This had been founded in the tenth century by Sant’Onofrio del Chao (d. 995). The devotion to Onuphrius persisted in this region, for we see that in 1198 Pope Innocent III confirmed the possessions of the abbey of Santa Maria del Patire near Rossano in the northeastern part of Calabria close to the Gulf of Taranto. Among the churches listed was that of Sant’Onofrio in Calonati. Since Innocent referred back to a previous bull of Paschal II (r. 1099–1118), this church existed prior to the twelfth century. Honorius III reconfirmed these possessions in 1216. Further north in the principality of Salerno, in 1018 Abbot Leontius drew up a memoratorium recounting how

---

he had been granted lands by the local count Alfanus and his nephew Landulf to build a church dedicated to Onuphrius. This was the monastery of Sant’Onofrio in Petina in the Val di Diano south of Salerno.\textsuperscript{359} This was a region with rocky caves occupied by hermits; since the \textit{memoratorium} did not mention the construction of housing, it was perhaps because the monks were expected to occupy these caves and form a \textit{laura}, an association of hermits, based on the Eastern model, who lived apart but came together for eucharistic celebrations.\textsuperscript{360}

There is another reason why his cult would have been particularly appealing to religious in Byzantine southern Italy. This had to do with its preferred form of monastic organization—eremitic rather than coenobitic. The hermits lived either in true solitude or in \textit{lauras}. Their numbers were augmented in the ninth century by monks fleeing Saracen incursions into Sicily.\textsuperscript{361} But even before this influx, monks and hermits were so prominent a part of the religious landscape that Jules Gay called Calabria in the tenth century “une nouvelle Thébaide.”\textsuperscript{362} It was into such an eremitical religious landscape, where, as Pierre Batiffol notes, “le moine était alors bien plus souvent ermite,” that Saint Nilus of Rossano was born.\textsuperscript{363}

Saint Nilus the Younger (to distinguish him from Nilus the Sinaite) was born in Rossano in Calabria in 910. According to the Life written by his disciple Bartholomew,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{359} “Et amodo et usque quinque anni completi hecclesia ibi faciamus et edifichemus in onore Sancti Enufri et monacos ad ipsa ecclesia congregemus, et in ipsa ecclesia ibi officiemus et officiare faciamus qualiter meruerit.” Rosanna Alaggio, \textit{Monachesimo e Territorio nel Vallo di Diano (secc. XI–XII)} (Salerno: Laveglia, 2004), pp. 72–73, at p. 72.
\item \textsuperscript{360} Ibíd., p. 61.
\item \textsuperscript{361} Hamilton, “\textit{Orientale lumen},” p. 182.
\item \textsuperscript{363} Battifol, \textit{L’Abbaye de Rossano}, p. xiii. This book focuses on the Basilian abbey of Santa Maria del Patire near Rossano, founded in 1100. Sections I and II of the Introduction sketch the history of pre-Norman southern Italy and its religious institutions.
\end{itemize}
from a young age he enjoyed reading the Lives of the Fathers, such as Anthony, Saba, Hilarion, and others whose pictures he saw painted in the Cathedral of Rossano and whose lives he read with pleasure and penetration. After marrying and having a daughter, at age thirty he entered the monastery of Mercurion on the border of Calabria and Lucania in AD 940 but fled to the monastery of Saint Nazario in the territories of the Lombard princes of Salerno because the Governor of Rossano and the church hierarchy had threatened the monks of Mercurion. There he took the monastic habit and the name Nilus after the fourth-century ascetic Nilus the Sinaite, who had also become a monk after marrying and having children. When the threats ended Nilus the Younger returned to the Mercurion forty days later. After three years he left the monastery and became a hermit in a cave in the mountains. When he had been living as a hermit for about three years he received two men from Rossano—Stephen and George—as disciples. Around 953 the incursions of the Saracens forced him to leave the area and move to another hermitage near Rossano at Saint Adriano. After twenty-five years, during which he declined the bishopric of Rossano, more Saracen raids threatened the area. Invited to Constantinople, he decided instead to move north among Latin Christians whom he felt would honor him less. In 979 he arrived in Capua, where Prince Pandolfo wished to make him archbishop. The prince urged Aligerno, abbot of Montecassino, to offer Nilus a

---

364 The Latin translation in the Greek Life in the Acta Sanctorum omits the part about the pictures. I therefore quote from the Italian translation by Antonio Rocchi, who was archivist at the abbey of Grottaferrata: “Garzoncello tuttavia, amava di leggere le vite dei Santi Padri, vale a dire di Antonio, di Saba e di Ilarione e di altri, le cui immagini erano dipinte nella Cattedrale, vite le quali percorreva con assai piacere e penetrazione.” See http://www.tradizione.oodegr.com/tradizione_index/vitesanti/nilogiovane.htm chapter 1, paragraph 2.
monastery. Aligern acceded to this request and gave Nilus and his sixty disciples the
monastery of Valleluce.\footnote{Here I follow Germano Giovanelli’s account in \textit{Bibliotheca Sanctorum}, vol. 9, cols. 995–1008, at cols. 995–1001.}

\textit{Nilus and Onuphrius}

I would like to propose that the translation of the Greek Life of Onuphrius occurred in the
milieu of the Basilian monks who settled along with Nilus at the monastery of Valleluce.
The epitome of the Life of Onuphrius in MS 143 (BHL 6335) depended on the longer
version (BHL 6334a), as I will demonstrate in a later section. This implies that the longer
version was circulating prior to the copying of MS 143, which I have dated 1022–1030.
There were also dependencies of Monte Cassino dedicated to Onuphrius, as well as other
churches associated with the monks at Valleluce. Before we turn to these I would like to
show the appearance of an unusual theme linking Nilus to Onuphrius that appears both in
the Life of Nilus and in the Life of Adalbert of Prague. This is the theme of the guardian
angel, one that is well developed in the Life of Onuphrius.

In Joseph Duhr’s long entry on angels in the \textit{Dictionnaire de Spiritualité}, section
B is devoted to guardian angels. Although there is no explicit mention of them in the
Bible, Christian belief in these entities goes back to the second-century text the \textit{Shepherd
of Hermas}. Duhr identifies four functions of guardian angels—they protect, provide
support, act as guides, and are our ambassadors to God. The support they provide can
take various forms, but the most unusual form is to provide communion to solitary
ascetics. Duhr provides three examples: a monk named Mark in Sozomen’s \textit{Historia
In the Life of Nilus there is an incident recounted toward the end of chapter 10. Nilus had hurt his foot but nevertheless insisted on making a journey in icy cold weather to succor a fellow monk. His brethren insisted that he cover his feet with some animal skins owing to the ice and the intense cold. On the way, he slipped and hurt himself so badly that he fainted from exhaustion and the loss of blood and thought that he was going to die. Taking a phylactery, which contained a little book of the New Testament, he touched it to his eyes, lips, and chest saying, “Into your hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit.” He then dozed off and fell into a swoon:

And behold, an angel appeared and comforted him while putting something—I know not what—into his mouth, which tasted as sweet as honey. As a result he got up, and feeling himself strengthened, he continued on his way with greater alacrity than before because, on account of the help received from the apparition, the loss of blood had been restored and his fatigue had ended.  

There are two similar passages in the Life of Onuphrius in which an angel appears and heals or strengthens those at the point of death, so that it appears that Nilus’s disciple and hagiographer Bartholomew was intimately familiar with the Life of the fourth-century hermit and that it became a model when he wrote the biography of the tenth-century saint. In the first part of the Life of Onuphrius, the narrator Paphnutius encountered the hermit Timotheus. After committing the sin of fornication with a nun, he decided to leave her in his old cell and flee to the desert to become a solitary. When asked whether it had been difficult at the beginning, Timotheus related that at a certain time he suffered to

366 “Ed ecco apparirgli un angelo che lo confortava, mentre che gli’introduceva nella bocca un non so che di soave come il miele. Quindi incontanente si levò su, e sentendosi corroborato, proseguiva la sua strada più alacremente di prima; perocché al soccorso ricevuto nell’apparizione, gli si era ristagnato il sangue e cessata la spossatezza.” See http://www.tradizione.oodlegr.com/tradizione_index/vitesanti/nilogiovane.htm, chap. 10.
such a great extent that he lay on the ground expecting death. It was then that an angel came and healed him by removing and cleaning his liver:

Factum est autem quodam tempore et eram nimium dolens in interiora corporis mei ut pre doloribus nimijs prostratus in terram finem mortis expectarem. Subito enim astitit mihi quidam vir splendidissimus et nimium decoris tenensque manum meam erexit me a terra dicens. Quid habes frater? Cui respondi... et dixit ad me. Ecce sanus factus es iam deprecare dominum et amplius noli peccare.\(^{367}\)

Here the monk Timothy was expiating his sin of fornication, whereas Nilus had fainted from loss of blood. But in both cases they were lying on the ground expecting death when an angel appeared and healed them—repairing a physical wound in the leg, in the case of Nilus, and cleansing the liver, in the case of Timotheus.

The second instance involved Paphnutius himself. After leaving Timotheus he traveled for two days and came to a cave, where he stayed for two days. He then left, and we are told that at that time he had bread to last fourteen days. When this ran out, he was worried in his spirit but suddenly received strength from God so that he could continue walking four more days. At this point, fatigued by the journey, and by hunger and scarcity, he lay on the ground expecting death. At this point a fearsome angel arrived and placed his hand on Paphnutius’s lips. He immediately received strength and forgot the hunger and scarcity. When his strength gave out again after four more days and nights of travel, once again the angel refreshed him:

Ducebam autem mecum modicos panes et paululum aque, que usque dies quatuordecim suffecere mihi. quo defitiente condolui animo subitoque uirtutem accipiens a deo ambulavi per uiam heremi usque aliorum dierum quatuor spatium. postea uero fatigatus ex itinere et famis inopia spiritus meus defecit in me. prostratusque in terram mortis finem expectabam. Tunc aspexi Et ecce uir

\(^{367}\) Morgan Library, MS M.626, fol. 85vb.
terribilis astitit michi extensaque manu posuit in labiis meis et subito uirtutem accepi ita ut nec fatigarer nec famis inopie memorassem. Surgens autem velotius ambulare cepi contra interiorem heremum. Cumque ambulassem per dies quatuor et noctes totidem et nimium hesitans extendi manus orans et iterum aspiens uidi illum virum priorem venientem ad me. et subito ab eo uirtutem accepi.\(^{368}\)

In the first instance, the similarity to the passage in the Life of Nilus is more marked for the angel refreshes him by touching his mouth. One assumes that in the second instance the angel succoured him in a similar way so that he was able to continue on to meet Onuphrius. He too was led by an angel when he left his monastery to live as a solitary in the desert. He also related a similar story of the difficulties of overcoming temptation. The pain was such that he felt himself close to death. When God saw that he was persevering he sent an angel daily with bread and water so he could survive:

\[\text{Frater mi dilectissime multa temptatio multusque dolor qui desperatus a uta declinabar usque ad mortem. Que adhuc famis inopia sitisque ad iacentis michi in calor solis per diem frigorisque uesperinis per noctibus tristabatur anima mea usque ad mortem et de hijs omnibus mutata est caro mea et omnia interiora mea pessime torquebantur...Sed pius dominus et misericors cum me omnia sustinere uidensque magnam super me tribuit tollerantiam. Nam capilli capitis mei corpus quod nudum erat protexit. Misitque pius dominus angelum suum ferentemque michi cotidie panem ex quo nutrior aquam que sufficit.}\(^{369}\)

Although it is not explicitly stated here that Onuphrius lay on the ground expecting death, one can assume that this was the case. He also mentioned that as a result of his asceticism, wild plants tasted as sweet as honey in his mouth: “Videns autem dominus quod tradissem in eo spem meam dum castigauit iterum misertus est et fuerant michi herbe siluarum duliores melle.\(^{370}\). This is one of half a dozen references to honey in the

\(^{368}\) Morgan, MS M.626, fol. 86ra–rb.  
\(^{369}\) Ibid., fol. 86rb.  
\(^{370}\) Ibid., fol. 87ra–va.
Life of Onuphrius. These form the intertextual references for Bartholomew’s mention of the food given by the angel tasting sweeter than honey in Nilus’s mouth.

There is, however, another hagiographical text that associates Nilus and the notion of the guardian or good angel. This is the Life of Adalbert of Prague. After giving up his diocese in 989, Adalbert and his brother came to Italy en route to Jerusalem. They came to Monte Cassino, where Abbot Manso urged Adalbert to become a monk, supposedly so they would have someone who could consecrate churches as well as priests. Nilus was then living at the Cassinese dependency of Valleluce, and Adalbert went to see him and asked him if he could join his community. Nilus declined, fearing that this would endanger the community at Valleluce by antagonizing Abbot Manso. He told Adalbert to return to Rome and to become a monk at the monastery of Saints Boniface and Alexius. The words put in Nilus’s mouth by Adalbert’s hagiographer refer to the good angel:

Terra autem, quantulacumque est, quam ego et mei mecum incolunt, illorum (i.e. the monks of Monte Cassino) quos tu bene fugis, propria est. Si, quod Deo uolente nimis uellem, una nobiscum cohabitaueris, tollunt ill, que sua sunt. Ego cum caris filiis expellor totus, tu de incerta re plus incertus eris. Quin ymmo accipe patris consilium et unde digressus es, repete Romam urben. Quo cum angelo bono te ducente perueneris.  

This notion of the angel leading the way for someone undertaking a journey to fulfill a pious destiny is one that comes straight from the Life of Onuphrius. It was long believed that the earlier Life of Adalbert had been written in his monastery in Rome. Now, Johannes Fried has shown by examining a manuscript in the archives of Aachen

Cathedral that it was first written in the region Aachen-Liege. The Life was written at the order of the German emperor Otto III soon after the saint’s martyrdom in order to commemorate his holy relative liturgically. Given the prominence of the subject and his royal connections, the fact that it was written so soon after his death based on the input of people who knew him, and that there was nothing at stake in misreporting this part of his encounter with Nilus, the words put in the latter’s mouth are probably very close to what the saint actually said. Thus the Vita Adalberti Prior is perhaps an additional witness to Nilus’s knowledge of the Life of Onuphrius and his use of its theme of a guiding or guardian angel.

ONUPHRIAN CHURCHES

The theory that it was the presence of Saint Nilus at Monte Cassino that led to the translation of the Life of Onuphrius from Greek into Latin finds support in the presence of two churches named for the hermit. These were S. Onufrius de Campo de Melle and S. Honuphrius in S. Elia. The first was founded in the eleventh century by the wish of Abbot Desiderius. There is less information on the second, but it is significant that it was a dependency of the Basilian monks of Valdelay, which was the residence of Saint Nilus when he stayed in the Cassinate, and which stayed Greek after Nilus’s departure in 994 until it was brought back to the Latin rite under Abbot Atenolfo.

---


374 The monks at Monte Cassino changed the reference to them in “quos tu bene fugis” to “quos tu non bene fugis.”
S. Onufrius de Campo de Melle

This church belonged to S. Nicolau de Pica, a dependency of Monte Cassino that became a priory in 1051. Three of its priors subsequently became abbots of the mother house. One of these, Girardus (abbot 1111–1123), acquired around 1072 an existing church named S. Onofrio and its pertinences.\(^{375}\) This was on a slope in a position that made it unsafe from robbers. Desiderius wished to turn it into a monastery,\(^ {376}\) and so Girardus demolished the church and rebuilt it as a monastery dedicated to the “holy confessor of Christ Onuphrius.”\(^ {377}\) This notice tells us two things: first, that there was already an existing church dedicated to that saint; second, that Abbot Desiderius wished to raise the prominence of his cult by converting the church into a monastery even though it meant demolishing the old structure and going to the expense of rebuilding it in expanded form as a monastery. A search in the Chronicle for the saint’s name does not bring up any earlier instances. We may therefore cautiously conclude that the church was built sometime in the eleventh century, after the cult had been introduced to the region by the Basilian monks, and that Onuphrius’s prominence rose as a consequence of Abbot

\(^{375}\) *MCMA*, pp. 399–400.

\(^{376}\) “Pari autem modo unacum Richardo cognomento de Aquila idem consules optulerunt huic loco ecclesiam sancti Onufrii cum pertinentiis suis. Et quoniam locus idem habilis ad construendum monasterium erat, Desiderius cupiens ibidem facere monasterium per Girardum prepositum sancti Nycolai in Pica, qui quintus post eum huius cenobii abbas effectus est, in statum, quo nunc cernitur, erexit.” *Chronica monasterii Casinensis* (Redactio II, cod. C), SS 34, Liber III, Cap. 39.

Desiderius’s devotion to the saint, which resulted in his “promotion” from a church to a monastery dedicated to him.

**S. Honuphrius in S. Elia**

There is not much information about this church. It is known to have been a dependency of Valleluce, as it appears on a list assembled by its prior Hieronymus in 1411.\(^378\) It is mentioned in the will of a priest, Leonardo Infante, that dates from 13 June 1250. He had built the main church—S. Maria la Nuova—of the castrum of S. Elia, and when he died he bequeathed it and its pertinences to Monte Cassino.\(^379\) The church was, however, outside the castrum.\(^380\) According to Marco Lanni, this was one of three churches in the area built by Basilian monks, the other two being the churches of S. Cataldo, also outside the castrum, as well as that of S. Basilio a Caira. It was built on the left bank of the river Rapido in 1146.\(^381\) Thus its absence from the Chronicle is probably due to the fact that it was under the control of Basilian monks at the time of the chronicler and remained so until such time as it came under the control of S. Maria la Nuova, the principal church within the castrum of S. Elia.

The creation of these two churches dedicated to Onuphrius shows that the devotion to the saint in the area around the mother house began in the eleventh century and continued into the fifteenth. That there was a church controlled by the Basilian monks is not so surprising, for it was they who must originally have brought his cult to

---

\(^{378}\) *MCMA*, pp. 722–723.

\(^{379}\) *MCMA*, pp. 197.


Monte Cassino from Calabria. Through their translations of Greek hagiographical and ascetic literature, they introduced the cult of Onuphrius to the Latin monks, who appear to have embraced it with enthusiasm. It is also worth noting the significance of the number of Greek works whose oldest Latin translations all appear in MS 143. What this suggests is that Nilus and his brethren were responsible not only for the copying of Greek manuscripts for the library of Monte Cassino but also for a surge in Greek-to-Latin translations sometime after the beginning of the eleventh century.

THE LITURGICAL COMMEMORATION OF ONUPHRIUS

According to BHLms, the largest number of surviving manuscripts corresponds to the category 6334. This recension ends at the death of Onuphrius and omits Paphnutius’s return to Egypt from the desert. Of the nine manuscripts listed, the three oldest and the bulk of the fourth are written in Beneventan script. This is additional support for the argument that the region around Monte Cassino was the center of the cult of Onuphrius in Italy and that it spread from here to the rest of Latin Christendom. How were these manuscripts used? As is the case with most hagiographical collections, the obvious context was the liturgical one. This is evident in the format of one of the two earliest manuscripts, Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS II. This is a hagiographical lectionary and specifically for the monastic office, since it indicates twelve lessons. It covers feasts from 12 June to 10 August and starts in its present form toward the end of the Life

---

382 I am grateful to Richard Gyug for answering questions about liturgical manuscripts.
383 These are Rome, Casanatanense, MS 1408, and Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS II (both dated 1076–1125); Rome, Casanatense, MS 1104 (dated 1101–1200); and Rome, Vallicelliana, Tomus III (dated 1201–1300, fols. 1–164 of the total 254ff. are in Beneventan script).
of Onuphrius. It has thus lost an unknown number of folios at the beginning of the manuscript and at the end. What is significant, though, is the arrangement according to the feast day, which identifies it as a lectionary. This tells us that the saint rather quickly received liturgical commemoration, and Monte Cassino is the obvious place for the dissemination of the cult within the Latin rite.

In her article on medieval calendars of the Neapolitan church, “A New Beneventan Calendar From Naples: The Lost ‘Kalendarium Tutinianum’ Rediscovered,” Virginia Brown analyzed a manuscript on deposit at the Public and University Library in Geneva and placed it in the context of other medieval sources from southern Italy in the region of Naples. These were of four different categories—Neapolitan sources, Capuan calendars, Beneventan calendars, and Beneventan martyrologies. An analysis of the manuscripts that include Onuphrius shows a variation in the day when his feast was celebrated: 10 June, 11 June, and 12 June. Surprisingly, there is only one source (a Beneventan martyrology) that shows the date of 12 June, which was the date in the Synaxarion of Constantinople, including all of its manuscripts from Byzantine Italy. Three sources had 10 June (two from Naples), but the overwhelming majority—nineteen sources—indicated 11 June as his feast day, according to the following table. Within each of the four categories of sources, I have arranged the manuscripts in chronological order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feast Day</th>
<th>Neapolitan Sources</th>
<th>Capuan Calendars</th>
<th>Beneventan Calendars</th>
<th>Beneventan Martyrologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C 1332</td>
<td>+2 XII/MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the case of the Capuan calendars, Brown was depending on a publication of 1630 that gave descriptions of the manuscripts consulted by the author M. Monaco. Both ii and iii were written “caractere Longobardo,” and the fourth “caractere Romano.” These calendars include the feasts of Thomas Becket, Francis, and Dominic. Since Dominic was the last of these three to be canonized—in 1234—these calendars must be after that date.

The earliest of the Beneventan calendars to include the feast is 10 (= Monte Cassino, MS 230). There has been much dispute over the dating of this manuscript. E. A.
Lowe had dated it to 969–987 based on the Easter tables. In 1991, Francis Newton argued for a redating to 1060, since the same hand had copied Vat. lat. 3784. Brown has followed Newton on this redating. Such a dating would make it an early product of the Desiderian scriptorium. This calendar is particularly interesting, since the feast of Onuphrius has been added on 11 June, after the feast of the apostle Barnabas. Without an examination of this manuscript it is impossible to say anything definitive about the date of the addition. However, the editors of Bibliotheca Casinensis are punctilious about alerting the readers to editorial changes made by manu recentiori, and they do not mention this in their footnote. Since Leo Marsicanus informs us that the church of S. Onuphrius was converted into a monastery at the behest of Desiderius and that the gift by the three laymen was in 1072, Leo was describing events that took place after his entry to Monte Cassino (between 1060 and 1063), and he and Desiderius were close. Taken together, we may conclude that while there was awareness of the hermit saint and probably a cult among the neighboring Basilian monks in the first half of the eleventh century, formal liturgical commemoration began under the reign of Desiderius.

The earliest calendar copied at Monte Cassino in which the feast appears as part of the original text is 4 (= Vat. borg. lat. 211; 1094–1105). This is dated by Newton to

---


387 See the edition of this calendar in Florilegium Casinense, in Bibliotheca Casinensis, vol. 4, p. 367 n. 4: “Festum sequens postea fuit additum.”

388 In the Chronicle, Leo says, “Desiderius “me...suscepit, instruxit, enuirit ac provexit.”” Quoted in Newton, Scriptorium, p. 17 n. 85.
The other calendars are either from the end of the eleventh century or from the twelfth century. It is worth noting that three of the six were copied at Monte Cassino, and that a fourth was either copied there or at the neighboring monastery of Santa Maria de Albaneta. In this calendar Onuphrius is identified not as a hermit but rather as a confessor. The other two were copied at the monastery of Santa Sophia in Benevento, a venerable Lombard foundation. This is not surprising, as there were historically close ties between the two monasteries. In the eighth century, the nunnery attached to the church had been subject to Monte Cassino. It became independent around AD 940 and became a male monastery; Desiderius, scion and heir of a noble family from Benevento, had become a monk there, in the most venerable religious house of his native city. Despite efforts by Monte Cassino to regain control of its former dependency, relations were respectful. It would therefore not be surprising if Santa Sophia followed the lead of Monte Cassino in adopting and disseminating the cult of Onuphrius in calendars copied in its own scriptorium. In 1630 Mario de Vipera reported that the relics of the saint were held in a marble crypt in a church named for him outside the Porta di Calore of Benevento. It is not clear when the relics came to Santa Sophia, but the Chronicon

---


392 Hartmut Hoffmann has argued that its abbot, Gregory, was commemorated in Leo’s calendar. Hoffmann, Der Kalender, p. 135 n. 51.

393 Marius de Vipera, Catalogus sanctorum quos ecclesia Beneuent. duplici ac semidupl. celebrat ritu et aliorum sanctorum Beneventanae civitatis naturalium... Adjecta... brevi ipsius historiae narratione... A Mario de Vipera...selectus (Neapoli: Ex Typographia Lazari Scorigij, 1635), p. 30. The entry is as follows: “IVNII XII./DE SANCTO ONUPHRIO/ANACHORITA./Duplex/ONUPHRIIUS Anachorita in/ vasta
Sanctae Sophiae, completed in 1119, does not mention these. It does mention, however, the acquisition of the monastery of Onuphrius and the church of Saint Michael the Archangel by Santa Sophia. In Archbishop Landulf’s charter of June 1114 confirming the offer of the monastery by its prior Adam, it is noted that Saint Onuphrius not only maintained its own customs but also had the right to elect a prior from its own brethren or from among the monks at Santa Sophia. These terms suggest that even though its prior Adam offered his monastery to Santa Sophia “pro tuitione ac defensione,” thus exchanging independence for greater security, it was an institution of some standing that was able to maintain a modicum of independence from the more venerable monastery in Benevento to which it was becoming subject. If the mention of its goods (ecclesiastical and other, movable and immovable) and people in the charter is not entirely formulaic, this would also imply that the monastery was not an impoverished one but entered the merger dowered with goods, lands, and people.394

Moving to the category of Beneventan martyrologies, once again the earliest witnesses are from the last quarter of the eleventh century. Virginia Brown dated X (= New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 642) to the eleventh–twelfth centuries.

---

394 Jean-Marie Martin, ed., Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae: Cod. Vat. Lat. 4939, 2 vols., Fonti per la storia dell’Italia medievale, Rerum italicarum scriptores 3 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 2000), vol. 2, pp. 693–695. It was confirmed in July by Count Jordan (ibid., pp. 727–728) and was listed as the “heremitarum S. Onufrii de Gualdo Mazocke” in Callixtus II’s confirmation of the possessions of Santa Sophia, 29 November 1120. Ibid, p. 782.
However, the folder notes to this manuscript argue persuasively that it was likely written before 9 May 1087 since there is no mention of the translation of the relics of Saint Nicholas of Bari.\(^{395}\) This feast is present in calendar 7 (= Naples, BNC, MS VI E 43; 1099–1118), which was copied at Santa Sophia and was added into martyrology XIV (= Monte Cassino, MS 149 [XI\(^1\)]), written for the monastery of S. Nicola della Cicogna as well as other twelfth-century martyrologies. If we assume that this was the case, then this is the earliest Beneventan martyrology that contains the feast of Onuphrius. The second earliest is II (= Vat. lat. 4958). Although Brown, following Lowe dated, it circa 1087, Newton dates it no earlier than 1080 and localizes it to Santa Maria di Albaneta.\(^{396}\)

It is equally instructive to examine the sources in which the feast is absent. I have arranged these in chronological order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neapolitan Sources</th>
<th>Capuan Calendars</th>
<th>Beneventan Calendars</th>
<th>Beneventan Martyrologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


As expected, it is generally the case that the sources prior to the late eleventh century lack a mention of the feast. Among Neapolitan sources it is absent in the Kalendarium Marmoreum of the late ninth century. Somewhat more surprising is the absence from later sources from the fourteenth/fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Among the Capuan calendars, it was absent only in i, which was the earliest of the calendars examined by Monaco. This can now be dated, however. Brown noted the absence of Thomas Becket, Francis, and Dominic in this source.\(^{397}\) Since Becket was canonized in 1173, the calendar was compiled prior to that date. However, it does contain the feast of the translation of the relics of Saint Nicholas of Bari, which took place on 9 May 1087. We can therefore date this calendar to after 1087. Since it is present in the four other Capuan calendars, the second of which is dated to circa 1300 (the others are undated in the 1630 publication), it appears that Capuan calendars lagged the Beneventan calendars, to which we must now turn.

It is not surprising that the feast is missing in the earlier Beneventan calendars from the eighth and ninth centuries. What is surprising, however, is the number of calendars copied at Monte Cassino in the period that began in the last quarter and continued into the thirteenth century. Thus the absence of the feast in 12 (= Monte Cassino, MS 444; 1075–90), which was a display manuscript produced in the Desiderian/Oderisian scriptorium, is particularly surprising given the first abbot’s known interest in the saint and that MS 230, which included the feast, is now dated to the 1060s. The same odd omission occurs in 3 (= Vat. urb. lat. 585; 1099–1105) and 20 (= Paris, Mazarine, MS 364; 1099–1105). One possible explanation is that the new abbot Oderisius was a liturgical conservative who disapproved of his predecessor’s innovation of including the feast of Onuphrius, which had traditionally been celebrated in the older calendar, among the others. Newton has already observed some of the changes in the scriptorium—the move toward “miniaturization” in display manuscripts. All three of these manuscripts were fine or display, as opposed to common, manuscripts. Presumably, they would have been subject to more careful scrutiny at every stage of their production. It cannot be a coincidence that the feast is missing from three display manuscripts produced in the scriptorium, two of which are securely dated to the Oderisian period. The dating range of MS 444 should therefore be changed to make it a product of the new abbot’s reign and not that of Desiderius. It should now be dated to 1087–90. Removing it from the Desiderian period would solve the conundrum of the absence of the feast from a display manuscript produced during the rule of an abbot with known devotion to this saint. This still leaves us with the problem of 4 (= Vat. borg. lat. 211; 1094–1105), which was copied during Oderisius’s reign. The calendar here was that of Leo Marsicanus, the
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chronicler, who also supervised the scriptorium. This is not a fine or display manuscript, and it is possible either that Leo had retained the feast out of a sense of loyalty to the abbot who had welcomed him as a monk or that Oderisius’s order to suppress the feast came after the calendar was composed in 1098/99, perhaps even in reaction to Leo’s calendar, which is the first surviving calendar produced during Oderisius’s abbacy. This is perhaps a more likely scenario. The appearance of Leo’s calendar underscored Desiderius’s innovation, and Oderisius ordered Leo to ensure that the calendars in the display manuscripts 3 and 20 were to omit the feast.

If Oderisius had indeed wished to return the liturgical calendar to the form that he had known when he entered Monte Cassino during the seventeen-year reign of Richer (1038–1055), he was not successful in stamping out liturgical commemoration of the saint in the world beyond Monte Cassino. The BHLms shows that manuscripts of BHL 6334, the shortened form of the Vita present in monastic lectionaries such as the aforementioned Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS II, continued to be copied from the twelfth to the fourteenth century. Notice of the saint traveled quickly north of Monte Cassino. Vatican Chigi D.VI.84 is a manuscript from the monastery of San Michele in Camerino, a town in the Marches between Assisi and Macerata. After a glossed text of the Rule of Saint Benedict, an unknown monk added the following list of the founders of monastic life:


On this abbey, see Pierre Bouet et al., eds., Culto e santuari di San Michele nell’Europa medievale = Culte et sanctuaires de saint Michel dans l’Europe médiévale: Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi, Bari, Monte Sant’Angelo, 5–8 aprile 2006 (Bari: Edipuglia, 2007).

This list is a window into the thought-world of an eleventh-century monk. Following the name of John the Baptist is a list of seven Egyptian monastic saints. Our interest is in the first, Paphnutius, for this is the author of the *Peregrinatio Paphnuitii* that contains the *Vita Onuphrii*. There are no versions of the *Peregrinatio* that omit the encounter with Onuphrius, whereas there are versions that concentrate only on the hermit and drop the first and third sections of Paphnutius’s travels. This addition is consequently a precious testimony to the speed with which the *Vita* traveled beyond the Beneventan zone.

In addition to the manuscript evidence, the art-historical evidence supports the hypothesis that Monte Cassino was the center both for the translation of the Life into Latin as well as for the liturgical celebration of the saint in the Latin Church. Although the earliest artistic depiction of Onuphrius in the Anatolian portion of the Byzantine Empire is that in the Snake Church in the Cappadocian monastic complex of the Göreme cave churches, which were painted in the period 900–1200, there do not appear to be any surviving images noted by art historians of the saint in Byzantine Italy from this period.

A search for images of the saint in the four volumes of George Kaftal’s *Saints in Italian Art* indicates that when these do begin to appear they first show up in the area between Monte Cassino and Sicily in the period following the Norman Conquest. A recent article by Valentino Pace, however, notes a surprising concentration of early
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401 See the entry by Angelo Maria Raggi in *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, vol. 9, cols. 26–29.
images in the Abruzzo: from 1159 (Santa Maria del Lago, Moscufo) and 1166 (San Pietro, Cugnoli). These were sculptures on the ambos of two rural churches. The artists who worked on these had worked two years earlier on another ambo in the church of Santa Maria in Valle Porclaneta. This had become a dependency of Monte Cassino in 1080. The church of Santa Maria del Lago had earlier been a Benedictine monastery. It is possible that this was the dependency of Monte Cassino called S. Benedict in Moscufo. If this is the case, then the commission for a second ambo in a different church owned by Monte Cassino in the valley of Pescara from the same artists would make sense. They also worked on the ambo at Cugnoli in the same valley. Cugnoli was not a dependency of the abbey of S. Clemente a Casauria. Therefore, pace Aventin, it is not to that abbey that one must look for the cult of Onuphrius but rather to Monte Cassino. The inscriptions at Moscufo and Cugnoli refer to a patron named Rainaldus. That of Moscufo reads “Rainaldus istius ecclesiae prelatus hoc opus fieri fecit,” while that of Cugnoli reads “Abbas Rainaldus hoc opus fieri fecit.” Evelyn Jamison first suggested that Rainaldus was the same person who was abbot of Monte Cassino from 1137 to 1166 and noted that the mother house owned numerous dependencies in the valley of Pescara. Given the attention paid to Onuphrius at Monte Cassino, it would not be surprising if artists commissioned by the great abbey were instructed to depict the hermit saint.

404 Ibid., p. 302.
The cult of Onuphrius had received a major boost shortly before these commissions when a resuscitation miracle was attributed to him in 1146. The account of this miracle appears on a folio that was written in a different hand and was added immediately after the epitome of his life that is the first text in Monte Cassino, MS 143. A monk named Almundus, who had been an oblate in the monastery of Saint Michael the Archangel (rather tellingly, this was the dependency that Aligern gave to Saint Nilus), was in some other church belonging to Monte Cassino when he died during vespers. Almundus used to celebrate the feast of Onuphrius with great devotion, once he had become a priest. That evening, when the monks began the funerary rituals for Almundus, he shouted at them, asking them to be quiet. Fearing that this outburst was of diabolical origin, they continued their prayers. He in turn shouted more loudly. The monks, astonished, stopped and fell silent. Almundus then informed them that as a result of the saint’s intercession, his illness had been removed. The monks were amazed and asked why he had merited such a gift from the saint. He responded that it was because he

406 The loss of folios immediately after is the reason why the beginning of the Life of Anthony, the next text in our manuscript, is lost.
had tried to cultivate his feast most devotedly. This account is interesting in that it reveals the variety of liturgical practice in the network of churches and dependencies belonging to Monte Cassino. Even though Onuphrius had been added to the calendar after the middle of the eleventh century, probably under Desiderius, it seems that not all churches were celebrating his feast, given the tenor of the questioning of Almundus by the other monks. This reinforces the notion that there might actually have been a conscious removal of the saint from the calendar under Oderisius. The churches named for the saint would of course have continued to celebrate his feast, but perhaps the others would not. It is telling that this miracle did not take place at S. Onofrio de Campo de Melle, for this was not a dependency of Valletuce but rather of the priory of S. Nicolaus de Pica and was promoted from a church to a monastery by the express wish of Desiderius. Nor did it appear to have taken place in one of the dependencies of the monastery of Saint Michael the Archangel at Valletuce, which as I have suggested was the place where the cult was first introduced to Monte Cassino, but rather in another dependency of the mother house in the area of Valletuce. The language is somewhat ambiguous, so one cannot be completely certain on this point.

One should also note the kind of miracle that took place. This was not a miracle of the homely sort, such as the first miracle of Saint Benedict, in which he fixed the broken sieve for his nurse. Nor was it one in which a lost object was found or an illness was cured. To be sure, this was a healing miracle, but not of the ordinary sort. Resuscitating the dead was the greatest of all miracles, and it was this that Onuphrius achieved for Almundus. The only miracle account given a BHL number is this one from Monte Cassino, which supports the idea that his cult began there. News of such a great
miracle would certainly have spread within the greater community of Cassinese monks and would undoubtedly have reached the ears of the abbot. In 1146 this abbot was Rainaldus II. It therefore seems very probable that it was this Rainaldus who was the patron who ordered that the saint be depicted in a privileged place on the ambo at Moscufo, the earlier of the two ambos.\(^{408}\) It is not surprising that in his commission he would wish to honor the saint and perhaps make amends for the suppression of his cult under his predecessor Oderisius, if that is the correct explanation for the absence or failure to incorporate the saint from the calendars in the display manuscripts produced during his abbacy.

The influence of another monastery in this valley should also be taken into account. This was the abbey of S. Bartolomeo in Carpineto, whose calendar, now in the Morgan Library, as we have seen, included the feast of Onuphrius before 1083.\(^{409}\) Thus there were two independent foci for the liturgical commemoration of Onuphrius in the Abruzzo. This was likely the reason why his cult expanded in the thirteenth century, as noted by Jerome Baschet.\(^{410}\)

The first “luxury” image of the saint is in a mosaic in the Norman cathedral of Monreale in Sicily. He appears along with Macarius in an arch separating the left aisle from the presbytery in the sanctuary, an area reserved for clergy. Paphnutius and Hilarion

\(^{408}\) See Aventin, Les ambons, p. 314.
are depicted in the opposite arch.\footnote{See Domenico-Benedetto Gravina, *Il duomo di Monreale, illustrato e riportato in tavole cromolitografiche*, 2 vols. (Palermo: F. Lao, 1859–70), vol. 1, pp. 119, 130, and vol. 2, pls. 2 and 24c; Otto Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily* (London: Routledge & Paul, 1949), p. 121 and pl. 92b; Demus’s four “Holy Hermits” are not mentioned in Eve Borsook’s *Messages in Mosaic: The Royal Programmes of Norman Sicily, 1130–1187*. The best photographs are in *Il duomo di Monreale: Lo splendore dei mosaici* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana; Castel Bolognese: ITACA, 2009), pp. 262–263 for Eunufrius (thus the titulus) and Macarius, pp. 284–285 for Paphnutius and Hilarion. The two other arches closer to the high altar show Paul the Hermit, Eutimius, Zosimus and Saba, Pachomius, and Arsenius. Thus the arches of the four openings into the the choir depicted ten desert fathers. For a plan showing the position of Onuphrius and Macarius, see Ernst Kitzinger, *I mosaici del periodo normanno in Sicilia*, 6 vols. (Palermo: Accademia nazionale di scienze lettere e arti, 1992–2000), vol. 5, pp. 41–42.} The depiction of Onuphrius in this splendidly and lavishly decorated edifice—the mosaics are dated to the 1180s—marks his iconographic “arrival” in monumental decorative schemes in the Latin Church. The next appearance, at the oratory chapel of S. Pellegrino near the monastery of Santa Maria Assunta in Bominaco in the Abruzzi, is also in a cycle—one painted in 1263.\footnote{J. Baschet, *Bominaco*.} His appearance in these monuments is significant, for they reflect a dependence on the Latin *Vita* of the saint and patrons who belonged to the Latin and not the Greek rite.\footnote{Valentino Pace, at the beginning of his article, “Eremiti,” p. 253, points out the lack of surviving images of hermits in southern Italy in the ninth and tenth centuries, despite their frequent appearance in written sources during this time.} Only in the fourteenth century, when vernacular translations began to appear in Tuscan and Sicilian, do we find larger numbers of images in other parts of Italy.\footnote{Kaffal’s volumes on Tuscany, northeastern Italy, and northwestern Italy show no artistic depictions prior to the fourteenth century.} To be sure, I do not wish to tie the appearance of these images solely to vernacular translations, for clerical patrons were not dependent on these in the way that lay patrons were. But the lack of images in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in areas beyond the south suggests that the circulation of the Latin *Vita* was not in itself sufficient to generate images. What appears to have been a prerequisite was liturgical commemoration. In southern Italy, as we have seen, this was already taking place by the end of the eleventh century (as noted, the prior liturgical commemoration in Byzantine southern Italy does not seem to have generated images that
have survived). Once he was part of the Latin liturgy, the political circumstance of
consolidated Norman power, and consequently resources for truly monumental artistic
commissions, resulted in an irony: the saint who dressed in leaves and lived in the most
rigorous asceticism appeared in surroundings that would make a modern-day debutante
pea-green with envy—the shimmering golden jewel box that is the cathedral of
Monreale.

THE LATIN MANUSCRIPT TRADITION

It has been argued above that the artistic depictions of Onuphrius followed the saint’s
inclusion in liturgical celebrations. This meant that there had to be a written Life of the
saint that could be read during the feast day. For Onuphrius, the Latin manuscript
tradition falls into five categories along with their subtypes. Their BHL numbers are
6334, 6335, 6336, 6337, and 6338. The following table, based on BHLms, shows the
number of manuscripts in each category and the date of the earliest manuscript:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BHL</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date of earliest surviving ms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6334</td>
<td>Vita auct. Paphnutio ab(?)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1076–1125/Beneventan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6334a</td>
<td>Vita auct. Paphnutio ab(?)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1076–1125/Beneventan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6334b</td>
<td>Vita auct. Paphnutio ab(?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1401–1500/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6335</td>
<td>Vita auct. Paphnutio ab(?)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000–1030/Beneventan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epitome</td>
<td></td>
<td>My dating of MC 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6335b</td>
<td>Vita auct. Paphnutio ab(?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1401–1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6335c</td>
<td>Vita auct. Paphnutio ab(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13c (addition to legenda aurea)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BHL 6334a: This is the long recension of the Life. *BHLms* only lists two manuscripts—Rome, Vallicelliana VIII, and Vatican City, Vat. lat. 7672. Morgan M.626 should be added as a third witness. Oddly, the description of this manuscript refers to it as an “Epitome vitae s. Onufrii.” The rubric reads “in natali sancti onufrii confessori.” This suggests a liturgical use, but the manuscript is not a lectionary. Since it is, however, a composite manuscript, it is possible that the fascicle was originally part of a lectionary. This is supported by the presence of verses addressed to the saint as a boy: “O gloriose puer, Onufrie.” These were added in a later hand on the blank folios, described somewhat snippily by Albert Poncelet as a “carmen rude.”

---

conservation has prevented any codicological analysis of its constituent parts. The
\emph{desinit} corresponds to that in Morgan M.626.

The second witness, Vat. lat. 7672, is an early fifteenth-century manuscript. It consists primarily of the \textit{Liber exhortationum diversorum sanctorum patrum anacoritarum et heremitarum de profectu monachorum} (301ff). This is followed by the Life of Onuphrius and the \textit{Legenda S. Antonii}. The \emph{desinit} corresponds to that in Morgan M. 626. This manuscript is a witness to the early assimilation of the Life of the saint into the \textit{Vitas patrum} tradition despite the lateness of its translation into Latin.

The third witness, Morgan M.626, is a fourteenth-century manuscript from Naples that contains mainly \textit{Vitas patrum} texts but with some visionary texts originally composed in Latin, such as the \textit{Visio Baronti}, Walafrid Strabo’s \textit{Visio Vettini monachi}, the Life of Fursey, and the \textit{Historia sancti Brendani abbatis}. It contains the full Life of Onuphrius.

The fourth witness is in the fourteenth-century Vatican palat. lat. 866. This is classified as 6334 in \textit{BHLms}, but it is actually the full Life of Onuphrius. This manuscript has Dominican associations, for it consists of Gerald of Fracheto’s \textit{Vitasfratrum ordinis praedicatorum} followed by the Lives of Marie d’Oignies, Amicus and Amelius, Euphrasia, Onuphrius, Malchus, and Eufrosina.

None of these manuscripts is organized by feast, so they are not lectionaries. Rather, they are hagiographical collections for contemplative reading, not liturgical use.

\footnote{See Vichi and Mottironi, \textit{Catalogo}, p. 145.}
\footnote{See Poncelet, \textit{Cat. lat. vat.}, p. 216.}
\footnote{For a description, see \url{http://corsair.morganlibrary.org/msdescr/BBM0626a.pdf}.}
This suggests that when the cult of Onuphrius developed after the translation of the Life into Latin, the long recension was liturgically cumbersome and for this reason does not survive in lectionaries.

