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Abstract

Martin Allan Hall

The historical, biographical and intellectual context of John of Garland’s *De triumphis Ecclesie*: a new critical edition

This is the first full critical edition of *De triumphis Ecclesie*, a Latin poem of 4602 lines in eight books (plus a short prose passage), completed in 1252 by John of Garland, an English cleric and eminent grammarian teaching in the Paris Schools. It is based on scrutiny of the only surviving manuscript, also from the thirteenth century. This new text makes some 180 emendations to the 1856 printed version by Thomas Wright, with systematic re-punctuation and some re-ordering of lines and suggested completion of lacunae. The Latin text is accompanied by full palaeographical, linguistic, literary and historical notes, and illustrated with images from the manuscript. I have also prepared the first translation in any language (not submitted as part of this thesis), which with the notes and Introduction will make this important text accessible to medievalists from a range of disciplines.

I offer many fresh insights into John’s life and works, as well as questioning long-standing assumptions about them. The Introduction places the poem in its classical, biblical and medieval literary setting, demonstrating a clear link with Matthew Paris’ *Chronica Maiora*. It examines John’s coverage of the Third and Albigensian Crusades, the reign of King John of England, Henry III’s invasion of Poitou in 1242 and the Mongol incursions into Europe in 1241-42 as well as his unique account of the hesitant first years of Toulouse University (1229-32). The poem was begun as a pastiche of these central events of John’s own lifetime as a prelude to Louis IX’s expected reconquest of Jerusalem in the Seventh Crusade. It is shown to have been hastily transformed into a rationalisation of Louis’ shocking defeat and capture in Egypt (1250), and a passionate appeal for a new crusade. I also examine John’s broader concerns for Anglo-French unity and an end to the dispute between papacy and empire, both obstacles to success in the Holy Land.
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Introduction

Foreword
Louis Paetow\(^1\) said in 1923 that, ‘From the viewpoint of modern scholarship this \([De triumphis Ecclesie]\) is the most important and most interesting of the works of John of Garland.’\(^2\) But, ‘Before the poem can be fully utilised for historical purposes it must be re-edited with an abundance of linguistic, literary and historical notes. This can probably best be done after we have critical editions of all the inedited works of John of Garland.’\(^3\) My doctoral submission attempts this task, now that Paetow's condition is largely satisfied.

It is based on scrutiny of the only surviving manuscript, London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A x. I have substantially revised Thomas Wright’s text of 1856, and provided extensive notes to explain textual changes, elucidate points of grammar, language and style, identify the poem’s diverse sources, and contextualise its contents. I hope with this revised text to prompt academic reappraisal of John’s semi-autobiographical account of the years 1189-1252, and make it readily accessible as source material to medievalists of many disciplines.

In the course of this work I have also prepared a translation, the first in any language, though I have not submitted it on account of the academic limitation on the total number of words. This is a more satisfactory approach than limiting the words by submitting only part of the poem. The introduction and footnotes are also somewhat constrained. This is however a useful discipline, and a disincentive to repetition. These materials are complementary, and in some specialised areas follow-up though secondary reading is suggested. There is a full bibliography.

A new text does not of itself bring to life a deliberately difficult poem. I have surveyed existing scholarship and read many texts by John and other medieval authors. On the basis of this I advance new theories on his life and works, and in particular demonstrate a connection with his close contemporary, Matthew Paris. This introduction seeks to place \(De triumphis Ecclesie\) in the context of John’s life and cultural constraints, as well as of historical events. He was hard-working,

---

\(^1\) See 32-33 below.
\(^2\) Paetow, MS, Intro.,110.
\(^3\) Paetow (1928), 209.
learned, devout, and unusually outspoken, but also a man of his times. I analyse
John’s perspective (as an Englishman in France) on the Crusades, especially the
agonising Seventh, and on the two fault-lines of Western Christendom, Anglo-
French relations and the split between papacy and empire. The Introduction also
questions some of the few apparently sound assumptions which underlie previous
scholarship.

For me, De triumphis Ecclesie has exercised a powerful fascination since
Jonathan Phillips suggested in 2009 that I base my MA dissertation on Paetow’s
1928 article about this poem.4 It quickly became clear, however, that a new
edition and a translation were needed if the poem was ever to be recognised as a
remarkable contemporary testament. It is also a quarry of information on much
else, especially the beginnings of the Universities of Toulouse and Paris. My
particular academic combination of classics and Crusades history, reinforced by a
love of the Languedoc, Oxford and Paris felt like a good starting point for what
has nevertheless proved a severe challenge.

4 Paetow (1928). The MA dissertation was based on a reading only of crusade narrative elements
of the poem. It was the basis for an article, ‘An Academic Call to Arms in 1252: John of Garland’s
Crusading Epic De triumphis Ecclesiae,’ Crusades, 12 (2013), 153-74. Traces of both remain in
this submission.
Section 1: Life and works of John of Garland

Biography
John of Garland was an English cleric with a prodigious output in Latin prose and verse. He became well-known\(^5\) in the Paris Schools as a didactic writer on grammar and rhetoric during his lifetime, in the first half of the thirteenth century. His grammatical texts were still in use in Tudor times.\(^6\) He made major contributions to the development of rhetoric. It is also possible that he was responsible for important steps in the evolution of music.\(^7\)

Much of what we know about John’s life has been well-documented by earlier scholars. Modern editors of John’s other works\(^8\) have largely accepted Paetow’s views as definitive. Most of the autobiographical facts we