**BHL 6334:** As noted earlier, the Life of the saint forms the middle section of the *Peregrinatio Paphnutii*. The first and third sections relate Paphnutius’s journey into the desert and his subsequent return to his monastery after Onuphrius’s death. This full recension is represented by BHL 6334a. It is not surprising that 6334, which ends with the death of the saint, has the largest number of surviving manuscripts. A comparison of the desinit for 6334—“et dirigat te in viam pacis. Amen.”—with the long recension shows that this phrase, without the amen, appears after the death and burial of the saint. From the point of view of the liturgist, Paphnutius’s return to Egypt and the ascetics he met along the way were irrelevant to the liturgical commemoration of Onuphrius. It is therefore not surprising that this version is found in monastic lectionaries, such as the late eleventh-century lectionary Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS II, in which the Lives are arranged according to the liturgical calendar. However, the roughly contemporary manuscript Rome, Casanatense, 1408, also in Beneventan script, is not a lectionary, which suggests that the shorter version enjoyed a wider use than just in the liturgy.

**BHL 6334b:** There is only one manuscript listed in *BHLms*. This is Naples, BN B.VIII. 9., from the early fifteenth century. This manuscript contains both eastern and western saints, Roman martyrs as well as chronologically more recent saints, such as Celestine V.
and Louis of Toulouse. It is not organized by feast date, but the desinit for Onuphrius clearly shows it was intended for liturgical use.\footnote{\textit{[L]aeto corde et humili prece sanctum Onuphrium, ut pro nobis peccatoribus Creatorem nostrum cotidie imploret, ut... ad caelestia gaudia pervenire mereamur, ipso praestante... Amen.” This is taken from the description of the manuscript by Colomba Coralba in the SISME\!L Mirabile online database.}}

**BHL 6335:** This is an epitome, albeit one of a slightly peculiar sort. The earliest witness, although not listed in \textit{BHLms}, is the version in Monte Cassino, MS 143, where this story began. In Appendix 3.3, I compare my transcription of the Life in Morgan M.626 and the published edition of this epitome in adjacent columns.\footnote{\textit{Bibliothe\!ca casinensi\!s; seu, Codic\!um manuscriptorum qui in tabulario casinensi asservantur} (Monte Cassino: ex Typographia Casinensi, 1873-94), III, \textit{Florilegium}, pp. 284-288.} This shows that the epitomizer worked in a very strange way. He copied section I in its entirety, omitting only a sentence that perhaps struck him as repetitive.\footnote{Appendix 3.3, p. 434-458.} He continued copying section II up to the point where Paphnutius asked Onuphrius whether his asceticism had been difficult for him at the beginning (p. 12). From then on, to the end of the section (pp. 13–20), he summarized in his own words and drastically reduced the longer recension. The third section (pp. 20–25) he summarized in a single line. This is a rather idiosyncratic way of proceeding. One would have expected instead that he would have summarized the first section as he did the third, and copied out the central section on Onuphrius. One gets the impression that he probably had not intended to create an epitome, since he copied section I and a good portion of section II word for word. One possibility is that the exemplar he was copying was required by someone else, and so in haste he stopped copying and started summarizing drastically.

There are two other witnesses, the earlier of which, Rome Vallicelliana MS Tomus XXII, is dated to the eleventh or twelfth century. This is a \textit{Vitas patrum}
manuscript with a mix of some western saints, such as Ildefonsus of Toledo and the tenth-century Benedictine monk Firmanus from Montelupone near Macerata. The combination of Beneventan script and the later dating suggests that the version in Monte Cassino MS 143 was copied as the cult of the saint spread in the region around Monte Cassino.

**BHL 6335b:** There is one witness, Novara Archivio Capitolare XXVII from the fifteenth century. The usual incipit is followed by “Decem et septem dies me ambulante.” Its desinit reads “in viam pacis. Haec dicens recessit a me.” This is the beginning and end of the second section. The copyist decided to omit the portions relating to Paphnutius’s travels and focus only on the central section on the saint.

**BHL 6335c:** Although *BHLms* does not indicate any manuscripts with the incipit “Onufrii vitam scripserunt Gregorius et Pafnucius. Ego Pafnucius ciruivi heremitas” and desinit “et visa praedicavi. Obit autem mense iun. die xii eiusdem mensis,” this is in fact the epitome found in certain manuscripts of the *Legenda Aurea*. Barbara Fleith lists eighteen manuscripts that contain this version O7 in her index of “Fremdlegenden.” The earliest manuscript is Einsiedeln, Klosterbibliothek, MS 629, dated 1288. Only two of the eighteen are of Italian provenance; the rest are all from north of the Alps, ranging in geographic distribution from Switzerland, Austria, and Germany to Sweden in the north. Of the two Italian manuscripts, one is a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscript,
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422 See Poncelet, *Cat. lat. rom.*, pp. 361–363.
Naples, BN VIII B 9, from the convent of S. Domenico Maggiore in Naples. This copy therefore circulated among the Dominicans.

There is another version that appears associated with the *Legenda Aurea* but in an incunable edition. This was the *Legenda aurea sanctorum sive Lombardica historia* printed by Ulrich Zel in Cologne in 1483. My transcription is included in Appendix 3.4. There is one German manuscript, dated 1460, whose incipit and explict correspond to this edition and which is classified as BHL 6337. It is an epitome of BHL 6336 (see below), but since it is printed as part of the *Legenda Aurea*, I include it here.

The manuscript tradition of the Latin epitomes associated with the Golden Legend show that this was primarily a phenomenon of the German-speaking regions north of the Alps, both in the age of manuscript and in the age of incunable printing. Even though Italy was both the land where the *Legenda Aurea* was compiled and where the Life of Onuphrius was first translated into Latin, its manuscript tradition of the *Legenda Aurea* proved remarkably resistant to incorporating Onuphrius.

**BHL 6336**: This number marks a version that differs from the Life in 6334a in three significant ways. In this version Onuphrius says he lived in the desert for seventy rather than sixty years; the hermit is nourished not on bread brought by angels but by a palm tree that brought forth fruit once a month on which the saint subsisted; at the saint’s death, Paphnutius buried the saint in a cleft in the rocks and there was no mention of the lions who came to help. The Coptic versions both mention the palm tree and do not

---

mention lions. This cleavage in the tradition suggests either that there were two versions circulating in the Greek manuscript tradition, one of which corresponded to the two surviving Coptic manuscripts, or that the translator into Latin added these details. It seems more likely that there were at least two Greek versions, for 6334 not only has a translator’s prologue, but it also has a much more elaborate treatment of the death scene of the saint. At any rate, the three earliest manuscripts are from the twelfth century, and five of the seven surviving manuscripts are in Italian libraries. This suggests again that this translation also took place in Italy, but later than the translation of 6334. It was perhaps a reflection of the increasing prominence of the cult in the twelfth century in Italy that led to a greater interest in the Greek manuscript tradition of the hermit.

Two of the three twelfth-century manuscripts are in the Vatican. Vat. lat. 1196 is a passionary of primarily western martyrs and saints with a sprinkling of eastern ones and is written in many different hands.\textsuperscript{426} There are two reasons for proposing a Roman origin for this manuscript. A number of the saints have churches dedicated to them in Rome, for example, Pancratius, Praxedis and Pudentiana, Nereus and Achilleus, Marcellinus and Peter, and so on. The second is that following the Life of Onuphrius there is an account of a miracle in which the saint appeared to a monk named Symeon and promised him recovery from his long illness if he celebrated his feast day. Prior to the account of the miracle is a prologue with desinit: “Sed iam Deo gratias per miraculum quod mox subiciemus per eius merita factum et hic a nobis licet paucis hodie celebratur et a compluribus aliis Romae veneratur.” This miracle is assigned BHL 6338b. Vatican vat.

\textsuperscript{426} See Poncelet, \textit{Cat. lat. vat.}, pp. 59–63.
lat. 1191, dated 116–1200, is a passionary consisting primarily of western saints. Since the last life is that of the apostle Peter excerpted from the *Liber Pontificalis*, this manuscript may have been assembled at the papal court. The late thirteenth–early fourteenth-century manuscript Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, Tomus VII is a lectionary with Onuphrius in the first section (fols. 1–318), which contained the Propers of the saints. This means that the Onuphrius commemorated in Rome depended on a different *Vita* from that used in Monte Cassino and the south.

This Roman popularity may be the reason why the incunable editions of the *Vitas patrum* included this version rather than BHL 6334a. Onuphrius was not included in the *editio princeps* of Caselle 1475. However, this did not include any extended biographies of any other saints. He does appear, however, in the first part of the influential Nuremberg Koberger edition of 1478. BHL 6336 was the version printed by Heribert Rosweyde in 1628 the third edition of which was reprinted in the *Patrologia Latina* by Migne. It was not, therefore, the version that had the widest circulation in the Middle Ages.

**BHL 6336b**: This recension is very close to 6336. It survives in a single manuscript from 1601. Vatican vat. lat. 6075 was copied by Paulus Sfondratus, cardinal priest of Santa Cecilia in Rome, “ex antiquissimo codice manuscripto” that he found at the convent of Santa Cecilia. He claimed that he copied it verbatim even when the sense was unclear. Since the earliest manuscripts of 6336 date to the twelfth century, it is possible that the similarity of this recension to 6336 was because the exemplar used for copying the
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427 Ibid., pp. 41–46.
ancient codex also dated to the twelfth century. In any case, it reflects once again the popularity of 6336 in Roman circles.

**BHL 6337:** This is an epitome of 6336. Since the sole surviving manuscript that contains the Life is the Cologne Carthusian Hermannus Greven’s *Legendarium*, dated to 1460, and the explicit and desinit match the Life printed in Cologne in 1483, this is the likely source for the incunable. Greven’s additions to the *Martyrologium Usuardi*, including many locally venerated men and women from Westphalia, were printed in 1490 in Cologne by Johann Koelhoff the Elder as an addendum to his edition of the *Legenda Aurea*. A glance at the entry in the British Library’s Incunabula Short Title Catalogue (ISTC) shows that the book survives both intact as well as in its two constituent parts, that is, the *Legenda Aurea* and the *Martyrologium Usuardi*.

**BHL 6337d:** There are no manuscripts listed for this number.

**BHL 6338:** This recension marks another stage in Roman interest in the saint, for it adds a section on his childhood. This is not present in any Greek manuscript and thus represents a Roman hagiographical accretion to the Life in 6336. *BHLms* lists a single manuscript, Rome, BN, S.Onofr, codex sancti Onofri, 95, dated 1401–1500. This version would have important art-historical consequences, for it was information on the saint’s childhood contained in this manuscript that was used as the basis for the fresco cycle in the cloister of the Roman church of Sant’Onofrio on the Janiculum in Rome. The desinit is that of 6334a, which suggests that the compiler of this version had come across the older version of the Life and found it more appealing to add his section on the saint’s childhood.
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childhood to this version rather than to 6336, which was the version that circulated in Rome.

In addition to the Roman manuscript, there is a German witness originally from Weingarten: Fulda, MS AA96, dated 1496.\textsuperscript{431} This indicates the continuing German interest in the developments of the hagiographical dossier of this saint taking place south of the Alps.\textsuperscript{432}

BHL 6338a: There are no manuscripts listed in \textit{BHLms}, but the incipit and desinit of 6338a are in fact the same as in 6338 and 6334a, respectively, except that they include more of the text. Thus there is no difference between 6338 and 6338a. The distinction is spurious.

\textbf{BHL 6338b and 6338d}: These refer to the two miracles associated with the saint. 6338d was the miracle that took place in Monte Cassino. Although \textit{BHLms} lists no manuscripts with this miracle, it is present in Monte Cassino MS 143 after the epitome BHL 6335. BHL 6338b is the Roman miracle appearing after the Life (BHL 6336) in Vat. lat. 1196.

\textit{Onuphrius Textus (s.n.)}: The manuscript listed is Vallicelliana VIII. This recension is BHL 6334a, the long version of the Life followed by the “carmen rude.”

\textit{VITAE ONUPHRII NOT IN BHLms}

Besides the versions classified in \textit{BHLms}, there are two additional versions of the Life of Onuphrius, one an epitome written in the fourteenth century by Petrus de Natalibus and

printed starting in 1493, and the second a new translation from a Greek manuscript
printed by Aloysius Lippomanus in 1558 and re-edited and reprinted by Bartholomeus
Surius in 1572.

1) *Catalogus Sanctorum et Gesta Eorum*. This was a legendary compiled by the
bishop Petrus Natalis or Petrus de Natalibus, who died between 1400 and 1406.\(^{433}\)
It was printed in Vicenza in 1493 and continued being printed in the sixteenth and
seventeenth centuries.\(^{434}\) For this epitome the bishop clearly used a manuscript in
the 6334a recension rather than 6336, since Onuphrius says he lived in the desert
for sixty years. It is possible that he also had a manuscript of the 6336 recension,
for in the epitome he mentioned that Onuphrius ate only the fruit of the palm tree
and roots of plants for thirty years and then subsisted on bread brought by the
angel for another thirty. However, since 6334a mentioned a palm tree next to his
cave, it is possible that Petrus assumed he must have eaten its fruit even though in
the Life it says that he lived on plants from the forests and water for thirty years
and for the next thirty he was visited by the angel. Petrus mentions lions helping
Paphnutius to dig the grave. Immediately following this entry is the entry on
Timotheus, one of the hermits Paphnutius met in part 1 of the *Peregrinatio*. Since
part 1 is omitted in 6334, it seems probable that Petrus simply concluded that the
palm tree provided fruit and that the angelic visits for the second thirty years were
to provide heavenly bread.

---

\(^{433}\) See the entry by Frank Soetermeer in *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 23 (2004),
cols. 1096–1097.

\(^{434}\) On this incunable, see the British Library ISTC entry at
http://istc.bl.uk/search/search.html?operation=record&rsid=1461972&q=0 . It is digitized at
2) *Vitarum Sanctorum Priscorum Patrum.* This important hagiographical collection by Aloysius Lipomanus, Bishop of Verona, was part of the Catholic response to the Reformation and was produced while the Council of Trent was taking place. Its polemical use of hagiography was made clear in the title of the sixth volume, which contained the Life of Onuphrius and which was published in Rome in 1558: “Tomus Sextus vitarum Sanctorum Priscorum Patrum Quae Instante R.P.D. Aloysio Lipomano, Episcopo veronensi, Nunc Primum Ex Symone Metaphraste Graeco Auctore Latinae Factae Sunt, Ac Per Eundem In vnum volumen Collectae Cum Solitis Scholijs Aduersus Praesentium Haereticorum Delirationes.” The title also tells us that the Greek manuscript(s) used to prepare the translation had some indication that they these were the product of the metaphrastic rewriting of Greek hagiography. Lipomanus appears to have made use of the services of Cardinal Sirletus, who consulted manuscripts at the abbey of Grotta Ferrata. My transcription of the Life of Onuphrius is in Appendix 3.5, with printed marginal notes turned into footnotes.

3) *De probatis sanctorum historiis.* Lipomanus’s work was edited and reprinted by the Carthusian Laurentius Surius. The Life of Onuphrius was published in volume 3 of his series in Cologne in 1572: “De probatis sanctorum historiis partim ex tomis Aloysii Lipomani, doctissimi episcopi, partim etiam ex egregiis manuscriptis codicibus, quarum permultae antehac nunquam in luce prodiere, nunc recens optima fide collectis per F. Laurentium Suriium Carthusianum. Tomus tertius complectens sanctos mensium maii et iunii.” The Life in this edition ended up partially in the AASS.
A comparison of the two versions shows that Surius made very few minor changes (punctuation, spelling, very occasionally a change in word order) to the Life as it appeared in Lipomanus. A comparison of the printed marginalia shows that Surius wished to point out different things to the reader of his edition. I cannot explore his *methodus edendi* further here, but an examination of the Lipomanus edition can help clarify the path the Greek life took. There are so many points in common between this Life and the version in 6334a that it seems very likely that the Life translated into Latin in the early eleventh century was one that circulated in Byzantine Italy. Since Onuphrius did not end up in the Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes (fl. 960), it was reworked by someone else in the Metaphrastic tradition. Thus even though Symeon did not rewrite this Life, it could easily have been appended to a manuscript of genuine Metaphrastic Lives at Grotta Ferrata. The editors of the AASS, and in particular Conrad Janning, found a Greek manuscript that matched very closely Lipomanus’s translation. It contains all three parts of the *Peregrinatio*. In the first part, Paphnutius’s encounter with the dead monk, then his encounter with Timotheus (the palm tree bearing fruit twelve times a year, which nourished Onophrius in the Coptic Life, is transferred to Timotheus), the guardian angel, all are present. There are also some changes that bear the mark of a metaphrastic rewriting that provided more details. Thus in 6334a, when Paphnutius left Timotheus he simply began “contra heremum ambulare” (Appendix 3.2, p 415). This metaphrast (I use this with lowercase m to describe any hagiographical rewriter) provided concrete details to increase the verisimilitude of the Life: “profectus sum in interiorem solitudinem in via auiia, ubi est gens eorum qui dicuntur Mazici” (Appendix 3.5, p. 466). A heightened prolixity of style is also evident in this metaphrastic rendering. Paphnutius’s reason for
entering the desert in 6334a are “Nimium uero desiderabam ut forsitan dei famulums
invenirem qui in heremo habitant ut eorum me benedictionibus committerem.” In
Lipomanus’s translation we read, “Omne enim studium a me in eo ponebatur, vt scirem,
an esset alius Anachoreta in interioribus partibus solitudinis Deo seruiens, vt ego quoque
dignus habererer, qui id consequerer.” In section 3, Paphnutius first meets an old man
who recognizes him, at which point Paphnutius falls at his feet. In this metaphrastic
reworking, an entire speech is put into the old man’s mouth, in which he explained that it
was through God’s providence that he knew who Paphnutius was.

There is, however, an important difference between this metaphrastic version and
6334a. This is the absence of the lions. In the former, Paphnutius buries the saint in a
cleft in the rock, whereas in the latter, two lions dig the grave, as they had done in the
Life of Saint Mary of Egypt and in Jerome’s Life of Paul the Hermit. The similarities
between the 6334a and this metaphrastic Life are so great that the most likely explanation
for this difference is that this picturesque element was removed by this metaphrast as an
implausible detail that would reduce the credibility of the Life. As such, this omission is
the mirror image of his addition of the detail about the people called the Mazici who lived
along the road Paphnutius took after departing from Timotheus. Adding this concrete
geographical detail made the Life more plausible. Removing the lions had the same
effect. This suggests that the rewriter prized credibility as well as a higher style in his
reworkings of Greek hagiography.

\[435\] Appendix 3.2, p. 415.
\[436\] Appendix 3.5, p. 466.
We now have a possible explanation for the absence of the lions in the Latin version in 6336. A comparison between this text and Lipomanus’s leads one to the conclusion that 6336 was perhaps translated from an abbreviated version of the metaphrastic reworking. Thus in part 1 the abbreviator skipped over the encounter with the dead monk and with Timotheus but left only the part with the guardian angel restoring Paphnutius’s strength when his supplies ran out. His version then goes straight to the encounter with Onuphrius, which it reports fairly fully, and then he drastically reduces part 3. Against this theory are some differences in detail. In 6336 Onuphrius lived in the desert for seventy years, whereas both the metaphrastic version and 6334a report this number as sixty. One possible explanation is that the error was made by the Greek abbreviator or by the Latin translator or by an early copyist; one would need a critical edition of 6334 to shed light on this point, as well as critical editions of the Greek recensions. This explanation seems more likely than positing the existence of two groups of early Greek versions, both of which had no lions and one of which had sixty years, which version reached the Metaphrast, and the other seventy years, which version reached first the abbreviator and then the translator. Both the Coptic recensions have sixty years but no lions. There is also a modern Greek version of the Life that has seventy years and two lions. Unfortunately this was published without any critical apparatus, so it is not clear what this edition was based on. When these lions first appeared in the Life remains a great mystery. One can understand the impulse to add them, for this detail would then have assimilated Onuphrius to Mary of Egypt and to Jerome’s Paul the First Hermit. This question will have to wait until the Greek manuscript tradition is analyzed, which might show the existence of abbreviations corresponding in content to 6336.
Nevertheless, since the earliest manuscripts of this recension are dated to the twelfth century, there would have been time to make abbreviated versions of the metaphrastic reworking and for these to reach Rome.

CAVALCA AND ONUPHIROUS

Before discussing the reasons for attributing the Life of Onuphrius in RC i.e. Casanatense 422 to Cavalca, it is useful to go over the reception history of the translation and the transition from manuscript to print. This involves various steps starting with the original translation. As noted before, Cavalca came from Vico Pisano and his native dialect was Pisano-Lucchese, which was the dialect spoken in western Tuscany. We do not have his autograph manuscript. Of the fifteen surviving manuscripts from the fourteenth century, seven are in Pisano-Lucchese and eight in other dialects, mainly but not exclusively Florentine. Of the seven, only RC has all four books, whereas Lu² has books 3 and 4 while R¹⁶ has only 4. RC is therefore the most important witness to the translation in its original form, even though it lacks the prologue and was copied by a careless scribe. It is for this reason that Carlo Delcorno based his recent reconstruction of the original version on RC.

Sometime in the 1330s an unknown Florentine commissioned Francesco di Ser Nardo, a scribe known for his work copying Dante’s Comedy, to produce a luxury manuscript in the Florentine dialect. This is RN. At the very top of folio 1 is written “Incomincia lo prolagho del vitapatrum traslatato in nostro uolgare fiorentino.” This notice is the only indication of the willed change in dialect that transformed the Pisano-

---

437 See Delcorno, Tradizione, p. 539.
Lucchese text into the Florentine text. The process by which this took place can only be inferred. At some point, copies of the translation reached Florence and someone noted its importance. This person then commissioned a “translation” from Pisano-Lucchese into Florentine so that it could be annexed to the superior, at least from their point of view, Florentine literary culture. Obviously a Florentine could read and understand other Tuscan dialects, but local pride and pleasure in one’s local tongue meant that s/he would prefer to read texts in Florentine. This patron then either commissioned someone to retranslate a Pisano-Lucchese manuscript and asked Ser Nardo to copy it in a beautiful manuscript, or asked Ser Nardo to do the retranslation as well as the copying. Since RN contains materials that are not found in any of the Pisano-Lucchese manuscripts, it seems more likely that Ser Nardo was provided with a translation along with the additional materials and instructions on how these were to be incorporated into the retranslated work. Just as the patron chose additional materials, he may also have chosen to omit certain texts. What is clear is that RN does not include the Life of Onuphrius. We will never know why this was so. One possible explanation is that it was not included in the manuscript that was retranslated into Florentine. A comparison of the contents of book IV in each of these four manuscripts can help shed light on this mystery. The following table shows the contents of book IV in these four manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>Lu²</th>
<th>R¹⁶</th>
<th>RN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iovanni elemosinario 1</td>
<td>Giovanni elimosinario 1</td>
<td>Giovanni elimosinario 1</td>
<td>Giovanni elimosinario 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraam 2</td>
<td>Habraam 2</td>
<td>D’uno sancto prete 9</td>
<td>D’uno sancto prete 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco di Syria</td>
<td>Malco 3</td>
<td>D’una santa donna</td>
<td>D’una sancta donna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Malchus) 3</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eufrosina 4</td>
<td>Eufrosina 4</td>
<td>Abraam 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina 5</td>
<td>Marina 5</td>
<td>Eustagio 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Egiziaca 6</td>
<td>Maria Egiptiacha 6</td>
<td>D’uno santo monaco di Syria (Malchus) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagia 7</td>
<td>Pelagia 7</td>
<td>Eufrosina 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taysi 8</td>
<td>Taysi 8</td>
<td>Marina 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’uno sancto preite 9</td>
<td>D’uno sancto preite 9</td>
<td>Maria Egusiacha 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’una sancta donna 10</td>
<td>D’una sancta donna 10</td>
<td>Pelagia 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macario Romano 11</td>
<td>Macchario Romano 11</td>
<td>Taisi 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell’abate Cassiano e d’alquanti padri 12</td>
<td>Tractato dell’abate Cassiano 12</td>
<td>Macario Romano 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Lu²</td>
<td>R¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furseo 13</td>
<td>Furseo 13</td>
<td>Tratato di Giovanni Cassiano 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustacio 14</td>
<td>Eustacio 14</td>
<td>Furseo 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplo d’uno che nego Cristo 15</td>
<td>Exemplo d’uno che negoe Cristo 15</td>
<td>Margarita 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita 16</td>
<td>Margarita 16</td>
<td>Iustina 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iustina 17</td>
<td>Iustina 17</td>
<td>Teodora 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodora 18</td>
<td>Theodora 18</td>
<td>Iuliana 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuliana 19</td>
<td>juliana 19</td>
<td>Patrisio 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the contents are set next to each other patterns begin to emerge. In the case of Lu², the order of Lives follows that present in RC except for the omission of Onofrio. The last Life in both the table of contents at the beginning of book IV and in the text is Patrick. A comparison of the Life of Marina in RC and Lu² shows that they are identical except for some variations in spelling that are closer to Florentine. This suggests that Lu² was either copied from RC or that they were both copied from the same exemplar. The absence of Onofrio is thus rather puzzling. Despite being a luxury manuscript with beautiful *mise en page* and red and blue decorated initials, there is no colophon at the end of the manuscript. R¹⁶ too lacks Onofrio but presents another puzzle. It contains the same Lives as Lu² but in an utterly different order. Items 9 and 10 were moved up, as was item 14. It looks as though item 15 was accidentally omitted, for it was added after the colophon. This implies that there was a conscious decision to preserve the contents of Lu² but to put them in a different order.

The colophon of R¹⁶ is worth examining, for it is the sole discursive colophon among the three surviving Pisano-Lucchese manuscripts:

Finiscie la legienda di sancto patricio e qui si chompie lo quarto libro de la uita patrum e tuto lo libro prodito auegna che in alcuni luoghi ci siano alchune
This should not be taken to mean that the scribe was suspicious in any way about the contents of book IV or even, to the extent that he was aware of it, of Cavalca’s authorship. A look at RC shows us that items 1–8 and 11–12 were texts that were taken from the *Vitas patrum* corpus. Items 9 and 10 were exempla. To this Cavalca added a northern European visionary text—the Life of Fursey. After this he added a block of seven Lives taken from the *Legenda Aurea*. Of these, six were from Egypt but the seventh—Patrick—was another northern European text. He probably included it to reinforce belief in purgatory. The scribe of R\(^1\) was likely conscious of these blocks and that, by rearranging them, he was scrambling the different groups of texts that formed book IV. His colophon was thus to alert his readers that not all the texts were set in Egypt.

A comparison of RN with R\(^1\) shows that the texts appear in the same utterly idiosyncratic order. RN, however, lacks the exemplum from Basil of the person who denied Christ. This suggests that either RN was copied from R\(^1\) before the exemplum was added (after the colophon) or that the two were copied from an exemplar that lacked it but that the scribe of R\(^1\) later became aware that a text was missing and copied it from a Pisano-Lucchese exemplar. The Florentine compiler, on the other hand, did not have other manuscripts to check against to ensure that his exemplar was complete. For this reason the exemplum was left out of RN. As for Onofrio, it is possible that Lu\(^2\) was

---


\(^{439}\) Item 9 reinforces orthodox belief in the Eucharist. It is from the Miracles of Saint Ninian and passed into Paschasius Radbertus’ eucharistic treatise *Liber de corpore et sanguine domini*. Item 10 is a vision of the afterlife dealing with the eschatological consequences of sinful and sinless ways of life.

\(^{440}\) The exemplum of one who denied Christ but later turned to penance is taken from the Life of Basil.
copied before RC from an exemplar that was itself tracking the original. Once Cavalca finished translating the Life of Onuphrius, it was added to the exemplar from which RC was copied. This would explain the great closeness of RC and Lu⁲—they were both copied at different times from the same exemplar.

Transition from Manuscript to Print Culture

The VSP made its debut into the world of incunable printing in 1474, when two separate editions appeared. In Ferrara, Augustinus Carnerius printed book IV,⁴⁴¹ and in Sant’Orso, Leonardus Achates from Basil printed all four books.⁴⁴² The surprise is that Carnerius followed the order in Lu², whereas Achates in his book IV followed the order of RN. As a result, neither contained Onuphrius. This equality did not last. Just as the manuscripts copied in Florentine crowded out those copied in Pisano-Lucchese, so the incunable tradition was dominated by the Florentine version of the VSP.

The first critical edition of the Florentine recension was that of D. M. Manni, who published a four-volume work between 1731 and 1735, and in so doing caused a great deal of confusion. The first two volumes were printed with the half-title Delle Vite de’ SS. Padri and the title Volgarizzamento delle Vite de’Santi Padri. The next two were printed with half-title Delle Vite de Santi and the title Vite di Alcuni Santi Scritte nel Buon Secolo della Lingua Toscana. However, since they were a single set all four volumes were catalogued by libraries under the title or half-title of the first two volumes. Thus even though only the first two volumes recognizably pertained to Cavalca, many

⁴⁴¹ See [http://istc.bl.uk/search/search.html?operation=record&rsid=1462744&q=1](http://istc.bl.uk/search/search.html?operation=record&rsid=1462744&q=1) for the British Library ISTC entry.
⁴⁴² See [http://istc.bl.uk/search/search.html?operation=record&rsid=1462744&q=0](http://istc.bl.uk/search/search.html?operation=record&rsid=1462744&q=0) for the British Library ISTC.
were led to believe that all four volumes contained Lives that he had translated. Manni included a Life of Onuphrius, written in beautiful Florentine, in *Delle Vite de Santi*. Thus Cavalca was presumed to be the author of this translation.

In 1858, B. Sorio and A. Racheli re-edited and reprinted Manni’s four volumes in a single quarto, which perpetuated the confusion, for its half-title page read: “Biblioteca/Classica Italiana/Secolo XIV/n° 8/Vite dei santi padri/di/Fra Domenico Cavalca.” The title page read: “Vite de’ Santi Padri/di frate/Domenico Cavalca/Colle Vite di Alcuni Altri Santi/Postillate e Recate a Miglior Lezione Coll’ Aiuto di Manoscritti e Delle Migliori St. ampe/per cura di/Bartolommeo Sorio P.D.O./E di A.Racheli.” “Vite De’ Santi Padri” was in a large font and “Domenico Cavalca” in an even larger font. They compounded the confusion by not including the whole title of Manni’s volumes 3 and 4. By putting “Colle Vite Di Alcuni Altri Santi” in large type below “Domenico Cavalca,” and by omitting “Scritte Nel Buon Secolo,” they heightened the impression that everything in their edition was by Cavalca. This edition enjoyed great popularity. As a result of the misleading half-title and title pages, many believed that Cavalca translated everything they were holding in their hands. The absence of a blank page at the end of “D’uno che nego Cristo” on page 312, which was the last text in Manni’s second volume, made the entire Sorio and Racheli edition an organic whole. A reader of Manni’s volume 3 would note a new half-title and title page and thus be alerted that this was something different from the first two volumes. Not so the reader of the 1858 edition. As a result, the Life of Onuphrius on pages 544–550 was considered to be by Cavalca.

In recent years, the work of Delcorno on the manuscript tradition has contrasted the more limited contents of the VSP manuscripts and the more expansive contents of the
Manni and the Sorio and Racheli editions. As a result, scholars have followed Delcorno’s lead. The publication in 2000 of his monumental book on the manuscript tradition gave scholars a more accurate idea of the contents of each of the four books of the *VSP*. Thus researchers working on the two Sicilian translations of the Life of Onuphrius, such as Lucrezia Lorenzini and Mario Pagano, have recognized that the Life printed by Manni was not by Cavalca but was an independent translation of the Life of the hermit.

Delcorno, however, noted in 2000 that the boundaries of the compilation fluctuated, ending sometimes with Patrick, sometimes with Onophrius, and sometimes with Giuliana. In his footnote to Onuphrius, Delcorno directed the reader to Manni, volume 4. This was the very Life that his research showed was not by Cavalca. Oddly, despite mentioning Onuphrius as the final Life in his description of *RC*, Delcorno did not direct the reader there. He also left it out of his recent reconstruction of the original Pisano-Lucchese version without giving an explanation, perhaps because it was not found in any other manuscript used to reconstruct the original.

I propose, however, that the Life at the end of *RC* is in fact by Cavalca and that it should be restored to its rightful place as the final Life in the *VSP*. I do so for three reasons: the evidence of the manuscript, art-historical considerations, and the manner of its translation, which bears the characteristic marks of Cavalca’s pastoral method of translation, and the reception history of the Life. I will deal with each of these in turn.

1) THE EVIDENCE OF THE MANUSCRIPT

---

443 Delcorno, *Tradizione*, p. 537.
444 Ibid., n. 15, which sends the reader to Manni, vol. IV, pp. 137–150.
One peculiarity of RC is that it begins with books III and IV and then moves on to books I and II. The first fascicle consists of a table of contents of three folios. The table suffered damage at the beginning, such that it begins at the 123rd of 147 chapters in book III. The list of eighty-two chapters for book IV begins on folio 1v and ends on 3v. Chapter lxxxii reads, “Di santo honofrio et chome labate panuctio lo trouo in del diserto.” This is in the same hand as the rest of the table of contents and the rest of the manuscript. The list of chapters for book I follows immediately below. This page shows no signs that the Life of Onuphrius was added later. It has the same appearance as the chapters that precede and follow it. We know from Cavalca’s prologues that he was concerned that his readers be able to find what they were looking for easily, and that in his translations he provided the list of chapters immediately following the prologue. It is unlikely that the prologue would have come at the beginning of book III, so we can assume that the scribe was copying from a manuscript that did not have the prologue. Perhaps he was given books III and IV first, so he started copying these and then moved on to copy books I and II. The second fascicle consists of two quires of twenty-five and twenty-four units. Book III occupies folios 1ra–58ra. Folio 58rb is decorated so that book IV could be started at the top of folio 58va. The book ended on fol. 127ra, but this meant that the scribe had a number of blank sheets that would go to waste if he were to start book I in a new fascicle so that he could assemble the four books in the right order after he finished copying. He therefore decided not to waste the folios and to live with the unorthodox order of books III, IV, I, and II. Therefore he began copying book I on folio 127rb. At that point he must have decided to wait until he had finished copying all four books before assembling the list of chapters. This is why the list of chapters in the first fascicle follows the order of the
books themselves. Actually, we cannot rule out the possibility that there was a prologue that was omitted because he thought it would be strange to have the prologue following the list of chapters of book IV. If he had copied the prologue and the list of chapters for books I to IV, this would not have corresponded to the way he had copied the manuscript. It is unfortunate for us that his thriftiness put him in a dilemma, as none of the Pisano-Lucchese manuscripts contain the prologue.

Where the Life of Onuphrius is concerned, the uninterrupted copying, which shows that the Life ended on folio 127ra and that the Life of Paul the Hermit, the first Life in book I, began on the very next column, tells us that it was not added by someone else at a later point. In addition, there is a colophon at the end of the Life marking the end of book IV: “qui finisce lo quarto libbro de uita padrj.” This implies that the Life was an integral part of book IV of whichever manuscript he was copying from, and thus became an integral part of RC. There is not always a one-to-one correspondence between the index capitulorum and the rubrics in the body of a medieval manuscript. This suggests that scribes copied the index and the rubricated text separately rather than copying the actual rubrics from the body of the text to create the index. Had the chapter been missing from the index or shown signs of having been added later, one might have grounds for thinking that the Life was added as an afterthought and the index adjusted accordingly. That is not the case here. Since this is the only fourteenth-century manuscript to have all four books of the VSP, it is the closest we will get to the original translation. Therefore if one is to exclude a Life present in it, one needs to provide good reasons for the omission. Otherwise it should be included. In this case there is nothing in the manuscript to suggest it was not in the exemplar.
2) THE ART-HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

This section will explore the relation between Cavalca’s translation and the monumental Thebaid fresco in the Camposanto of Pisa.\(^{446}\) I will not go over the same ground covered by Chiara Frugoni, Lina Bolzoni, and Lucia Battaglia Ricci, who have all explored in different ways the purpose, functioning, iconography, and Dominican context of these Thebaid scenes and of the other frescos nearby.\(^{447}\) I will, instead, examine more closely the relations between the inscriptions and the translation itself.\(^{448}\) For, as Battaglia-Ricci points out, the idea that Cavalca was the ideator of this cycle is still a hypothesis.

Scholars have long tied the frescos to the appearance of Cavalca’s translation. This is part of a methodological approach that seeks out texts as the foundation for iconographic choices. This approach is a fruitful one, but one needs to take into account the educational level and cultural capital of the patrons before assuming that vernacular texts can explain iconographical choices. In the case of the Camposanto, these decisions would have been taken at the level of the Archbishop of Pisa and his close collaborators, the Dominicans at the convent of Santa Caterina. These were highly educated clerics who did not need vernacular texts in order to make iconographic decisions. Rather, they produced

---

\(^{446}\) For the history of this monument, see Mauro Ronzani, *Un’idea trecentesca di cimitero: La costruzione e l’uso del camposanto nella Pisa del secolo XIV* (Pisa: PLUS, 2005).


both the images and the texts to reinforce messages that they wished to convey. Thus the appearance of the translation and the decision to depict scenes from the Thebaid both spring from the same clerical impulse to use texts and images to mold the behavior of their lay audiences.

The elusive connection between Cavalca and the Thebaid frescos can in fact be strengthened considerably. The fresco combined text and image in various ways. Texts were present within cartouches or scrolls, they were written directly onto the surface of the fresco,\(^{449}\) and they were included on scrolls held by figures within lozenges in the broad horizontal decorative borders that frame the fresco (there are no figures in the two narrow vertical borders to the left and right).\(^{450}\) Morpurgo had in fact suggested that the verses were likely composed by those who made the iconographical choices. Cavalca’s own use of verses as mnemonic devices at the end of his devotional treatises has also been noted by the scholars listed above. So far no one has been able to show a precise link between Cavalca and the verses. There are, however, direct quotations from the VSP in the sonnet below the figure of Saint Marina, which show that Cavalca had to have been the composer of the verses. The sonnet is as follows:

\begin{quote}
Vergine pudicha, sancta Marina,
Che intrasti monacha in acto maschile,
Servendo il munisterio casta et \textit{humble},
St. ando in oratione et disciplina

Un fanciullino in fascie una mattina
\end{quote}

\(^{449}\) See S. Morpurgo, “Le epigrafi volgari,” fig. ii on p. 52, for scrolls and cartouches, figs. xvii and xviii on pages 79 and 80, for writing directly onto the surface of the image.

\(^{450}\) See the photograph in \textit{Pisa—Museo delle Sinopie del Camposanto Monumentale} (Pisa: Opera della Primaziale Pisana, 1979), p. 64.
Fu posto ad luogo dove ella era servile
Dato fu colpa ad quell’alma gentile
Che era ripiena di gratia divina
    Che gli era suo, et cchelo haveva acquistato
D’una femina che era nel paese
Ad Sancta Marina apposon quel peccato
    Quella non si scusò né fe’difese
Come maschio di chiesa fu cacciato
Con esso in bracio et mai no fe’ palese
    Li monaci poi che ‘l corpo suo fu morto
Cognobeno che gli avevan facto torto.451

The first thing that ties this sonnet to Cavalca is the choice of the adjective *humile.*

Humility is a favored Cavalcan virtue, and the frequent use of the adverb *humbly* is a characteristic of his pastoral translation that is absent in the Latin originals. In the appendix, the Life of Marina is in the central column between the Latin Life transcribed from two different manuscripts—Morgan Library, MS M.626, and Florence, BNC, Conv. Sopp. J.7.11 (= CS), from Santa Maria Novella. The word *humile* and its cognates *humilta, humilmente* appear seven times in Cavalca’s translation but only once in the Latin in CS. In contrast, a search in a fifteenth-century vernacular Life of Marina in Florence, BNC, Magliabechiana XXXVIII. 66 (= M), shows not a single appearance of *humile* or its cognates. The adjective used to describe Marina in the Latin Life is *obedient* not *humble.* Humility was a virtue that combated the vice of pride and was therefore one marshaled frequently by Cavalca in his translations.

Besides this evidence there is a direct quotation of a phrase in the Life that can also be attributed to Cavalca’s pastoral translation methods, since it does not appear in the Latin. Not surprisingly, it does not appear in M either. When Marina is falsely accused of raping the innkeeper’s daughter, in the Latin text she thought for a long time and groaned. In Cavalca’s rendering she thought for a long time, groaned, and did not excuse herself (“non si schusoe”) but began to cry.\footnote{452} In contrast, the fifteenth-century translation in M has “la giouanna santa in se medesimo pensando a diuine cogitationi disse padre pecchai.”\footnote{453} This is of course much closer to the Latin than to Cavalca’s version, which stressed the virtue of patience and the quality of compunction.

Thus the sonnet reveals details that are missing in the Latin Life of Marina and therefore missing in M, the faithful fifteenth-century translation, but which are present in Cavalca’s pastoral translation. These deviations from the Latin served a purpose of making the saint actively model behavior and virtues that Cavalca wished to instill in his audience but that had nothing to do with the original Latin texts. This shows that he was almost certainly the composer of the sonnets. Since he was also the translator of the texts—scenes from which are depicted in the fresco—he was probably also the person who conceived the cycle and made the iconographic choices for the artist to execute. In other words, he was the \textit{conceuteur} of the cycle.\footnote{454}

Having established Cavalca’s intimate connection with these frescos, we now turn to the depictions of Onuphrius and Paphnutius on the far right in the upper register. They

are given three different prominent scenes and occupy a surprising amount of “real
estate.” Indeed, more space is devoted to them than to any other scene. If the bridge at the
bottom of the fresco is roughly in the middle of the fresco, then the two paths leading up
from it to the two caves in the hills divide the area into roughly equal thirds. The two
saints sit in earnest colloquy just to the right of the right-hand path. They are therefore at
the left edge of the right third of the painting. Three different inscriptions are devoted to
them. The first says, “Questo abate Pannufio per volonta di dio ando cercando nel gran
diserto di Tebaide per trentacinque giornate; nel quale trovo certi sancti padri.” The
second reads, “Questo sancto...da XXX anni si pasce di questo cibo che uno angelo li
recha,” and the third tells us, “Qui li leoni fanno la fossa per lo corpo di Onufrio.” The
expression certi sancti padri appears frequently in the VSP, both in chapter titles and in
the body of the text. To the immediate right of Onuphrius and Paphnutius there is a
hermit in a treehouse, but to its right is the scene where Onuphrius’s hut crashes down
and the palm tree collapses as a sign to Paphnutius that he must not stay in the desert.
Between this scene and the right edge of the fresco is the scene of the two lions digging
the grave and, below them, Paphnutius wrapping the corpse in his cloak. Thus the space
devoted to these two figures stretches across the entire right panel from its left edge to the
border on the right. If three sets of inscriptions were not sufficient accompaniment, there
are also verses held up by a figure in the bottom border:

........

Del contemplar che nel diserto amate
Ponete ad questi Patri Sancti cura
Li giusti et vertuosi riguardate

This is a great deal of attention paid to just these two, more than to any other figures in
the fresco. It is clear that they were very important to Cavalca, given the space and words
he devotes to them. I should also like to point out two symmetries. RC begins with the
Life of Paul the Hermit and ends with the Life of Onuphrius. In the fresco, the first scene
on the left is from the Life of Paul and the last scene on the right is from the Life of
Onuphrius. Each Life has three episodes devoted to it. The first scene on the left of the
upper register is the conversation of Paul and Anthony. This balances the conversation of
Onuphrius and Paphnutius. Next is the scene of Anthony wrapping Paul’s corpse. The
equivalent scene on the right is Paphnutius doing the same for Onuphrius. The next
episode is that of the two lions facing each other digging Paul’s grave. The identical
scene appears on the right. The two Lives that bookend the most important manuscript
witness to Cavalca’s translation also bookend the upper register of the frescos. It would
be very peculiar to not include the Life of Onuphrius in RC among Cavalca’s works.

3) ONUPHRIUS AND THE PASTORAL TRANSLATION.

456 Ibid.
A third reason for considering the Life of Onuphrius in RC as one translated by Cavalca
is that it bears the hallmarks of his pastoral method of translation that takes into account
the cultural capital of the reader. The first challenge is therefore to find the Latin Life of
the saint in question. Our earlier survey of the hagiographical dossier showed that there
were a number of choices for the Latin text. A comparison of the transcription with the
various Latin recensions shows that Cavalca used a manuscript of the long recension
BHL 6334a. This was also the correct classification of Vat. lat. 866, a manuscript of
clearly Dominican provenance, since it contained the Vitas fratrum. Cavalca must have
used a manuscript that was in the same family as Morgan M.626, since he repeats an
error—Eriti for Heremopoliti—in the name of Onuphrius’s monastery in the Thebaid
fresco. This error is also present in M.626. In Appendix 3.2, I place the transcription of
the Life from this manuscript next to my transcription from RC.

The first thing to note is that Cavalca omits the prologue. This is consistent with
his remarks on the translation of Latin texts for lay people in his own prologue to the
VSP. In this instance we are lucky to have comparanda—the list of manuscripts
containing the vernacular version of his Life assembled by Fagnoni. A glance at these
shows that of the four groups of her classification, manuscripts in groups I, III, and IV all
translate the Latin prologue. These account for fourteen of the twenty-five manuscripts
she was able to classify. Of the six remaining that could not be easily classified, five
translated the prologue and the sixth is missing its initial folios. Excluding it, nineteen of
thirty manuscripts translated the prologue. The remaining eleven in group II are all
manuscripts that share the desinit. The explicit shows some slight variation in the
beginning—they either say “Leggesi in vita patrum” or “Leggesi nella vita dei sancti
padri di uno sancto abate or Fue uno sancto abate,” as is the case in RC. Group II therefore represents the Cavalcan manuscript of the *Vita Onuphrii*. Not surprisingly, these eleven manuscripts also total the largest number in any of Fagnoni’s four groups. This popularity is consistent with the great success of the *VSP*.

Besides the characteristic omission of the prologue, a glance at Appendix 3.2 shows that Cavalca omitted all of part I and jumped straight to the encounter with the saint. The fourteenth-century Tuscan translation printed by Manni, the fourteenth-century Sicilian translation printed by G. B. Palma, and the fifteenth-century Sicilian translation edited by Lorenzini are more reverent to the Latin text, and all translate the first part of the long recension in its entirety. It should be noted that is clear that these translations were all made from the long recension BHL 6334a. This freedom to omit is characteristic of Cavalca and set him apart from medieval traditions of translation.

In section II, Cavalca follows the Latin closely but not slavishly. As befits a pastoral translation, he glosses where necessary and summarizes in other places. There is a telling instance of this when Onuphrius recounts how he decided to leave his monastery to become a hermit: “Interrogabam autem fratres dicens quid enim ipsi qui in heremo habitant fortiore nostri sunt apud deum.” Literally, “are those who live in the desert stronger in God’s eyes?” The fourteenth-century Sicilian translator rendered it thus: “Dimandaj eu ali frati et dichiali: ‘Li fratj ki habitanu in lu desertu, pluj fortj su di nuj’.”

The Manni edition has: “Allora domandaj i frati e dissi: Chi è più forte nel

---

servigio di Dio tra noi e quegli che stanno nel diserto?" The fifteenth-century Sicilian translator rendered it: “Et eu adimandaua alli frati si quilli chi habitauanu in lu boscu fussiru plui forti di nui annanti Deu?” Of the three, only the Manni translator recognized that the expression was not self-evidently clear. However, he did not get it quite right. Monks would have immediately understood the expression as pertaining to eschatological rewards. Cavalca recognized that this monastic vocabulary posed a stumbling block to a correct understanding by lay people unfamiliar with monastic terms. He glossed the expression in two different ways to make sure his audience understood it properly: “Io domandai li frati e dissi, ‘Questi che stanno in del diserto sono pio forti di noj et piu presso innansi ad dio cioè meritano più di noj?’” He first translated it literally, then to explain it he posed two questions that made the sense increasingly clear: “Are hermits closer to God, that is, are they more meritorious than we?” His translation ensured that lay readers would understand that Onuphrius made his choice to leave the monastery and become a hermit because he sought a way of life that would provide greater eschatological rewards. Cioè is a characteristically Cavalcan word, for he is interested less in translating than in explaining.

There is another signature adverb much beloved of Cavalca that marks this as his translation. At the end of the discourse about hermits, Onuphrius describes how he took their advice: “Hec et similia apud sancti [sic] patres cum didicissem ego humillimus onufrius multo magis mente et corde recipiens.” The fourteenth-century Sicilian rendered it “Et quando eu, humillisimu Honofriu, appi intisu tucti quisti cosi dali santi

---

460 Appendix 3.1, p. 404.
461 Appendix 3.2, p. 419.
patri pluș mantinenti richippi li parolj in la menti et inlu cori.” The Manni translator chose
“Avendomi dette queste cose e molte altre simiglianti della vita de santi padri,
immantenente io Onofrio ricevetti queste cose nella mente e nel cuore.”462 The fifteenth-
century Sicilian chose this: “Et havendu audutu et insignatu tutti li supraditti cosi di quilli
santti patri et mei frati, eu humili Honofriu multu assai di la menti et di lu corpu [sic].”
Cavalca, interested always in modeling behavior, changed the superlative adjective into
an adverb: “quando io honofrio molto humilemente ebbi vddite queste et simiglianti cose
da isti padre molto malgiolmente li receuetti nella mente et nel chuore.”

All these changes to the Latin can only have been made by Cavalca. In the Life of
Marina we saw how he added humilemente even when the Latin did not say humiliter.
Similarly in this case, turning it into his favorite adverb allowed him to show the proper
attitude that one had to take to more senior monks. All of these changes are small, but
they are Calvalca’s stylistic DNA. Taken together, they smoothed the experience of
reading and provided for deeper understanding of unfamiliar texts. The statistical analysis
of the manuscripts catalogued by Fagnoni bears this out. They were more popular
because they were by Cavalca.

462 Sorio and Racheli, Vite, p. 546.
Appendices for Chapter 2: Transcriptions of the Life of Marina

Appendix 2.1— Cambridge, Harvard University Houghton Library Ms Typ 194 (157v-159)

Appendix 2.2 – Comparison of NY Morgan Library MS M.626, Paris Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 1734, Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Conv. Sopp. J. 7. 11

Appendix 2.3—Transcriptions from Incunables: Brussels 1476, Cologne 1477, Nuremberg 1478, Ulm 1478

Appendix 2.4-Comparison of Latin and Pisano-Lucchese Text in Casanatense 422

Appendix 2.5—French Incunable 1486 Lyons, 1486 Paris, 1494 Paris

Appendix 2.6—Spanish Incunable Salamanca 1498
Incipit uita sancte Marine uirginis

Frater quidam erat secularis habens unicam filiam paruulam. ipse uero conuerti cupiens commendauit eam cuidam parenti suo et abijt in monasterium quod longe erat ciuitate milia xxxª duo. Et ingressus perficiebat omne opus quod erat monasterij ita ut abbas ejus eum plus quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant diligeret eo quod fidelis esset et obediens. Contigit autem post aliquod tempus ut recordaretur caritatis filie sue et ce pit contristari atque affligi intra se. Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret uidit eum abbas eius tribulantenem et dixit ei. Quid habes frater quod sic tristis ambulas? Dice mihi. Et deus qui consolatur omnes det tibi auxilium. tunc ille procedens cum lacrimis ad pedes ejus. Habeo inquit unicum filium in ciuitatem quem reliqui paruulum et recordatus affligor propter eum et noluit illi indicare quod puella esset Abbas uero eius ignorans quod esset et nolens eum amittere qua necessarius erat monasterio dicit ei. Si diligis eum uade et adduc eum hoc tecum et sit tecum. Et abiens adduxit eam et dicebatur marina et mutauit ei nomen et vocauit marinum et dedit eam ad discendas litteras intra monasterium et erat cum eo et nullus cognouit de fratribus quod puella esset sed uocabant eam omnes marinum. Et dum esset annorum quat[u]or decim coepit eam docere pater suus uiam domini et dicebat ei. Vide filia nullus cognoscat ministerium tuum et sollicita sis ab insidijs diaboli inimici ut non seducaris ab eo ne istud sanctum monasterium uideatuper nos solui et in conspectu Christi et sanctorum angelorum eius cum impii eternam damnationem accipiamus. Et alia multa docebat eam per singulos dies de regno dei.

CAP II---Dum autem facta esset annorum decem et septem defunctus est pater eius. Remansit autem sola in cella patris sui et ipsa obseruabat se in omnibus doctrinis patris sui et erat obediens in monasterio ut ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligeretur. Habebat autem monasterium par boum et carrum quia uicinum habebat mare ubi erat empurium ad milia tria et ibant monachi et afferebant quae necessaria erant monasterio. Vna uero die dicit abbas eius. Frater Marine quare et tu non uadis cum fratribus et adiuuas eos? Qui respondit. non iussisti pater. Erat autem in ipso empurio pandotium. Cepit autem frater marinus frequenter pergere cum carro et si fiebat tarde ad reuertendum manebat in ipso pandotio cum ceteris monachis.

CAP III--- Contigit autem per insidias inimici ut pandox ille haberet filiam uirginem. Ad quam ingressus miles concubuit cum ea et concepit puella de illo milite. Et dum cognitum fuisse a parentibus eius ceperunt affligere pelllum dicentes. Dice nobis de quo concepiisti? Respondit eis. De illo monacho qui dicitur frater marinus qui hic frequenter

CAP IV---Postmodum uero uidentes fratres misericordia compuncti sunt ingressique ad abbatem rogare ceporent ut eam recipierent in monasterium dicentes Abba indulge et suscipe fratem marinum. Ecce quinque anni sunt quod in penitentia ante ianuam monasterij iacet et non recessit unquam hinc. Suscipe eum in penitentiam sicut dominus noster Jesus Christus precepit. Vix autem coegerunt et iussit eam ingredi et uocauit eam ad se et ait Pater tuus fuit uir sanctus quod tu nosti et paruulum introduxit te in hoc sancto monasterio et non est operatus aliquid mali quod tu cogitasti et fecisti nec aliquis in hoc sancto monasterio. Nunc autem ingressus est domum tu cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes unde oportet te grauiter penitere. graue enim peccatum fecisti. Et hoc tibi iubeo ut omnes munditas monasterij tu solus cotidie fatias et aquam ad necessaria purganda tu portes et calciaaria omnibus per singulos dies tu perficias dies et omnibus seruias. in hoc enim meam habebis gratiam. Sancta urgo libenti animo mandata suscipientium omne opus quod ei iussum fuerat perficiebat.

CAP VI--Eadem autem die puella illa arrepta a demonio uenit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimen quod ei imposuerat et de quo concepisset. Et septima die repausationis eius in domino ibi intra oratorium liberata est a demonio. Audientes autem qui erant in ipso empurio et in uicinis monasterijs mirabilia que facta fuerant accipientes cruces et cereos cum hymnis et canticis et psalmis benedicentes dominum uenerunt in eodem monasterio et ingressi oratorium ubi corpus eius requiescebat benedixerunt deum. Vbi usque modo dominus orationibus sancte uirginis multa facit mirabilia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NY Morgan M626</th>
<th>Paris Mazarine 1734</th>
<th>Florence BNC C.S. J.7.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incipit uita uel obitus beate marine uriginis christi</td>
<td>Incipit vita sancte marine virginis</td>
<td>Incipit sancte marine uriginis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I---ERat quidam uir secularis habens unicam filiam paruulam ipse vero conuerti cupiens commendauit eam cuidam parenti suo et abijt in monasterium quod longe erat ciuitate miliaris triginta duo.</td>
<td>I---Erat quidam secularis habens vniam filiam paruulam Ipse vero conuerti cupiens. commendauit eam cuidam parenti suo et abijt ad monasterium quod longe erat de civitate miliaria triginta duo.</td>
<td>I---Erat quidam secularis habens unicam filiam parvulam. Ipse vero converti cupiens, commendavit eam cuidam parenti suo, et abiiit ad monasterium, quod triginta duobus milibus a civitate distabat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ingressus ad monasterium perficiebat omne opus quod erat monasterij ita ut abbas ejus amplius eum quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant diligeret eo quod fidelis esset et obediens.</td>
<td>Et ingressus perficiebat omne opus monasterij: ita vt abbas eius amplius eum quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant diligeret. eo quod fidelis esset et obediens</td>
<td>Qui obedire regulari ita operam dedit ut ab abbate preceteris diligeretur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contigit aut&lt;em&gt; post aliquod tempus ut recordaretur caritatis sue filie et cepit contristare atque affligi intra se.</td>
<td>Contigit autem post aliquod tempus vt recordaretur caritatem filie sue et cepit contristari atque afligii intra se</td>
<td>Contigit autem, post aliquod temporis intervallo, ut recordaretur unice filie sue, et cepit contristari atque afligi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret uidit eum abbas eius tribulandum et dixit ei: Quid habes frater quod sic tristi animo ambulas dic mihi. Et deus consolator omnium dabit tibi auxilium.</td>
<td>Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret: vidit eum abbas eius tribulatum et dixit ei Quid habes frater quod sic tristis ambulas? Dic mihi et deus qui consolatur omnes dabit tibi auxilium</td>
<td>Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret, abbas eius hoc perspexit et ait ei: Quid habes, frater, quod sic tristi animo am[b]ulas? Dic mihi, et deus qui consolatur omnes, dabit tibi auxilium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tunc ille procidens cum lacrimis ad pedes eius dixit. Habeo unicum filium in ciuitate quem reliqui paruulum et recordatus afligior propter eum</td>
<td>Tunc ille procidens cum lacrimis ad pedes eius habeo inquit vnum filium in ciuitate quem reliqui paruulum: et recordatus afligior propter eum</td>
<td>Tunc ille procidens ad pedes eius cum lacrymis dixit: Habeo unicum filium in civitate quem reliqui parvulum, et eius recordatus infantie valde afligior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
et noluit illi indicare quod puella esset

Abbas uero eius ignorans quid esset et nolens eum amittere quia necessarius erat in monasterio dicit ei.

Si diligis eum uade et adduc eum huc et sit tecum.

Et abiens adduxit eam et dicebatur marina et mutavit ei nomen et vocavit eam marium et dedit eam ad discedentias litteras intra monasterium et erat cum eo et nullus cognouit de fratribus eo quod puella esset sed vocabant eam omnes marium.

Et cum esset annorum quat[u]or decim cepit eam docere pater suus viam domini et dicebat ei.

Vide filia nullus cognoscat misterium tuum usque in finem tuum et sollicita sis ab insidiis diaboli et ne seducaris ab eo et istud sanctum monasterium videatur per nos solvi et in conspectu Christi et sanctorum angelorum eius cum impiis eternam dampnationem accipiamus.

Et alia multa dicebat ei per singulos dies de regno dei.

Et noluit illi indicare: quod puella esset

Abbas vero eius ignorans quod esset et nolens eum amittere quia necessarius erat in monasterio dicit ei.

Si diligis eum. vade et adduc eum hic et sit tecum.

Et abiens adduxit eam Et dicebatur marina et mutavit ei nomen et vocavit marium Et dedit eam ad discedentias litteras intra monasterium: et erat cum eo et nullus cognouit de fratribus eo quod puella esset: sed vocabant eam omnes marinum.

Et dum esset annorum quatuordecim: cepit eam docere pater suus viam domini: et dicebat ei.

Vide filia vt nullus cognoscat misterium tuum. vsque in finem tuum: et sollicita sis ab insidiis diaboli ne seducaris ab eo et istud sanctum monasterium videatur per nos solvi: et in conspectu cristi et sanctorum angelorum eius cum impiis eternam dampnationem accipiamus.

Et alia multa docebat eam per singulos dies de regno dei.

Et noluit abbati confiteri quod esset femina.

Abbas vero eius ignorans et nolens eum amittere, quia necessarius et perfectibilis erat in monasterio, dicit ei:

Si diligis eum, vade, et adduc eum ut habitet nobiscum.

Et abiens adduxit eam habitu et nomine mutato. Ex Marina scilicet Marinum vocavit et infra monasterium ad addiscendas litteras dedit.

Et nullus cognovit ex fratribus quod esset puella. Et vocabant eum omnes Marinum.

Cumque esset .xiii. annorum docebat eum pater suus viam Domini, et dicebat ei:

Vide, filia, ne cognoscas misterium tuum usque in finem et sollicita sis semper contra insidias dyaboli, ne seducaris ab eo, et ne hoc sanctum monasterium videatur per nos solvi, et in adventu Christi et sanctorum angelorum eius cum impiis et peccatoribus in eternum dampnemur.

Et alia multa sine cessatione per singulos dies docebat eam.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II---Dum autem sancta esset annorum decem et septem: defunctus est pater eius. Remansit autem sola in cella patris sui et ipsa obseruabat se in omnibus doctrinis patris sui.</th>
<th>II---Dum autem facta esset annorum decem et septem: defunctus est pater eius. Remansit vero hec sola in cella patris sui.</th>
<th>II---Cum ergo annorum decem et octo esset, defunctus est pater eius et ipsa sola remansit in cella patris sui, et observavit omnia precepta eius.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>et erat obediens in monasterio ita ut ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligeretur.</td>
<td>et erat obediens omnibus in monasterio: ita ut ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligeretur.</td>
<td>Et ita erat obediens omnibus fratribus ut ab abbate et cunctis monachis valde diligeretur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habebat autem monasterium par boum et carrum quia vicinum habebat mare ubi erat emporium pantocis ad miliaria tria et ibant monachi et afferebant que necessaria erant in monasterio.</td>
<td>Habebat autem monasterium par boum et carrum. quia vicinum erat mare ubi erat emporium: et ibant monachi et afferebant que necessaria erant monasterio.</td>
<td>Habebat autem monasterium par boum et carrum, quia vicinum erat mare, ubi erat emporium tribus milibus distans a monasterio; et ibant monachi, et que necessaria erant deferebant in monasterio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cepit autem frater marinus frequenter cum carro ire. Cumque tardius fieret ad remeandum in ipso manebat emporio pandocis cum ceteris fratribus.</td>
<td>Cepit frater marinus frequenter pergere cum carro: et si fiebat tardius ad revertedendum manebat in ipso pandocio cum ceteris monachis.</td>
<td>Erat autem in ipso emporio pandochium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibat ergo frater Marinus frequenter cum carro, et si fiebat tarde ad revertendum, manebat in ipso pandochio cum ceteris monachis.</td>
<td>Erat autem in ipso emporio pandochium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III---Pandox autem habebat filiam virginem. Contigit autem ut per insidias dyaboli et inimici ingressus miles concubaret cum ea et concepit de milite illo.</td>
<td>III---Contigit autem per insidias inimici vt pandox ille haberet filiam virginem. ad quam ingressus miles concubuit cum ea et concepit puella de illo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III---Contigit autem per insidias inimici, ut pandox loci illius haberet filiam virginem. Ad quam ingressus miles, concubuit cum ea, et concepit puella.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>English Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et dum cognitum fuisset parentibus eius ceperunt affligere puellam dicentes. Dic nobis de quo concepisti uiro?</td>
<td><strong>milite</strong> Et dum cognitum fuisset a parentibus eius: ceperunt affligere puellam dicentes Dic nobis: de quo concepisti?</td>
<td>Cumque cognitum fuisset parentibus eius, ceperunt affligere puellam, dicentes: Dic nobis de quo concepisti?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondit eis. De monacho illo qui marinus dicitur qui hic cum carro mansit ipse me obpressit et concepi.</td>
<td><strong>Respondit eis De illo monacho qui dicitur marinus frater qui hic frequenter cum carro mansit: ipse me oppressit et concepi.</strong></td>
<td>Respondit eis: De illo monacho, qui dicitur frater Marinus, qui hic frequenter cum carro mansit, ipse me compressit, et concepi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicit eis abbas. Videamus si uera sunt que dicitis.</td>
<td><strong>Dicit eis abbas Sinite videamus si manifesta sunt que dicitis</strong></td>
<td>Dicit ei[s] abbas: Sinite, videamus si manifesta sunt que dicitis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et iussit eum uocari.</td>
<td><strong>Et veniente eo dicit ei abbas eius Frater marine. tu hoc scelus operatus es in filia eorum?</strong></td>
<td>Et vocato illo dicit ei abbas: Frater Marine, tu hoc scelus operatus es in filia istorum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo ueniente dixit ad eum abbas suus. frater marine. Vere tu scelus hoc operatus es in filiam istorum.</td>
<td><strong>Stans vero diutius cogitavit intra se et ingemiscens dicit Pater peccavi</strong> penintentiam ago huic peccato: ora pro me</td>
<td>Stans vero diutius cogitavit, intra se et ingemiscens dixit: Peccavi, Pater, penitentiam ago de hoc peccato; ora pro me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stans ille diutius excogitans intra semetipsum et ingemiscens dixit. Peccauui pater.</td>
<td><strong>Ad iracundiam autem commotus abbas eius iussit eam contundi et affligi et ait illi.</strong></td>
<td>Abbas autem iracundia motus ait:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad iracundiam autem commotus abbas eius iussit eam contundi et affligi et ait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In veritate dico quia tu quicunque hoc malum operatus es: non manebis in hoc monasterio.</td>
<td>Ipsa vero nulli umquam confessa est ministerium (sic) suum, sed abiens proeicit se ante foras monasterij, et iacebat in terra in penitentia ita se affligens tanquam si ipsa peccasset.</td>
<td>In veritate dico, quia tu quicunque hoc malum operatus es, non habitabis in isto monasterio. Et eieicit eum foras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et eieicit eum foras.</td>
<td>Et ab ingredientibus fratibus postulabat ut una buccella panis daretur.</td>
<td>Et ab ingredientibus fratibus postulabat ab eis ut bucellam panis illi darent. Hoc fatiens per triennium a porta uero non recessit monasterij.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipsa vero nulli umquam confessa est ministerium suum sed abiens iactauit se ante fores monasterij et iacebat super terram: in penitentiam affligens se tamquam si ipsa peccasset.</td>
<td>Et reliquit eum ibi et abijt.</td>
<td>Pandocis vero filia peperit infantem masculum, et cum ablactasset eum adductus est ad monasterium a pandocissa et ait: frater Marine, ecce filium tuum, quomodo nosti nutrica eum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et reliquit eum ibi et abijt.</td>
<td>Sancta vero virgo suscipti eum ut filium proprium et de ipsa bucella panis quam accipiebat ab introeuntibus in monasterium nutriebat filium alienum.</td>
<td>Et reliquit infantem ibi, et abijt ad sua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta autem virgo suscipti eum filium proprium et de ipsa bucella panis quam accipiebat ab introeuntibus in monasterium nutriebat filium alienum.</td>
<td>Sancta virgo suscipti eum nutriebat tamquam proprium filium: et de ipsa bucella panis quam exigebat ab introeuntibus monasterium nutricabat filium alienum</td>
<td>Sancta vero virgo Marina suscipti eum uelud proprium filium, de ipsa bucella panis, quam ab introeuntibus accipiebat nutriebat filium alienum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factum est autem hoc per biennium.</td>
<td>Factum est autem hoc annos alios duos.</td>
<td>Fecit autem hoc per alios duos annos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV---Postmodum uidentes eam fratres misericordia compuncti ingressi sunt ad abbatem rogare eum ceperunt ut eum recipieret in penitentia in monasterium dicentes abbati.</td>
<td>IV---Postmodum vero videntes fratres misericordia compuncti ingressi ad abbatem rogare ceperunt: vt eum recipieret in monasterio dicentes</td>
<td>IV---Postmodum vero videntes fratres, misericordia moti, ad abbatem ingressi rogare ceperunt ut eum recipieret in monasterio dicentes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indulge abba et suscipe fratem marinum. Ecce quinqueannis habet quod in penitentiam ante ianuam iacet monasterij et non recessit umquam hinc.</td>
<td>Abba indulge: et suscipe fratem marinum Ecce quinque anni sunt quod in penitentiam ante ianuam monasterij iacet: et non recessit umquam hinc</td>
<td>Domine abba, indulge et recipe fratem Marinum. Ecce quinque anni sunt, ex quo in penitentia ante ianuam monasterij iacet, et nusquam recessit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suscipe eum in penitentia sicut dominus noster ihesus christus precepit.</td>
<td>Suscipe eum in penitentiam: sicut dominus noster ihesus cristus precepit</td>
<td>Suscipe illum in penitentia, sicut Dominus noster ihesus christus precepit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vix autem imposuerunt ei ut eum recipieret. Et iussit eam ingredi uocauitque ad se eam et ait illi.</td>
<td>Vix autem impositum est ei et iussit eum ingredi: et vocaut ad se et ait:</td>
<td>Vix autem impositum est ei a fratribus et iussit tandem eum ingredi. Et vocavit ad se, et ait ei:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pater tuus vir sanctus fuit qui ad nos paruulum te introduxit in hoc monasterium et non est malum operatus sicut tu cogitasti et fecistij sed nec aliquis de hoc sancto monasterio.</td>
<td>Pater tuus fuit vir sanctus quod tu nosti et paruulum introduxit te in hoc monasterio sancto:</td>
<td>Pater tuus vir sanctus fuit, sicut tu ipse nosti, et paruulum introduxit te in hoc monasterium et nichil mali hic operatus est quod tu cogitasti, et fecisti in hoc monasterio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunc autem ingressus es cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes</td>
<td>nunc autem ingressus es cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes:</td>
<td>Nunc autem ingressus es modo cum filio tuo, quem de adulterio habes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unde oportet te penitere--grae neim peccatum fecisti.</td>
<td>vnde oportet te penitere Grave enim peccatum fecisti:</td>
<td>Vide quam diligenter te oporteat (sic) penitere grave enim peccatum fecisti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibi namque iubeo ut omnes munditias monasterij solus fatias et aquam ad necessaria portes et</td>
<td>et hoc tibi iubeo vt omnes immundicias monasterij tu solus facias cotidie: et omnibus seruias et aquam</td>
<td>Et hoc tibi iubeo, ut omnes immunditias monasterii tu solus mundare debeas cotidie, et aquam ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caltiamenta omnium per singulos solus perfitias dies.</td>
<td>ad necessaria purganda tu portes et calcaria per singulos dies tu omnibus perficias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in hoc enim habebis meam gratiam.</td>
<td>In hoc enim habebis meam gratiam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta enim urgo libenti animo opus quod ei iussum fuerat perfitiebat.</td>
<td>Sancta vero libenti animo suscipient omne opus quod ei iussum fuerat: perficiebat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V---Contigit autem eam intra paucos dies dormire in domino. Euntes fratres nuntiauerunt abbati dicentes. Frater marinus obijt.</td>
<td>V---Contigit autem eam intra paucos dies dormire in domino Euntes autem fratres nunciauerunt abbati dicentes Frater marinus defunctus est</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicit eis abbas. Videte quale peccatum fecit quia nec penitentiam agere meruit.</td>
<td>Dicit eis abbas Videte fratres quale peccatum fuit ut nec meretur penitentiam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed tamen iste lavate eum et sepelite eum longe a monasterio. Euntes autem fratres dum uellent lauare eum agnouerunt quia femina erat et ceperunt omnes uociferare et et tunde[n]tes pectora sua clamabant et dicentes quia talis conversatio et penitentia sancta inuenta est in ea cuius nullus cognouit misterium et sic ab eis afflicta fuisset.</td>
<td>Sed tamen ite lavate eum et sepelite longe a monasterio Et euntes dum laurent eam cognouerunt quia femina esset Et ceperunt omnes mittere voces: et tundentes se clamabant quia talis conversatio et patientia sancta inuenta est in ea cuius misterium nullus cognouit et sic ab eis afflicta est</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessarium purgandum tu portes, calciamenta per singulos dies abstergas et, omnibus fratibus humiliter servias.</td>
<td>In hoc enim habebis meam gratiam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sancta itaque urgo hec omnia animo libenti suscipients, quidquid ei iussum fuerat spontanea voluntate faciebat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V---Contigit autem non post multos dies ut dormiret in pace et euntes fratres, nuntiaverunt abbati dicentes: frater Marinus defunctus est.</td>
<td>V---Contigit autem non post multos dies ut dormiret in pace et euntes fratres, nuntiaverunt abbati dicentes: frater Marinus defunctus est.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicit eis abbas: Videte fratres quale peccatum fuit ut nec meretur penitentiam ad integrum agere.</td>
<td>Dicit eis abbas: Videte, fratres, quam grande peccatum fuit ut non meretur penitentiam ad integrum agere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ite tamen et lavate eum et sepellite procul a monasterio. Illi vero euntes, dum lavarent corpus cognoverunt quia femina esset,</td>
<td>Ite tamen et lavate eum et sepellite procul a monasterio. Illi vero euntes, dum lavarent corpus cognoverunt quia femina esset,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceperunt omnes mittere voces, et tundentes capita et pectora percutientes clamabant dicentes:</td>
<td>ceperunt omnes mittere voces, et tundentes capita et pectora percutientes clamabant dicentes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia talis conversatio et patientia sancta inuenta est in ea, cuius ministerium (sic) nemo cognovit cum sic ab eis afflicta fuisset.</td>
<td>Quia talis conversatio et patientia sancta inuenta est in ea, cuius ministerium (sic) nemo cognovit cum sic ab eis afflicta fuisset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertio hoc dicto perrexit et usque ad corpus uenit et leuantes pallium quo erat cooperta et cum uidisset quia femina esset expauiit et mox cecidit et caput suum percuciebat in terram et uociferabat dicens.</td>
<td>Ille territus perrexit et venit ad corpus et leuans pallium vnde cooperta erat vidit quia mulier esset; Et mox cecidit et caput suum percuciebat in terram Et vociferabat dicens</td>
<td>Ille autem huius perterritus perrexit, et venit usque ad corpus. Et levantes pallium, unde erat cooperta, vidit quia femina esset; et mox ad pedes eius cecidit, et caput suum in terra reclinavit, et vociferabat dicens:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adiuro te per dominun nostrum ihesum christum ne mecum contendas ante conspectum dei eo quod afflixerim te quia ignorans feci.</td>
<td>Coniuro te per ihesum christum dominum nostrum ne me condempnes ante conspectum dei eo quod afflixerim te: quia ignorans feci</td>
<td>Coniuro te per ihesum christum dominum nostrum, ne me condempnes ante conspectum Dei eo quod afflixerim te, eo quod ignorans feci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu domina non es confessa misterium tuum et ego non cognoui in veritate sanctam conversationem tuam.</td>
<td>Tu domina non dixisti misterium tuum et non ego cognoui in veritate sanctam conversationem tuam</td>
<td>Tu, domina, non dixisti ministerium tuum, et ego non cognovi in veritate sanctam conversationem tuam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo cognito abbas sanctum corpus eius in monasterio intra oratorium reponi eadem die precepit.</td>
<td>Et iussit sanctum corpus eius in monasterio intra oratorium reponi</td>
<td>Tunc iussit sanctum corpus eius in monasterio intra oratorium reponi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI---Puella autem arrepta a demonio uenit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimen quod ei admiserat et de quo concepisset.</td>
<td>VI---Eadem vero die puella illa arrepta a demonio venit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimine quod ei admiserat et de quo concepisset</td>
<td>VI---Eadem autem die predicta puella a demonio correpta venit ad monasterium, et confitebatur crimine quod admiserat, et de quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septimo quoque die repausationis marine in domino ibi intra oratorium predicta calumniatrix femina liberata est a demonio.</td>
<td>Et in septima die repausationis eius in domino: ibi intra oratorium liberata est a demonio.</td>
<td>concepisset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audientes autem qui erant in ipso emptorio et vicina monasteria mirabilia que facta fuerant accipientes cruces et cereos cum ynnis et canticis et psalmis benedicentes deum uenerunt in eundem monasterium et ingressi oratorium ubi corpus ejus requiescebat benedixerunt dominum.</td>
<td>Audientes autem qui erant in ipso emptorio et vicina monasteria mirabilia que facta fuerant: accipientes cruces et cereos cum ynnis et canticis et psalmis benedicentes deum venerunt in eodem monasterio et ingressi in oratorium vbi corpus eius requiescebat benedixerunt dominum.</td>
<td>Audientes autem omnes qui erant in ipso emptorio, et vicina monasteria, mirabilia que facta fuerant, accipientes cruces et cerea, cum hymnis et canticis et psalmis, benedicentes Deum, venerunt ad ipsum monasterium, et ingressi oratorium ubi sanctum corpus requiescit et benedixerunt Dominum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cui est honor et gloria in secula saeculorum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qui vivit et regnat in secula saeculorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit de sancta marina. Incipit uita uel obitus sancte eufrosine uirginis christi</td>
<td>Explicit uita sancte uirginis marine Incipit conuersatio sancte pelagie meretricis.</td>
<td>Explicit vita sancte Marine virginis. Incipit de puella filia boni patris et pessime matris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I have retained Rosweyde’s chapter divisions. There are no such divisions in text.

De sancto marino monacho

CAPUT I—[Yrb] Erat quidam secularis habens unicum filiam paruulam Ipse vero conversi cupiens commendavit eam cuidam parenti suo et abijt ad monasterium quod erat longe de civitate miliaria triginta duo [Yva]Et ingressus perficiebat omne opus monasterij ita vt abbas eius amplius eum quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant diligeret eo quod fidelis esset et obediens Contigit autem post aliquod tempus vt recordaretur caritatis filie sue et cepit contristari et affligi intra se Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret vidit eum abbas eius tribulari et dixit ei Quid habes frater quod sic tristis ambulas? Di mihi et deus qui consolatur omnes dabit tibi auxilium Tunc ille procidens cum lacrimis ad pedes eius dixit Habeo unum filium in civitate quem reliqui paruulum et recordatus affligor propter eum Et noluit indicare ei quod puella esset Abbas vero eius ignorans causam et nolens eum amittere quia necessarius erat monasterio dicit ei Si diligis eum vade et adduc eum hoc et sit tecum Et abien adduxit eam Et dixebatur marina Et mutauit ei nomen et vocavit eam marinem Et dixit eam ad discendas litteras intra monasterium et erat cum ea nulloque agnouit de fratibus sed vocabant eam omnes marinum Et dum esset annorum quatuordecim cepit eam docere pater suus viam domini et dicebat ei Vide filia vt nullus agnoscat mysterium tuum vsque in finem tuum et sollicita sis ab insidiis dyabolis ne seducaris ab eo et istud sanctum monasterium videatur per nos soluis in conspectu cristi et sanctorum angelorum eius ne cum impiis eternam damnationem accipiamus [Yvb] Et alia multa docebat eam per singulos dies de regno dei

CAP II---Dum autem facta esset annorum decem et septem defunctus est pater eius Remansit vero hec sola in cella patris sui et erat obediens omnibus in monasterio ita vt ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligetur Habebat autem monasterium par boun et carrum quia vicinum habebat mare vbi erat emporium et ibant monachi et afferebant que necessaria erant monasterio Vna vero die dicit abbas eius Frater marine quare et tu non vadis cum fratibus et adiuvas eos? Qui respondit Jussisti pater? Erat autem in ipso emporio pondocium Cepit igitur frater marinus frequenter pergere cum carru et si fiebat tardius ad reuertendum manebat in ipso pondocio cum ipsis monachis

CAP III---Contigit autem per insidiis inimici vt pandox ille haberet filiam virginem Ad quam ingressus miles concubuit cum ea et concepit puella de illo milite Et dum cognitum fuisset a parentibus eius ceperunt affligere puellam dicentes Dice nobis de quo concepisti Respondit ei De illo monacho qui dicitur marinus qui hic frequenter cum carru mansit ipse me oppressit et ex eo concepi Statim autem perrexerunt parentes eius ad
monasterium et dixerunt abbati Ecce domine abba quid fecit monachus tuus marinus quomodo deceptit [Y+1ra] filiam nostram Dicit eis abbas Sinite videamus si manifesta sunt que dicitis Et venienti eo dicit ei abbas eius Frater marine hoc scelus operatus es in filia eorum? Stans vero diiclus cogitauit intra se et ingemiscens dixit peccavi pater Ago huic peccato penitentiam ora pro me Ad iracundiam autem commotus abbas iussit eam contundi et affligi et ait In veritate dico quia tu qui hoc malum operatus es non manebis in hoc monasterio Et iactavit eam foras Ipsa vera nulli unquam confessa est misterium suum sed abiens iactuit se ante foress monasterij et iacebat super terram in penitentia affligens se tanquam ipsa peccasset Et ab ingredientibus fratribus postulabat vt vel vna buccella panis ei daretur Hoc faciens per tres annos non recessit de monasterio Pondocis vero filia peperit filium masculum et ablactauit et adduxit eum mater puelle Et dum iaceret ibi ante monasterium dicit ei Ecce frater marine hoc scelus operatus es in filia eorum? Stans vero diicet ibi ante monasterium dicit ei Ecce filia tuum? Et venienti eo dicit ei frater marine quomodo nosti nutri filium tuum Et reliquit eum ibi et abijt Sancta virgo suscipients puerum nutriebat tanquam proprium filium et de ipsa buccella panis quam exigebat ab introeuntibus monasterio tarn etiam in monasterio Factum est hoc per annos alios duos

CAP IV---Postmodum autem videntes fratres misericordia conjuncti ingressi ad abbatem rogare coperunt [Y+1rb] vt eum recuperet in monasterio dicentes Abba indulge et suscipe fratrem marium Ecce quinque anni sunt quod in penitentia ante ianuam monasterij iacet et non recessit hinc Suscipe eum in penitentiam sicut dominus noster Ihesus cristus precepit Vix autem impositum est ei et iussit eum ingredit et vocauit ad se et ait Pater tuus fuit vir sanctus quia tu nosti et paruulum te introduxit in hoc monasterium Nunc autem ingressus es cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes vnde oportet te penitere Grave enim peccatum fecisti et hoc tibi iubeo vt omnes immundicias monasterij tu suscipe cotidie et aquam ad necessaria portes et calcarius omnibus per singulos dies te perficias omnibus que servias in hoc enim habebis nee eam sanctamm Sancta vero libenti animo suscipients omne opus quod ei iussum fuerat perficiebat

CAP V---Contigit autem eam inter paucos dies dormire in domino Euntes fratres nunciauerunt abbatii dicentes Frater marinus defunctus est Dicit eis abbas Videte fratres quale peccatum fuit nec meruerit penitentiam Sed tamen ite lavate eum et sepelite longe a monasterio Et euntes dum lavant eam cognouerunt quia femina esset Et ceperunt omnes mittere voces et tundentes se clamabant quia talis conversatio et patientia sancta inuenta est in ea cuius misterium nullus agnouit et sic ab eis afflicta [Y+1va] est Et venientes cum lacrimis dicunt abbatii Abba veni et vide fratem marium Dicit eis Quid est hoc? Fratres dicunt ei iterum Veni et vide mirabilia dei et vide quid de te agas Ille territ us perrexit et venit ad corpus et leuans pallium vnde cooperta erat vidit quia mulier esset; Et mox cecidit et caput suum percuciebat in terram Et vociferabatur dicens Coniuro te per ihesum crismum dominum ne me condemnes ante spectum dei eo quod aflixerim te quia ignorans feci Tu domina non dixisti misterium tuum et non cognoui in veritate sanctam conversationem tuam Et iussit sanctuum corpus eius in monasterium intra oratorium reponi

CAP VI---Eadem vero die puella illa arrepta a demonio venit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimine quod admissaret et de quo concepisset Et in septima die repausationis eius in domino ibi intra oratorium liberata est a demonio Audientes autem qui erant in
ipso emporio et vicina monasteria mirabilia que facta fuerant accipientes cruces et cereos
cum ymnis et canticis et psalmis benedicentes deum venerunt in eodem monasterio et
oratorium ingressi vbi corpus eius requiescebat benedixerunt deum Vbi vsque modo
cristus orationibus sancte virginis multa facit mirabilia ad laudem et gloriam nominis sui
qui cum patre et spiritu sancto viuit et regnat deus per omnia secula seculorum Amen
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374a Quomodo deus compleuit labores beate Marine virginis et mendaces ostendit qui
maculauerunt eam. Ca. xciiii
CAPUT I.--Erat quidam secularis habens vnicam filiam paruulam. Ipse conuerti cupiens,
commendauit eam cuidam parenti suo, et abijt ad monasterium, quod longe erat de
civitate miliaria triginta duo. Et ingressus perficiebat omne opus quod erat monasterij, ita
vt abbas eius amplius eum quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant diligeret, eo quod fidelis
esset et obediens. Contigit autem, post aliquod tempus, vt recordaretur caritatis filie sue,
et cepit contristari atque affligi intra se. Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret, vidit eum
abbas eius tribulantum, et dixit ei: Quid habes, frater, quod sic tristis ambulas? Dic michi,
et deus qui consolatur omnes, dat tibi auxilium. Tunc ille procidens [374b] cum lacrimis
ad pedes eius, dixit: Habeo vnum filium in ciuitate quem reliqui paruulum, et recordatus,
affligor propter eum. Et noluit indicare ei quod puella esset. Abbas vero eius ignorans
causam et nolens eum amittere, quia necessarius erat monasterio, dicit ei: Si diligis eum,
vade, et adduc eum huc, et sit tecum. Et abiens adduxit eam et dicebatur Marina. Et
mutauit ei nomen, et vocauit eam Marinum. Et dedit eam ad discendas litteras intra
monsterium, et erat cum ea: nullusque agnouit de fratribus quod puella esset, sed
vocabant eam omnes Marinum. Et dum esset annorum quatuordecim, cepit eam docere
pater suus viam domini, et dicebat ei: Vide, filia, vt nullus cognoscat misterium tuum
vsque in finem tuum, et sollicita sis ab insidijs dyaboli, ne seducaris ab eo, et istud
sanctum monasterium videatur per nos solvi, et in conspectu cristi et sanctorum
angelorum eius cum impijs ne eternam damnacionem accipiamus. Et alia multa docebat
eam per singulos dies de regno dei.
CAP. II.---Dum autem facta esset annorum decemse et ptem, defunctus est pater eius.
Remansit vero hec sola in cella patris sui, et erat obediens omnibus in monasterio, ita vt
ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligeretur. Habebat autem monasterium par boum et
carrum, quia vicinum habebat mare, vbi erat emporium [375a] et ibant monachi, et
afferebant que necessaria erant monasterio. Vna vero die dicit abbas eius: Frater Marine,
quare et tu non vadis cum fratribus et adiuvas eos? Que respondit: Jussisti, pater? Erat
autem in ipso emporeo pandocium. Cepit ergo frater Marinus frequenter pergere cum
carro, et si fiebat tardus ad reuertendum, manebat in ipso pandocio cum ceteris monachis.
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misterium tuum, et ego non cognoui in veritate sanctam conversacionem tuam. Et iussit sanctum corpus eius in monasterium intra oratorio reponi.

CAP. VI.---Eadem vero die puella illa arrepta a demonio venit ad monasterium, et confitebatur crimen quod admonerat, et de quo concepisset. Et in septima die repagationis eius in domino, ibi intra oratorium liberata est a demonio. Audientes autem qui erant in ipso emporio, et vicina monasteria, mirabilia que facta fuerant, accipientes cruces et cereos, cum hymnis et canticis et psalmis, benedicentes deum, venerunt in eodem monasterio, et oratorium ingressi ubi corpus eius requiescebat, benedixerunt deum. Vbi usque modo cristus oracionibus sancte virginis multa facit mirabilia, ad laudem nomini sui. Qui cum patre et spiritu sancto viuit et regnat deus, per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.
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Quomodo deus compleuit labores beate Marine virginis et mendaces ostendit qui maculauerunt eam. Ca. xciii

CAPUT I—[LXIIIva] Quit frater quidam secularis habens unicum filiam pauperam Ipse vero conuerti cupiens commendavit eam cujus parenti suo et in monasterium quod longe erat a civitate per miliaria triginta duobus et ingressus perfecit opus monasterij ita ut abbas eius plus quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant eum diligere tuebat eo quod fidelis esset et obediens Contigit autem post aliquod tempus ut recordaretur caritatis filiae suae et cepit contristari atque affligi intra se Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret vidit eum abbas eius tribulatum et dixit ei Quid habes frater quod sic tristis ambulas? Dic mihi et deus qui consolatur omnes dabit tibi auxilium Tunc ille procidens cum lacrimis ad pedes ejus abiit filius in civitate quem reliquis parvulum et recordatus affligor propter eum Habeo unum filium in civitate quem reliquis parvulum et recordatus affligor propter eum Etnoluit indicare abbatii eo quod puella esset Abbas vero eius nec ignorans et nolens eum amittere quia necessarius erat in monasterio dixit ei Si diligis eum vade eum et sit tecum Et [LXIIIvb] abini adduxit eam dicebat autem marina et mutavit ei nomen et vocavit eum marinum et dedit eam ad discendas litteras intra monsterium et erat cum ea Et nullus cognouit de fratribus quod puella esset sed vocabant eam omnes marinum Et dum esset annorum quatuordecim cepit eam docere pater suus viam domini et dicebat ei Vide filia vt nullus cognoscat misterium tuum vsque in finem tuum et solicita sis ab insidiis dyaboli ne seducaris ab eo et istud sanctum monasterium per nos solui videatur et in conspectu christi et coram sanctis angeliis eius cum impiis eternam damnationem accipiamus Et alia multa docebat eam per singulos dies de regno dei
CAP II---Cum autem facta esset annorum decem et septem defunctus est pater eius Remansit autem sola in cella patris sui et erat obediens omnibus in monasterio ita vt ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligeretur Habebat autem monasterium par bom et carrum aut bigam quia vicinum habebat mare vbi erat emporium ad tria miliaria et ibant monachi et afferebant quia necessaria erant monasterio Vna ergo die dicit abbas ad marinum Frater marine quare et tu non vadi cum fratribus et adiuvus eos? Que respondit vt iubes pater Erat autem iuxta viam homo manens nomine pandox per quem fratres ibant et reuerentans Et cepit igitur frater Marinus frequenter pergere cum carro ad opus sibi inuinctum et ubi tardior euenebet hora ad reuertendum manebat in domo ipsius pandociij cum ceteris monachis

CAP III--- Pandox autem habebat filiam virginem ad quam ingressus miles per insidias dyaboli concubuit cum ea et concepit de illo milite Et dum cognitum fuisset a parentibus eius ceperunt affligere filiam dicentes Deprosequi a quo concepisti? Respondit eis De illo monacho qui dicitur frater Marinus qui hic frequenter cum carro mansit ipse oppressit et concepi Statim autem parentes eius prexerunt ad monasterium et dicunt abbati eius Ecce domine abba quid fecit monachus tuus Marinus quamodo decepit filiam nostram Dixit eis abbas Quid dicitis? Et iussit eum vocare Et [LXIIIra] veniente eo dicit ei abbas suus Frater Marine tu hoc scelus operatus es in filia eorum? Stans vero dicit et cogitans intra se ingemiscendo dicit Peccavi pater mi penitentiam ago pro hoc peccato sed queso te intercede pro me deum ut hanc perfercere possim. Abbas vero ad iracundiam commotum dicit ei iussit eam contundi et affligi et ait in veritate dico tibi quia hoc malum operatus es hic nobiscum non manebris in hoc monasterio Et proiecit eam foras Ipsa vero nulli unquam confessas est misterium suum sed abiens iactauit se ante fores monasterij et iacebat super terram in penitentia affligens se tanquam si ipsa peccasse t et ingredientibus fratribus postulabat vt vna bucella panis ei daretur Hoc faciens per quatuor annos non reessit de foribus monasterij §Pandocis vero filia de mortuus filium masculum et ablactauit eum et adduxit eum mater puellae secum et posuit eum ibi ante monasterium et dicit ei Ecce frater marne quomodo nosti nutri filium tuum Et reliquit eum et abiit Sancta virgo marina suscipli eum thanquam proprium filium de ipsa bucella panis quam accipiebat ab introuentibus monasterium nutriebat filium alienum Factum est autem hoc per duos alios annos

CAP IV---Postmodum vero videntes fratres misericordia compuncti ingressi ad abbatem rogare ceperunt vt eum recipere in monasterium dicentes Abba indulge et suscipe fratrem marinum Ecce quinque anni quod in penitentia ante ianuam monasterij iacet et non reessit unquam hinc Suscipe eum in penitentia sicut precepit dominus noster Jesus christus Vix autem coegerunt eum et iussit ingredi et vocavit eam ad se et ait Pater tuus fuit vir sanctus quod tu nosti et paruo introduxit te in hoc sanctum monasterium et non est operatus aliquid mali quod tu cogitasti et fecisti nec aliquis in hoc sancto monasterio Nunc autem ingressus es tu cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes vnde oportet te multum penitere Grande enim peccatum fecisti et hoc tibi iubeo vt omnes immundicias monasterij tu solus facias et aquam ad necessaria parganda tu portes et calciarium omnibus per singulos [LXIIIrb] dies tu perficias et omnibus servias In hoc enim habebis gratiam meam Sancta virgo libentissimo animo hec suscipli omne opus quod ei iussum fuerat perficiebat
CAP V—§Contigit autem eam intra paucos dies dormire in domino euntes autem fratres nunciauerunt abbatii dicentes Frater marinus defunctus est dicit eis Abbas Videte fratres quale peccatum fuit quod nec penitentiam meruit implere Sed tamen ite et lavate eum et sepelite longe a monasterio euntes autem dum lauarent eam cognouerunt quia mulier esset Et ceperunt omnes emittere voces et contundentes se clamabant quia talis conversatio et paciencia sancta inuenta est in ea cuius mysterium nullus agnouit cum sic ab eis afflicta fuisset et venientes cum lacrimis dicit abbati Abba veni et vide fratrem marinium dic eis Quid est hoc fratres? Dicunt ei iterum Veni et vide mirabilia dei et quid de te agas Ille territus perrexit et venit usque ad corpus et levantes pallium unde cooperta erat et vidit quia mulier esset Et mox cecidit et caput suum percuciebat in terra et vociferabatur dicens Coniuro te per dominum nostrum Jesum christum ne me condemnes ante conspectum dei eo quod afflixerim te quia ignorans feci Tu domina non dixisti mysterium tuum et ego non cognoui in veritate sanctam conversacionem tuam Si enim cognouissim te nunquam afflixissem. Et iussit sanctum corpus eius intra monasterium in oratorio reponi

CAP VI—Eadem autem die puella illa cuius filius erat arrepta a demonio venit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimen quod admiserat et de quo viro concepisset et septima die repausationis eius in domino ibi intra oratorium liberata est a demonio Audientes autem qui erant in ipso emporio et vicina monasteria mirabilia que facta fuerant accipientes cruces et cereos cum hymnis et canticis et psalmodia benedictenses deum venerunt in eodem monasterio et ingressi oratorium vbi corpus eius requiescet benedixerunt deum Vbi vsque modo deus orationibus sancte virginis multa facit mirabilia ad laudem et gloriam nominis domini Qui cum eterno patre et spiritu sancto viuit et regnat in secula seculorum Amen
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Incipit vita sancte Marine virginis

CAPUT I—[fLXIIIva] QUIT FRATER QUIDAM SECULARIS HABENS VNICAM FILIAM PARUULAM IPSE VERO CONUERTIT CUPIENS COMMENDAUIT EAM CUIDAM PARENTI SUO ET IN MONASTERIUM QUOD LONGE ERAIT A CIVITATE IN Miliaria triginta duo et ingressus perficierat opus monasterij ita vt abbas eius plus quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant eum diligeret eo quod fidelis esset et obediens Contigit autem post aliquod tempus vt recordaretur caritatis filie sue et cepit contristari atque affligi intra se Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret vidit eum abbas eius tribulatum et dixit ei Quid habes frater quod sic tristis ambulas? Dic mihi et deus qui consolationem omnes dabit tibi auxilium Tunc ille procedens cum lacrimis ad pedes eius ait Habeo vnum filium in ciuitate quem reliqui paruulum et recordatus affligor propter eum...
Et noluit abbati indicare eo quod puella esset Abbas vero eius hec ignorans et nolens eum amittere quia necessarius erat in monasterio dixit ei Si diligis eum vade et adduc eum huc et sit tecum Et [fLXIIIvb] abiens adduxit eam dicebatur autem marina et mutavit ei nomen et vocavit eam marium et dedit eam ad discendas litteras intra monasterium et erat cum ea Et nullus cognovit de fratribus quod puella esset sed vocabant eam omnes marium Et dum esset annorum quatuordecim cepit eam docere pater suus viam domini et dixit ei Vide filia vt nullus cognoscat mysterium tuum vsque in finem tuum et sollicita sis ab insidij dyaboli ne seducaris ab eo et istud sanctum monasterium per nos solui videatur et in conspectu chris et coram sanctis angelis eius cum impijs eternam damnationem accipiamus Et alia multa docebat eam per singulos dies de regno dei

CAP II---Cum autem facta esset annorum decem et septem defunctus est pater eius Remansit autem sola in cella patris sui et erat obediens omnibus in monasterio ita vt ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligeretur §Habeat autem monasterium par boum et carrum aut bigam quia vicinum habet mare vbi erat emporium ad tria miliaria et ibant monachi et afferebant quae necessaria erant monasterio Vna ergo die dicit abbas ad marinum Frater marine quare et tu non vadis cum fratribus et adiuvas eos? Que respondit vt iubes pater Erat autem iuxta viam homo manens nomine pandox per quem fraters ibant et reuertebantur Et cepit igitur frater marinus frequentem percere cum carro ad opus sibi iniunctum et ubi tardior eueniebat hora ad reuertendum manebat in domo ipsius pandocij cum ceteris monachis

CAP III--- Pandox autem habebat filiam virginem ad quam ingressus miles per insidias dyaboli concubuit cum ea et concepit de illo milite Et dum cognitum fuisset a parentibus eius ceperunt affligere filiam dicentes Dic nobis a quo concepisti? Respondit eis De illo monacho qui dicitur marinus qui hic frequenter cum carro mansit ipse me oppressit et concepti Statim autem parentes eius perrexerunt ad monasterium et dicunt abbati eius Ecce domine abba quid fecit monachus tuus Marinus quomodo decepit filiam nostram Dixit eis abbas Quid dicitis? Et iussit eum vocare. Et [LXIII] veniente eo dicit ei abbas suus Frater Marine tu hoc scelus operatus es in filia eorum? Stans vero dioius et cogitans intra se ingemiscens dicit Peccavi pater mi Penitentiam ago pro hoc peccato sed ques te intercede pro me ad deum ut hanc perficere possim Abbas vero ad iracundiam commotus abbas iussit ei contundi et affligi et ait In veritate dico tibi quia hoc malum operatus es hic nobiscum non manebris in hoc monasterio Et proiect eam foras Ipsa vero nulli unquam confess est misterium suum sed abiens iactuit se ante fores monasterij et iacebat super terram in penitentia affligens se tanquam si ipsa peccasset et ingredientibus fratribus postulabat vt vna bucella panis ei daretur Hoc faciens per quattuor annos non recessit de foribus monasterij §Pandocis vero filia peperit filium masculum et ablactavit eum et adduxit eum mater puellae secum et posuit eum ibi ante monasterium et dixit ei Ecce frater marine quomodo nosti nutri filium tuum Et reliquit eum ibi et abijt Sancta virgo marina susciens eum tanquam proprium filium de ipsa bucella panis quam accipiebat ab introeuntibus monasterium nutriebat filium alienum Factum est autem hoc per duo alios annos

CAP IV---Postmodum vero videntes fratres misericordia compuncti ingressi ad abbatem rogare ceperunt vt eum recipere et in monasterium dicentes Abba indulge et suscipe
fratrem marinum Ecce quinque anni sunt quod in penitentia ante ianuam monasterij iacet et non recessit unquam hinc Suscipe eum in penitentia sicut precepit dominus noster Jesus christus Vix autem coegerunt eum et iussit ingredi et vocauit eam ad se et ait Pater tuus fuit vir sanctus quod tu nosti et paruulum introduxit te in hoc sanctum monasterium et non est operatus aliquid malo quod tu cogitasti et fecisti nec aliquis in hoc monasterio. Nunc autem ingressus es tu cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes vnde oportet te multum penitere Grande enim peccatum fecisti et hoc tibi iubeo vt omnes immundicias monasterij tu solus facias cotidie et aquam ad necessaria tu portes et calciarium omnibus per singulos dies [LXIII] tu perficias et omnibus servias In hoc enim habebis gratiam meam Sancta virgo libentissimo animo hec suscipiens omne opus quod ei iussum fuerat perficiebat

CAP V---§ Contigit autem eam intra paucos dies dormire in domino euntes autem fratres nunciauerunt abbati dicentes Frater marinus defunctus est dicit eis Abbas Videte fratres quale peccatum fuit quod nec penitentiam meruit implere Sed tamen ite et lavate eum et sepelite longe a monasterio Euntes autem dum lauarent eam cognouerunt quia mulier esset ceperunt omnes emittere voces et contundentes se clamabant quia tali conversatio et paciencia sancta inuenta est in ea cuius mysterium nullus agnouit cum sic ab eis afflictas fuisset et venientes cum lacrimis dicit abbati Abba veni et vide fratrem marinum dic eis Quid est hoc fratres? Dicunt ei iterum Veni et vide miracula dei et quid de te agas Ille territus perrexit et venit usque ad corpus et leuantes pallium vnde cooperta erat et vidit quia mulier esset; Et mox cecidit et caput suum percuciebat in terra et vociferabatur dicens Coniuro te per dominum nostrum Jesum christum ne me condemnes ante conspectum dei eo quod afflixerim te quia ignorans feci Tu domina non dixisti mysterium tuum et ego non cognoui in veritate sanctam conversationem tuam Et iussit sanctum corpus eius intra monasterium in oratorio reponi

CAP VI---Eadem autem die puella illa cuius filius erat arrepta a demonio venit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimen quod ad minerat et de quo viro concepisset et septima die repauationis eius in domino ibi intra oratorium liberata est a demonio Audientes autem qui erant in ipso emporio et vicina monasteria mirabilia que facta fuerant accipientes cruces et cereos cum hymnis et canticis et psalmodia benedicentes deum venerunt in eodem monasterio et ingressi oratorium vbi corpus eius requiescebat benedixerunt deum Vbi vsque modo deus orationibus sancte virginis multa facit mirabilia ad laudem et gloriam nominis domini qui cum eterno patre et spiritu sancto viuit et regnat in secula seculorum Amen

Explicit vita sanctissime marine virginis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit uita uel obitus beate marine uirginis christi</th>
<th>Di Santa Marina vergine.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERat quidam uir secularis habens unicam filiam paruulam ipse uero conuerti cupiens commendauit eam cuidam parenti suo et abijt in monasterium quod longe erat ciuitate miliaris triginta duo.</td>
<td>Un omo seculare rimanendo, morta la moglie, chon una sua figluola picchola volendo lassare lo mondo a fare penetentia, rachomandoe questa' sua figliuola ad un suo parente; e introe nuno monasterio dilungi dalla citta trenta sette miglia e portosi si bene e si fedelmente che ll' abate 1' amava quasi piu delli altri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ingressus ad monasterium perficiebat omne opus quod erat monasterij ita ut abbas ejus amplius eum quam ceteros qui in monasterio erant diligeret eo quod fidelis esset et obediens.</td>
<td>Or avenne che, dipo alchun tempo, ricchordandosi di questa sua figliuola, e chome l'avea lassata , incominciosi a contristare e stava molto malanchonico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contigit aut&lt;em&gt; post aliquod tempus ut recordaretur caritatis sue filie et cepit contristare atque affligi intra se.</td>
<td>Della qual cosa avedendosi l'abate, chiamollo e disseli: Or che ai tu, fratello mio? dimmelo sighuramente, e dio consolatore tri potio (sic) dar consillio e consalattione per me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et cum per multos dies hoc faceret uidit eum abbas eius tribulantem et dixit ei. Quid habes frater quod sic tristi animo ambulas dic mihi. Et deus consolator omnium dabit tibi auxilium.</td>
<td>Allor quelli piangiendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tunc ille procidens cum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacrimis ad pedes eius dixit.</td>
<td>Habeo unicum filium in ciuitate quem reliqui paruulum et recordatus affligor propter eum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et noluit illi indicare quod puella esset</td>
<td>E non volse manifestare all' abate che fusse femina, e non maschio, e disse ch era figliuolo e non figliuola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbas uero eius ignorans quid esset et nolens eum amittere quia necessarius erat in monasterio dicit ei.</td>
<td>E vedendo l' abate ch'elli si mostrava malcontento e pare che desse vista di volersene andare per chovernare questo suo figliuolo over figliuola, considerando che questi li era molto utile in del monasterio, si lli disse:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si diligis eum uade et adduc eum huc et sit tecum.</td>
<td>Se tu llami, va' e menanello qui, e io lo ricevere per monacho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et abiit et adduxit eum. Dicebatur marina. et mutauit ei nomen et uocauerunt eam omnes marinum.</td>
<td>Allor quelli ando e muto l’ abito a questa sua figliuola e fecella ricevere per maschio, e puoselli nome frate Marino, e feceali insegnare a lleggere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et cum esset annorum quar[t]iuor decim cepit eam docere pater suus uiam domini</td>
<td>E poiche fu in eta di quattordici anni questo suo padre lenchomincio ad insegnare li comandamenti di Dio e lla via di Cristo, e maximamente lamoniva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et dicebat ei. Vide filia</td>
<td>et dicebat ej. Uide filia ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nullus cognoscat misterium tuum usque in finem tuum et sollicita sis ab insidiis diaboli et ne seducaris ab eo et istud sanctum monasteriumuideatur per nos solui et in conspectu Christi et sanctorum angelorum eius cum impiis eternam damnationem accipiamus.

Et alia multa dicebat ei per singulos dies de regno dei.

**II---**Dum autem sancta esset annorum decem et septem defunctus est pater eius. Remansit autem sola (sic) in cella patris sui et ipsa obseruabat se in omnibus doctrinis patris sui et erat obediens in monasterio ita ut ab abbate suo et ab omnibus diligeretur.

Habebat autem monasterium par boum et carrum quia uicinum habebat mare ubi erat emportium pantocis ad miliaria tria et ibant monachi et afferebant que necessaria erant in monasterio.

che ssi guardasse che niunla chognoscesse per femmina infin alla sua morte e che ssi guardasse dall ensidie del nimicho; e chosi continuamente questo suo padre l’amonia di chose devote.

**II---**E venendo alla eta di anni discesette, questo suo padre passo di questa vita, e ella rimase sola in della cella del suo padre, oservava li comandamenti e lla dotrina sua ; e si hobediente e vertuoso era, che llabate e tutti lamavano singhularmente.

Or avea questo monasterio un paio di buoi col carro, quel quale spesse volte l’abate mandava alcun monacho a mare, che v’era presso a tre miglia, e quine era un ridutto d’un buon omo ch’avea nome Pandocci, dove li monacci potevano tornare chor caro regavano le chose necessarie per lo monasterio, perche quine si sposavano (sic) li legni e le mercantantie che venivano per mare.

**II---**Cum autem esset annorum decem et septem defunctus est pater ejus. Remansit autem sola in cella patris sui et obseruabat in omnibus doctrinam patris sui. et erat oboediens omnibus in monasterio. et abbati suo. ita ut ab omnibus diligeretur.

Habebat autem monasterium par boum et carrum quia uicinum habebat mare. ubi erat emporium pandocis ad miliaria tria. ibant monachi et afferebant quae necessaria erant monasterio.

aliquis cognoscat ministerium tuum usque in finem tuum sed sollicita sis ab insidiis diaboli. ut non seducaris ab eo et sanctum monasterium uideatur per nos solui. et in conspectu christi et sanctorum angelorum cum impiis aeternam damnationem accipiamus.

Haec et alia multa docebat eam pater suus per singulos dies de regno dei.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>Italian Translation</th>
<th>Spanish Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cepit autem frater marinus frequenter cum carro ire. Cumque tardius fieret ad remeandum in ipso manebeat emporto pandociis cum ceteris fratribus.</td>
<td>Or inchominco frate Marino ad andare col carro; e quando alchuna volta li prese tardi di tornare al monasterio, rimanea a chasa di questo Pandoci co lli altri frati.</td>
<td>Cepit frater marinus frequenter cum carro ire. Cumque tardius fieret ad remeandum in ipso manebeat emporto pandociis cum caeteris fratribus;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III---Pandox autem habebat filiam virginem. Contigit autem ut per insidias dyaboli et inimici ingressus miles concubere cum ea et concepit de milite illo.</td>
<td>III---Or avenne in quel tenpo, per operation del nimicho, ch un chavalieri amando una figliuola vergine di questo Pandoci, intro a llei ochultamente e peccho co llei, sich ella rimase gravida.</td>
<td>III---Pandox autem habebat filiam virginem. Contigit autem ut per insidias diaboli. et inimici ingressus miles concubere cum ea. et concepit de milite illo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et dum cognitum fuisset parentibus eius ceperunt affligere puellam dicentes. Dic nobis de quo concepisti uiro? Respondit eis. De monacho illo qui marinus dicitur qui hic cum carro mansit ipse me obpressit et concepi.</td>
<td>E avedendosi de questo fatto diopo alchum tenpo lo padre e lla madre inchinicionella molto ad affriggere di dimandalla di chui era gravida; e quella, istigata dal dimonio rispuose: Quel monacho ch a nome frate Marino, In quale ci e aberghato col carro piu notti mi sforsoe e di lui son gravida.</td>
<td>Et cum cognitum fuisset parentibus eius. ceperunt affligere puellam dicentes. Dic nobis de quo concepisti uiro. Respondit eis. De monacho illo qui marinus dicitur qui hic cum carro crebrius mansit. ipse me oppressit et concepi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quo audito parentes eius continuo perrexerunt et ad monasterium et dicunt abbatii eius. Ecce dominus Abbas quid monachus tuus marinus fecit. quomodo deceit filiam nostram.</td>
<td>La qual chosa udendo lo padre e lla madre, andonsoe all' abate a far lamento di questo fatto.</td>
<td>Quo audito parentes eius continuo perrexerunt ad monasterium. et dicunt abbatii ejus. Ecce abba. quod monachus tuus fecit marinus. quomodo deceit filiam nostram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Italian Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicit eis abbas. Videamus si uera sunt que dicitis.</td>
<td>La qual chosa l' abate non potendo credere, considerando la santita di Marino, rispuose loro ch' ei volea saper da lui in lor presentia se questo fatto era vero.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et iussit eum uocari. Quo ueniente dixit ad eum abbas suus. frater marine. Vere tu scelus hoc operatus es in filiam istorum.</td>
<td>E facciendosi chiamar frate Marino e dimandolo s era vero ch' elli avesse sforsata la figliuola di choloro; e udendo queste chose frate Marino, pensoe molto e strinse e non si schusoe ma inchomincio a pia[n]gere e disse: Padre, pecchai, sono apparecchiato alla penitenzia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stans ille diutius excogitans intra semetipsum et ingemiscens dixit. Peccau pater.</td>
<td>Allor l' abbate irato, credendo veramente che lli fusse in corpa, fecelo duramente battere e affligger e disseli: In verita ti dico che tu in questo monesterio non strarai. E cacciolo fuor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In ueritate dico quia tu qui hoc commisisti scelus in hoc non manebis monasterio et eieicit eam foras</td>
<td>Ipsi uero nulli umquam suum confessa est misterium sed abijt iactauitque se ante portas monasterij iacebatque iacebatque (sic) super humum in penitentia se affligens tamquam ipsa peccasset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipsu uero nulli umquam suum confessa est misterium sed abijt iactauitque se ante portas monasterij iacebatque iacebatque (sic) super humum in penitentia se affligens tamquam ipsa peccasset.</td>
<td>e ella humilemente sostenne ogni chosa, e non confessoe mai ad altrui la verita di questo fatto, ma stavasi fuor del monesterio alla porta e gieaca in terra piangiendo e affrigiendosi come se veramente avesse pecchato, e vivea delle lemosine che ricevea alla porta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ingredientibus fratribus postulabat ab eis ut</td>
<td>et ingredientibus fratribus postulabat ab eis ut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bucellam panis illi darent.

Hoc fatiens per triennium a porta uero non recessit monasterij.
Pandocis uero filia peperit filium (sic) masculum et ablactauit eum et adduxit eum mater puellae ad marinum cum iaceret ante monasterium dicebatque ei. Ecce frater marine quomodo noris filium tuum nutri.

Et reliquid eum ibj et abijt.

Sancta autem uirgo suscepit eum <ut> filium proprium et de ipsa bucella panis quam accipiebat ab introeuntibus in monasterium nutriebat filium alienum.

Factum est autem hoc per biennium.

IV---Postmodum uidentes eam fratres misericordia compuncti ingressi sunt ad abbatem rogar eum ceperunt ut eum recipereit in penitentia in monasterium dicentes abbati.

Indulge abba et suscipe fratrem marinum. Ecce quinquennium habet quod in penitentiam ante ianuam iacet monasterij et non recessit umquam hinc.

bucellam panis illi darent.

Hoc faciens per triennium non recessit monasterii. Pandocis uero filia peperit filium masculum. et ablactauit eum et adduxit eum mater puellae ad marinum. cum iaceret ante monasterium dicebatque illi. Ecce frater marine quomodo noris filium tuum nutri.

Et abiit

Sancta uirgo suscepit eum tanquam filium proprium. et de ipsa bucella panis quam accipiebat ab introeuntibus in monasterium nutriebat filium alienum.

Factum est autem hoc per biennium.

IV---Postmodum autem uidentes eam fratres misericordia compuncti ingressi sunt ad abbatem et rogare ceperunt ut eum recipereit in poenitentia in monasterium dicentes abbati.

Indulge et suscipe fratrem marinum. Ecce quinquennium habet quod in poenitentia ante ianuas iacet monasterii. et non recessit unquam Hinc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suscipe eum in penitentia sicut dominus noster ihesus christus praecepit.</td>
<td>Unde ti preghiamo poich' elli e tanto humiliato e cognoscis cosi bem la sua corpora, che tu li facci misericordia, segondo che Cristo fa e comanda di fare al peccatore che ssi humilia e chognoscse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vix autem imposuerunt ei ut eum recuperet. Et iussit eam ingredi uocauitque ad se eam et ait illi.</td>
<td>E per molti preghi appena lo poterono inducere a volerlo ricevere; ma pure alt (sic) urtimo si lasso vincere e fecie chiamare frate Marino e disseli:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pater tuus uir sanctus fuit qui ad nos paruulum te introduxit in hoc monasterium et non est malum operatus sicut tu cogitasti et fecistj sed nec aliqus de hoc sancto monasterio.</td>
<td>Lo tuo padre fue un buon omo e missetici piccholo fanciullo, e ne elli ne altro monacho di questo monasterio feceno mai fallo, chome ai fatto tu, lo qual ci ai tutti vituperati;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunc autem ingressus es cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes.</td>
<td>E echo al priegho di questi monaci ti ricevo con questo tuo misero figliuolo, lo quale ai avuto d' adulterio in del monasterio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unde oportet te penitere--graece enim peccatum fecisti.</td>
<td>Cogniosce la corpora tua e pensati che si gram peccato e scandalai ai fatto che bizogno e che, se tu ne voi misericordia, facci grave penetentia;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibi namque iubeo ut omnes munditias monasterij solus fatias et aquam ad necessaria portes et calciamenta omnium per singulos solus perfitas dies. in hoc enim habebis meam</td>
<td>unde io ti ricevo a questo pacto, e chosi ti comando che tu spassi l monasterio e porti tu solo ongni imundisia, reghi tutta l'acqua che cci e bizogna, e calsiamenti de' frati forbi e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suscipe eum in penitentia sicut dominus noster ihesus christus praecepit.</td>
<td>Unde ti preghiamo poich' elli e tanto humiliato e cognoscis cosi bem la sua corpora, che tu li facci misericordia, segondo che Cristo fa e comanda di fare al peccatore che ssi humilia e chognoscse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vix autem imposuerunt ei ut eum recuperet. Et iussit eam ingredi uocauitque ad se eam et ait illi.</td>
<td>E per molti preghi appena lo poterono inducere a volerlo ricevere; ma pure alt (sic) urtimo si lasso vincere e fecie chiamare frate Marino e disseli:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pater tuus uir sanctus fuit qui ad nos paruulum te introduxit in hoc monasterium et non est malum operatus sicut tu cogitasti et fecistj sed nec aliqus de hoc sancto monasterio.</td>
<td>Lo tuo padre fue un buon omo e missetici piccholo fanciullo, e ne elli ne altro monacho di questo monasterio feceno mai fallo, chome ai fatto tu, lo qual ci ai tutti vituperati;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunc autem ingressus es cum filio tuo quem de adulterio habes.</td>
<td>E echo al priegho di questi monaci ti ricevo con questo tuo misero figliuolo, lo quale ai avuto d' adulterio in del monasterio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unde oportet te penitere--graece enim peccatum fecisti.</td>
<td>Cogniosce la corpora tua e pensati che si gram peccato e scandalai ai fatto che bizogno e che, se tu ne voi misericordia, facci grave penetentia;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibi namque iubeo ut omnes munditias monasterij solus fatias et aquam ad necessaria portes et calciamenta omnium per singulos solus perfitas dies. in hoc enim habebis meam</td>
<td>unde io ti ricevo a questo pacto, e chosi ti comando che tu spassi l monasterio e porti tu solo ongni imundisia, reghi tutta l'acqua che cci e bizogna, e calsiamenti de' frati forbi e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gratiam.</td>
<td>richuci quand e bisogno--e per questo modo tornerai a mmia gratia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta enim uirgo libenti animo opus quod ei iussum fuerat perficiebat.</td>
<td>Et la santissima vergine volentier compiendo tutte le chose,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V---Contigit autem eam intra paucos dies dormire in domino. Euntes fratres nuntiauerunt abbatij dicentes. Frater marinus obijt.</td>
<td>Or vedete che si gram peccato a stato quel di co-stui che dio noll a volsuto ricevere a penentia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicit eis abbas. Videte quale peccatum fecit quia nec penitentiam agere meruit.</td>
<td>Tuttavia andate e per miserricordia lo soppellite, ma non colli altri frati e dilungi dal monestero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed tamen iste lavate eum et sepelite eum longe a monasterio.</td>
<td>Et andando li frati per soppellillo, volendo in prima lavare secondo l uzansa, trovono ch' era femmina,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euntes autem fratres dum uellent lauare eum agnouerunt quia femina erat et ceperunt omnes uociferare et et tunde[n]tes pectora sua clamabant et dicentes quia talis conversatio et penitentia sancta inuenta est in ea cuius nullus cognouit misterium et sic ab eis afficita fuisset.</td>
<td>e tutti incominzione a piangere e a picchiarsi il petto per le niurie et affliction che fatte li aveano; e dicieano chotal conversatio e penentia non fu mai trovata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et uenientes dicunt cum lacrimis abbatii suo. Abba</td>
<td>E tornando alquantu all'abate, disseno: Padre, vieni, e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ueni et uide fratrem marinum.


Adiuro te per dominum nostrum ihesum christum ne mecum contendas ante conspectum dei eo quod afflixerim te quia ignorantem t' abbo afflicto peroche ignorantemente l o fatto.

Tu domina non es confessà misterium tuum. et ego non cognoui in ueritate sanctam conversationem tuam.

Quo cognito abbas sanctum corpus eius in monasterio intra oratorium reponi eadem die praecepit.

VI---Puella autem

arrepta a demonio uenit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimen quod ei admiserat et de quo concepisset.

vedrai mirabile cose.

E non sapendo l abate quel ch era, non vi volea andare; ma pur poi essendoli molto ditto, v' andoe, e schoprendola li frati e mostrando ch' era femmina, temette molto e fu molto afflicto, e fecie gran pianto, e perchotea lo capo a tterra e dicea:

O santissima anima, io ti schongiuro e prego per llo nostro Signore Iesu Cristo che non contendi con mecho in del cospetto di Dio di ciò che inustamente t' abbo afflicto peroche ignorantemente l o fatto.

E comando l abate chel corpo fusse quel giorno lassato in dell'oratoio (sic) per devotton della giente.

VI---E a quella inqua (sic) giovana che llavea infamata e ditto ch' era gravida di frate Marino,.introe lo demonio addosso e venne al corpo di Santa Marina, e gridando confessava la sua corpa e chome l' avea infamato a torto,

Tu domina non es confessà misterium tuum. et ego non cognoui in ueritate sanctam conversationem tuam.

Quo cognito abbas sanctum corpus eius in monasterio intra oratorium reponi eadem die praecepit.

VI---Puella autem

arrepta a demonio uenit ad monasterium et confitebatur crimen quod ei ammiserat et de quo concepisset.
| Septimo quoque die repausationis marine in domino ibi intra oratorium predicta calumniatrix femina liberata est a demonio. | e l septimo giorno dipo la morte di Santa Marina, ad dimostrare dio la sua santita, questa indemoniata fu libberata al corpo e al sepolcro suo. | Septimo uero die repausationis marinae in domino ibi intra oratorium praedicta criminatrix femina liberata est a demonio. |
| Instantaneus autem qui erant in ipso emptorio et uicina monasteria mirabilia que facta fuerant accipientes cruces et cereos cum ynnis et canticis et psalmis benedicentes deum uenerunt in eundem monasterium et ingressi oratorium ubi corpus ejus requiescebat benedixerunt dominum. | Audientes haec qui erant in ipso emporio et uicini monasterii quae acta fuerant. benedixerunt deum in del quale per lli meriti della sua vergine Santa Marina dio mostra molti miraculi, la quale e gloriosa in secula seculorum. | Audientes autem haec qui erant in ipso emporio et uicini monasterii quae acta fuerant. benedixerunt deum ubi usque modo deus orationibus sancte uirginis multa facit mirabilia. |

*Explicit de sancta marina*
De sainte Marine. Et se commence en latin fuit frater quidam. Chapiter. xlviii.

Adis fut vng seculier qui auoit vne seule fille laquelle il bailla en gouvernement a vng de ses parens Puys se mist en religion: ou il faisoit de bon courage tout ce que labbe luy commandoit. Apres qu'il eut este la par long espace de temps luy venoit souuvenement ffois a memoire la souuuenance de sa fille. tellement qu'il en estoit fort melencolieux. Labbe voyant son courage mue et qu'il nestoit point si joyeux comme il auoit acostume luy demanda la cause de sa tristesse. A donc respondit en plourant qu'il auoit laisse en la cite vng seul filz lequel il aimoit fort. et pour ceste cause il estoit melencolieux: mesmement pource qu'il ne scuoit comment il se portoit. Labbe luy dist. Va le querir et si lameaine affin qu'il demeure açuc toy Et toutefoys le dit religieux nauoit point de filz: mais seulement auoit la fille dont dessus est touche laquelle auoit nom Marine. mais il ne le vouloit pas dire a labbe: pource que desia il auoit delibere de la faire venir leans en habit dissimule: Si sen alla en la cite qui estoit distante de son monaste<re> de .xxxii. mil ou enuiron. et admena sa ditte fille vestue dun habit domme et la fist appel [f60rb] ler Marin Auquel estat elle fut leans iusques en laage de .xiii. ans. et y fut souffisamment instruite: tant en lettres que autrement a la voye de salut Son dit pere luy remonstra fort que virginite estoit vng bel estat et moul agreade a dieu: en la priant tres affectueusement de la bien garder. et quelle feust caute et sage de se preseruer des las de lennemy et quelle ne se fist iamais congoistre estre femme. Elle ayant laage de xviii ans son pere ala de vie a trespassement. Depuyis lequel elle se rendit fort obeissante a labbe et a tous ceulx du monastere: tellement quelle estoit merueilleusement amee de labbe et de tous les religieux cuidant tousiours que ce feust vng homme. Audit monastere auoit deux beufz et vng petit chariot seruant aux religieux pour aler querir leurs necessitez a la mer qui estoit prochaine deulx de trois lieues ou enuiron. Vne fois labbe en l'appellant marin luy demanda pourquoi il naloit aucune ffois come les autres religieux querir les viures pour le conuent Marin qui estoit fort obeissant incontinent y ala Or est il a noter que sur le chemin y auoit vng home nomme pandoux en lostel duquel iceluy marin comme les autres demouroit aucune ffois au giste quant il naiuoit point heure suffisante pour retourner au monastere. Et aduint que la fille di celuy pandoux fut lors esante du fait d'un home de guerre. Le pere voyant sa fille grosse la reprint austerement et la menaca fort pour saoir delle qui estoit celuy qui lavoit engrossée A donc par l'instruction de son amoureux respondit que ce auoit fait Marin le religieux. Le pere doncques accompagne de ses parens vint a labbe et luy raconta le cas. dont labbe fut moult emuereille Si enuoya querir le religieux marin et luy demanda sil auoit commis iceluy enorme crime. Marin se print a plourer: et dist. Pere abbe iay griefuement peche: dont il me desplaist for t. Si vous supplie que men chargez penitence telle que verrez appartenir [f60va] a la correction de ma griefue offense. Labbe tant courrouce que plus ne le pouuoit estre le chassa hors du monastere deuant lequel sans y rentrer elle fut par lespace de quatre ans couchant dessoubz la porte sur la terre nue: faisant illec austere penitence du peche quelle nauoit pas commis Et quant les freres aloyent en prouision pour le conuent elle leur demandoit
du pain pour lamour de dieu. laquelle penitence elle continua par lespace de quatre ans. durant lesquelz elle souffrit et endura non pas seulement grandes indigences mais aussi plusieurs opprobres: tant des parens et amys de la fille qui lauoit enchargee dudit cas come dautres gens illec suruenans: qui lappelloient papalart et ypocrite Et encore que est pys: apres ce que la ditte fille fut acouchée et quelle eut par aucun temps nourry son enfant: de sa mamelle elle luy apporta iceluy: en luy disant Tien marin pr ens cest enfant et le nourriz ainsi que tu las fait Elle le receut benignement. et durant deux ans elle le nourrit doulement de ce quon luy donnait pour lonneur de dieu Les religieux voyans sa grande pacience et humilite meuz dune grande pitie et compassion supplierent a labbe quil luy pleust en preferant misericorde a rigueur de iustice rappeller (sic) frere marin: ce quil ne vouloit aucunelement faire. ayant tousiours contre luy merueilleuse indignacion a cause dudit cas. finablement vaincu par les continuelles prieres de ses freres le rappella et luy dist. Marin ie fais grant conscience veu la crainte de ton peche. Si te rappelle ceans: mais neantmoins pour complaire a mes freres qui pour toy mont supplie par plusieurs fois Je permetz que toy et ton miserable enfant que tu as conceu en adultere soyez com e personnes estranges logez ceans. Et pourceque tu nez pas digne de communiquer avec les freres sinon en leur faisant servir enceinte et pour le cas le requerra Je ordonne que tu soyes tousiours subiect a nettoyer tous les lieux de ceans et oster et porter hors les immundices. et pareillement a aler querir leue quil fauldra a lauer et potager et subuenir aux necessitez des freres. Laquelle penitence elle accepta voulentiers et de bon cuer. et tant y continua que finablement elle ala de vie a trespas Ceste chose prononcee par le s freres a leur abbe il leur dist. Mes freres vous scauez assez lenormite de son peche duquel i l na pas fait penitence condigne. et pourtant ce nest pas chose deuenable quil soit enterre en nostre monastere. mais neantmoins veue son obedien<ce> ie suis content que loignez en la maniere acoustumee. et quil soit enterre par vous hors du monastere Les freres pour faire a frere marin ce que permis leur estoit vindrent en la chambrette ou il estoit mort, et en le despoillant pour le vouloir oindre congneurent que cestoit vne femme. et furent merueilleusement esbahiz: et se prindrent a gemir amerement auec grand abundance de larmes: et incontinent le vindrent denoncer a labbe Lequel de ceste chose fut fort esmeu. et touche dune merueilleuse contricion et desplaisance se va ietter illec a terre frappant de ses mains closes contre son estommac et contre sa teste en disant. O glorieuse marine ie te supplie que des afflictions lesquelles ie tay donnees tu ne me accuses point deuant dieu. car par ignorance ie lay fait. Helas se tu meusses di t la verite: ie neusse point enuers toy commys ceste merueilleuse faulte Apres quil eut beaucoup lamente il la fist enterrer solenellement dedens leglise du monastere. Et ce iour mesymes y suruint celle qui lauoit inuistement inculpe ducas pour lequel elle auoit fait de si grandes penitences. Laquelle vexee et tourmentee du dyable confessa publiquement son peche: declarant le nom de celuy a qui estoit lenfant: Tous les religieux des monasteres voins aduertiz de ce mistere en lonneur de la glorieuse vierge vinrent au monastere atout leurs croix et sierges alumez en chantant himnes et pseaulmes en louant le nom de dieu. auquel rendirent deuotes graces de ce quil luy auoit pleu a ledification de leurs ames [f61ra] leur communiquer ce merueilleux fait. Et depuys en iceluy monastere se sont faitz plusieurs miracles par les prieres de ma dame sainte marine.
De sainte marine Et se commence ou latin fuit frater quidam etcetera chapitre xlviii

[ra] Iadis fut vng seculier qui aoit vne seule fille laquelle il bailla en gouernement a vng de ses parens puys se mist en religion ou il faisoit de bon couraige tout ce que labbe luy commandoit. Apres qu'il eut este la par longue espace de temps luy venoit souvent ffois a memoire la souuuenance de sa fille tellement qu'il en estoit fort melencolieux. Labbe voiant son couraige mue et qu'il nestoit point si ioieux comme il aoit accoustume lui demanda la cause de sa tristesse. A donc respondit en pleurant qu'il aoit laisse en la cite vng seul [rb] filz lequel il aimoit fort Et pour ceste cause il estoit melencolieux mesmement pour qu'il ne scauoit comment il se portoit. Labbe lui dist Va le querir et si lamaine affin qu'il demeure avec toy Et touteffois le dit religieux n'aoit point de filz mais seulement aoit la fille dont dessus est touchie laquelle aoit nom Marine mais il ne le vouloit pas dire a labbe pour que desia il aoit delibure de la faire venir leans en habit dissimule Si sen ala en la cite qui estoit distante de son monastere de xxxii mil ou enuiron et admena sa dite fille vestue dun habit domme et la fist appeller marin Ouquel es taut elle fut leans iusques en la age de xiiii. ans et y fut souffissamment instruite tant en lettres que autrement a la voye de salut Son dit pere luy remonstra fort que virginit e estoit vng bel estat et moul agreable a dieu en la priant tres affectuesement de la bien garder et quelle feast caute et saige de se preseruer des las de lennemy et quelle ne se feist jamais congoisstre estre femme. Elle aiant laage de xvii. ans son pere ala de vie a trespassement depuys lequel elle se rendit fort obeissante a labbe et a tous ceulz du monastere tellement quelle estoit merueilleusement amee de labbe et de tous les religieux cuitant toutsours que ce fust vng homme [va] Oudit monastere aouit deux beufz et vng petit chariot servuant aux religieux pour aler querir leurs necessitez a la mer qui estoit prochaine deulx de trois lieues ou enuiron. Vne fois labbe en l'appellant marin lui demanda pour quoy il naloit aucunes fois come les autres religieux querir les viures pour le couvent. Marin qui estoit fort obeissant incontinent y ala Or est il a noter que sur le chemin y aoit vng homme nomme Pandoux en lostel duquel icellui marin comme les autres demouroit aucune ffois au giste quant il n'aoit point heure suffisante pour retourner au monastere. Et aduit que la fille dicelui pandoux fut lors enceinte du fait dun homme de guerre. Le pere voyant sa fille grosse la reprit austerement et la menaca fort pour sauoir d'elle qui estoit celui qui lavoit engrossee. Adonc par l'instruction de son amoureux respondit que ce aoit fait Marin le religieux. Le pere doncques acompaigne de ses parens vint a labbe et luy raconta le cas dont labbe fut moul esmerueille. si enuoa querir le religieux Marin et lui demanda sil aouit commis icelui enorme crime. Marin se print a pleurer et dist. Pere abbe iay griefue peche dont il me desplaisit fort si vous supply que men chargez penitance telle que verrez appartcnir [vb] a la correction de ma griefue offense Labbe tant courrouce que plus ne le pouuoit estre le chassa hors du monastere deuant lequel sans y rentrer elle fut par lespace de quatre ans couchant dessoubz la porte sur la terre nue faisant illec austere penitence du peche quelle n'aoit point commis. Et quant les freres aloient en prouision pour le couvent elle leur demandoit du pain pour lamour de dieu laquelle penitence elle continua par lespace de quatre ans durant lequelz elle souffrit et
endura nompas seulement grandes indignences neccessitez mais aussi plusieurs opprobres
tant des parens et amis de la fille qui lauot encharge dudit cas comme dautres gens illec
suruenans qui lappelloient papelart et ypocrite Et encore qui est pis apres ce que ladite
fille fut acouchée et quelle eut par aucun temps nourry son enfant de sa mamelle elle lui
aporta icelui en lui disant tien Marin pren cest enfant et le nourrir ainsi que tu las fait.
Elle le receut benignement et durant deux ans elle le nourriss doucelement de ce quon lui
donnoit pour lonner dieu Les religieux voians sa grande pacience et humilite meu

dune grande pitie et compassion supplient a labbe quil lui pleust en preferant
misericorde a rigueur de iustice rapppeller frere marin ce quil ne vouloit aucunement
faire ayant toisjours contre luy merueilleuse indignacion a cause dudit cas. finalement
vaincu par les continuelles prieres de ses freres le rappella et luy dist. Marin ie fais grant
conscience veu la crainte de ton pechie Si te rappelle ceans mais neantmoins pour
complaire a mes freres qui pour toy mont supplie par plusieurs foys Je permetz que toy et
ton miserable enfant que tu as conceu en adultere soiez come personnes estranges logez
ceans. Et pourcause tu nez pas digne de communiquer avec les freres sinon en leur
faissant service ainsi que le cas le requerra Je ordonne que tu soies toisjours subject a
nestoier tous les lieux de ceans en oster et porter hors les immundices et parellement a
aler querir leauue qu'il fauldra a laver et potager et subuener aux necessitez des freres.
Laquelle penitance elle accepta voulentiers et de bon cuer et tant y continua que
finalement elle ala de vie a trespas Ceste chose pronuncee par les freres a leur abbe il
leur dist. Mes freres vous sauez assez lenormite de son pechie duquel il na pas fait
penitence condigne Et pourtant ce nest pas chose decente ne conuenable qu'il soit enterre
en nostre monastere mais neantmoins veu son obedience ie suis content que loignez en
la maniere acoustumee et qu'il soit enterre par vous hors du monastere. Les freres
pour faire a frere marin ce que permis leur estoit vindrent en la chambrette ou il estoit
mort. et en le despoillant pour le vouloir oindre congneurent que c'estoit vne femme et
furent merueilleusement esbahis: et se prindrent a gemir amerement auc grand
abundance de larmes et incontinent le vindrent denoncer a labbe. Lequel de ceste chose
fut fort esmeu. et touche dune merueilleuse contricion et desplaisance se va ietter illec a
terre frappant de ses mains closes contre son estoumac et contre sa teste et
disant. O glorieuse marine je te supplie que des afflictions lesquelles ie tay donnees tue ne macuses
point deuant dieu car par ignorance ie lay fait. Helas se tu meusses dit la verite ie neusse
point enuers toy commys ceste merueilleuse faulte Apres quil eut beaucoup lamente il la
fist enterrer solenellement dedens leglise du monastere. et ce iour mesmes y suruint celle
qui lauot injustement inculpe du cas pour lequel elle auoit fait de si grandes penitences
Laquelle vexee et tourmentee du diable confesssa publiquement son pechie en declarant le
nom de celui a qui estoit l'enfant. Tous les religieux des monasteres voisins aduartis de ce
mister in lonneur de la glorieuse vierge vindrent au monastere atout leurs croix et
cierges alumez en chantant hymnes et pseaulmes. en louant le nom de dieu [ra] Auquel
luy rendirent deuotes graces de ce qu'il luy aouit pleu a ledification de leurs ames leur
communiquer ce merueilleux fait Et depuis en icelu monastere se sont fais plusieurs
miracles par les prieres de madame sainte marine.
De sainte Marine. Et se commence en latin fuit frater quidam. Chapiter. xlviii.

Adis fut vng seculier qui auoit vne seule fille laquelle il bailla en gouernement a vng de ses parens/ puis se [f48vb] mist en religion ou il faisoit de bon courage tout ce que son abbe lui commandoit. Long temps apres lui vint a memoire la souuenance de sa fille: par quoy fut moulc melancolieux. Labbe voyant son courage mue: lui demanda la cause de sa tristesse. Adonc respondit en pleurant quil auoit laisse en la cite vng seul filz lequel il aymoit fort Et pour ceste cause il estoit melancolieux: mesmement pource quil ne sauoit comment il se portoit. Labbbe lui dist. Va le querir et si lamaine: affin quil demeure auec toy. Et toutefoys le dit religieux nauoit point de filz mais seulement auoit la fille dont dessus est touche laquelle auoit nom Marine. mais il ne le vouloit pas dire a labbe pour que desia il auoit delibere de la faire venir leans en habit dissimule Si sen alla en la cite qui estoit en la montre de trentedeux mil ou enuiron et admena sa dicte fille vestue dun habit domne et la fist appeller marin: auquel estat elle fut leans iusques en la age de xiiii. ans. et y fut suffissamment instruite: tant en lettres que autrement. Son dit pere lui remonstra fort que virginite estoit vng bel estat et moult agreable a dieu. et liu priant tres affectuesement de bien le garder: et quelle fust caute et saige de se preseruer des las de lennemi: et quelle ne se feist iamais congoistre estre femme. Elle ayant laage de xviii. ans le pere alla de vie a trespass. depuys lequel elle se rendit fort obeissante a labbe et a tous ceulz du monastere tellement quelle estoit merueilleusement aymee de labbe et de tous les religieux cuidans tousiours que ce fust vng homme. Audit monastere auoit deux beuzf et vng petit chariot seruant aux religieux pour aler querir leurs necessitez a la mer qui estoit prochaine deulz de troys lieux ou enuiron. Vne fois labbe en lappellant marin lui demanda pourquoy il naloit aucunefois come les autres religieux querir les viures pour le conuent. Marin qui estoit fort obeissant incontinent y ala. Or e st il a noter que sur le chemin y auoit vng homme nomme pandoux en lostel duquel icellui marin comme les autres demouroit aucunefois au giste: quant il nauoit point heure suffissante pour retourner au monastere Et aduint que la fille di icellui pandoux fut lors enceinte du fait de ung homme de guerre. Le pere voyant sa fille grosse [49ra] la reprint et la menaca fort pour sauoir celle qui lavoit engrossee. Adoncques par linstruction de son amoureux respondit que ce auoit este frere marin le religieux. L e pere donc acompaigne de ses parens vint a labbe et lui raconta le cas: dont labbe fut moult emerueille. Si enuoya querir le religieux marin: et lui demanda sil auoit commis icellui enorme crime. Marin se print a pleurer: et dist. Pere abbe iay griefuum pech: dont il me desplaist fort si vous supplie que menchargez penitence. telle que verrez apparte nir a la correction de ma griefue offence Labbe tant courrouce que plus ne le pouuoit estre la chassa hors du monastere deuant lequel sans y entre elle fut lespace de quatre ans couchant dessoubz la porte sur la terre nue faisant illec austere penitence du pech quelle nauoit point commis. Et quant les freres aloient en prouision pour le conuent elle leur demandoit du pain pour lamour de dieu. laquelle penitence elle continua par lespace de quatre ans durant lesquelz elle souffrit et endura grans indigences et plusieurs opprobres tant des parens de la fille come dautres illec suruenans qui lappelloient papela rt et
ypocrite. Doncques aduint que la dicte fille eust enfant. Et apres quelle eut par aucun temps nourry son enfant de sa mamelle elle lui apporta icellui: en luy disant. Ti en marin prens cest enfant et le nourriz ainsi que tu las fait. Elle le receut benignement et durant le temps elle le nourrit doucement de ce quon lui donnait pour lamour de dieu. Les religieux voyans sa grande pacience et humilite: meuz dune grande pitie supplierent a labbe quil lui pleust en preferant misericorde a rigueur de iustice: rappeller frere marin, ce quil ne vouloit aucunement faire ayant tousiours contre lui merueilleuse indignacion a cause dudit cas. finablement vaincu par les continuelles prieres de ses freres le rappella et lui dist. Marin ie fais grant conscience veu la crainte de ton peche si te rappelle ceans mais neantmoins pour complaire a mes freres qui pour toy mont supplie par plusieurs fois ie permeiz que toy et ton miserable enfant que tu as eu en adultere soyez comme personnes estranges logez ceans. Et pour cause que tu nes pas digne de communiquer avec les fre [49vb] res si non en leur faisant service ainsi que le cas le requerra: ie ordonne que tu soies tousiours subiect a nettoyer tous les lieux de ceans/ en oster et porter hors les immondices: et pareillement a aler querir l'eau qui fauldra a lauer et potager et subuenir aux necessitez des freres. Laquelle penitence elle accepta voueant et de bonne grace de ceans. Et tant y continua que finablement ala de vie a trespas. Ceste chose prononcee par les freres a leur abbe il leur dist. Mes freres: vous sauez assez lenormite de son peche duquel il na pas fait penitence condigne. Et pourtant ce nest pas chose decente quil soit enterre en nostre monastere. Mais neantmoins veue son obedience ie suis content que loignez en la maniere acoustumee: et quil soit enterre par vous hors du monastere. Les freres pour faire audit marin ce que permis leur estoit/ vindrent en la chambre ou il estoit mort. et en le despouillant pour le oindre congnurent que cestoit vne femme et furent merueilleusement esbahiz: et se prindrent a gemir amerement a uie crave abondance de larmes/ et incontinent le vindrent denoncer a labbe: lequel de ceste chose fut fort esmeu. et touche dune merueilleuse desplaisance: se ietta a terre frappant de ses mains closes contre son estomach et contre sa teste en disant: O glorieuse marine ie te supplie que des afflictions lesquelles ie tay donnees tue ne me accuses point deuant dieu: car par ignorance ie lay fait. Helas se tu meusses dit la verite ie neuss e point enuers toy commmys ceste faulte Apres quil eut lamente longuement il la fist enterrer solenellement dedens leglise ou monastere. Et ce iour mesmes y suurint celle qui lauoit iniustement inculpee du cas pour lequel elle auoit fait de si grandes penitences. Laquelle vexee et tourmentee du dyable confessa publiquement son peche en declarant le nom de cellui a qui estoit lenfant. Tous les religieux des monasteres voisins aduertis de ce mistere en lonner de la glorieuse vierge vindrent au monastere a tout leurs croix et cierges alumez en chantant hymnes et pseaulmes en louant le nom de dieu auquel luy rendirent deuotes graces de ce quil lui auoit pleu a ledification de leurs ames leur communiquer ce merueilleux fait. Et depues en icellui [ ]monastere se sont faitz plusieurs miracles par les prieres de ma dame saincte marine.
Fue vn frayle que era primero lego e no tenia mas de vna hija pequeña. E el deliberando de hazer se religioso encomendo la aun pariente suyo: e entro en vn monesterio que estaua lexos de la ciudad onze leguas: e entrado hazia las cosas del monesterio tan bien que el abad le amaaua mas que a todos por que era leal: e obediente e acaescio acabo de algun d<e> tiempo que se recordo del amor de su hija. E començo de entristecer: e afligir se consigo e haciendo lo muchos dias vio le atribulado el abad: e dixo le. Que has que vas tan triste. di me lo e dios que a todos consuela te ayudara: e el entonce derriuo se a sus pies llorando: e dixo le. yo tengo enla ciudad vn hijo que dese pequeña e recordando me del recibo aflccion: e no quiso dezir al abad que fuesse hija. E el abad no supiendo esto: e no queriendo le perder porque era muy necessario enel monesterio dixo le: si tanto le amas ve: e trae le acá: e este contigo. E el [f56va] fue e traxo la: e llamauan la marina e hiudo le el nombre e llamo la marino e dio enel monesterio paro que aprendiesse letras: e estana con ellos: e ninguno de los frayles conocio que fuesse moça: ante todos la llamauan marino. E siendo de .xiiii. años començo le de enseñar su padre la carrera del señor: e dezia le “paramientes hija que ninguno sepa este secrero hasta tu fin E guarda te delas assechanças del diablo que no te engañe e que este sancto monesterio se pierda por causa nuestra: e en presencia de christo: e delante sus angeles seamos damnados: e enseñaua le cadaldia otras cosas muchas del reyno de dios. E como fuesse de diez y siete años murio su padre: y quedo sola enla cella de su padre: e era muy obediente a todos los del monesterio tanto que de su abad: e de todos era muy amada. E auia enel monesterio vn par de bueyes: e vn carro porque tenia cerca la mar a vna legua donde estaua el puerto: e trato de las mercadurias e los monges yuan e trayan las cosas necessarias al monesterio: e vn dia dixo el abad a marino: hermano porque no vas e ayudas a los frayles. E ella respuso: padre yo fa relo lo que me mandares: e estaua cabe el camino vno que moraua ende llamado pandocio por cuya casa yuan. e boluian los frayles e començo fray marino yr mucho conel carro alo quele mandaan: e quando le annochecia posaua en casa de pandocio conlos otros monges: e tenia pandocio vna fija moça ala qual entro vn caullero: e tentado por el diablo dormio con ella: e concibio del: e como la barruntaron su padre e madre: comenzaron dela atormentar diziendo. di nos de quien concebiste. E respuso les de aquel monge que se llama fray marino que poso aqui muchas vezes con el carro el qual me forço e concebi del. E luego el padre e la madre fueron al monesterio. e dixieron al abad. Catad aqui señor abad que ha hecho tu monge marino como ha engañado nuestra fija: dixo les el abad que dezis e mandole le llamar: e el viñiendo dixo le su abad. Fray marino has tu deshonrrado la fija de estos. e estando mucho entre si e pensando: e suspirando dixo: padre yo he peccado e quiero fazer penitencia por esta culpa mas ruego te que fagas oracion a dios por me que la pueda acabar. e el abad mouido a saña mandole messar e aprisionar e dixo. En verdad te digo pues has cometido esta vellaqueria no
[57ra] estaras con nos otros mas eneste monesterio: e echo la fuera: e ella no confesso a
hombre del mundo su secreto: mas fue e lanzo se ante las puertas del monesterio. E yazia
sobre la tierra atormentando se con penitencia como si ella lo houiesse cometido e pedia a
los frayles que entrauan que le diessen vn bocado de pan. E faziendo esto cuatro aynos no
se partio delas puertas del monesterio: e la fija de pandocio pario vn fijo: e crio le: e truxo
le consigo y puso le delante del monesterio: e deziale: ahe fray marino cria tu fijo: e dexo
le ende: e fue se: e esta santa virgen recibiendo le como propio fijo: de aquel çatico de
pan que le dauan los que entrauan en el monesterio: mantenía el fijo ageno: e esto fizo
otros dos aynos. E despues viendo lo los religiosos moudos de piedad entraron al abad e
rogaron le que le recibiesse en el monesterio diziendo. Padre perdona e rescibe a fray
marino ca cinco aynos ha que faze penitencia ante la puerta del monesterio e nunca se ha
de aqui moudido: recibe le pues en penitencia como nuestro señor ihesu christo mando e a
penas pudiendo lo recabar: mando le entrar: e llamó le asi e dixo le. Tu padre fue sancto
como tu bien sabes: e niñito te puso eneste santo monesterio: e no fizo escandaló alguno.
lo qual tu has pensado e fecho: e no otro alguno eneste monesterio E agora has entrado tu
con tu fijo bastardo. por lo qual es necesario que fagas muy gran penitencia. ca muy gran
peccado has fecho e yo te mando que tu entiendas en todas las suziedades del monesterio:
e traygas agua para lauer lo que es menester: e que fagas çapatos: e siruas a todos: e con
esto auras mi gracia. E la sancta virgen recibiendo esto de grado: fazia quanto le
mandauan. E conteció que en breue tiempo fenecio sus dias: yendo los frayles dixieron al
abad como fray marino era finado: dixo les el abad: mirad hermanos que tal peccado fue
que no ha merescido cumplir la penitencia. Empero yd et lauad le: e lexos del monesterio
sepultad le. E como fueron para lauer le conocieron que era muger: e comenzaron todos
de dar bozes: e messando gritauan como tal pratica e paciencia santa fue hallada enella
cuyo secreto ninguno conocio: siendo por ellos tan encorrida: e viniendo con lagrimas
 Dixie- [57ra] ron al abad. Padre ven: e mira a fray marino. E el dixo les. Que es esto
hermanos: e dixieron le otra vez. ven e mira los milagros de dios: e que faras de ti mismo.
e el espantado: fue e llego se al cuerpo: e alçada la ropa vio como era muger: e derribo se
enceste punto e feria su cabeza en tierra: e gritaua diziendo: yo te coniuro por nuestro
señor ihesu christo que no me condemnes delante dios por que te di affliccion que no
cuydando lo fize: tu señora no dixiste tu secreto: e yo en la verdad no conosci tu santa
conversacion: ca si la houiesse conocido: nunca te houiera affligido. E mando poner su
santo cuerpo dentro del monesterio en una capilla. E el seteno dia aquella moça cuyo era el
fijo arrebatada del demonio vino al monesterio: e confessaua el peccado que hauia
cometido: e de quien hauia concebido. E el seteno dia de su muerte ende enla capilla fue
delibrado del demonio. e oyendo los que estauan enel puerto e los monesterios vezinos:
los milagros que hauian acaescido tomadas cruzes: e cirios con hymnos e cantares: e
psalmos bendiziendo a dios vinieron al monesterio: e entrados enla capilla donde yazia su
cuerpo: bendixieron a dios: donde fasta oy por las oraciones dela virgen sancta dios faze
muchos milagros.
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130jpg [123vb] Di sancto honofrio et chome labate pannuctio lo trouo in del diserto lxxxii

Fue vno sancto abate chebbe nome pannutio estando ellj in del suo monasterio chollj suoi monaci vna note pensando in se medesmo dicea che vita e la mia et che ragio renderoe io addio al di del giudicio e chosí pensando volle abandonare questo mondo et cerchare lauta de santi padre che stauano in del diserto e nar A questo pannuctio lassando stare la vita della parti che Andando adentro perlio diserto per xvii die chomolta fame e sete e in chapo de xvii die vidde da lunga vno homo che vno aspetto molto terribile col corpo ingnudo li chapelli del [124ra] chapo suo grandi e bianchi chome nieue lo corpo choperto chome bestia salvatiche e auea intorno alla vergognia del corpo foglie darbori et vegendolo ebbi grande paupra e appressimandomisi montaj in su vno sasso del monte che mera presso temendo che non mi diuorasse quellj vegnendo sotto lo sasso viuo era gittosi in terra allonbra sel monte e era molto affadighato per leistade chera vecc hio e perllo incendio del sole leuo il chapo suso e chiamomi dicendo vieni a me huomo santo et non auer paura chio sono homo chome tu a sostenere pena et chesto in del diserto perllassi drio e perla salute dellanima gia vii de io pannutio vendo questo incontenente asciesi et inginocchiamenti innansi a suoj santi piedi chiedendoli perdonanza et quellj mi disse sta su figliuolo che tusse amicho di dio e de suoi santi quando io fui levato mi chomando chio sedesse innansi alluj allora incontenente lo preghaj chelli mi dicesse lo suo nome elli mi disse lo mio nome e heunofrio sesanta anni sono cheio obbitato in questo diserto notricato dalla misericordia di dio e neuno homo oe veduto in questo tenpo se no te E tu ci se mandato da dio a me che facci hofficio di mortorio al mio corpo et ne tenpin passati io staua in nuno monesterio—chessi chiamaua herity? Che auevano la legge delli herimoliti nella provincia di tebanda oue auea nommero di cento fraty intra quali era vna fede e uno amore et uno raunamento la paura di dio et grande osseruando sylentio et humilita e laultra? Virtu intralloro io era piccholo [124rb] fanciullo e di pogho tempo apparando la santa scrittura ella diritta fede sichome sichome li saui christiani anno g?eritato lo regno di vita eternal udij loro dire vno miraullioso decto di beato helia come fue confortato da dio per la humilita e per la costansa chelli a dio in del diserto ancho vdy del beato jouannj battista come estette in del diserto infino alla venuta sua in gerusalem io di osan?daj lifinti et dissí questi che stanno in del diserto sono pio forti di noj et pio presso innansi a dio cioe meriano pio di noj elloro mi dissero chosi sono pio forti e pio presso innansi a dio che noj et? Rauniamo insieme e ueggianci insieme e per chagione damore spesso aretrouiamo e se neuno di noj inferma e uisitato da tutti et se neuno a fame v sete incontenente et aparecchiato quelli che stanno in del diserto sono fuori di queste chose se neuno di quellj chotali sostiene tentassioni dal malugaio nimicho vuero tribullatione ouero anghoscia oue si troua homo chello sostegna o souegna ouero chello consoli nel tenpo della fame e della sete oue lo pane ello uino di chellj si possa recreare ellino sono fuore di tucte queste consolattionj e di queste allegresse neuna chosa nonanno se non sola la speranza in dio e humilita chastita e continuo combattimento neuno pensieri anno se no como Con digiunj e continue orattonj soprafiano Ake saette e a quelle cose ce continuamente lenimicho delluma gen?ratto asaetta quellj che ?idioso e contrario a tutti quellj che queste chose disiderano da denpi? Tutti questi che tentano di sopras?re queste chos?e riceuerano grande guiglial?
[131.jpg 124va] che quando ellino eschno delcorpo liangeli vegnno loro aparecchiare et a seruire e quellj che mortificano lidosiderij della lo’r carne e delle loro corpora adiuiene grande gratia et grande guiglialsone gloria danno potere pensare alla qual Gloria liangeli disidererjo dipotere agiungere sono notricate da pieta come dice ysaia propheta tutti quellj chamanon idio mutano virtu sono vestati de penne come aquila quando vanno non anno fame quando sono afadighati non anno sete diuentano loro lerbe saluatiche piu dolci che mele quando lo combattimento del nimicho viene e le tentationi leuano le mani addio e domenedio pietoso che continuamente li pascie presta loro aiuto da alto vegnno li angeli e aparechiano loro et chaciano via li maluagi lancioni del nimicho. figliulo non aj tu udito la scrittura che dice che domenedio non abandoneraji lo pouero giamaj la sapiensia del pouero non ulla maj meno beato sera choklu che fara la ulonta di dio sopra la terra inpercio che li angeli suoi li aparecchia et fanno laalegrare e confortare in nogni tenno quando io honofrio molto humilemente ebbi vdite queste et simili giante chose da isti padre molto malgiolmente li receuetti nella mente et nel chuo pensaj la lor dirittura essere molto grande e pensaj da quellj chotali quasi come stesseno in dell aultro mondo leuami la notte e tolsi pane chemi bastasse per iiij di e usciti del monesterio incomincia appiglia la uia che ua nel diserto et chosi andiendo vna colona di fuocho andarmini innanssi molto terribile auedere et vegindola ebbi grande paura et [124vb] pensaj per la paura di tornare arreto oue io era stato nel monesterio ma dio onnipotente che uuole che tutti li homini si saluino non mi lascio fare tale operattione/ riulogendosi quello glorioso che mi andaua innançi chiamandomi per nome e dissemi/ honofrio dio ti dia pace/ io sono angelo che per volonta di dio ti fui dato a guardia dal tuo nascimento/ infino alla tua fine/ accio chio ti guardi/ io ti dico che questo luogho in del quale domenedio ta fatto degno ti congiungera seco et allora confortato in dio seguitaj lui et eunni in questo diserto per sesanta et sei miglia e trouaj vi una speluncha picchola in della quale entraj et trouaj quini vno seruo di dio molto vecchio innançi alli quaj piedi santi io minginocchiaj et pigliaj llo che facesse orattione per me et facia lorattione disse a me vieni qua figl iuolo dami pacie/ quando io lebbj baciato e eili mi disse tu sse honofrio fratel mio et procurare mio apo ddivo vnej figliulo domenedio sia tua guardia et allora entrj e stetti colluj per septe die insegnandomi quello che santi adoperano in del diserto dipo septe di me disse quel vecchio stassu figliulo seguitami eco ti m<e>nerro i n quel luogo che dio a comandato che tu stij io me leuaj et seguitatmealie (sic) et andando per iiij di e per iiij notti trouammo vna picchola speluncha alla quale era accostata vna cella molto pincchola e una palma et una fonte daccia corrente riulogesi quel vecchio [125ra] e dissemi figliulo questo e i luogho che te aparecchiato da dio qui ti conuie dere tutte di della vita tua entro quel vecchio stette meccno nella cella xxx. di/ amanse randomi de lopere di santi/ io dimandaj lui della generattione et del nome suo et eili mi disse della generattione desitarj lo mio nome et ermeo ricordati di me addio e dipo li .xxx. di se levo e torno al luogho suo da quel tempo innanssi ogni anno venia a me infino alla fine sua loquale sotteraj presso alla ciella mia mentre che sancto honofrio dicea queste chose lo domandaj et dissi padre al tuo cominciamento auesti tentatitionj o no et quellj mi rispuose chosi fratel mio amoroso/ molta tentatione et molto dolore et che disperato dell a vita chiedea la morte quanta misserrira (sic) di fame et di sete lo di lo chaldo et lla notte lo freddo lanima mia si conturbaua infine alla morte e lle enteriuola miei erano pessimamente conturbate le vesamenta miei vennero meno nel tempo loro e caddeno da me et chosi rimase lo corpo mio igniudo e molta pena sostenea. ma domenedio pietoso et
misericordioso quando vidde che io sostenea tutte queste pene diede a me grande
patientia lo corpo mio chera ingiudo coperse di chapellj e mandomj langelo suo che mi
recha pane di che io mi notricho e acqua o che mj basta trenta annj stessti poi chio vscitti
del monesterio che io non [125rb] mangiain pane se non erbbe saruatiche et acqua a
miçura da trenta annj infine ad ora et per altri trenta annj che ora si chompieno ma
visitato dio di di in et vegendo idio chio auea messa tucta la speransa in luj et quando
mebbe chasticato ebbe missericordia di me che le berbe saluatiche mi funno piu dolci che
mele quando mi ricordaua che non pure di pane viue luomo ma delle parole ch eschano
della bocca di dio chosifraterlo mio panuntio ogni homo che fa la volonta di dio trova
misericordia appolluj elli si e pietoso et ancho dice idio in del vangelio no pensate che
douete mangiare ouero bere in inperro chel padre vostro celestrael sa di che uu
albiçognate/ in prima chiedete lo regno di dio et possa arete tutte queste chose/ vdendo
queste chose dal sancto padre honofrio domandailllo e dissi/ padre mio lo salbato/ ella
domenicha onde te dato lo corpo el sangue di ihesu christo e quellj mi disse langelo di dio
viene a me che mi regha la uerace chomunione del corpo e del sangue di ihesu christo et
quando sono chomunichat del corpo e del sangue di ihesu christo sono ripieno di spirito
santo et non o fame ne sete ne non o piu dolore ne tentassione/ et quando io disideraua di
udere delle chose alte di dio era leuato innalto a ccielo e uedea ogni gloria de santi et
quando ritornava ne luogo mio quasi tramortito mi pareua essere innun altro mondo e
chosi dimentichaua tutte le tribulattioni et anghoscie che innanti auea sostenute queste
sono loperationj et li conbattimenti loro E dicendomi queste chose lo santissimo et
honofrio et [132 jpg. 125va] dissemi sta su fratel mio et andiamo e io vdendo queste
chose dalla sua bocca melata ogni anghoscia et fadigha chio auea sostenuta nel diserto e
lla fame e lla sete dimentichaj et dissi alluj beato sono io quando io o meritato di vedere
lo seruo di dio et leuaimi su et seguitaillo e andammo per tre miglia et trouammo l a cella
e lla palma e intramo dentro e inchomincio lo beato vecchio a dire salmi e orattionj
quando ebbe conpiuto lorattione e fatta la fine rispuosi amen nel liuerare del die coll
tramontare del sole guardai in del meçço della cella viddj vn pane e uno vaçello dacqua e
dissemi sancto honofrio sta ssu fratel panuntio mangia lo pane e be lacqua vedj che te
posto innansi io ti ueggio molto affadigato per la fame Risspuosi io et dissi viue idio e
uiue lanima mia non mangero ne non bero se tu non mangi chon esso mecho et quando io
lebbi molto preghato tolse lo pane e disse a me tollj lo pane che cci a mandato idio
continuamente m era regato meçço auale per llo tuo auenimento fratel mio sano te
mandato da dio quando fummo leuati da mangiare et cominciamo a salmegiare e adorare
idio et chosi stemmo infine alla mattina orando a ddio fatta la mattina guardaj e uiddi lo
seruo di dio col uiso mutato la faccia palida e io ueggendolo ebbi grande paura e ellj si
riuolse a me e dissemi non auere paura seruo di dio ma magiolmente ti conforta e sij
pronto pero ti ci a mandato idio accio chel corpo mio dij alla terra et facci officio di
mortorio al mio corpo et sotterrillo eccho oggi esco di questo corpicciuolo et uo in nel
riposo [125vb] mio voggi e xvii di apo quellj dipau che xi di giugno appo romanj tu fratel
mio quando torneraj in egipto predica che ssi faccia memoria di me tra monaci e lli altri
christiani io chiesto questo al mio signore e questo o aspettato e o llo auuto da dio che se
alchuna persona fara memoria di me ouero limosina ouero pasciera pouero nel mio nome
ouero che per ricordamneto del mio nome o delle mia vita v chi iscriuera la mia
leggenda li siano perdonate tutte le pecchata suoj se alchuno fara queste chose io
preghero dio per lluj che tutte le suoj pecchata li siano perdonate e quando lanima
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vsiera del corpo et di questo mondo sera lauato dal peccato chome vno fanciullo che allora fusse nato Rispusi io panuccio e dissi padre mio per lla tua fe se sera alchuno pouero che non possa fare lemosina o uestire pouero come tu aj detto che ara et elli mi disse sancto honorfrio se llj sera nessuno pouero che non possa dare altro ch uno biccheiere d'acqua m<a> darallo nel mio nome chosi ara la gratia chome io lo chiesta a ddio E dicendo queste cose leuoe le manj a ccielo et standing ginocchionj gridoe a ddio e disse Signore altissimo da non vedere la chuaj podesta e da non pensare la chuaj glolia e da non stimare la chuaj missiercordinja e sensa finne io ti lodo io ti benedichio cui io o amato cui io o seguitato dalle puppe de mia madre in qua ma ode mi signore gridante a te magnifico e lodo te domennedio inpero che ai guardata la mia vmilta et non mandato et nelle manj del nimicho [126ra] e ai ordinati li piedi miei in lungho spatio aguale idio guardami cholla tua mano directa pero ch e conturbata lanima mia quando uscira di questo corpo Signore idio non mi eugna innanssi lo marauagio auersario del dimonio non mi ueggia le schure faccie et tenebrose de dimonij ma io ti pregho che llj riceui choi tuoj pacifichi angjoli e alluoghila in nel riposo tuo perche se benedetto in secula sechulor amen E chiegiarj signore alla tua pietade et preghotj che abbi missiercordia al populo christiano e qualunque persona chiamaj a tte dio esaldiscie li loro preghi et perdona a tutti li peccati e se alchuno sera inn anghoscia ouero in pericholo ouero in pregione ouero in sake ouero in furore di falso iudicio vin qualunque tribulattione sera et elli ti chiamiera et dira idio onipotente abbi missiercordia di me per lli meriti del tuo seruo chonofrio preghotj signore che incontenente lo esaldischi li loro preghi et dimostri la tua potentia per lo mio amore et per lla tua missiercordia amen Andai io panuccio innanssi et inginocchiameli a piedj chol lagrime et dissi Voglio padre che uscito te di questo seculo stare in questo luogho e elli mi disse non se mandato accio che stiej in questo luogo ma accio che ralegrj li seruj de dio che stanno in del diserto chome ai ralegrato me/ ancho et uenisti accio che L mio corpo fusse sotterrato pero ritorna n egypto et predicha a frati tutte quelle chose chaj vdite et vedute nel diserto ancho et tr oueraj tra sancti de dio in vita eterna [126rb] et di tutte queste chose a fratellj accio che ssi faccia sancto ricordamento de noj nella gente che uerra et ancho col lagrime li dissi io ti scongiuro sancto padre per quello idio per loquale tu aj macerata la tua carne che tue mi benedichie e ricordi di me in del riposo de santi ch et te dato de dio et quellj mi disse domenedio et tutto possente che uole che tutti li hominj si saluino et che uegnano a chognoscimento di verita ellj sia tua guardia elli leriti da tutte le nsidie del nimico et lla benediezione del padre et del figliuolo et dello spirito santo sia teco et dette queste chose mai no fauelle leuaimi di terra et guardaj et uidi la faccia sua chome fuochio candida collj occhi et colle manj a ccielo leuate et pianamente oraua si ch io non poteua odjre quello chellj dicea baciando io li suoj sancti piedi escia ne odor de che soprastaua a tutte le spetie del mondo e pareami esserere (sic) nel paradijo di dio per lo grande odor de allora guardaj et eccho vno grande turbamento nel aire et uno grandissimo suono et molto merauiglioso che per paura caddi in terra e giacea chom uno tramortito et per lla paura tutte le mie interiuela elemelria si disnodoarllla giacebo in terra con grande paura e pur guardando echo aperti furono li cielli et molti angej amellieche amellieche montauano et scenduano in sul corpo del sancto padre honorfrio et sentij uoci inn aire candando salmi le quaj voci
suauissime vdia e non vedea quelle conpagne de santi vestiti a palj in quella medesima
hora viddi li cori di santi angeli voci tenendoli in del <le> loro manj E udij vna voce
[133jpg 126va] che disse esci fuora pacificha anima e uien a me accio ch io ti metta in
nel mio riposo che tu aj amato tra pratraltici e tutti li altri sancti eccho subbitamente s
aperseno li ciejl e li nostro signore iheus chrsto li uenne in contra allora io viddi l anima
del bea honofrio bella chome vna cholona chandida chome nelle andando innansi li
angell cantando li bellj canti passarono l aire del cielo allora lo nostro signore iheus
chrsto aperse le manj e prese l anima del beato padre honofrio e portandola secho monto
in cielo allora ritornaj in me e leuami e toccando li sancti piedi erano anchora chaldi lo
corpo suo risprendea chome pretiosa margaritta allora incomminciaj a pensare et dissi chome
fare ch io non posso chauare neneferrj chon che io possa chauare ch io sotterj questo
sancto corpo pensando questo viddj due leonj et venero e adorarono lo sancto corpo e
colle lingue elcchauano li sancti piedj e fatto questo s inginochiarono allato a quel sancto
corpo e piangiendo mecho chome fusseno homij quando io ebbi molto orato leuami
innansi a lloro e dissi io so che dio spirera nelle bestie e umili eral et percio voj ci siete
mantati accio che m aitiate sotterrire questo sancto corpo istate su fratelli e ssofferiamo lo
corpo di questo sancto padre e io tolsi lo bastone mio e disegnaj lo luogho della
solpoltura allora li leonj vennero a colle branche feciemo molto tosto la fossa allora mi
chauaj vna mia tonicha e uestij quello sancto corpo e bac<1>aj li suoj santi piedi quando
lo soterraj li leonj che chapi chinati torno [126vb] rono nel luogo loro allora viddi che lla
cella chadde e lla palma seccho alloro cominciaj fortemente a piangere e contristarmi et
eccio langelo di dio venne e dissemi non piangere ma maggiormente ti llalegra che se
stato dengno di uedere contante merauiglie esce quinci e ua inn egipto et predicha a
monaci quelle chosa chaj vedute et vdite et quello che cti disse labate sancto honorofrio la
gratia chellj a chiesta elli la auuta il nostro signore iheus chrsto abbia missericordia di te
et guarditi in bene e meniti in della vita della pace et ditto questo langelo si partij da me e
usciendo quinde presi ad andare per lla ua che ua in nel diserto andandomi innansi quello
homo che n prima m era apparito e chosi andando trouaj .vij. altri serui di dio li primi
.iij. vecchi uestiti di pelli di bestie morte in due luoghi e stauano li primi delle uarme e
abitauano insieme e lli altrj altresi la uita loro lasso per tosto venire affine ma questo diro
che standing con quellj .iij. giouanj vestiti di pellj aregandoci l angero la domenicha
mattina lo corpo el sangue del nostro singore iheus chrsto e chomunichatoci noj mi disse
langelo stassu fratello panuccio tornati inn egipto e predicha ongni chosa che aj udj et
ueduto da sancti de dio et quello che beato honorofrio ti disse e predicha a tutti li monaci che
sguittino la utia de sancti che stanno [127ra] nel diserto et predicarono di fare festa et porte li
libri in tucte le terre
di sitarij e pruoserlo (sic) nelle chiese in ricordamento de santi choi qualj noj meritiamo d
auere parte et rimissione delle nostre pecchata prestante in cielo o lluj che chol padre e
col figliuolo e collo spirito sancto viue et regna in secula et sechulorum amen.

qui finisce lo qurto libbro de uita padrj
Appendix 3.2 Vita Onuphrii Latin and Pisano-Lucchese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morgan Library M626</th>
<th>Casanatense 422</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[f.84vb] Incipit de uita atque conversatio beatissimj onufrij anachorite</td>
<td>130jpg [123vb] Di sancto honofrion et chome labate panuctio lo trouo in del diserto lxxxii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f.85ra] Paphnutius humilis seruus uestre sanctitate omnibus dei famulis atque uniueris fidelibuis qui per uniueris terrarum ecclesijs in fidem christi constitutis salutem. Pax ubis et gratia salvatoris nostri ihesu christi permaneat. Volo sollicitatem esse uestram magnitudine de magno quodam patre onufrio anachoritarum sotio cuius uite meritis uestris auribus intumare dispono. Quadam uero die dum essem in monasterio meo cum ceteris fratribus in cenobio conspiratus sum in corde meo dicens. Que est uita mea uel qua retributio nobis erit apud deum in die illo quando uniueris uiris uite meritis rationem reddemur. Numquid in hoc cenobio fratres pariter congregamur et dum ex fratribus quispiam infirmatur visitatur a ceteris et congregatio nostra ab omnibus reficitur Sancti vero qui in heremo latitant sine hijs omnibus permanent Certe quia ipsi magni sunt vere quia nobis meliores sunt sicut dictum est quoniam hij secuntur agnum quocumque ierit Cumque talia cogitassem per tote noctis spatium mane surgens festinus exij de monasterio viamque pergens itineris heremum petij Invenique quandam speluncam cuius ianua erat clausa Existimans me ibidem fratrem quempiam habitantem cepi clamare dicens Famule dei famule dei Cumque diu clamassem et neminem audissem respondere: Aperiens ianuam speluncte introivi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fue vno sancto abate chebbe nome pannutio estando ellj in del suo monesterio chollj suoi monaci vna note pensando in se medesmo dicea che vita e la mia et che ragio renderoe io addio al di del giudicio e chosi pensando volle abandonare questo mondo et cerchare lauita de santi padre che stauano in del diserto e nar A questo pannuctio lassando stare la vita della parti che
Tunc inveni quendam senem quasi in oratione stantem in pedibus suis accedensque ad eum tetigi veniam pulsans quo tacto corpus eius corruit et extendit se super terram

Territus autem nimis pre timore psallere cepi orans ad dominum Invenique ibidem indumentum ex palmis quo tacto dissolutum est sicut pulvis in manu mea

Eadem vero nocte permansi psallens et orans ad dominum Mane autem facto tollens qua eram veste indutus mediam dividit partemque eius defunctum corpus induit orationeque acta exij veniam deo postulans et clausa ianua heremi cepi pergere iter

Cumque triduum ambulassem inveni ibidem alia speluncam ianua clausa et ex foris scopis mundatam per circuitu valde decore Cui aderat iuxta palma plena fructibus valde mirabilis et fons aquae spetiose nimirum

Quo viso deo reddidi gratias permansique ibidem usque ad uesperum expectans dei famulum redeuntem Et ecce ad vesperum vidi venientem multitudinem bubalorum gregem et in medio eorum quendam virum benigno uultu nudus a vestibus capillis uero toto corpore coopertus

Ille me viso cepit expavescere et signare se existimans me spiritum esse orans permanebat Multa autem in illo loco demoniæ eum temptaverant sicut mihi postea ipse locutus <est>

Ad quem protinus uoce magna locutus sum dicens Quare dubitas dei famule noli timere quia homo peccator sum Tempta et vide quia caro et ossa et cutis indutus sum et dei famulos quero ut forsitan per eos sit michi peccatorum remission
Tunc ille gratias agens occurrit michi et ego ueniam postulans adoravi eum Post salutationis officia duxit me in spelunca Et dixit michi quomodo vero huc advenisti frater panpnutie?

Cui dixi Quia dei famulos quero ut eorum meritis sotiarer Tunc interrogavi eum dicens Quo tempore hic aduenisti dei famulae et quod tibi nomen est? Si inveni gratiam apud te indica mihi

Ille vero ait ad me Ego frater antea in thebaide monasterio cum plurimis fratribus cenobij habitabam operabam cum fratribus tarsicaria

Quodam vero tempore menti meae accidit ut me solum manente protinus a deo plus mercedem accipiam Surgens autem exij de monasterio veniensque in quondam solitario loco edificavi cellulam mihi in qua solus manebam cupiens a deo amplius mercedem accipere

Operabam uero manibus meis sicut prius tharsicaria et multi ad me ex populis fluebant pro mihi operis studio Multa autem michi ferebantur pro eo quod nichil ex illis amplius quantum pauperibus et orphanis erogabam Tunc ex invidia dyaboli qua omnium malorum seminarium oritur

Accidit ut quedam mulier monachile habitu veniens ad me conpulit mecum unanimiter habitare Cui consentiens excepit eam in cellula et quod peius est maligni consilio parturivimus dolorem et genuimus iniquitatem

Et sic permansimus in peccato anno uno et mensibus quatuor Post hec uero memor mei sceleris et dei iuditij et iuste retributionis dixi Heu me heu me miser
homo quid respondebo domino quomodo ante iusto iudicis assistebo fatiem?

Surge miser evade a peccato melius est michi hec omnia derelinquere et fugere a peccato et exiens ueni in loco isto Et habitavi in solitudine invenique speluncam hanc et palmam istam cum fonte que sunt causa salutis meae

Palma hec per unumquemque annum generat duodecim ramos hij sunt pleni fructibus ut sic per unumquemque mensem ramus solumodo cum fructibus michi sufficit et sic per aliud mensis secundus et tertius usque totum anni spatium ita michi efficitur sed et vestimenta mea tempore finierunt et capilli capitis mei tota mei corporis membra cooperierunt

Ipse autem misericors et patiens dominus suave mihi temporis curricula tribuit qui cum triginta et eo amplius anni sunt ex quo in isto veni loco quod figuram panis non vidi nec gustai

Hec audiens ego pamnutius an iusto illo uiro admiratus sum in sermonibus eius dicenti quod per triginta annorum tempus figuram panis non uidisset nec gustasset

Interrogavique iterum dicens eum ab initio dum huc aduenisti famule dei non conturbaris in mente et animo?

Et ille respondit fortiter homo dei turbatus fui ab initio et plenus mestitia dolebam nimium interiora corporis mei et cor meum turbabatur et pre doloribus et multis meis angustijs prosternatus in terra sic orationis mee complebamini (sic) offitium

Tunc obsecrabam dominum ut discederet a
me dolor ille et angustia que inerat corpori meo Dico autem tibi frater quia hodie triginta annos et eo amplius manco in loco isto ubi multa expugnatione demonum multisque doloribus et tribulationibus fatigatus ita permansi orans et deprecans dominum pro remissione peccatorum meorum

Factum est autem quodam tempore et eram nimium dolens in interiora corporis mei ut pre doloribus nimijs prostratus in terram finem mortis expectarem

Subito enim astitit mihi quidam vir splendidissimus et nimium decoris tenensque manum meam erexit me a terra dicens Quid habes frater?

Cui respondi Domine epar meum doleo Et dixit michi ostende mihi locum ubi dolor est Indicavique ei Tunc ille vir gloriosus posuit digitum suum aperuitque latus meum eitiensque epar meum foras ostendit michi illud et erat nimium putredinis plenum

dixitque mihi Noli timere ob hoc iam sanus eris ab infirmitate hac Ideo quasi medicus novacula tenens in manu extersit epar meum et tulit ab eo omnem putredinem et reposuit corpori meo signansque ligavit amomum

et dixit ad me Ecce sanus factus es iam deprecare dominum et amplius noli peccare Tunc ille vir ab oculis meis evanuit Ex illo enim die usque modo eripuit me dominus ex illis doloribus et temptationibus manco enim gratias agens omnipotenti deo

Tunc ostendit mihi amomum quo ille
gloriosus uir in lateris eius plagam
alligaverat quod audivi ego
pampnutius gratias agens deo dixit (sic) ei

Rogo te famule dei excelsi ut si inveni
gratiam coram deo uolo tecum permanere

Et ille dixit michi Numquid poteris
sustinere minas daemonum et temptationes
eorum Dixi autem illi Obsecro domine mi
ut dicas michi quod tibi nomen est?

At ille dixit Thimotheus vocor memento mi
frater et ora pro me ad dominum ut dignus
effitiar opus mee salutis in bonis proficere
Tunc procedens ego interrogavi eum michi
orationem perficere atque benedictionem

Et ille dixit Dominus noster ihesus christus
benedicat te frater karissime et cooperiat et
erat te a temptationibus inimicorum et
tribuat tibi vias rectas ut cum gudio possis
occurrere sanctorum suorum mansiones
sicut cepisti ambula in pace et memor esto
mei orationibus uiam ambulare (sic)

Tunc benedictione aucta cepi itineris mei
uiam ambulare gaudens et magnificans
deum qui me dignatus est beatum
thimotheum uidere famulum

Veniens autem in quodam loco solitudinis
permans in eo duorum dierum spatium
Considerabam vero mei sceleri
dicens Que est vita mea? quam mercedem
accepiam cum nichil operis gesserim?

heu heu cum nichil certamen certauerim
quantum mercedem expecto?
Omnis preliator qui pugnam non vicerit
nichil premium accipit non coronatur a
domino qui operibus extra efficitur
Post biduum uero promptior factus cepi contra heremum ambulare Nimium uero desiderabam ut forsitan dei famulos invenirem qui in heremo habitant ut eorum me benedictionibus committerem

Ducebam autem mecum modicos panes et paululum aque que usque dies quatuordecim suffecere mihi

quo defitiente condolui animo subitoque uirtutem accipiens a deo ambulavi per uiam heremi usque aliorum dierum quatuor spatium postea uero fatigatus ex itinere et famis inopia spiritus meus defecit in me prostratusque in terram mortis finem expectabam

Tunc aspexi Et ecce uir terribilis astitit michi extensaque manu posuit in labijs meis et subito uirtutem accepi ita ut nec fatigarer nec famis inopie memorassem

Surgens autem velotius ambulare cepi contra interiorum heremum Cumque ambulassem per dies quatuor et noctes totidem et nimium hesitans extendi manus orans et iterum aspitiens uidi illum virum priorem venientem ad me et subito ab eo uirtutem accepi

[f.86rb] decem uero et alias septem dies simul ambulantem me interiorum heremum uidi a longem quemdam uirum qui erat aspectu terribilis capilli capitis eius maiiores albi tanquam nix et huic corpus coopertum sicut bestie pessime. Erat autem nudus aeste et folia arborum circumdatus circa ueretri corporis.

Et uident eum uenientem ualde contremui. Cumque appropinquaret in timore perterritus ascendi super saxem montis qui

Andando adentro perlo diserto per xvii die chomolata fame e sete e in chapo de xvii die vidde da lunga vno homo cho vno aspetto molto terribile col corpo ingnudo li chapelli del [124ra] chapo suo grandi e bianchi chome nieue lo corpo choperto chome bestia saluaticha e auea intorno alla vergognia del corpo foglie darbori

et vegendolo ebbi grande paura e appressimandomisi montaj in su vno sasso del monte che mera presso temendo che
erat iuxta me timens ne forte ueniens
deorasset me.

Ille uero ueniens subter saxum et ego
desuper astabam prostruit se in
umbraculum montis nimium autem erat
fatigatus de etate senili et solis incendio
eleuansque uocem sursum aspiens dixit.

Descende ad me homo sanctissime noli
timere quia et ego homo sum sicut et tu
similis enim sum tibi passabilis habitans in
heremo propter deum et salutem anime
mee.

Audiens autem hec festinus descendi et
prostratus ante pedes eius ueniam
postulabam. At ille [f.86va] dixit mihi.

Surge fili surge, quia amicus dei es et
sanctorum eius. Cum autem surrexissem
precepit mihi sedere ante eum. Tunc festine
rogavi eum ut protinus mihi nomen
indicaret.

Qui dixit mihi. Onufrius mihi nomen est.
Sexaginta etenim sunt anni quod in hac
heremo habito nutritus a dei misericordia.
et nullius hominis aspexi effigiem nisi te
hodie. et hic a deo missus es ut corporis
mei <funeris> offitium tribuas.

Temporibus autem prioribus eram habitans
in quodam monasterium quod eriti
uocabatur. qui eritioliti regis thebayde
prouintie ubi numerus centum erat fratrum.

Inter quos erat una fides et una congregatio
et magnus dei timor et amor caritatis
nimius et pax christi magna inter illos
silentii quoque et humilitate alterutrum
consentientes.

Ego autem in parua etate eram inter illos
non mi diuorasse

quellj vegnendo sotto lo sasso viuo era
gittosi in terra allonbra sel monte e era
moltò affadighato per leistade chera
vecchio e perlo incendio del sole
leuo il chapo suso e chiamomi dicendo

veni a me huomo santo et non auer paura
chio sono homo chome tu a sostenere pena
et chosto in del diserto perlamar di dio e
perla salute dellanima gia vii de

io pannutio vdendo questo incontenente
asciesi et inginocchiamelli innansi a suoj
santi piedi chiedendoli perdonanza et quellj
mi disse

sta su figliuolo che tusse amicho di dio e de
suoi santi quando io fui levato mi
chomando chio sedesse innansi alluj allora
inchetente lo preghaj chelli mi dicesse lo
suo nome

elli mi disse lo mio nome e heunofrio
sesanta anni sono chio oe abbitato in questo
diserto notricato dalla misericordia di dio e
neuno homo oe veduto in questo tenpo se
no te E tu ci se mandato da dio a me che
facci hofficio di mortorio al mio corpo et
ne tenpin passati io staua in nuno
monesterio—chessi chiamaua herity? Che
auevano la legge delli herimoliti nella
prouincia di tebanda oue auea nommero di
cento fraty

intra quali era vna fede e uno amore et uno
raunamento la paura di dio et grande
osserrando sylentio et humilita e laultra?
Virtu

intralloro io era piccholo [124rb] fanciullo
meditans sanctarum scripturarum studia et rectam fidem sicut christianis meruerit.

Audiui eos loquentes de beato helia mirabile dictum sicut a deo confortatus erat propter humilitatem et castitatem quae in deserto optinuit.

Insuper et de beato iohanne baptista qualiter in deserto heremi extiterit usque dum ostensus est in israel.

Interrogabam autem fratres dicens quid enim ipsi qui in heremo habitant fortiiores nostri sunt apud deum?

Qui dixerunt mihi. Ita fortiiores et primos esse nobis illos etenim illos nos unanimiter habitantes inuicem nos uidemus et congregationis causa nobis pariter congregamur.

Et si quis ex nobis infirmus fuerit a ceteris confortatur. Si autem esurimus uel sitimus in proximo nobis adest cibus et potus. et omnis utilitas que nobis necesse est in proximo nobis inuenitur.

Habitatibus autem in heremo hijs omnibus extra permanent. Si autem illorum quaelibet temptatio contigerit ab inimici hostis seu turbatio uel angustia ubi inuenitur homo qui eis [86vb]subueniat aut qui consolaretur illos. Tempore autem famis uel sitis ubi panis inuenitur. ut ex ipso refitiantur.

Hijs omnibus extra sunt illi nichil aliud nisi sola spes in deo et humilitas castitas uero et ymnodia et magnum certamen.
Nichil aliud illi est cogitatio nisi ut per
ieunijus et obseccionibus exuperent
sagittas inimici et que cotidie in occulto
insidiatur ille inimici humani generis qui
contrarius omnibus est qui hec cupiunt
adimplere.

Hij autem omnes qui omnia hec uincere
temptant magnam apud deum
retributionem accipient quando autem
exeunt de corpore angeli dei ueniunt
administrantes eis.

Et illos uero qui hec sua desideria corporis et
carnem mortificauerunt magna preuenit
gratia magna retributioni inestimabilis gloria
in qua angeli dei attingere desiderant
nutriuntur uero de petra sicut dixit ysaia
propheta.

Omnes autem qui sustinent dominum
mutant uirtutem pennis induuntur ut aquile
cum ambulant non esurient et cum fatigati
fuerint numquam sitiunt effitiunt illis
siluarum herbe super mel et fauum.

Cum autem illis pugna diaboli surrexerit
eul temptatio extendunt manus suas ad
celum et dominus pius qui eos pascet
cotidie ex alto eis auxilium praestat et
omenia tela nequissima dyaboli effugent.

Numquid audisti fili scripturam dicentem
quia non derelinquet dominus pauperem in
eternum patientiam (sic) pauperum non
peribit in finem

Beatus enim erit omnis qui facit
voluntatem dei super terram. angeli
amministrant ei et exultare eum fatiunt et
confortantur eum in omni tempore.

Hec et hijs similia apud sancti (sic) patres
cum didicissem ego humillimus onufrius
neuno pensieri anno se non como con
digiunj e continue orattionj soprafiano Ake
saette e a quelle cose ce continuamente
lenimicho delluma gen?rattio asaetta quellj
che ?idioso e contrario a tutti quellj che
queste chose disiderano da denpi?

Tutti questi che tentano di sopras?re queste
chos?e riceueroano grande guiglial?
[131jpg 124va] che quando ellino eschano
delcorpo liangeli vegnono loro
aparecchiare et a seruire
e quellj che mortificano lidisiderij della
lo?r carne e delle loro corpora aduuiene
grande gratia et grande guigialionsone gloria
danno potere pensare alla qual Gloria
liangeli disiderano dipotere agiungere sono
notricate da pieta come dice ysaia propheta
tutti quellj chamano idio mutano virtu sono
vestati di penne come aquila quando vanno
non anno fame quando sono afadighati non
anno sete diuentano loro lerbe saluatiche
pio dolci che mele

quando lo combattimento del nimicho
viene e le tentationi leuano le mani addio e
domenedio pietoso che continuamente li
pascie presta loro aiuto da alto vegnono li
angeli e aparechiano loro e echaciano via li
maluagi lancioni del nimicho.

figliulo non aj tu udito la scrittura che dice
che domenedio non abandonerae lo pouero
giamaj la sapiensia del pouero non uerra
maj meno

beato sera choluj che fara la uolonta di dio
sopra la terra inpercio che lli angeli suoi li
aparecchia e fannolo lalegrare e confortare
in nogni tenpo

quando io honofrio molto humilemente
ebbi vdite queste et simiglianti chose da isti
padre molto malgolmente li receuetti nella
Exurgens uero nocte actuli paucos panes suffitientes michi usque dies quattuor. exiens autem de monasterio cepi uiam pergere que duc ebatur in heremo.

Et ecce aspitiens uidi antecedere michi columna ignis terribilem uisu. Quam uidens nimium expaui cogitauique pre timore retrorsum unde exij redire et habitare in cenobio sed dominus omnipotens qui uult omnes saluos fieri non permisit me hoc opus peregi.

Conuersus autem ille gloriosus qui antecedebat me et uocato nomine meo dixit Onufri noli timere quia ego angelus sum qui tibi datus fui custos ab infantia tua ut custodiam te usque in diem exitus tui.

Dico autem tibi quia iconomia hec in qua dignatus est dominus tecum ambulare et efficitur tibi in domino. [Tunc confortatus in domino serua: super eum] secutus sum eum et uenj in heremum istum per milibus sexaginta sex.


Cumque osculassem eum dixit ad me tu es frater onufrius cooperator meus in domino. Veni fili. dominus protector sit tuus et custodiat te in omnibus operibus tuis.

mente et nel chuore pensaj la lor dirittura essere molto grande e pensaj da quellj chotali quasi come stesseno in dell aultro mondo

leuami la notte e tolsi pane chemi bastasse per iiij di e uscitti del monesterio incomincia appiglia la uia che ua nel diserto

et chosi andando viddi vna colonba di fucho andarmi innanni molto terribile auedere et vegindola ebbi grande paura et pensaj per la paura di tornare arreto oue io era stato nel monesterio ma dio onnipotente che uuole che tutti li homini si saluin non mi lascio fare tale operattione/

ruiolgensosi quello glorioso che mi andaua innanni chiamandomi per nome e dissemi/ honofrio dio ti dia pace/ io sono angelo che per volonta di dio ti fui dato a guardia dal tuo nascimento/ infine alla tua fine/ accio chio ti guardi/

io ti dico che questo luogho in del quale domenedio ta fatto degno ti congiungera seco et allora confortat in dio seguitaj luj e uenni in questo diserto per sesanta e sei miglia

e trouaj vna espeluncha/ picchola in della quale entraj e trouaj quini vno seruo di dio molto vecchio innanni alli quaj piedi santi io minginocchiaj et pigliaj llo che facesse orattione per me et facta lorattione disse a me vieni qua figliuolo dami pacie/

quando io lebbj baciato e elli mi disse tu sse honofrio fratello mio e procuratore mio apo ddio vienj figliuolo domenedio sia tua guardia in tutte le tue buone operattionj
Tunc ingressus habitaui cum eo per dies septem docentem me illo de omnibus que in heremo sancti patres operantur.

Post septem uero dies ait ad me senex. Surge fili onufrij sequere me et ducam te in predestinatum locum ubi te dominus habitare precepit.

 Qui exurgens secutus sum eum et ambulantes per dies quattuor et noctes similiter inuenimus speluncam paruulam cui aderat cellula pusilla et pal ma et fons aque fluens.

Conuersus autem senex dixit mihi fili hic est locus qui tibi paratus est a domino. hic te habitare oportet omnibus diebus uite tue.

Ingressusque ille senex permansit mecum in cellula usque dies triginta docens me sanctorum patrum operibus. Interrogauique eum de genere et nomine et dixit michi de genere scitharum nomine ermeus uocor memento mei in domino.

Et post dies triginta surgens reuersus est in locum suum Ex illo autem <die> per unumquemque annum occurrebat mihi usque dum migrauit ad dominum. Quem accipiens sepeliui iuxta cellulam meam.

Cumque hec mihi narrasset beatus onufrius interogauique eum dicens pater sancte ab initio dum hic uenisti. Accusaui<tt> tibi temptatio an non.

et ille respon<tt>s it michi. frater mi dilectissime multa temptatio multusque dolor qui desperatus a uita declinabar usque ad mortem.

Que adhuc famis inopia sitisque ad iacentis michi in calor solis per diem frigorisque allora entraj e stetti colluj per septe die insegnandomi quello che santi adoperano in del diserto
dipo septe di mi disse quel vecchio stassu figliulo seguitami eco ti m<e>nerro in quel luogo che dio a comandato che tu stij

io me leuaj et seguitalio (sic) et andando per iiij di e per iiij notti trouammo vna picchola speluncha alla quale era accostata vna cella molto pinçholla e una palma et una fonte dacaqua corrente

ruiolgesi quel vecchio [125ra] e dissemi figliulo questo e i luogo che te aparecchiato da dio qui ti conuiene stare tutti di della vita tua

entro quel vecchio stette meccho nella cella .xxx. di/ amaastrandomi de lopere di santi/ io dimandaj luj della generattione et del nome suo elli mi disse della generattione de sitarj lo mio nome e ermeo riccordati di me addio

e dipo li .xxx. di si levo e torno al luogo suo da quel tenpo innansi ogni anno venia a me infino alla fine sua loquale sotteraj presso alla ciella mia

mentre che sancto honofrio dicea queste chose lo domandaj e dissi padre al tuo cominciamento auesti tentatitionj o no

e quellj mi rispuose chosi fratel mio amoroso/ molta tentatione et molto dolore et che disperato della vita chiedea la morte

quanta misserira (sic) di fame e di sete lo di lo chaldo e lla notte lo freddo lanima mia si conturbaua infine alla morte e lle enteriuola
uesperinis per noctibus tristabatur anima mea usque ad mortem et de iis omnibus mutata est caro mea et omnia interiora mea pessime torquebantur.

Nam et vestimenta mea tempore suo et desinierunt (sic) et ecciderunt a me et sic nudus effectus corpus meum nimirum patiebatur.

Sed pius dominus et misericors cum me omnia sustinere uidensque magnum super me tribuit tollerantiam.

Nam capilli capitis mei corpus quod nudum erat protexit. Misitque pius dominus angelum suum ferentemque michi cotidie panem ex quo nutrient aquam que sufficit.

Triginta autem annos quidum de monasterio meo exiui panem numquam comedii necnon herbas siluarum et aquam in misura.

Deinde usque modo per alios triginta annos qui mihi expletur uisitauit me dominus in die in die.

Videns autem dominus quod tradissem in eo spem meam dum castigauit [f.87va] iterum misertus est et fuerant michi herbe siluarum dulciorem melle dum recordarem quod non in solo pane uiuit homo sed in omni uerbo quod procedit de ore dei.


miei erano pessimamente conturbate
le vesamenta miei venneno meno nel tempo loro e cadono da me et chosi rimase lo corpo mio igniudo e molta pena sostenea.

ma domenedio pietoso et missericordioso quando vidde che io sostenea tutte queste pene diede a me grande patientia

lo corpo mio chera igniudo coperse di chapellj e mandomj langelo suo che mi recha pane di che io mi notricho e acqua o che mj basta

trenta annj stessti poi chio vscitti del monesterio che io non [125rb] mangiaj pane se non erbbe saruatiche et acqua a miçura da trenta annj

infine ad ora et per altri trenta annj che ora si chompieno ma visitato dio di in di

et vegendo idio chio auea messa tucta la speransa in luj et quando mebbe chasticato ebbe missericordia di me che lerbe saluatiche mi funno piu dolci che mele quando mi riccordaua che non pure di pane viue luomo ma delle parole ch eschano della boccha di dio

chosi fratello mio panuntio ogni homo che fa la uolonta di dio trova missericordia appolluj elli si e pietsoso et ancho dice idio in del vangelio non pensate che douete mangiare ouero bere in inperro chel padre vostro celestiale sa di che uoj albicognate/ in prima chiedete lo regno di dio et possa arete tutte queste chose/

vdendo queste chose dal sancto padre
Hoc audiens a sancto patre onufrio
interrogavi eum dicens. Pater mi per diem
sabbati et diem sanctissimum dominicum
unde tibi corpus domini datur.

Et ille respondit. Angelus domini astitit ad
me qui me corporis et sanguinis domini
precipue efficit non solum michi sed et
omnibus similiter qui in heremo habitant.

Cumque corpus et sanguis domini
refitiuntur omnes spiritu sancto replentur et
nec esuriuntur nec sitiuntur amplius nec est
in eis ullus dolor nequeulla temptatio
quam priora transierunt.

Et dum quispiam illorum hominem (sic)
desiderat ita <alta> uidere assumitur in
paradiso per aera celi et uidet omnem
gloriam sanctorum et in ecstasi effecti cum
reddeunt in sua estimant se in alio esse
muno et ideo oblitist oblitiuntur omnes
tribulationes et angustias que antea erant
passuri.

Hec sunt opera sanctorum et certamina.
Hec mihi loquente beato patre onufrio
supernis dixit mihi.

Surge frater eamus pariter. Ego autem
omnia illius melliflua audiens uerba
omnem angustiam que in uia heremi eram
passus famique et sitis inopiam obluiunj
tradidi.

Dixitque illi O pater sanctissime beatus
sum ego cum talem dei famulum inuenire
merui. Surgens autem secutus sum eum et
cum peruissemus quasi trium milium
stadia inuenimus cellulam et palma<m>.

Assistente <me>autem beatus senex cepit
psallere et orare. Cum autem complessam
orationem et finem daret [f.87vb] respondi
Amen.
Aduersperascente autem die cum solis occasu aspitiens in medio celle uidit panem adiacentem et urceum aque.

Et dixit ad me.

Surge frater Pamphuti comede panem et bibe aquam ecce ante te positum est. Video enim te fatigari fame.

Respondens autem dixi ei. Vivit dominus et uiuit anima mea non comedam nec bibam nisi tu mecum comederis.

Cumque dirogassem illum accepit panem benedicens dedit michi dicens. Accipe panem quem misit dominus nobis Cotidie enim michi medium panis ferebatur modo pro te fratre Pamphuti sanus nobis a domino missus panis est.

Cum autem surgeremur a cena cepimus psallere et orare ad dominum et sic permansimus usque mane orantes ad dominum.

Mane autem facto aspexi et uidi dei famulum uultu mutato pallescente fatie. Quod uidens uehementer expaui.

Conuersus autem ad me dixit michi. Noli timere dei famule magis confortare et promotus esto.

In hoc enim te ad me mjsit dominus ut corpori meo yconomiam tribuas et funeris mei corpus terre sepelias.

Ecce enim hodie exeo de hoc ergastulo corporis et uado in requiem meam. Et est dies sextisdecimus mensis paion qui est dies undecima iunii apud romanos

tu autem frater cum egressus fuisses in egyptum predica in memoriam mei fiuntur

nel liuerare del die col tramontare del sole guardai in del meçço della cella viddj vn pane e uno vaçello daccua

e dissemi sancto honofrio

sta ssu fratello panuntio mangia lo pane e be lacqua viddj che te posto innansi io ti ueggio molto affadigato per la fame

Risspuosi io et dissi viue idio e uiue lanima mia non mangerò ne non bero se tu non mangi chon esso meco

et quando io lebbi molto preghato tolse lo pane e disse a me tollj lo pane che cci a mandato idio continuamente m era regato meçço auale per llo tuo auenimento fratel mio sano te mandato da dio

quando fummo leuati da mangiare et cominciamo a salmegiare e adorare idio et chosi stemmo infine alla mattina orando a ddio

fatta la mattina guardaj e uiddi lo seruo di dio lo seruo di die col uiso mutato la faccia palida e io ueggendolo ebbi grande paura

e ellj si riulose a me e dissemi non auere paura seruo di dio ma magiamente ti conforta e sij pronto

pero ti ci a mandato idio accio chel corpo mio dij alla terra e facci officio di mortorio al mio corpo et sotterilo

eccho oggi esco di questo corpiciuolo e uo in nel riposo [125vb] mio voggi e xvii di apo quellj dipau che xi di giugno appo romanj

tu fratel mio quando torneraj in egipto predica che ssi faccia memoria di me tra monaci e lli altri christianj
medios fratrum et omnibus Christianis.

Hoc autem petij a domino deo nostro et hoc postulaui quod et datum est mei a domino ut siquis memoriam mei fecerit seu oblationem aut pauperum susceptionem fecerit in nomine meo aut memorie uite mee liber scripserit dimitantur ei uniuaera peccata.

Siquis hec que audistis fecerit ego rogabo dominum ut deleantur eius uniuaera peccata. Siquis hec que audistis fecerit ego rogabo dominum ut deleantur eius uniuaera peccata (sic) et cum exerit de mondo hoc et de corpore f.88ra sup erit mundus a peccato quasi modo genitus infans.

Respondens autem ego panuccus dixi. Pater mi esto tua bonitas et si quis inops fuerit non ualens oblationem facere aut nudos uestire sicut superius locutus est (sic) quid erit in eo.

Et dixit michi beatus onufrius. Siquis inopia detentus fuerit et non amplius habuerit nisi solum modo calicem aqua frigide et in nomine meo dederit sic erit postulatio mea super eum sicut a domino impetraui.

Hec dicens eleuatis manibus et oculis in celum iacens in pauimento clamauit ad dominum dicens

Dominator altissime inuisibilis eius (sic) potestas inestimabilis est cuius gloria inennarabilis cuius misericordia sine fine est te deprecor te laudo te adoro te benedico quem dilexi quem secutus sum ab uberibus matris mee exaudi me domine clamantem ad te.

Magnificans magnificabo te domine quia respexisti humilitatem meam nec

io chiesto questo al mio signore e questo o aspettato e o llo auuto da dio che se alchuna persona fara memoria di me ouero limosina ouero pastcia ouero pouero nel mio nome ouero che se per ricordamennto del mio nome o delle mia vita v ch si iscriuera la mia leggenda li siano perdonate tutte le pecchata suoj

se alchuno fara queste chose io preghero dio per lluj che tutte le suoj pecchata li siano perdonate e quando lanima vsciera del corpo et di questo mondo sera lauato dal pecchato chome vno fanciullo che allora fusse nato

Rispusoi io panuccio e dissi padre mio per lla tua fe se sera alchuno pouero che non possa fare lemosina o uestire pouero come tu aj detto che ara

et elli mi disse sancto honofrio se llj sera nessuno pouero che non possa dare altro ch uno biccheiere dacqua m<d> darallo nel mio nome chosi ara la gratia chome io lo chiesta a ddio

E dicendo queste cose leuoe le manj a ccielo e stando ginocchionj gridoe a ddio e disse

Signore altissimo da non vedere la chuj podesta e da non pensare la chuj glolia e da non stimare la chuj missericordia e sensa finne io ti lodo io ti benedicho cui io o amato cui io o seguitato dalle puppe de mia madre in qua ma ode mi signore gridante a tte

magnificho e lodo te domennedio inpero che ai guardata la mia vmilta e non
conclusisti me inimici manibus statuisti in loco spatio pedes meos

nunc autem domine protegat me dextera tua et ueniat super me misericodia tu quia conturbata est anima mea dum exerit de corpore isto et ne occurrat in [ dyabolus neque michi]tenebre.

esto domine et ne uideat anima mea obscura illa tenebrosa demonium effigies sed oro ut tu eam suscipias cum sanctis tuis pacificis angelis et collocare (sic) eam facias in requiem tuam quia tu es benedictus in secula seculorum. amen.

Peto domine clementiam tuam et obsecro miserer populo christiano et siquis mei memoriam fecerit seu oblationem in laudem et gloriem nominis tui seu fratrum quempiam cibavit seu propriis laboribus pauperes refitiet cum inuocaueruit te domine exaudi preces eorum et dele omnia peccata eorum.

Et si quis in angustijs uel in carceribus [f.88rb] aut in mari seu in furore iudjcis aut in quacumque tribulatione te inuocauerit et dixerit deus omnipotens misere nobis per merita sancti tui onufrij statim obsecro ut exaudias orationes eorum et imples petijiones eorum quia tu es benedictus in secula seculorum. amen.

Accedens autem ego pampnutius misime ante pedes eius cum lacrimis dicens. Volo pater ut migrante te de hoc seculo in isto loco manere. Et ille dixit michi. Non es missus ut hic habiteris nisi ut letifices seruos dei qui in heremo habitant sicut me letificasti rursum uenisti ut corpus meum iubeas re tradi sepulture.

mandato in nelle manj del nimicho [126ra] e ai ordinati li piedi miei in lungho spatio
guole idio guardami cholla tua mano direta pero ch e conturbata lanima mia quando uscira di questo corpo Signore idio non mi uegna innanssi lo maruagio auersario del dimonio non mi uegna innanssi le tenabre

Signore abbi misericordia di me accio che llanima non ueggia le schure faccie et tenebrote de dimonij ma io ti pregho che lla riceui choi tuoj pacifici angioli e alluoghila in nel riposo tuo perche se benedetto in secula sechulorum amen.

E chiegejoti signore alla tua pietade e preghoti che abbi misericordia al populo christiano e qualunqua persona chiamera a tte dio esaldiscie lli loro preghi e perdona a tutti lli loro pecchati

e se alchuno sera inn anghoscia ouero in pericholo ouero in bouero in mare ouero in furore di falso iudicio vin qualunque tribulattione sera et elli ti chiamera e dira idio onipotent abbi misericordia di me per lli meriti del tuo seruo chonofrio preghoti signore che incontenente lo esaldischi lli loro preghi e dimostrli la tua potentia per lo mio amore e per llla tua missericordia amen

Andai io panuccio innanssi e inginocchiamenti a piedj chol lagrime e dissi Voglio padre che uscito te di questo seculo stare in questo luogo e elli mi disse non se mandato accio che stiej in questo luogo ma accio che ralegrli li seruj di dio che stanno in del diserto chome ai rallegrato me/ ancho et uenisti accio che l mio corpo fusse sotterrato
Regredere in egiptum et predica fratribus uniuersa que uidisti et audisti in heremo et adhuc uidebis apud sanctos dei. Omnia enarra uniuersis fratribus ut agatur memoria sancta in postis gentibus.

Rursus iterum cum lacrimis dixi. Adiuro te sancte pater per dominum excelsum pro quo carmem tuam macerasti benedic me et memor esto mei in requiem sancta in postis gentibus. Ille autem dixit.

Deus omnipotens qui uult omnes saluos fieri et ad agnitionem urerat in ipse sit tuus protector et eripiat te ab insidiis inimici et benedictio patris et filij et spiritus sancti sit super te. Hec dicens amplius michi numquam locutus est.

Surgens autem a terra aspitiens uidi fatiem eius tanquam ignem candentem nimis oculis autem et manibus in celum semper intentus tacitus orabat ita ut non possem ego intelligere que dicebantur ab eo.

Cumque osculassem sanctissimos eius pedes factus est odor nimius aromatum in altitudo quasi in paradiso

Tunc aspexi et ecce turbatio magna in aere facta est et sonus teterinimus et corruscus (sic) pre cuius timore cecidi in pauimento et tamquam semi [f.88va] uiuimus iacebam et omnia membra mea dissoluta sunt pre timore.

Tunc in extasi me iacentem sursum tantum aspitientem uidi et ecce aperti fuerunt celi et multitudo angelorum militie descendebant super corpus sancti patris onufrij

pero ritorna n egipto e predicha a frati tutte quelle chose chaj vdite et vedute nel diserto ancho et troueraj tra sancti di dio in vita eterna [126rb] e di tutte queste chose a fratellj accio che ssi faccia sancto ricordamento di noj nella gente che uerra e io ancho col lagrime li dissi io ti sconfiguro sancto padre per quello idio per loquale tu aj macerata la tua carne che tue mi benedichi e ricorditi di me in del riposo de santi ch e tte dato da dio et quellj mi disse domenedio e tutto possente che uoole che tutti li hominj si saluino e che uegnano a chognoscimento di veritj sia tua guardia elli leriti da tutte le nsidie del nimico e lla benediccione del padre et del figliuolo et dello spirito santo sia teco et dette queste chose mai no faelulo

leuaimi di terra e guardaj e uidi la faccia sua chome fuocho chandida collj occhi e colle manj a ccielo leuate et pianamente oraua si ch io non poteua odjre quello chellj dicea

baciando io li suoj sancti piedi escia ne odore che soprastaua a tutte le spetie del mondo e pareami esserere (sic) nel paradiço di dio per lo grande odore

allora guardaj et eccho vno grande turbamento nel aire et uno grandissimo suono et molto merauiglioso che per paura caddi in terra et giacea chom uno tramortito et per lla paura tutte le miej interiuola elemerlia si disnodarlo

allora giacebo in terra con grande paura e pur guardingo echo aperti furono li cielli et moltj angelj amellicie amellicie montauano e scendeuano in sul corpo del sancto padre honofrio
et facte sunt uoces intra psallentium
quorum laudes suauissime audiebam
neminem autem intelligebam Ventum est
autem affuisse multitudines sanctorum
pulchritudinis palliata agmina eadem hora.

Et uidi choros sanctorum angelorum in
circuitu cum thuribulis et cereis tenentibus
in eorum manibus

et audui uocem terribiliem dicentem
Egredi pacifica anima et ueni ad me ut
mittam te in requiem quam dilexisti intra
patriarchas et prophetas et omnes sanctos.

Et ecce subito aperti sunt celi et dominus
christus exijt obuiam apparuit autem anima
beati patris onufrij sicut columba spetiosa
candida tamquam nix antecedentibus
angelis cum ymnis et laudibus aerem celi
penetrauit expansisque manibus dominus
noster ihesus christus suscepit eam et
baiulans secum ascendit ad celos.

Tunc ad me reuersus et tacto pede sancti
corporis erant adhuc candentes corpus
autem eius sicut margarita pulchra
splendebat.

Eadem hora cepi cogitare dicens. Quid
fatiam quia non ualeo fodere nec fossorium
habeo unde possim fodere ut tradam
sepulture sanctissimum corpus.

Talia me cogitante uidi et ecce duo leones
astiterunt sanctum corpus et linguis suis
sanctos pedes lingebant. Hoc facto
prosternerunt se iuxta corpore et flebant
mecum ut homines cunque diu orassent

surgens astij coram illos dicens Scio quia
et in bestijs placatur dominus et spirat in
e sentij uoci inn aire candando salmi le quaj
voci suauissime vdia e non vedea quelle
conpagne de santi vestiti a palj in quella
medesima hora

viddi li cori de santi angeli voci tenendolj
in del<le> loro manj

E udij vna voce [fol. 126va] che disse esci
fuora pacificha anima e uien a me accio ch
io ti metta in nel mio riposo che tu aj amato
tra pratrialci e tutti li altri sancti

eccho subbitamente s apereseno li cielj e l
nostro signore ihesu christi li uenne in
contra allora io viddi l anima del bea
honofrio bella chome vna cholonba
chandida chome nieve andando innansi li
angelj cantando li belj canti passarono l
aire del cielo allora lo nostro signore ihesu
christo aperse le manj e prese l anima del
beato padre honofrio e portandola secho
monto in cielo

allora ritornaj in me e leuami e toccando li
sancti piedi erano anchora chaldi lo corpo
suo risprendea chome pretiosa margaritta

allora incminciaj a pensare et dissi chome
fare ch io non posso chauare nenoferrj chon
che io possa chauare ch io sotterj questo
sancto corpo

pensando questo viddj due leonj et venero e
adoraron lo sancto corpo e colle lingue
elchchauano li sancti piedj e fatto questo s
inginochiarono allato a quel sancto corpo e
piangiendo mecho chome fusseno hominj
quando io ebbi molto orato

leuami innansi a lloro e dissi io so che dio
spirera nelle bestie e umili eral et percio voj
omnibus et in hoc uenistis ut sancti corporis auxilium una mecum unite mei

Surgite fratres et beati sancti patris corpus sepulture tradimus. Tollens autem baculum meum signaui locum sepulture et uenientes leones uelocius foderunt terram unngilijs suis.

Tunc exui me leuitonarium quo inditus eram inuolui sanctum corpus et osculatus eius sanctos pedes tradidi sepulture. Leones uero illi capitibus inclinatis recesserunt in locis suis.

Reuersusque ego uidi et ecce ipsa cellula ceclidit et palma similiter corruit. Tunc cepi flere nimis contristari et ecce angelus domini astitit qui dixt michi.

Noli flere magis autem exultare quia dignus fuisti uidere tanta mirabilia. Egredere hinc et uade in egiptum et predica omnia que audisti et uidisti sicut dixit tibi pater onufrius et dominus noster protegat te in bonis operibus et misereatur tui et dirigat te in uiam pacis. Hec dicens angelus domini recessit ad (sic) me.

Exiens autem inde cepi uiam contra heremum ambulare antecedente me ille uir qui prius michi apparuit.

Cumque ambulassem per quatuor dierum itinere inueni domum hedificatum in altissimo loco et erat clausa pulchraque nimis. Veniens autem requieui iuxta eam cogitans in me ipso dicens. En intus est quispiam dei servus habitans in ea. Hec me cogitante ecce quidam uir sanctus canitie plenus indutus ueste et palmis uultu miracile tamquam angeli dei. Qui ueniens ci siete mantati accio che m aitiate sotterrare questo sancto corpo istate su fratelli e sotterriamo lo corpo di questo sancto padre e io tolsi lo bastone mio e disegnai lo luogho della solpoltura allora li leonj vennero a colle branche fecieno molto tosto la fossa allora mi chauaj vna mia tonicha e uestij quello sancto corpo e bac<iu>aj li suoj santi piedi quando lo soterraj li leonj cho chapi chinati torno [126vb] rono nel luogo loro allora viddi che lla cella chadde e lla palma secch alloro cominciaj fortemente a piangere e contristarmi et eccho langelo di dio venne e dissemi non piangere ma magiormente ti llalegra che se stato dengno di uedere contante merauglie ese quinci e ua inn egipto e predica a monaci quelle chose chaj vedute et vdite et quello che cti disse labate sancto honofrio la gratia chellj a chiesta elli la auuta il nostro signore ihesu christo abbia missericordia di te e guarditi in bene e meniti in della vita della pace e ditto questo langelo si partij da me e usciendo quinde presi ad andare per lla ua che ua in nel diserto andandomi innassi quello homo che n prima m era apparito e chosi andando trouaj .viiij. altri serui di dio li primi .iiij. vecchi uestiti di pelli di bestie morte in due luoghi e stauano li primi delle uarme e abitauano insieme e lli altrj altresi la uita loro lasso per tosto venire affine ma questo diro che stando con quelj .iiij. giouanj vestiti di pellj aregandoci l angero la domenicha mattina
salutauit me dicens. Pax tibi frater a
domo. Tu es frater pamphnutius cooperator
noster in domino tu es qui induisti corpus
sancti onufrij. Veniens autem ego
prostratus ante pedes eius ueniam
postulabam. Eadem hora uenerunt alijs tres
senex (sic) et ipsi similiter palmis induti
ieroprepes uultu angelico et osculati sunt
me dicentes. Pax tibi dei famule et amice
sanctorum. Tu es frater pamphnutius qui o
[\textit{f.89r}] peruisti corpus sancti onufrij et quia
in hac nocte notum est nobis de aduentu
tuo. ideo congregamur ut tecum hodie
exultemus. Notum tibi facimus frater quia
sexaginta anni sunt hodie quod in hoc
heremo habitamus et neminem uidimus
hominem nisi te hodie et dum nos isti
fratres congregamur per diem sabbati et
dominico sancto oramus te ut usque uno
die nobiscum permaneas. Cumque duarum
omnia spatio sedentibus nobis et de
sancto onufrio loqui requemur ad inuicem
dixerunt ad me. Dilecte nobis surge
comedamus modicum panis quia fatigatus
ex itinere uenisti ad nos. Tunc omnes
surgentes unanimiter cepimus orare.
Orantibus nobis ecce quinque panes
appositos uidimus pulchiores nimis et
recentes quasi eadem hora coctos et
sedentes comedimus. Et dixerunt michi.
Ecche frater panpnuci cotidie nobis quatuor
seruunt panes hodie pro tui aduentu
quinque nobis panes astiterunt. Ideoque
nescimus unde ueniunt nisi quia paratos
illos accipimus. Tunc rogau ut cum illos
(sic) habitarer qui dixerunt michi. Non es
missus ut hic permaneas sed egredere in
egypto ut enarres uniuersaque audisti a
sancto onufrio. Rogauique eos iterum ut
michi edisserent nomina sua qui noluerunt
sed dixerunt michi. Indulge frater deus qui
omnia nouit ipse scit nomina nostra tantum
memor esto nostri in tuis orationibus ut
digni effitiamur uidere nos inuicem in
domo dei in die illo quando unusquisque ex
factis proprijs reddemus rationem. Certa
nunc frater ut effugere possis temptationes inimici. Hec audiens ab illis cepi contra interiorem heremum pergere. Cumque quasi sexaginta et eo amplius ambulans fere milibus inueni locum mirabilem pulcriorem nimis in quo erat spe [f.89rb] lunca et fons unde aqua plurima manabat. Et ideo requieui modicum. Et aspitiens uidi iuxta speluncam multitudinem arborum astantem qui erant palme dactilorum plene nimi. Surens autem introiui inter illos et admirabam in eorum pulcritudinem dicens. Vtinam scire uolui quis eas plantauit. Erant enim palme et çinçife et roa et uinee modice et amigdale (sic) cit et alij arbores omnia fructibus plena quorum gustus erat dulcis dulcius mel. Aqua vero fontis affluебat et rigabat omnes arbores illas inter quas me astante putabam me esse in paradiso dei. Et ecce iuuenes quatuor fratres uenerunt ad me ualde pulchriores induti pelhiculas oúium qui dixerunt mici. Aue frater pennutie. Et ego procedens adoraui eos. Sede uero pariter iuxta speluncam loquebamur ad inuicem putabam illos angelos dei esse. Ducentes uero ex fructibus arborum dederunt michi et comedi erant enim dulcis dulcius mel. Interrogauit autem eis dicerentes. Vnde huc famuli dei uenistis qui dixerunt michi ex quo te dominus misit ad nos omnia de nobis nuntiabimus tibi. Nos sumus de ciuitate que nescitur extron et parentes nostri nobiliiores ciuitatis traditi autem liciterarum studijs pariterque nobis una ms accusauit domino operante in bonis. Quadam die inter nos consiliantes exiuimus de ciuitate neminem sciente uenimus in locum istum. Duximus autem panes nobiscum quiusque diebus septem nobis suffeccenit et io in extasi effecti astitit nobis quidam uenerabilis senex qui nos confortauit et firmauit in loco isto et ecce nunc per annos sex habitamus in loco isto. Ille autem senex habita [f.89va] uit nobiscum anno uno docens nos quomodo
nos opperet domino seruire. Deinde ille pater migravit ad dominum nos autem remansimus in loco isto. Ecce frater karissime manifesti sumus coram te hodie quia sunt anni sex quod panem non comediumus uisi ex fructibus arborum istorum entrimus Et per totam ebdomadam semel nos congregamur in hac spelunca sabbato et die sancto dominico. Deinde sanctum dominicum celebrantes exeuntes unusquisque uaditin locum suum nesciens unus de alio quo agit uel quid operatur. Dixique illis. Vnde communicatis in sabbato in sanctum diem dominicum corporis domini nostri ivesu christi qui dixerunt michi. Pro eo quod congregamur angelus enim domino ueniens conferit nobis corpus et sanguinem domini. Audiens autem hec omnia ualde lotus effectus sum mansique cum illis diebus septem et illo septimo die dixerunt ad me. Paratus esto homo dei hac enim die angelus domino ueniens conferens nobis inuisice communionis et omnis qui accipit eam de manu eius exuritur et dimittur ei peccata sua et nulla temptatio appropinquat in eo. Inde loquentibus ad me audiui et ecce odor suavitatis astitit mire magnitudinis. Exurgentes autem astiti pariter cepimus psallere et laudes ferre domino et ecce angelus domini uenit et recepimus ab eo corpus et sanguinem domini et benedicens omnes subito abatus est nobis. Cum autem accepissem eucharistiam dei manu angeli tremescens sum tamquam dormiens. Accendentes autem fratres dixerunt ad me surge frater confortare noli timere. Vespere autem sancto tardius excitari potui territus pretinore Iterum noctem illam sine sompno pergimus psallentes atque orantes ad dominum. Mane autem facto iterum odor aduenti nobis et ita repleti sumus odoris et magne letitie ut putaremus nos esse in paradiso dei. Et ecce angelus domini iterum astitit et dedit omnibus unususce communionis dicens. Sit nobis
corpus et sanguis domini nostri ihesu
christi uiuita sempiterna et incorruptibile
gaudium. Ideoque unanimes respondimus
Amen. Conuersus autem angelus dixit
michi.

Surge frater papnutie egredere in egyptum
et predica omnia que uidisti a sanctis dei et
audisti omnia que locutus est ad te beatus
pater onufrius predica uniuersis fratribus ut
ipsi sequantur uestigia sanctorum patrum
qui sunt in heremo deo seruentes

noli morari necque pigeat te amplius quia
non est tibi datum a domino hic habitare
nisi ut uideas dei seruos et enarres uniuersis
ecclesijs opera eorum. Magis que tibi
precepit beatus onufrius

ecce enim et tu computatus es in numero
sanctorum. Beatus est es (sic) bonum tibi
erit quia tales patronos meruisti uidere et
tanta mirabilia meruisti dicere. Pax tecum
et esto robustus.

Hec dicente angelo donum benedicens
omnes ascendit ad celos.

Fratres autem illi surgentes apposuerunt
nobis ex fructibus arborum et comedimus
pariter et exultauiimus in illo die.
Mane autem facto exiens cepi itineris uiam
que contra egyptum ducebatur. Secutique
sunt me illi sancti fratres quasi milia
quinque. Introgauique (sic) illos nosce me
nomina illorum qui respondens primus
dixit. Iohannes michi nomen est. Secundus
andreas. Tertius raclaon. Quartus
theophilus memento nostri et ambula in
pace. Osculatis inuicem reuersis sunt in
locis suis.

Ego autem [f.90ra] ire cepi tristis et iterum
gaudens de uniuersea mirabilia que dignus
fuj videre et audire a sanctis patribus.

e chomunichatoci noj mi disse langelo

stassu fratello panuccio tornati inn egipto e
predicha ongni chosa che aj vdito e ueduto
da sancti di dio e quello che beato honofrio
ti disse e predicha a tutti li monaci che
siguitino la utia de sancti che stanno
[127ra]nel diserto a seruire a ddio

no stare e non t incresha piu dandare che
non t e dato da dio di stare qui ma accio
che uisiti li sancti di dio e dichj a tutte le
chieze l opre loro magiormente te l
comando santo honofrio

e eccho che tu sse chompitato da dio nel
numero de beati sancti beato se che ne araj
che aj meritato di uedere chotalj padronj et
tante merauiglie dio ti dia pace

ditte queste chose langelo ci benedisse tutti
et andone in cielo

incominciaj a ire tristo ma rallegrandomi
pensando le merauiglie che dio m auea
fatto degno di uederle
Iterum per tribus diebus ambulans exij in egyptum inuenique et requieui cum illis per dies decem narrauique omnia que uidi miracula et auribus eorum per ordinem narrai.

Qui audientes deo gratias agebant dicentes. Beatus es tu qui tales meruisti dei seruos uidere.

Ipsi autem erant nimis timentes deum et misericordes et hospitalitem (sic) precipui et omni bonitem (sic) pleni. Loquente autem me uniuersa que uidi et audiui ipsi cum magno studio scripserunt adque composuerunt festinantesque deportauerunt librum uniuersam terram scitharum et cognitum est uniuersis fratribus.

Et dum legentur uniuersi et reuersi sunt in monasterio. Et posuerunt librum in sanctam ecclesiam in memoria sanctorum cum quibus et nos mereamur portionem accipere et remissionem peccatorum in uita eterna.

Ipso adivuante qui cum patre spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat nunc et semper et in secula seculorum. Amen.

Explicit de beato onufrio.
### Chapter 3 Appendix 3 Long recension of Vita Onuphrii and Monte Cassino Epitome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paphnutius humilis seruus uestre sanctitate omnibus dei famulis atque uniuersis fidelibus qui per uniuersis terrarum ecclesijis in fidei christi constitutis salutem Pax ubis et gratia salvatoris nostri ihesu christi permaneat</td>
<td>Paphnutius humilis servus vestae sanctitatis omnibus dei famulis atque universis fidelibus (quam) que per universas terrarum aecclesias in fidei christi constitutis salutem Pax vobis et gratia salvatoris nostri ihesu christi permaneat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volo sollicitatem esse uestrae magnitudine de magno quondam patre onufrio anachoritarum socio eius vitae meritum uestris auribus intimare dispono</td>
<td>Volo sollicitus esse vestae magnitudini de magno quondam patre onuphrio anachoritarum socio eius vitae meritum auribus intimari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Quadam vero die dum essem in monasterio meo cum ceteris fratribus in cenobio conspiratus sum in corde meo dicens Que est vita mea uel qua retributio nobis erit apud deum in die illo quando uniuersis nostris uite meritis rationem reddemur</td>
<td>I Quadam vero die dum essem in monasterio meo cum ceteris fratribus in cenobio conspiratus sum in corde meo dicens quae est vita mea? vel quae retributio nobis sit apud deum in die illo? quando pro universis nostris vitae meritis rationem redderemus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numquid in hoc cenobio fratres pariter congregamur et dum ex fratribus quispiam infirmatur visitatur a ceteris et consolatio nostra ab omnibus reficitur Sancti vero qui in heremo latitant sine his omnibus permanent Certe quia ipsi magni sunt vere quia nobis meliores sunt sicut dictum est quoniam hi secuntur agnum quocumque hierit</td>
<td>Numquid in hoc cenobio fratres pariter congregamur et dum ex fratribus quispiam infirmatur visitatur a ceteris et consolatio nostra ab omnibus efficitur Sanctorum vero qui in heremo latitant sine his omnibus permanent Certe quia ipsi magni sunt vere quia nobis meliores sunt sicut dictum est quoniam hi secuntur agnum quocumque hierit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumque talia cogitassem per totum noctis spatium mane surgens festinus exij de monasterio viamque pergens itineris heremum petij Invenique quandam speluncam cuius ianua erat clausa</td>
<td>Cumque talia cogitassem per totum noctis spatium mane surgens festinus exii de monasterio viamque pergens itineris heremum petii Invenique quandam speluncam cuius (cuius) ianua erat clausa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiae me ibidem fratem quemiam habitantem cepi clamare dicens Famule dei famule dei Cumque diu clamassam et neminem audissem respondere: Aperiens ianuam spelunce introivi</td>
<td>Existentiae me ibidem fratem quemiam habitantem cepi clamare dicens famule dei famule dei Cumque diu clamassam et neminem audissem respondere: aperiui ianuam spelunce et introivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc inveni quendam senem quasi in</td>
<td>Tunc inveni quendam senem quasi in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
oratione stantem in pedibus suis accedensque ad eum tetigi veniam pulsans quo tacto corpus eius corruit et extendit se super terram

Territus autem nimis prae timore psallere coepi orans ad dominum Invenique ibidem indumentum ex palmis quo tacto dissolutum est sicut pulvis in manu mea

Eadem vero nocte permansi psallens et orans ad dominum Mane autem facto tollensque qua eram veste indutus median dividit partemque eius defunctum corpus indui orationequa acta exij veniam deo postulans et clausa ianua heremi cepi pergere iter

Cumque triduum ambulassem inveni ibidem aliam speluncam ianua clausa et ex foris scopis mundatam per circuitum valde decoram Cui aderat iuxta palma plena fructibus valde mirabilis et fons aque speciosus nimis

Quo viso deo reddidi gratias permansique ibidem usque ad uesperum expectans dei famulum redeuntem Et ecce ad vesperum vidi venientem multitudinem bubalarum gregem et in medio eorum quendam virum benigno vultu nudus a vestibus capillis uero toto corpore coopertus

Ille me viso cepit expavescere et signare se existimans me spiritum esse orans permanebat Multa autem in illo loco demonia eum temptaverant sicut mihi postea ipse locutus <est>

Ad quem protinus uoce magna locutus sum dicens Quare dubitas dei famule noli timere quia homo peccator sum Tempta et vide quia caro et ossa et cutis indutus sum et dei famulos quero ut forsitan per eos sit michi peccatorum remissio

oratione stantem in pedibus suis accedensque ad eum tetigi veriam pulsans Quo tacto corpus eius corruit et extendit se super terram

Territus autem nimis prae timore psallere coepi orans ad dominum Invenique ibidem indumentum ex palmis quo tacto dissolutum est sicut pulvis in manu mea

Eadem vero nocte permansi psallens et orans ad dominum Mane autem facto tollensque qua eram veste indutus median dividit partemque eius defunctum corpus indui orationequa acta exij veniam a deo postulans et clausa ianua heremi coepi pergere iter

Cumque triduum ambulassem inveni ibidem aliam speluncam ianua clausa et ex foris scopis mundatam per circuitum valde decoram Cui aderat iuxta palma plena fructibus valde mirabilis et fons aque speciosus nimis

Quo viso deo reddidi gratias permansique ibidem usque ad vesperum expectans dei famulum redeuntem Et ecce ad vesperum vidi venientem multitudinem (magnum) bubalis gregem et in medio eorum quendam virum benigno vultu nudus a vestibus capillis toto corpore coopertus

Qui me viso coepit expavescere et signare se existimans mespiritum esse orans permanebat Quinto die stante multa autem in illo loco demonia eum tentaverant sicut mihi ipse postea locutus est

Ad quem protinus voce magna locutus sum dicens quare dubitas dei famule? noli timere quia homo peccator sum tenta et vide quia caro (carnem) et ossa et cutis (cutem) indutus sum et dei famulos quaero ut forsitan per eos sit michi peccatorum remissio
Tunc ille gratias agens occurrit michi et ego veniam postulans adoravi eum Post salutationis officio duxit me in spelunca Et dixit michi quomodo hic advenisti frater panpnutiae?

Cui dixi Quia dei famulos quero ut eorum meritis sotiarer Tunc interrogavi eum dicens Quo tempore hic advenisti dei famulae et quod tibi nomen est? Si inveni gratiam apud te indica mihi

Ille vero ait ad me Ego frater antea in thebaida monasterio cum plurimis fratribus cenobij habitabam operabam cum fratribus tarsicaria

Quodam vero tempore menti meae accidit ut me solum manente protinus a deo plus mercedem accipiam Surgens autem exij de monasterio veniensque in quondam solitario loco edificavi cellulam mihi in qua solus manebam cupiens a deo amplius mercedem accipere

Operabam uero manibus meis sicut prius tharsicaria et multi ad me ex populis confluebant pro mihi operis studio Multa autem michi ferebantur pro eo quod nihil ex illis amplius quantum pauperibus et orphanis erogabam Tunc ex invidia dyaboli qua omnium malorum seminarium oritur

Accidit ut quedam mulier monachile habitu veniens ad me compulit mecum unanimiter habitare Cui consentiens excepit eam in cellula et quod peius est maligni consilio parturivimus dolorem et genuimus iniquitatem

Et sic permansimus in peccato anno uno et mensibus quattuor Post haec uero memor mei sceleris et dei iuditij et iuste retributionis dixi Heu me heu me miser

cui dixi quia dei familia quaero Ut eorum meritis socier Tunc interrogavi eum dicens quo tempore hic (huc) advenisti dei familiae? et quod tibi nomen est? si inveni gratiam apud te indica mihi

Ille vero ait mihi ego frater antea in thebaida (thebaide) monasterio cum plurimis fratribus coenobii habitabam operabam cum fratribus tharsicaria

Quodam vero tempore menti meae accidit ut me solum manente protinus a deo plus mercedem (mercedis) acciperem surgens autem exii de monasterio veniensque in quondam (quodam) solitario loco edificavi cellulam mihi in qua solus manebam cupiens a deo amplius mercedem accipere

Operabam manibus meis sicut prius tharsicaria et multi ad me ex populis confluebant pro meo operis studio Multa autem michi ferebantur pro eo quae nihil ex illis amplius accipiebam nisi quantum pauperibus et orphanis erogabam Tunc ex invidia diaboli qui (ex quo)omnia malorum seminaria oritur

accidit ut quedam mulier monachili habitu veniens ad me compulit mecum unanimiter habitare quibus (cui) consentiens excepit eam (eam) in cellulam quo peior maligni consilio parturivimus dolorem et genuimus iniquitatem

et sic permansimus in peccato anno uno et mensibus quattuor Post haec vero memor mei sceleris et dei iudiciis (iudicii) et iuste retributionis dixi Heu me heu me miser
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homo quid respondebo domino quomodo ante iusto iudicis assistebo fatiem?</th>
<th>Homo quid respondebo domino quomodo ante iusto iudici (iustum iudicum) astabo?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surge miser evade a peccato melius est michi hec omnia derelinquere et fugere a peccato et exiens ueni in loco isto Et habitavi in solitudine invenique speluncam hanc et palmam istam cum fonte que sunt causa salutis meae</td>
<td>Surge miser evade a peccato melius est haec omnia derelinquere et fugere a peccato et exiens veni in loco isto Et habii (habitavi) in solitudinem Invenique speluncam hanc et palmam istam cum fonte quae sunt causa salutis animae meae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma hec per unumquemque annum generat duodecim ramos hij sunt pleni fructibus ut sic per unumquemque mensem ramus solumodo cum fructibus michi sufficit et sic per aliud mensis secundus et tertius usque totum anni spatiun ita michi efficitur sed et vestimenta mea tempore finierunt et capilli capitis mei tota mei corporis membra cooperierunt Ipse autem misericors et patiens dominus suave mihi temporis curricula tribuit qui cum triginta et eo amplius anni sunt ex quo in isto veni loco quod figuram panis non vidi nec gustau Hec audiens ego pampnupius an iusto illo uiro admiratus sum in sermonibus eius dicenti quod per triginta annorum tempus figuram panis non uidisset nec gustasset Interrogavique iterum dicens eum ab initio dum huc aduenisti famule dei non conturbaris in mente et animo? Et ille respondit fortiter homo dei turbatus fui ab initio et plenus mestitia dolebam nimium interiora corporis mei et cor meum turbabatur et pre doloribus et multis meis angustijs proternatus in terra sic orationis mee complebamini (sic) offitium Tunc obsecrabam dominum ut discederet a</td>
<td>Palma haec per unumquemque annum generat duodecim ramos hi sunt pleni fructibus ut sic per unumquemque mensem ramus solumodo fructibus michi Sufficit sic per alium mensem secundus et tertius usque totum anni spatii ita michi efficitur sed et vestimenta mea tempore finierunt et capilli capitis mei tota mei corporis membra cooperierunt Ipse autem misericors et patiens dominus suave mihi temporis curricula tribuit qui dum triginta et eo amplius anni sunt ex quo in isto veni loco ex quo figuram panis non vidisset nec gustasset Interrogavique eum iterum dicens nunc conturbaris (numquid conturbabaris) in mente et animo? Et ille respondit fortiter homo dei turbatus fui ab initio et plenus mestitia dolebam nimium interiora corporis et cor meum conturbabatur et pre doloribus et multis meis angustiis proternatus in terra sic orationis meae complebam officium Tunc obsecrabam dominum ut discederet a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
me dolor ille et angustia que inerat corpori meo Dico autem tibi frater quia hodie triginta annos et eo amplius manco in loco isto ubi multa expugnatione demonum multisque doloribus et tribulationibus fatigatus ita permansi orans et deprecans dominum pro remissione peccatorum meorum

Factum est autem quodam tempore et eram nimium dolens in interiora corporis mei ut pre doloribus nimiis prostratus in terram finem mortis expectabam

Subito enim astitit mihi quidam vir splendidissimus et nimium decoris tenensque manum meam erexit me a terra dicens Quid habes frater?

cui respondi Domine epar meum doleo Et dixit michi ostende mihi locum ubi dolor est Indicavique ei Tunc ille vir gloriosus posuit digitum suum aperuitque latus meum eitiensque epar meum foras ostendit michi illud et erat nimium putredinis plenum

dixitque mihi Noli timere ob hoc iam sanus eris ab infirmitate hac Ideo quasi medicus novacula tenens in manu extersit epar meum et tulit ab eo omnem putredinem et reposuit corpori meo signansque ligavit amomum

et dixit ad me Ecce sanus factus es iam deprecare dominum et amplius noli peccare Tunc ille vir ab oculis meis evanuit Ex illo enim die usque modo eripuit me dominus ex illis doloribus et temptationibus manco enim gratias agens omnipotenti deo

et dixit mihi ecce sanus factus es iam deprecare dominum et noli peccare Tunc ille vir ab oculis meis evanuit et ex illo enim die usque modo eripuit me dominus ex illis doloribus et temptationibus illis manco enim gratias agens omnipotenti deo

Tunc ostendit mihi amomum quo ille

Tunc ostendit mihi amomum quod ille

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>me dolor ille et angustia que inerat corpori meo Dico autem tibi frater quia hodie triginta annos et eo amplius manco in loco isto ubi multa expugnatione demonum multisque doloribus et tribulationibus fatigatus ita permansi orans et deprecans dominum pro remissione peccatorum meorum</th>
<th>me dolor ille et angustia quae inerat corpori meo Dico autem tibi frater quia hodie (per) triginta annos et eo amplius manco in loco isto ubi multas expugnationes demonum multisque doloribus (multosque dolores) et tribulationes sustinui et ita permansi orans et deprecans dominum pro remissione peccatorum meorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factum est autem quodam tempore et eram nimium dolens in interiora corporis mei ut pre doloribus nimiis prostratus in terram finem mortis expectabam</td>
<td>Factum est autem quodam tempore et eram nimium dolens interiora corporis mei ut pre doloribus nimiis prostratus in terra finem mortis expectabam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subito enim astitit mihi quidam vir splendidissimus et nimium decoris tenensque manum meam erexit me a terra dicens Quid habes frater?</td>
<td>Subito enim astitit mihi quidam vir splendidissimus et nimium decoris tenensque manum meam erexit me a terra dicens quid habes frater?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cu respondi domine ypar meum dolet (qui) dixit michi ostende mihi latus ubi dolor est indicavique ei Tunc ille vir gloriosus posuit digito suo (digitum suum) aperuitque latus meum eiiciensque ypar meum a foris et ostendit illud mihi et erat nimium putredine plenum</td>
<td>dixitque mihi noli timere ob hoc iam sanus eris ab infirmitate hac Ideo quasi medicus novacula tenens in manu extersit ypar meum et tulit ab eo omnem putredinem et reposuit corpori meo signansque ligavit amomum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dixitque mihi noli timere ob hoc iam sanus eris ab infirmitate hac Ideo quasi medicus novacula tenens in manu extersit ypar meum et tulit ab eo omnem putredinem et reposuit corpori meo signansque ligavit amomum</td>
<td>dixitque mihi ecce sanus factus es iam deprecare dominum et noli peccare Tunc ille vir ab oculis meis evanuit et ex illo enim die usque modo eripuit me dominus ex illis doloribus et temptationibus illis manco enim gratias agens omnipotenti deo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habeo autem palmam hanc et fontem (istum) quae sunt vitae meae causa</td>
<td>Tunc ostendit mihi amomum quod ille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Text</td>
<td>Translated Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloriosus vir in lateris eius plagam alligaverat quod audiens ego papnutius gratias agens deo dixi ei rogo te famule dei excelse ut si inveni gratiam coram deo uolo tecum permanere</td>
<td>Et ille dixit mihi nunquid potes sustineres minas demonum et temptationes eorum dixi autem illi obsecro domine mi ut dicas mihi quod tibi nomen est? At ille dixit timotheus vocor memento mei frater et ora pro me ad dominum ut mihi orationem perficeret: atque benedictionem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogo te famule dei excelsi ut si inveni gratiam coram deo uolo tecum permanere</td>
<td>Et ille dixit Numquid poteris sustineres mina demonum et temptationes eorum? Dixi autem illi Obsecro domine mi ut dicas mihi quod tibi nomen est? At ille dixit Thimotheus vocor memento mi frater et ora pro me ad dominum ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ille dixit michi Numquid poteris sustineres mina demonum et temptationes eorum? Dixi autem illi Obsecro domine mi ut dicas mihi quod tibi nomen est? At ille dixit Thimotheus vocor memento mi frater et ora pro me ad dominum ut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc procedens ego interrogaui eum michi orationem perficeri atque benedictionem</td>
<td>Tunc benedictione accepta coepi itineris mei viam ambulare gaudens et magnificans deum qui me dignatus est beatum thimotheum uidere famulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc benedictione aucta cepi itineris mei viam ambulare gaudens et magnificans deum qui me dignatus est beatum thimotheum uidere famulum</td>
<td>Tunc benedictione accepta coepi itineris mei viam ambulare gaudens et magnificans deum qui me dignatus est beatum thimotheum suum (facere) videre famulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veniens autem in quodam loco solitudinis permansi in eo duorum dierum spatium Considerabam vero mei sceleri dicens Quae est vita mea? quam mercedem accepiam cum nichil operis gesserim?</td>
<td>Veniens autem in quodam loco solitudinis permansi in eo duorum dierum spatium considerabam vero mei sceleribus dicens quae est vita mea? Quam mercedem acceperim cum nil opera gesserim? (accipiam cum nil boni operis gesserim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heu heu cum nichil certamen certauerim quantum mercedem expeclo? Omnis preliator qui pugnam non vicerit nichil premium accipit non coronatur a domino qui operibus extra efficitur</td>
<td>Heu heu cum nichil certamen (certaminis) consumavi Quam mercedem expeclo? Omnis preliator qui pugnam non vicerit nichil premium accipit non coronatur a domino qui operibus extra escitur (operibus bonis extraneus noscitur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post biduum uero promptior factus cepi</td>
<td>Post biduum uero promptior factus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contra heremum ambulare Nimium uero
desiderabam ut forsitan dei famulos
invenirem qui in heremo habitant ut eorum
me benedictionibus committerem

Ducebam autem mecum modicos panes et
paululum aque que usque dies
quatuordecim suffecere mihi

quo deficiente condolui animo subitoque
uirutum accipiens a deo ambulavi per uiam
heremi usque aliorum dierum quatuor
spatium postea uero fatigatus ex itinere et
famis inopia spiritus meus defecit in me
prostratusque in terram mortis finem
expectabam

Tunc aspexi Et ecce uir terribilis astitit
michi extensaque manu posuit in labijs
meis et subito uiritum accepi ita ut nec
fatigarer nec famis inopie memorassem

Surgens autem velotius ambulare cepi
contra interiorem heremum Cumque
ambulassem per dies quatuor et noctes
totidem et nimium hesitans extendi manus
meas orans et iterum aspiiens uidi illum
virum priorem venientem ad me et subito
ab eo virtutem accepi

II Decem uero et alias septem dies simul
ambulantem me in interiorem heremum
uidi a longem quemdam uirum qui erat
aspectu terribilis capilli capitis eius maior
albi tanquam nix et huic corpus coopertum
sicut bestie pessime

Erat autem nudus aueste et folia arborum
circumdatus circa ueretri corporis Et uidens
eum venientem valde contremui

Cumque appropinquaret in timore

coeperi contra haeremum ambulare nimium
vero desiderabam ut forsitan dei famulos
invenirem qui in heremo habitabant ut
eorum benedictionibus comitari (valerem)

Ducebam autem mecum modicos panes et
paululum aquae quae usque dies quattuor
sufficeret mihi

quo deficiente condolui animo subitoque
uirutem accipiens a deo ambulavi per viam
haeremi usque aliorum dierum quattuor
spatium postea vero fatigatus ex itinere (et)
de famis inopiae (inopia) spiritus meus
defecit in me prostratusque in terram
mortis finem expectabam

Tunc aspexi et ecce vir terribilis astitit
mihi extensamque manum posuit in labris
meis et subito virutem accepi ita ut nec
fatigarer ut nec famis inopie memorassem

Surgens autem velocius ambulare coeperi
contra interiorem heremum Cumque
ambulassem per dies quattuor et noctes
quattuor et nimium aequitans extendi manus
meas orans ad dominum et iterum aspiiens
vidi illum virum priorem venientem ad me
et subito virutem habeo (ab eo) accepi

II) decem vero et alios septem dies simul
ambulante me in interiorem heremum
vidi a longe quondam virum qui erat
aspectu terribilis capilli capitis eius major
albi (capilli capitis eius valdo magni
erant et) albi tanquam nix et huic corpus
coopertum sicut (vestis) bestiae pessimae

erat autem nudus a veste et folia (arborum)
circumdatus circa veretri (verenda)
corporis et viden tam venientem valde
contremui (contremui)

Cumque appropinquasset michi timore
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perterritus ascendi super saxem montis qui erat iuxta me timens ne forte ueniens deuorasset me

Ille uero ueniens subter saxum et ego desuper astabam prostravit se in umbraculum montis nimium autem erat fatigatus de etate senili et solis incendio

elevansque uocem sursum apsitiens dixit Descende ad me homo sanctissime noli timere quia et ego homo sum sicut et tu similis enim sum tibi passibilis habitans in heremo propter deum et salutem anime mee

Audiens autem hec festinus descendit et prostratus ante pedes eius ueniam postulabat
Et dixit mihi Surge fili surge quia amicus dei es et sanctorum eius Cum autem surrexissem precepit mihi scdere ante se

Tunc festine rogavi eum ut protinus mihi nomen indicaret Qui dixit mihi Onufrius mihi nomen est Sexaginta etenim sunt anni quod in hac heremo habito nutritus a dei misericordia et nullius hominis aspexi effigiem nisi te hodie et hic a deo missus es ut corporis mei <funeris> officium tribuas

Temporibus autem prioribus eram habitans in quodam monasterium quod eriti vocabatur qui eritioliti regis thebayde prouintie ubi numerus centum erat fratrum

Inter quos erat una fides et una congregatio et magnus dei timor et amor caritatis nimius et pax christi magna inter illos silentii quoque et humilitate alterutrum consentientes

perterritus ascendi super saxem montis quae (quod) erat iuxta me timens eum ne forte veniens devoraret me

Hic vero ueniens subter saxum ubi ego desuper astabam prostravit se in umbraculum montis nimium autem erat fatigatus de aetate senili et solis incendii (incendio)

Elevans autem vocem rursus aspiciens dixit descende ad me homo sanctissime noli timere quia et ego homo sum sicut et tu similis enim sum tibi passibilis habitans in heremo propter deum et pro salute animae meae

Audiens autem haec festinus descendit et prostratus ante pedes eius veniam postulabat (postulabam)
At ille dixit mihi surge fili surge quia amicus dei es et sanctorum eius Cum autem surrexissem precepit mihi scdere ante se

Tunc ego festinus rogavi eum ut protinus michi nomen suum indicaret Qui dixit michi onufrius mihi nomen est sexaginta etenim anni sunt quo in hoc (hanc) heremum habitabi (habitavi) nutritus a dei misericordia et nullius hominis aspexi effigies nisi solum te hodie et hic (huc) a deo missus es ut corporis mei (corpori meo) funeris officium tribuas

Temporibus autem prioribus eram habitans in quodam monasterium quae (quod) eriti vocabatur qui eri moliti legis (sic) thebaide provinciae ubi numerus centum erat fratrum

inter quos erat una fides et una ungregatio et amor caritatis nimis et pax christi magna inter illos silentii (silentio) quoque et humilitate alterutrum consentientes
Ego autem in parva etate eram inter illos meditans sanctarum scripturarum studia et rectam fidem sicut christianis meruerit

Audiui eos loquentes de beato helia mirabile dictum sicut a deo confortatus erat propter humilitatem et castitatem quae in deserto optinuit Insuper et de beato iohanne baptista qualiter in deserto heremi extiterit usque dum ostensus est in Israel

Interrogabam autem fratres dicens quid enim ipsi qui in heremo habitant fortiores nostri sunt apud deum? Qui dixerunt mihi Ita fortiores et primos esse nobis illos etenim illos nos unanimiter habitantes inuicem nos uidemus et congregationis causa nobis pariter congregamus

Et si quis ex nobis infirmus fuerit a ceteris confortatur Si autem esurimus uel sitimus in proximo nobis adest cibus et potus et omnis utilitas que nobis necesse est in proximo nobis inuenitur

Habitantibus autem in heremo his omnibus extra permanent Si autem illorum quaelibet temptatio contigerit ab inimici hostis seu turbatio uel angustia ubi inuenitur homo qui eis subueniat aut qui consolaretur illos

Tempore autem famis uel sitis ubi panis inuenitur ut ex ipso refitiantur Hijs omnibus extra sunt illi nichil alii nisi sola spes in deo et humilitas castitas uero et ymnodia et magnum certamen

Nichil aliiud illi est cogitatio nisi ut perieiunijs et obsecrationibus exuperent sagittas inimici et que cotidie in occulto

Ego autem in parva etate eram inter illos meditans sanctis scripturis (sanctae scripture) studia et rectam fidem sicut christianis meruit (convenit)

Audiui eos loquentes de beato helia mirabile dictu sicut a deo confortatus erat propter humilitatem et castitatem quae in deserto optinuit Insuper et de beato iohanne baptista qualiter in deserto heremi extiterit usque dum ostensus est in Israel

Interrogabam autem fratres dicens quid enim ipsi qui in heremo habitant fortiores nostri sunt apud deum? qui dixerunt michi Ita fortiores et primos esse nobis illos (certum est) etenim nos unanimiter habitantes inuicem nos uidemus et congregationis causa nos pariter congregamus et si quis ex nobis infirmatus fuerit a ceteris confortatur Si autem esurimus uel sitimus in proximo nobis adest cibus et potus et omnis hutilitas quae necessaria est in proximo nobis advenit

Habitantibus autem in heremo his omnibus (hec omnia) extra permanent Si autem cuilibet illorum temptatio contigerit ab inimici hostis seu tribulatio vel angustia ubi non inuenitur homo qui ei subveniat aut qui consoletur illos (illum)

Tempore autem famis vel sitis ubi panis non invenitur ut ex ipso reficiant His omnibus extra sunt illi nichil alii nisi sola spes in deo et humilitas castitas vero et ymnodia et magnum certamen

Nichil aliiud illi est cogitatio nisi ut perieiunijs et obsecrationibus exuperent sagittas inimici et quae cotidie
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>insidiatur</th>
<th>insidiatur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ille inimicus humani generis qui contrarius omnibus est qui hec cupiunt adimplere</td>
<td>omnibus qui haec cupiunt adimplere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hij autem omnes qui omnia hec vincere temptant magnam apud deum retributionem accipient quando autem exeunt de corpore angeli dei ueniunt administrantes eis Et illos uero qui hec sua desideria corporis et carnem mortificuerunt magna preuenit gratia magna retributio inestimabilis gloria in qua angeli dei attingere desiderant</td>
<td>Hi autem omnes qui omnia haec vincere temptant magna apud deum retributionem accipient quando autem de corpore exequnt angeli dei veniunt amministrantes ei Et illos vero qui haec sua desideria corporis et carnem mortificaverunt magna praevenit gratia magna retributio inestimabilis gloria in qua angeli dei attingere desiderant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nutriuntur uero de petra sicut dixit ysaia propheta Omnes autem qui sustinent dominum mutant uirtutem pennis induuntur ut aquile cum ambulant non esurient et cum fatigati fuerint numquam sitiunt effitiuntur illis siluarum herbe super mel et fauum</td>
<td>Nutriuntur vero de petra sicut dixerat aesayas propheta omnes enim qui sustinent dominum mutand virtutem pennis induuntur ut aquile cum ambulant non esurient cum fatigati fuerint numquam sitiunt efficiuntur enim illis siluarum herbae super mel et favum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum autem illis pugna diaboli surrexerit uel temptatio extendunt manus suas ad celum et dominus pius qui eos pascet cotidie ex alto eis auxilium praestat et uenientes angeli ministrant eis et omnia tela nequissima dyaboli effugient</td>
<td>Cum autem illis pugna diaboli surrexerit vel temptatio extendunt manus suas ad coelum et dominus pius qui eos pascet cotidiaex alto eis auxiliu praestat et uenientes angeli ministrant eis et omnia tela nequissimi diaboli effugient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numquid audisti fili scripturam dicentem quia non derelinquist dominus pauperem in aeternum patientiam (sic) pauperum non peribit in finem Beatus enim erit omnis qui facit uoluntatem dei super terram angeli amministrant ei et exultare eum fatiunt et confortant eum in omni tempore</td>
<td>Numquid audisti fili scripturam dicentem quia non derelinquuet dominus pauperem in aeternum patientiam pauperum non peribit in finem? Beatus enim erit omnis qui facit voluntatem dei super terram quia angeli amministrant ei et exultare cum faciunt et confortant eum in omni tempore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec et his similia apud sancti (sic) patres cum didicissem ego humillimus onufrius multo magis mente et corde recipiens et plusquam mellis dulcedine eorum uerba recipiens magna&lt;\textit{n}&gt; illorum existimau rectitudinem et quasi in alio mundo beatos illos unitari sanctos dei studuj</td>
<td>Haec et his similia apud sanctos patres cum didicissem ego humillimus onufrius multo magis mente et corde recipiens et plusquam mellis dulcedine eorum verba recipiens magnam illorum existimav rectitudinem et quasi in alio mundo beatos illos habitari sanctos dei studij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exurgens uero nocte actuli paucos panes</td>
<td>Exurgens vero nocte attuli paucos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficientem michi usque dies quattuor exiens autem de monasterio coepi viam pergere quae ducebatur in heremo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et ecce aspiciens vidi ante cedere michi columbam ignis terribile visu quern videns nimium expavi cogitaviqve praetimore retrorsum unde exii redire et habitare in cenobio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sed dominus omnipotens qui vult omnes saluos fieri non permisit me hoc opus peregi Conversus autem ille gloriosus qui antecedebat michi et vocato nomine meo dixit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onufri noli timere quia ego sum angelus qui tibi datus sum custos ab infantia tua ut custodiam te usque in diem exitus tui Dico autem tibi quia iconomia hec in qua didignatus est dominus tecum ambulare et efficitur tibi in domino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunc confortatus in domino serva super eum et veni in heremum isto per milia sexaginta sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveni autem quandam speluncam parvam in qua ingressus inueni ibi quondam dei servum nimis senem cuius ante pedibus prostratus orationem fieri postulavi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta vero oratione postea dixit mihi Accede fili da mihi osculum Cumque osculatus essem cum dixit ad me tu es frater onufrius cooperator meus in domino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veni fili dominus protector sit tuus et custodiat te in omnibus operibus tuis Tunc ingressus habitavi cum eo per dies septime docente me de omnibus que in heremo sancti patres operantur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post septem vero dies ait ad me senex Surge fili onufrii sequere me et ducam te in praedestinatum locum ubi te dominus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
habitare precepit

Qui exurgens secutus sum eum et ambulantes per dies quattuor et noctes similiter inuenimus speluncam paruulam cui aderat cellula pusilla et palma et fons aque fluens

Conuersus autem senex dixit mihi fili hic est locus qui tibi paratus est a domino hic te habitare oportet omnibus diebus uite tue

Ingressusque ille senex permansit mecum in cellula usque dies triginta docens me sanctorum patrum operibus Interrogavi eum de genere et nomine et dixit michi de genere scitharum nomine ermeus vocor memento mei in domino

Et post dies triginta surgens reuersus est in locum suum Ex illo autem per unumquemque annum occurrebat mihi usque dum migravit ad dominum Quem accipiens sepelivi iuxta cellulam meam

Cumque hec mihi narrasset beatus onufrius interrogavi eum dicens pater sancte ab initio dum hic uenisti accusauit tibi temptatio an non et ille respon<it>

michi frater mi dilectissime multa temptatio multusque dolor qui desperatus a uita declinabar usque ad mortem

Que adhuc famis inopia sitisque ad iacentis michi in calor solis per diem frigorisque vesperinis per noctibus tristabatur anima

habitare precepit

Qui exurgens secutus sum eum et ambulantes per dies quattuor et noctes similiter inuenimus speluncam paruulam cui aderat cellula et palma et fons aque fluentis

Conversus autem senex dixit mihi fili hic est locus qui tibi paratus est a deo hic te habitare oportet omnibus diebus vite tue

Ingressusque ille senex permansit mecum in cellula usque dies triginta docente me sanctorum patrum opera Interrogavi eum de genere et nomine et dixit mihi de genere scitharum nomine ermeas voca memento mei in domino

Et post dies triginta surgens reversus est in locum suum Ex illo autem die per unumquemque annum occurrebat mihi usque dum migravit ad dominum quem accipiens sepelivi iuxta cellulam meam

Cumque hec mihi narrasset beatus onufrius interrogavi eum dicens pater sancte ab initio dum hic venisti accidit tibi tentatio an non et ille respondit

michi frater mi dilectissime multa tentatio multusque dolor qui desperatus a vita declinabar usque ad mortem

Nam sicut dicit apostolus diligentibus deum omnia cooperantur in bonum et ideo neque mors neque vita non fames non sitis non nuditas neque tribulatio aliqua potest separare servos dei a caritate christi Existimantes quod non sunt condigne passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam que revelabitur in nobis
mea usque ad mortem et de his omnibus mutata est caro mea et omnia interiora mea pessime torquebantur

Nam et uestimenta mea tempore suo et desinierunt (sic) et ceciderunt a me et sic nudus effectus corpus meum nimis patiebatur Sed pius dominus et misericors cum me omnia sustinere uidensque magnam super me tribuit tollerantiam

Nam capilli capitis mei corpus quod nudum erat protexit

Misitque pius dominus angelum suum ferentemque michi cotidie panem ex quo nutrior aquam que sufficit

Triginta autem annos quidum de monasterio meo exiui panem numquam comedii necnon herbas siluarum et aquam in misura Deinde usque modo per alios triginta annos qui mihi expletur usitauit me dominus in die in die

Videns autem dominus quod tradissem in eo spem meam dum castigauit iterum misertus est et fuerant michi herbe siluarum duliores melle dum recordarem quod non in solo pane uiuit homo sed in omni uerbo quod procedit de ore dei

Ita frater pamnuti omnis qui uluntatem dei facit inuenit mercedem et misericordiam apud deum

Dicit enim in euangelio ipse pius dominus Nolite cogitare quod manducetis uel quod bibatis quia pater uester celesis scit quibus indigetis Primum querite regnum dei et hec omnia dabuntur uobis

Hoc audiens a sancto patre onufrio interrogauit eumicens Pater mi per diem sabbati et diem sanctissimum dominicum unde tibi corpus domini datur

Et licet famem ac sitim passus sim non modicam per triginta annos nec panem viderim sed solum herbas silvestres comederim tamen piissimus dominus misertus mei per alios triginta annos per angelorum ministerium michi famulo suo panem mittere dignatus est
Et ille respondit Angelus domini astitit ad me qui me corporis et sanguinis domini precipue efficit non solum michi sed et omnibus similiter qui in heremo habitant Cumque corpus et sanguis domini refitiuntur omnes spiritu sancto repleuntur et nec esuriuntur nec sitiuntur amplius nec est in eis ullus dolor necque ulla temptatio quam priora transierunt

non solum me sed et omnes qui sollicitudinem suam in deum proicientes sperantes quoniam ipsi cura est de illis angelorum ministerio fovere dignatur dominus ut apostolus ait Nonne omnes amministratorii sunt spiritus propter eos qui hereditatem capiunt salutis

Et dum quispiam illorum hominem (sic) desiderat ita <alta> uidere assumitur in paradiso per aera celi et uidet omnem gloriam sanctorum et in ecstasi effecti cum reddeunt in loca sua estimant se in alio esse muno et ideo obliti oblitiuntur omnes tribulationes et angustias que antea erant passuri

Hec sunt opera sanctorum et certamina Hec mihi loquente beato patre onufrio supernis dixit mihi Surge frater eamus pariter

Ego autem omnia illius melliflua audiens uerba omnem angustiam que in uia heremi eram passus famique et sitis inopiam obliuionj tradidi Dixitque (sic) illi O pater sanctissime beatus sum ego cum talem dei famulum inuenire merui Surgens autem secutus sum eum et cum peruenissemus quasi trium milium stadia

O pater sanctissime beatus sum ego cum talem dei famulum inuenire merui Surgens autem secutus sum eum et cum peruenissemus quasi trium milium stadia

inuenimus cellulam et palma<m> Assistente <me>autem beatus senex cepit psallere et orare Cum autem complessam orationem et finem darem respondi Amen

Aduersperascente autem die cum solis occasu aspiiens in medio celle uidit panem adiacentem et urceum aque Et dixit ad me Surge frater Pamphuti comede panem et Sanctissimo quoque corpore et sanguine in die dominico
bibe aquam ecce ante te positum est Video
enim te fatigari fame

Respondens autem dixi ei Vivit dominus et
uiuit anima mea non comedam nec bibam
nisi tu mecum comederis Cumque
dirogassem illum accepit panem
benedicens fregitque dedit michi dicens

Accipe panem quem misit dominus nobis
Cotidie enim michi medium panis ferebatur
modo pro te fratre pampnuti sanus nobis a
dominio missus panis est

Cum autem surgeremur a cena cepimus
psallere et orare ad dominum et sic
permansimus usque mane orantes ad
dominum Mane autem facto aspxei et uidi
dei famulum uultu mutato pallescente fatie

Quod uidens uehementer expaui Conuersus
autem ad me dixit michi Noli timere dei
famule magis confortare et prom<p>tus
esto

In hoc enim te ad me mjsit dominus ut
corperi meo yconomiam tribuas et funeris
mei corpus terre sepelias

Ecce enim hodie exeo de hoc ergastulo
corporis et uado in requiem meam
Et est dies sextisdecimus mensis paiun qui
est dies undecima iunii apud romanos

tu autem frater cum egressus fuisses in
eygptum predica in memoriam mei fiuntur
medjos fratrum et omnibus christianis

Hoc autem petij a domino deo nostro et hoc
postulaui quod et datum est mei a domino
ut siquis memoriam mei fecerit seu
oblationem aut pauperum susceptionem
fecerit in nomine meo aut memorie uite
mee liber scripserit dimitantur ei uniuersa
peccata
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siquis hec que audistis fecerit ego rogabo dominum ut deleantur eius uniuersa peccata</th>
<th>Siquis hec que audistis fecerit ego rogabo dominum ut deleantur eius uniuersa peccata (sic) et cum exierit de mundo hoc et de corpore suo erit mundus a peccato quasi modo genitus infans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondens autem ego pampnutius dixi Pater mi esto tua bonitas et si quis inops fuerit non ualens oblationem facere aut nudos uestire sicut superius locutus est (sic) quid erit in eo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et dixit michi beatus onufrius Siquis inopia detentus fuerit et non amplius habuerit nisi solum modo calicem aque frigide et in nomine meo dederit sic erit postulatio mea super eum sicut a domino impetraui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec dicens eleuatis manibus et oculis in celum iacens in pauimento clamauit ad dominum dicens Dominator altissime inuisibilis eius (sic) potestas inestimabilis est cuius gloria inennarabilis cuius misericordia sine fine est te deprecor te laudo te adoro te benedico quem dilexi quem secutus sum ab uberibus matris mee exaudi me domine clamantem ad te</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificans magnificabo te domine quia respexisti humilitatem meam nec conclusisti me inimici manibus statuisti in loco spatio pedes meos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nunc autem domine protegat me dextera tua et ueniat super me misericodia tu quia conturbata est anima mea dum exierit de corpore isto et ne occurrat in [ dyabolus neque michi]tenebre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misertus esto domine et ne uideat anima mea obscura illa tenebrosa demonium effigies sed oro ut tu eam suscipias cum sanctis tuis pacificis angelis et collocare (sic) eam facias in requiem tuam quia tu es</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benedictus in secula seculorum amen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peto domine clementiam tuam et obsecro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miserere populo christiano et siquis mei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memoriam fecerit seu oblationem in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laudem et gloriam nominis tui seu fratum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quempiam cibauit seu proprijs laboribus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pauperes refitiet cum inuocaueruit te</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domine exaudi preces eorum et dele omnia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peccata eorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Et si quis in angustijs uel in carceribus aut |
| in mari seu in furore judicis aut in |
| quacumque tribulatione te inuocaueruit et |
| dixerint deus omnipotens misere nobis per |
| merita sancti tui onufrij statim obsecro ut |
| exaudias orationes eorum et impleas |
| petitiones eorum quia tu est benedictus in |
| secula seculorum amen |

| Accedens autem ego pamnutius misime |
| ante pedes eius cum lacrimisicens \(\text{Volo} \) |
| pater ut migrante de hoc seculo in isto |
| loco manere Et ille dixit michi |

| Non es missus ut hic habiteris nisi ut |
| letifices seruos dei qui in heremo habitant |
| sicut me letificasti rursum uenisti |
| ut corpus meum iubeas re tradi sepulture |

| Regredere in egiptum et predica fratribus |
| uniuersa que uidisti et audisti in heremo et |
| adhuc uidebis apud sanctos dei Omnia |
| enarra uniuersis fratribus ut agatur |
| memoria sancta in postis gentibus |

| Rursus iterum cum lacrimis dixi Adiuro te |
| sancte pater per dominum excelsum pro |
| quo carnem tuam macerasti benedic me et |
| memor esto mei in requiem sanctorum in |
| qua (sic) data est tibi a domino |

| Quod audiens ego pamnutius vehementer |
| mirari cepi cupiens cum tanto uiro morari |
| Quod cum notificarem illi dixit |
| mihi |

| Non es missus ut maneas hic |
| sed ut tradas corpus meum sepulturae |

| et enarres mirabilia dei |
| que vidisti per heremum cunctis volentibus |

| Hoc autem impetravi a domino ut quisquis |
| mei memoriam fecerit omnia eius deleantur |
| peccata et vitam consequatur aeternam |
Ille autem dixit Deus omnipotens qui uult omnes saluos fieri et ad agnitionem ueritatis uenire ipse sit tuus protector et eripiat te ab insidijs inimici et benedictio patris et filij et spiritus sancti sit super te Hec dicens amplius michi numquam locutus est

Surgens autem a terra aspitiens uidi fatiem eius tanquam ignem candentem nimis oculis autem et manibus in celum semper intentus tacitus orabat ita ut non possem ego intelligere que dicebantur ab eo

Cumque osculassem sanctissimos eius pedes factus est odor nimius aromatum in altitudo quasi in paradiso

Tunc aspexi et ecce turbatio magna in aere facta est et sonus teterrimus et corruscus (sic) pre cuius timore cecidi in pauimento et tamquam semi uiuimus iacebam et omnia membra mea dissoluta sunt pre timore

Tunc in extasi me iacentem sursum tantum aspicientem uidi et ecce aperti fuerunt celi et multitudo angelorum militie descendent super corpus sancti patris onufrij et facte sunt uoces intra psallentium quorum laudes suauissime audiebam neminem autem intelligebam

Ventum est autem affuisse multitudines sanctorum pulchritudinis paliata agmina eadem hora Et uidi choros sanctorum angelorum in circuitu cum thuribulis et cereis tenentibus in eorum manibus et audiiu uocem terribilem dicentem

Egredi pacifica anima et ueni ad me ut mittam te in requiem quam dilexisti intra patriarchas et prophetas et omnes sanctos

His dictis subito vultus eius pallidus vehementer effectus est et cepit orare

Cumque diu orasset expansis manibus ad dominum sancta illa anima a carne soluta est et ita quievit in domino pridie idus iunii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Et ecce subito aperti sunt celi et dominus christus exijt obuiam apparuit autem anima beati patris onufrij sicut columba spetiosa candida tamquam nix antecedentibus angelis cum ymnis et laudibus aerem celi penetrauit expansisque manibus dominus noster ihesus christus suscepit eam et baiulans secum ascendit ad celos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunc ad me reuersus et tacto pede sancti corporis erant adhuc candentes corpus autem eius sicut margarita pulchra splendebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadem hora cepi cogitare dicens Quid fatiam quia non ualeo fodere nec fossorium habeo unde possim fodere ut tradam sepulture sanctissimum corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talia me cogitante uidi et ecce duo leones astiterunt sanctum corpus et linguis suis sanctos pedes lingebant Hoc facto prosternerunt se iuxta corpore et flebant mecum ut homines cunque diu orassent surgens astij coram illos dicens Scio quia et in bestijs placatur dominus et spirat in omnibus et in hoc uenistis ut sancti corporis auxilium una mecum unite mi Surgite fratres et beati sancti patris corpus sepulture tradimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollens autem baculum meum signaui locum sepulture et uenientes leones uelocius foderunt terram unngilijs suis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cernens autem hoc ego papnutius stabam hesitans quidnam agerem quia nec fossorium habebam cum quo terram foderem ubi illum sopelire possem diutius nempe ita permanens aspexi et ecce duo leones nil ferocitatis ostendentes venerunt usque ad hominem dei quasi ad obediendum parati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitans namque illos a deo missos designavi locum ubi vir dei sepeliri debuisset et imperans illis in nomine domini ut foderent velociter ungulis terram foidentes et fecerunt foveam uti illam designaveram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepto itaque lebitone quo indutus eram involvi corpus viri dei et facto obsequio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leones uero illi capitibus inclinatis recesserunt in locis suis Reuersusque ego
uidi et ecce ipsa cellula cecidit et palma similiter corruit

Tunc cepi flere nimis contristari et ecce angelus domini astitit qui dixit michi Noli flere magis autem exultare quia dignus fuisti uidere tanta mirabilia Egredere hinc et uade in egiptum et predica omnia que audisti et uidisti sicut dixit tibi pater onufrius et dominus noster protegat te in bonis operibus et misereatur tui et dirigat te in uiam pacis Hec dicens angelus domini recessit ad (sic) me

III) Exiens autem inde cepi uiam contra heremum ambulare antecedente me ille uir qui prius michi apparuit

Cumque ambulassem per quatuor dierum itinere inueni domum hedificatum in altissimo loco et erat clausa pulchraque nimis Veniens autem requieui iuxta eam cogitans in me ipso dicens En intus est quispiam dei seruus habitans in ea

Hec me cogitante ecce quidam uir sanctus canitie plenus indutus ueste et palmis uultu mirabile tamquam angeli dei

Qui ueniens salutauit me dicens Pax tibi frater a domino Tu es frater papnutiius cooperator noster in domino tu es qui induisti corpus sancti onufrij

Veniens autem ego prostratus ante pedes eius ueniam postulabam Eadem hora uenerunt alijs tres senex (sic) et ipsi similiter palmis induti ieroprepes uultu angelico et osculati sunt me dicentes

Pax tibi dei famule et amice sanctorum Tu es frater papnutius qui operuisti corpus sancti onufrij et quia in hac nocte notum est nobis de aduentu tuo ideo congregamur ut tecum hodie exultemus Notum tibi facimus

sicut mos est circa defunctos sepelivimus eum

Leones autem humiliato capite recesserunt Expletis omnibus palma aruit fons exiccatus est et cellula eius cecidit

III) Quod cum vidissem ego papnutius descendi de heremo annuntians omnibus mirabilia dei qui est super omnia benedictus in secula seculorum amen
frater quia sexaginta anni sunt hodie quod in hoc heremo habitamus et neminem uidimus hominem nisi te hodie et dum nos isti fratres congregamur per diem sabbati et dominico sancto oramus te ut usque uno die nobiscum permaneas

Cumque duarum omnium spatio sedentibus nobis et de sancto onufrio loqui requemur ad inuicem dixerunt ad me Dilecte nobis surge comedamus modicum panis quia fatigatus ex itinere uenisti ad nos

Tunc omnes surgentes unanimiter cepimus orare Orantibus nobis ecce quinque panes appositos uidimus pulcriores nimis et recentes quasi eadem hora coctos et sedentes comedimus Et dixerunt michi

Ecche frater panpnuici cotidie nobis quatuor seru< u>ntur panes hodie pro tui aduentu quinque nobis panes astiterunt Ideoque nescimur unde ueniunt nisi quia paratos illos accipimus Tunc rogaui ut cum illos (sic) habitarer

qui dixerunt michi Non es missus ut hic permaneas sed egredere in egipto ut enarres uniuersaque audisti a sancto onufrio Rogauique eos iterum ut michi edisserent nomina sua qui noluerunt sed dixerunt michi

Indulge frater deus qui omnia nouit ipse scit nomina nostra tantum memor esto nostri in tuis orationibus ut digni effittiamur uidere nos inuicem in domo dei in die illo quando unusquisque ex factis proprijs reddemus rationem Certa nunc frater ut effugere possis temptationes inimici

Hec audiens ab illis cepi contra interiorem heremum pergere Cumque quasi sexaginta et eo amplius ambulans fere milibus inueni locum mirabilem pulcriorem nimis in quo erat spelunca et fons unde aqua plurima
Et aspitiens uidi iuxta speluncam multitudinem arborum astantem qui erant palme dactilorum plene nimis Surgens autem introiui inter illos et admirabam in eorum pulcritudinem dicens Vtinam scire uolui quis eas plantauit

Erant enim palme et çinçife et roa et uinee modice et amigdale (sic) cit et alij arbores omnia fructibus plena quorum gustus erat dultior plusquam mel

Aqua uero fontis affluebat et rigabat omnes arbores illas inter quas me astante putabam me esse in paradiso dei Et ecce iuuenes quatuor fratres uenerunt ad me ualde pulchriores induti pelhiculas ouium qui dixerunt michi

Aue frater pennutie Et ego procedens adoraui eos Sedentes uero pariter iuxta speluncam loquebamur ad inuicem putabam illos angelos dei esse ducentes uero ex fructibus arborum dederunt michi et comedi erant enim dultior supra mel

Interrogaui autem eos dicentes Vnde huc famuli dei uenistis qui dixerunt michi ex quo te dominus misit ad nos omnia de nobis nuntiabimus tibi Nos sumus de ciuitate que nescitur extron et parentes nostri nobiliores ciuitatis traditi autem licterarum studijs pariterque nobis una ms accusauit domino operante in bonis Quadam die inter nos consiliantes exiuimus de ciuitate neminem sciente uenimus in locum istum Duximus autem panes nobiscum quiusque diebus septem nobis suffecenit et io in extasi effecti astit nobis quidam uenerabilis senex qui nos confortauit et firmauit in loco isto et ecce nunc per annos sex habitamus in loco isto
Ille autem senex habituit nobiscum anno uno docens nos quomodo nos opponet domino seruire Deinde ille pater migravit ad dominum nos autem remansimus in loco isto

Ecce frater karissime manifesti sumus coram te hodie quia sunt anni sex quod panem non comedimus uisi ex fructibus arborum istorum enutrimus

Et per totam ebdomadam semel nos congregamur in hac spelunca sabbato et die sancto dominico Deinde sanctum dominicum celebrantes exeuntes unusquisque uaditin locum suum nesciens unus de alio quo agit uel quid operatur

Dixique illis Vnde communicatis in sabbato in sanctum diem dominicum corporis domini nostri ihesu christi qui dixerunt michi

Pro eo quod congregamur angelus enim domino ueniens conferit nobis corpus et sanguinem domini Audiens autem hec omnia ualde letus effecus sum mansique cum illis diebus septem et illo septimo die dixerunt ad me

Paratus esto homo dei hac enim die angelus domino ueniet conferens nobis inuisice communionis et omnis qui accipit eam de manu eius exuritur et dimmitur ei peccata sua et nulla temptatio appropinquat in eo Inde loquentibus ad me audiui et ecce odor suauitatis astitit mire magnitudinis

Exurgentes autem astiti pariter cepimus psallere et laudes ferre domino et ecce angelus domini uenit et recipimus ab eo corpus et sanguinem domini et benedicens omnes subito ablatus est nobis

Cum autem accepissem eucharistiam dei
manu angeli tremescens sum tamquam dormiens Accendentes autem fratres dixerunt ad me surge frater confortare noli timere

Vespere autem sancto tardius excitari potui territus pretinore Iterum noctem ilam sine sompno pergimus psallentes atque orantes ad dominum Mane autem facto iterum odor aduenti nobis et ita releti sumus odoris et magne letitie ut putaremus nos esse in paradiso dei

Et ecce angelus domini iterum astitit et dedit omnibus unusice communionis dicens Sit nobis corpus et sanguis domini nostri ihesu christi uiuita sempiterna et incorruptibile gaudium Ideoque unanimes respondimus Amen

Conuersus autem angelus dixit michi Surge frater papnutie egredere in egyptum et predica omnia que uidisti a sanctis dei et audisti omnia que locutus est ad te beatus pater onufrius predica uniuersis fratribus ut ipsi sequantur uestigia sanctorum patrum qui sunt in heremo deo seruentes noli morari necque pigeat te amplius quia non est tibi datum a domino hic habitare nisi ut uideas dei seruos et enarres uniuersis ecclesijs opera eorum

Magis que tibi precepit beatus onufrius ecce enim et tu computatus es in numero sanctorum Beatus est es (sic) bonum tibi erit quia tales patronos meruisti uidere et tanta mirabilia meruisti dicere Pax tecum et esto robustus Hec dicente angelo donum benedicens omnes ascendit ad celos

Fratres autem illi surgentes apposuerunt nobis ex fructibus arborum et comedimus pariter et exultauius in illo die Mane autem facto exiens cepi itineris uiam que contra egiptum ducebatur Secutique sunt me illi sancti fratres quasi milia quinque
Introgauique (sic) illos nosce me nomina illorum qui respondens primus dixit
Iohannes michi nomen est Secundus
andreas Tertius raclaon Quartus theophilus
memento nostri et ambula in pace Osculatis
inuicem reuersis sunt in locis suis

Ego autem ire cepi tristis et iterum gaudens de uniuersa mirabilia que dignus fuj videre et audire a sanctis patribus Iterum per tribus diebus ambulans exij in egyptum inuenique et requieui cum illis per dies decem narrauique omnia que uidi miracula et auribus eorum per ordinem narrai

Qui audientes deo gratias agebant dicentes Beatus es tu qui tales meruisti dei seruos uidere Ipsi autem erant nimis timentes deum et misericordes et hospitalitem (sic) precipui et omni bonitem (sic) pleni

Loquente autem me uniuersa que uidi et audiui ipsi cum magno studio scripserunt adque composuerunt festinantesque deportauerunt librum uniuersam terram scitharum et cognitum est uniuersis fratribus

Et dum legentur uniuersi et reuersi sunt in monasterio Et posuerunt librum in sanctam ecclesiam in memoria sanctorum cum quibus et nos mereamur portionem accipere et remissinem peccatorum in uita eterna Ipso adivuante qui cum patre spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat nunc et semper et in secula seculorum Amen

Explicit de beato onufrio
Appendix 3.4, epitome in incunable Legenda Aurea

Jacobus de Voragine

Legenda aurea sanctorum, sive Lombardica historia. Add: Antonius Liber: Epigramma in laudem urbis Coloniae

Cologne: [Ulrich Zel], 1483, 1483

[fol. 297va\textsuperscript{463}] De sancto Onufrio heremita et confessore

CAP. I.--

Quodam die, dum ego Paphnutius solus tacitusque sederem, cogitavi in corde meo quod deserta peterem, et univera loca sanctorum monachorum, piaeque conversationis habitum lustrarem, ac qualiter Deo ministrarent, considerarem. Unde factum est ut tacitus iter arriperem, et in eremum cursu de siderabili properarem. Panes itaque cum aqua exigua mecum portavi, ne deficerem a labore iteris coepti. Quarto autem die peracto, alimenta quae mecum sumpsi defecerunt, meaque membra nullo victu refocillata vires perdiderunt. Moxque divina illustrante gratia, mors imminens ablata est; assumptisque viribus iter arripui, atque dies alios quatuor nihil gustando peregi. His itaque compleitis, niumim fessus, humo prostratus jacui velut mortuus. Extemplo quoque coelesti solatus adjutorio, assistere mihi vidi virum, gloria mirabilem, splendore terribilem, pulchritudine laudabilem, magnitudine procerum, aspectu praeclarum. Quem ut aspexi, vehementer obstupui; sed tamen ille vultu placido accedens, nunc manus, nunc labia mea tetigit, mihi vires potenter restauravit (Joannes, libello III, n. 12). Continuo laetus surrexi, Deoque favente, per solitudinem exinde decem et septem dierum cursum direxi, quousque ad locum quem Dominus mihi famulo suo indigno providebat ostendere, perveni; illic ab itineris labore cessavi.

CAP. II.--

Igitur dum fessus requiescerem, et quam aegre profectus esse me cogitarem, virum procul aspectu terribilem vidi, in modum bestiae pilis undique circumseptum; cui tanta scilicet capillorum prolixitas erat, ut corpus illius ipsorum diffusi one tegeretur. Pro vestimento quoque foliis herbeisque utebatur, quibus subteriora renum tantummodo cingebat. Talis viso homine, nimio perterritus sum terrore, anxiatus ultra quam credi potest timore et admiratione, quoniam tam mira forma meis oculis nunquam fuit ostensa in humana specie. Quid facerem ignoravi; sed quantum valui, fugam petii, montemque propinquum concito cursu ascendii; ibique tremefactus corrui, atque me sub frondium densitate a facie illius abscondi, multa dans suspiria. Defeci pene aetate e t labore abstinentiae. Hic vero dum me cernebat in monte jacentem, voce nimia clamavit, et dixit: Vir Dei, descende de monte. Noli timere; ego enim sum homo passibilis, tibi similis. His itaque consolatus verbis, mentem recipi, moxque descendi, et ad virum sanctum perveni, atque pedibus ejus me timidus prostravi. Ille quoque me prohibens ante se jacere, Surge, inquit, surge; tu enim es Dei servus, et vocaris Paphnutius, sanctorum amicus. Statim surrexi; et quamvis fessus, tamen laetus ante eum sedi, jam ferventi desiderio, quis ipse, et qualis ejus esset vita, cupiens dignoscere, dicens: Ecce votum adimplevit, qui me per
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hanc eremum direxit. En artus mei fatiscentes aliquod sentiunt solatium, sed mens sitibunda non adhuc invenit refrigerium. Idcirco te, senior, corde devoto deprecor, atque per illum, ob cujus amorem hujus solitudinis deserta habitas, te contestor, ut unde sis aut quomodo voceris, seu quando huc adveneris, apertis mihi verbis denunties. Et vir Dei recognoscens quam libenti animo sententiam sui laboris audirem, dixit mihi:

CAP. III.---Quoniam te, frater dilecte, avida mente vitae meae longas a erumnas velle scire video, repete me tibi non dubites has ab exordio. Ego, licet immitterus, vocor Onuphrius. Et ecce non minus sunt quam septuaginta anni,

quod in hoc [fol. 298ra] deserto laboriose vixi. Cum feris conversatus sum crebrius, pro pane comedi herbarum fructus, in montibus et in speluncis ac con vallibus meum reclinavi miserabile corpus. Tot annis neminem nisi te solum aspexi, alimentum a nullo hominum sumpsi, Verumtamen in monasterio Hermopolito dicto nutritus eram in provincia Thebaida nominata, ubi simul pene centum monachi degebant. Porro vita illorum talis exstitit, ut more et actione viverent aequanimitatem omnem, et uno corde unoque spiritu, iugo ac discipline sancte regule se submitterent, atque fluctus huius saeculi omnino non formidarent. Quicquid uni cunctis placet, placet. Mente sancta, fide pura, caritate perfecta ante Deum incidebant, cui die noctuque omni mansuetudine et patientia ministrare non cessabant. Tanta erat his taciturnitas cum abstinentia, ut nullus auderet nisi cum justa interrogatione, vel cum recto responso, reddere verbum. Ibi quoque pabulum sancte doctrine ab adolescentia suscepi; Ibi sancte regularis vite normam a fratribus didici, a quibus amabiliter diligebar; ab his, qualiter instituta mandatorum dei servare deberem, instruebar.

CAP. IV.---Profecto vitam beati patris helye venerabiles fratres meos audivi frequenter laudare, qui se in heremo tanta abstinentia et oratione studuit affligere, ut maximam virtutem et donum prophetae et miraculorum a Domino promeruisset accipere; et igneo curru transvectus, spiritusque sancti dono habuit impartiri, et adhuc longevus senio, mortis penam non videre. Insuper ad exemplum, beatum baptistam Johannem protulerunt, qui in novi testamenti serie clarissimus effulsit, Et qui plurima annorum spacia divino mancipatus seruitio, corpus suum maceravit, donec in iordanis unda mundi redemptorem baptisare dignus existerebat, atque ipsum dei agnum esse digito suo demonstraret.
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corpora sua cruciant; contra dyabolicas insidias viriliter dimicant; et ut vincant, contra
tela nequissimi gladijs spiritualibus pugnant. Omnipotens ergo deus circundat eos armis
sue potentie, ut eos incursio sathane non valeat prosterne Ad eos angeli iugiter
mittuntur, et per manus ipsorum necessaria eis crebrius amministrantur. Talibus itaque
vorribum et similibus ab eis instructus cepi tacita mente tractare quod gloria felicitate
perfruunt in celus quia laboriosa certamina propter amorem dei tollerant in terris. cor
meum ardebat, mens mea desiderabiliter fervebat mundi gaudia spernere, patrie
celesti totis viribus anhelare Nocte igitur silenti surgens parvum panem mecum detuli
cum exiguis leguminibus, ut vix in quartum diem sufficerent; sicque secundum dei
dispensationem profectus sum deprecans dominum nostrum ihesum christum ut mihi
ostenderet habitationis mee locum. Egrediente autem me de monasterio in montana, veni
et continue lumen splendidum quasi obvians mihi vidi. Quo ex timplo autem de medio
luminis vir aspectu pulcherrimus accessit ad me

[fol. 298va\textsuperscript{465}] et dicit mihi: noli pavesce, Ego enim sum angelus dei, ad te
custodiendum ab ortu tuo providentia divina destinatus, ut iubente deo tecum manerem,
et te in heremum ducerem. Perfectus esto, humilis incedem ambulator in conspectu tuo.
Cor tuum in omni custodia conserva, vive sine querela, in bono opere persevera. Ego
vero non te derelinquam, donec animam tuam in praesentiam summe maiestatis offeram.
Hec locutus est mihi angelus, iter inceptum mecum comitans.

CAP. VIII.---Pergebamus itaque secum sex milliaria vel septem, et devenimus ad
quamdam speluncam nimis decoram. Accessi, volens scire si intus aliquid esse secundum
autem consuetudinem monachorum clamare incepit clamare benedictionem humili me
petto. Inde virum sanctissimum exire vidi, quem prostratus humo tenus adoravi. Ille vero
manus suas mihi porrexit, de terra me elevavit, osculum pacis mihi tribuit, atque dixit:
Tu es frater meus heremitice vite cooperator o fili, ingredere. Deus tibi concedat, ut timor
eius in te perenneat, opus tuum in conspectu suo compleat. Statimque cum eo
speculuncam introivi opera eius cupiens discere, et solitariam habitationem curiosius
investigare; Ipse quoque ut meum desiderium agnovit, consilium honorabile mihi
praebuit; ac qualiter insidias dyaboli superare deberem, verbis caritativi s gratanter
patefecit. Transactis itaque diebus quibusdam, talibus ammonuit me verbis, dicens: Fili,
surge, mecum perge; interiora deserti debes intrare, et in alia spelunca solus habitare: Ibi
si viriliter dimicas, omnia demoniorum temptamenta superas. Et vadens ipse per quatuor
dies venimus die quinta vero die ad locum qui caldiuma dicitur, ibique palmc propinquque
erant. et dixit michi Ecce, fili, locum quem tibi dominus preparavit ad manendum. Fuit
autem mecum triginta diebus edocens me doctrinam mandatorum dei. Quibus ita peractis,
oratione sua domino me commendavit; et ad propria remeavit. Per singulos vero annos
solitus erat me visitare, ac quali industria et simplicitate vivere deberem, divinis eloquijs
non cessabant ammofol. 298vb\textsuperscript{nere.

CAP. IX.---Quadam (sic) autem tempore, iuxta consuetudinem ad me veniens, inter verba
salutationis in terram corruit et in domino obdormivit. Cuius corpus abortis lacrimis mox
secus caldiuma terre commendavi
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CAP. X---Tunc ego Paphnutius sancto Onufrio dixi Pater sancte, laborem esse non modicum sentio, quem pro nomine domini tolerasti in hac heremo. Vir sanctus respondit: Michi, frater, crede dilectissime: tantos labores et persecutiones in deserto sustinui, ut sepius putarem me mortem superare. Ab spe multotiens eram vite, ut vix alitum in corpore sentirem remanere. Per diem estu et igne solis ardentibus urebar, per noctem algore gelida nivis cruciabar rore et pruina infectus, Fame ac siti defec tus. O quanta et qualia passus sum. Qualia expertus sum. Non puto quempiam plagas ac labores posse enarrare, quos homo moriturus pro dei viventis amore debet tolerare propter quem aut ista sustinui potens est inter angelorum catervas me consolari: Alimenta vero sprevi corporalia, ut dignus acciperem spiritualia. Sanctus igitur angelus cotidie mihi panem offerebat, aquam per mensuram ministrabat. Arbores palmarum ibidem constitute erant, que duodecies in anno dattilorum fructus germinaverant . Quos per singulos dies colligens, pro pane edebam, mixtos herbarum folijs, et erant in ore meo tamquam favus mellis. Frater Paphnuti, si implere studes voluntatem dei, omnia tibi necessaria preparantur ab eo.

CAP. XI---Cumque hec a beato onufrio diligenter audissem dixi: Pater benigne, die domino vel sabbato communionem percipis ab aliquo? Que ayt: Omni die dominico et sabbato angelum paratum invenio sacrosanctum corpus et sanguinem domini nostri ihesu christi secum deferentem: de cujus manu mihi pretiosissima munera donantur,


CAP. XIII---Mane autem facto, post horam orationis, videbam vultum eius in pallorem mutatum, et quid ei acciderit quesivi ab eo. Qui ayt: Non expavescas frater Pafnuti, quoniam omnipotens deus recto itinere in hanc solitudinem te direxit et ut corpus meum terre commendes. Hac etenim hora anima carnis vinculis absolvitur, atque ad creatorem suum in celesti regno deportatur. Rogo te quod dicas hominibus quod hec est postulatio quam impetravi a Domino. Si quis oblationem ob amorem nominis mei ante conspectum domini nostri ihesu christi immolat, ab omni temptatione dyaboli, et a vinculo pravitatis humane liber existit, atit que sum in sanitas angelis in regno celorum eternae beatitudinis capax erit. Si quis oblationem non valet offerre, vel pre inopia redimere, pro amore meo in nomine domini elemosinam tribuat, et ego pro eo orabo ut dignus in celestibus vita superna perfrui valeat. Si quis nec oblationem, nec elemosinam potest offerre, pro caritate mea incensum deo accendat, et ego rogo pro eo, ut gaudium perhenne possideat. Et si quis pauper in deserto, vel aliquo loco oblationem aut elemosinam, seu incensum non habeat ad ymmolandum, surgat, et manus suas ad deum extendat, et ter orationem
dominicam pro amore meo me intenta mente, in nomine sancte trinitatis psallat. Ego vero pro ipso ad dominum intercedo, ut vitae celestis[fol. 299rb] mereatur particeps fieri cum omnibus sanctis.

CAP. XIV.---Tu vero in egiptum perge et esto ibi usque in finem vite tue; opus bonum perfice, et accipies coronam perpetue glorie.


CAP. XVI.---Repente vero vocem angelorum vocem audivi, laudantium deum Mox oculi mei in fletum profluunt, interiora gemitus producunt, lacrimarum rivi manarunt illud flebiliter planxi, quia quem vix inveni, diutius habere non potui. Deinde tunicam meam per medium scindens, una parte sum indutus in alteram collocavi corpus beatum, et sepelivi illud in sepulcro de petra excisum. Videns autem me solum remanere, iterum cepi lugere. Ita merens surrexi, specusque illius habitaculum intrare volui. Denique me astante, ipsa spelunca cecidit cum magna ruina, et palme radicitus erute simul procubuerunt. Cognovi itaque quod ego pafnutius, quod non esset voluntas domini, me in loco illo habitare; In egiptum igitur redii: et ecclesie retuli [fol. 299va][466]que vidi et audivi.

Migrauit autem beatus Onufrius confessor dei preciosus undecima die mensis iunii in die sancta sancti Barnabe apostoli Meritis vero ipsius ibidem et vndique hominibus beneficia prestantur.
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Onuphrius Lipomanus edition vol. 6 Rome 1558

Digitised on google books,


f.54r Mensis Iunius

N.B. The footnotes correspond to printed marginal notes in this edition.

VITA SANCTI HONOFRIJ EREMITAE

et aliorum patrum, quos ego Paphnutius Anachoreta Dei prouidentia, vt cognoscerem, dignus fui habitus, & quorum audeo pijs ac religiosis fratribus narrare historiam.

Quodam die studium adhibui, vt in interiorem venirem solitudinem, & viderem an esset ullus alius Frater Monachus, qui interius meo serviret Domino. Cumque surrexissem, profectus sum iter quatuor dierum in interiorem solitudinem, licet nec panem interim comedissem, neque vinum aut aquam bibissem. Quarto autem die, cum peruenissem ad antrum venerabile, manxi hora vna pulsans ostium, & sperans fore, vt pro more egredetur aliquid ex Fratribus, & me ipse salutaret. Cum vero pulsassem, & nemo respondisset; aperui ostium, & ingressus sum clamans, Benedic. Cumque vidissem quendam sedentem, tetigi eius humerum: fuitque tanquam lanugo. Cumque reliquum corporis contractassem, inueni eum iam longo tempore mortuum. vidi vero pendens quoque colobium. Cumque ego id tetigisset, euasit non secus ac puluis in manu mea, adeo vt ego statim me veste propriam exuerim, & mortui corpus contessem, prompte & alacri animo propriis manibus effossa terra arenosa, eius deposuerim reliquias, cum precibus & multis lachrymis.


---

467 Quod potest, facit sanctus vir, sepelit corpus mortui cum precibus & multis lachrymis.


Postquam ex illo justo haec audijssem, eum interrogaui, dicens: In principio quando huc venisti, laborastine valde, an non? Ipse autem respondens mihi dixit: Primum quidem valde laborabam, o frater, adeo, deo vt dolore cruciatus me in terram projicerem, vt qui in ventre maximam sentiment molestiam, nec possem caput erigere: ob idque cogenet meam synaxim peragere volutatus, Deum, qui in omnibus est misericors, rogans, tam propter eum, qui me tunc affligebat dolorem, quam pro redemptione meorum peccatorum. Cum vero multos labores sustinuisset, quodam die dum meum pottem, & graui dolore ventris vexar in sinistram, vidi virum ignem coram me stantem, qui me est allocutus dicens: Quid habes, & quidnam tibi dolet? Statim autem, postquam hoc ex eo audijssem, confirmau vires, & ei dixi: Domine, dolet mihi iecur. Is vero dixit. Ostende mihi locum, in quo sentis dolorem. Cum ego autem ei iecur ostendissem, ipse manu

---

468 Vide in monachis opera manuum, & quomodo in fructibus operum & se & pauperes alerent.
469 Grauissimam appellat iniquitatem, monachum moniali carnaliiter commisceri, quod tamen nostri temporis haeretici peccatum esse negant.
470 Ecce asperrimam vitam sancti nam panem tanto tempore non gustans, solu palmae fructibus vescebatur.
extensa, & mihi imposita, & coniunctis digitis, perinde ac gladio scidit latus, & meum iecur eduxit, meo maximo cum dolore; & ostendit mihi plagas, quas in eo habebam. Illud vero manu sua erasit, & ei pannum mundum iniecit, & iecur meum in locum suum restituit. Cumque totum [p.55r] corpus meum contractasset benedictis suis manus, lateris mei vulner conglutinavit, & dixit: Ecce sanus factus es, noli amplius peccare, ne deteriori tibi contingat: sed serui Domino nunc, & vsque in secula. Ecce autem ab illo die curata sunt omnia mea interiora, cessauitque dolor mei iecoris. Ex illo ergo tempore maneo sine dolore, Deo benedicens, & ipsum glorificans propter suum in me misericordiam.

Mihi autem ostendit vir ille insignis pannum amomi, quem meo lateri imposuit, Quando vero mihi Paphnutio narravit hae omnia, rogavi eum, vt cum ipso manerem in spelunca. Ipse autem mihi respondit, dicens: Non poteris, frater mi, ferre insultus daemonum. Postea vero rogavi eum, vt mihi nomen suum significaret. Is vero mihi dixit: Nomen est mihi Timotheus, Memento mei, & roga pro me, frater dilecte, vt Deus in me perficit bonum, quo sum dignatus. Ego autem Paphnutius procidi ad eius pedes, preces ab eo postulans. Ipse autem respondens mihi, dixit: Dominus noster Iesus Christus benedicet te, & defendet te ab omni laqueo diaboli, & praebet tibi vias rectas ad hoc, vt pergas ad sanctos eius in secula. Benedictionem autem eis consecutum, prompto, & alacri animo cum gaudio sum egressus, Deum laudans propter egregios sermones, quos audii a Sancto illo Timotheo. Inter ambulandum vero apud me considerabam, & animo valde anxius, dicebam: Quidnam est mea vita aut quidnam meum institutum? Mansi autem non paucos dies haec apud me cogitans, & huius iusti viri Deo grata opera sequiens. Cum vero clementis Dei mihi illuxisset prudentia non abieci curam meae vitae, sed excitatus rursus profectus sum in interiorem solitudinem in via auiia, vbi est genus eorum qui dicuntur Mazici. Omne enim studium a me in eo ponebatur, vt scirem, an esset alius Anachoreta in interioribus partibus solitudinis Deo seruiens, vt ego quoque dignus habererer, qui id consequerer.

Hoc autem iter cum coepissem ingredi, tuli mecum paucos panes, & aquae modicum. Quae quidem mihi suffecerunt vsque ad quatuor dies. Cum ij autem praeteripissent, & expletem suet quod manducarem, affligebar adductus in magna vestigio. Statim vero sumptis viribus, & mortem habens ante oculos, ea cura dimissa, alios quatuor dies, & noctes sum profectus, cum nec panem aut aquam gustassem: adeo vt rursus sumeret cibus, valde laborarem, & et me humi abijciens, mortem expectarem. Tunc vidi virum insignem venientem, & manum suam labris meis imponentem, non secus atque medicus scalpellum oculo, & protinus rursus sumpsi vires, adeo vt neque famem, neque situm sentirem. Cum magnam autem, & terribilem vissem visionem, surgens rursus prompto, & alacri animo proiectum sum in interiorem solitudinem alios quatuor dies & noctes. Defessus vero &471 extensis in caelo manibus, Deum oraui. Cumque rursus virum illum vissem ad me venientem, accepi ab eo magnas vires, Cumque septemdecim dierum itineri finem (vt semel dicam) imposuissem, vidi princem virum venientem aspectu admodum terribilem, hirsutum pilis, eisque tectum toto corpore, non secus ac feram terribilem. Erat enim a veste nudus, lumbosque cinctos habebat folijs herbarum. Cum is autem prope me accessisset, territus

471 Extensis in coelum manibus oraui (sic) Deum.

Saepe autem rogau, vt mihi diceret nomen suum. Is vero mihi dixit: Est mihi nomen Honofrius. Sexagesimus iam annus agitur, ex quo habito in hac solitudine, ambulans in montibus huius solitudinis: quo tempore nullum omnino hominem vidi, qui in carne cognosceretur, te solo excepto. Habitaui autem antea in sancto monasterio, quod nomine appellatur Erity Hemopolitani Thebanorum regionis, quod e fratribus impletur numero centum, qui eiusdem sunt fidei, & animi: & eos communer comendunt in charitate, & multitudine pacis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, & in magno silentio quieteque se exercent, & glorificant eum bonitatem. Cum ergo in iuuenili aetate illic illici degere, & erudiri, Deique amorem & sanctis patribus, puramque ac sinceram fidei & regulam pietatis, audiui sanctos patres dicentes de admirabili pioque, & religioso patre nostro Elia, quemadmodum ei fuerunt vires a Deo confirmatae, per tolerantiam & patientiam eorum, quae sustinuit in deserito: & rursus de Ioanne Baptista & praecursore, cui nullus pars fuit ex hominibus, & de ijs,quae passus est in solitudine vsque ad diem, quo reuelatus est Israeli.


Postquam haec omnia mihi narruit, rogaui eum quoque ego minimus Paphnutius, dicens: Bone pater, multum ne laborem sustinuisti, quando primum venisti in hanc solitudinem? Dicit autem mihi beatus senex: Crede, dilecte frater, tantum laborem sustinui: vt mei saepe sper avsque ad mortem, fame, & siti mihi imminentibus, & simul etiam igne solis in die, & frigore aeris noctu, madafactaque fuit mihi caro a rore coeli. Cum vero bonus Deus vidisset, haec me sustinuisse, & certamen ieunii, & quod dedissem animam meam exercitationi, iussit sanctum suum Angelum mihi proudiere, & ad me afferre alimen tum quotidiane, & medicum aquae ad meum corpus confirmandum: & haec palma mihi quotannis producit duodecim spathas, adeo vt sit vna singulis mensibus. His ego cum vescerem cum herbis solitudinis, fuerunt mihi per Dei prouidentiam melle dulciora. Scriptum est enim: Non in solo pane viuit homo, sed in omni verbo, quod proficiscitur ex ore Dei. Si ergo, o frater Paphnuti, feceris voluntatem Domini nostri, ab eo tibi prouidebitur. Dicit enim in sancto suo Euangelio: Nolite esse solliciti, quid comedatis aut bibatis: Dominum enim & pater vester, qui est in coelis, nouit quonam opus habeatis. Petite ergo primum regnum eius, & iustitiam, & haec omnia adjicientur vobis.


Dum esset autem mane, vidi ipsum post matutinas preces mutasse faciei aspectum & colorum, & fui contrerritus. Ipse autem cum hoc cognoisset, me est allocutus, dicens: Ne timeas frater Paphnuti. Deus enim, qui est in omnibus misericors, te ad me misit, vt curam geras sepulturae mearum reliquiarum. Ecce enim hodierno die perficio meam administrationem, & abeo in requiem meam vsque in seculum. Erat autem dies sextus quidem decimus Pauen, nonus autem Junij mensis apud Romanos. Mihi autem hoc quoque praecepit: Si in Aegyptum exieris, frater Paphnuti, annuncia mei memoriam, ad

472 Vide quantas carnis afflictiones passus siit sanctus iste.
473 Mandat sanctus fieri animae suae memoriam & offerri ei thymiama in medio, fratrum & omnibus Christianorum. Vide ergo num vane & nos oremus pro mortuis sicut dicunt modo quidam.
thymiama ei praebedendum in medio fratrum, & omnium Christianorum. Si quis enim oblationem in nomine meo, & in mei memoriam obtulerit Domino Deo nostro in omni loco, feret ipsum Dominus in primam horam annorum meorum. Haec est enim petitio mea, quam ab ipso petui. Et si quis fratrem pauperem nutriterit in nomine meo, meminero eius, vt dignum eum censeat Dominus, qui veniat in primam horam meorum annorum. Respondi vero ei, & dixi: Si quis autem sit pauper, qui non possit offere aliquid, aut nutrire pauperem in tui memoriam, non veniet is in primam horam annorum tuorum? Is autem dixit: Modicum thymiamatis in nomine meo in odorem suavitatis si Domino obtulerit, dignus habebitur similii laetitia. Ausus sum autem hoc quoque ei dicere: Si quis autem non inuenerit thymiama, sicut tu degens in solitudine, aut ei nequaquam suppeterit ad offerendum, non feretur in primam horam mille annorum? an potius, [f.57r] o pater, ad nos peruenient praeces tuae iustitiae? Si quid enim a Domino petieris, dabit t ibi: neque tua tardius veniet petitio, propter tuam impriam seruitus, quam sexaginta annos sustinuisit quibus tuus in solitudine expectatus Dominum. Ipsa autem respondens, dixit mihi: Si quis est pauper habitans in solitudine, & non potest offere oblationem, aut mittere thymiama, is vero surgens dixerit, Pater noster qui es in coelis, & reliqua vsque ad Amen in nomine meo Domino obtulerit, rogabo eum, vt dignus habeatur, qui in prima hora mille annorum cum omnibus iustis mercedem consequatur. Ego autem rursus ei dixi: Bone pater, si sum dignus, cupe habitare in hoc loco, postquam tu e corpore excesseris. Is vero dixit mihi: Fili, non venisti ad hanc administrationem: sed Deus te misit, vt recceas suos sanctos, qui habitant in solitudine, & an anunciationes bonum odorem eorum vitae in medio fratrum. Abi ergo fili in Aegyptum, & perseuera in bonis operibus Domini nostri Iesu Christi, praedicans omnia tua, quae vidisti in solitudine.


His verbis celeram ad futuri seculi felicitatem adventum innuit

471
Dei voluntatem vt in illo loco habitarem, comedì panis id quod superfuit & aquam bibi similiter.


Postquam ergo me fecerunt surgere, vnanimes Deum precati sumus, & ecce vidimus ante nos quinque panes leues, & admodum pulchros & delicatos, tantummodo coctos. Ipsi quoque attulerunt aliquid aliud esculentum, quod quidem sumpsimus cum panibus, omnesque sedimus & simul comedimus. Ipsi autem rursus mihi dixerunt: Ecce, vt iam tibi dixim ans antea, cum sexaginta annis habitauerimus in hac solitudine, quatuor panes Dei iussu ad nos e coelo quotidie deferuntur: Nunc autem cum tu ad nos veneris, ecce panum numerus pro te quoque est ad nos missus: neque scimus vndenam afferantur, sed quotidie speluncam ingredientes, inuenimus eos per se paratos. Postquam vero nos simul gustaquim, tota illa nocte fecimus orationes, & magnam synaxim\textsuperscript{476} celebrauimus; Erat enim\textsuperscript{477} sanctus dies Dominicae. Cum esset autem mane, rogaui ipsos, vt manerem cum eis in spelunca vsque ad diem vltimum. Ipsi vero respondentes mihi dixerunt: Non est voluntas Dei, vt tu habites in hac solitudine: sed surges, & vade in Ægyptum, & narrare fratibus Christi amantibus omnia quæcumque vidisti, ad nostri memoriam, & ad lucrum, & velitatem eorum, qui audiunt. Cum iij hæc dixissent, eos valde rogaui, vt sua nomina

\textsuperscript{474} Extensis in coelum manibus oraui,
\textsuperscript{475} Nota asperum sancti vestitum
\textsuperscript{476} phantom note.
\textsuperscript{477} Aduerte, Erat enim sanctus dies Dominicae

Cum autem ab eis abijsemine, ambulaui vno die per interiorem solitudinem. Cumque venissem ad speluncam fontis aquæ, illic sedi, vt parumper requiescerem a labore itineris. Erat autem locus ad id aptus, vt qui circa illum fontem multas haberet arbores, plenas fructibus. Cum vero parum quieuissem, & surrexissem; circuiui in medio arborum, admirans ipsorum fructuum multitudinem, & cogitans apud me, quisnam esset is, qui illo loco plantauerat. Erant autem fructus illarum arborum multæ palmæ, citri, punica, symocama, zizipha, & vites; alæ quoque amœnæ arbores & frugiferæ, quorum gustus est melius dulcior. His accedebant myrti quoque, & alæ variae arbores in medio earum, quæ illic sitæ erant, suauem odorem emittentes; ille quoque fons ex se scatens, & omnes illas arbores irrigans, adeo vt existimarem eum esse Dei paradisum. Cum ergo illud admirarer spectaculum, vidi quatuor adolescentes, hilares & valde speciosos, ad me procul venientes, succinctos pellibus ouium. Qui cum appropinquassent, dixerunt: Salve, frater Paphnuti. Ego autem protinus humi cecidi in faciem, & eos veneratus sum. Qui cum me erexissent, mecum sederunt, & locuti sumus inter nos. Erant vero tanta gloria insignes, vt ego existimarem eos esse Angelos, & descendisse de coelo. Mecum autem magna sunt affecti lætitia, & collectos fructus ex illis arboribus mihi dederunt ad vescendum; & lætatum est cor meum, eo quod ego ab eis diligerer. Mansique apud illos septem dies, vescens fructibus illarum arborum.

Rogaui autem eos: Quomodo huc venistis, & vnde estis? Ipsa vero respondentis mihi dixerunt: Frater, quandoquidem Deus te misit ad nos, omnem nostram tibi vitam narrabimus. Nos sumus ex ciuitate quæ dicitur Oxyrrynchos: nostri vero parentes, sunt senatores illius ciuitatis. Cum autem in illorum litteris ab eis institueremur, vii scholæ traditi, litteras quidem pedestres didicimus. Cum vero etiam superiorem inchoas semus doctrinam, in vnam conuenimus sententiam, Deo nobis opem ferente ad id, quod est melius, & statuimus eius quoque discere sapientiam. Ex illo ergo tempore, nos quotidie mutuo excitantes ad animi alacritatem, & bonum scopum habentes in nostris cordibus, studentesque locum inuenire, & paucos dies quiescere donec sciremus Dei de nobis prouidentiam; acceptis nobiscum paucis panibus, & modico aquæ, ad nostrum cibum & potum vsque ad septem dies, recessimus. Cum vero peruenissesmus intra solitudinem, fuimus in ecstasi; & vidimus ante nos virum gloriam insignem; qui nos apprehensos manibus deduxit in hunc locum, & nos tradidit viro valde proiectæ ætatis, qui Deo seruiebat. Ecce autem hic iam habitauiussex annos, mansimis vero cum eo vsque ad vnum annum, ab illo docti quemadmodum Domino seruiremus. Impleo autem illo anno, consummatus est hic pater, & ex illo tempore hic soli sumus. Ecce autem, frater dilecte, nos tibi confitemur, spatio sex annorum, vt diximus, in hoc loco degimus. Panem non gustauimus, nec alium cibum sumpsimus, nisi solummodo de fructibus harum arborum.

478 Panem sancti iuuenes non gustabant, sed fructibus dumtaxat arborum vescebantur.
Singulis vero hebdomadis semel tantum nos videmus invicem. In hoc enim loco inuenimur, & nobis invicem occurrimus sabbato & sancta Dominica. Post hos autem duos dies vnusquisque nostrum venit in locum proprium, & apud se degit. Ipsi vero rursus fructus attulerunt, & communiter cibum sumpsimus. Cumque postea egressi fuissetus, simul processimus circiter quinque milliaria per solitudinem. Cum autem eis vale dicerem, rogaui eos vt dicerent mihi sua nomina. Et primus quidem dixit, Ioannes; Secundus autem, Andreas; Tertius vero, Heraclambon; Quartus, Theophilus; præcipientes mihi dicere nomina sua fratribus ad sui memoriam. Ego vero eos rogaui, vt mei meminissent.


479 Ergo sancti intercedunt pro nobis; & pax, & gratia Iesu Christi datur nobis eorum intercessionibus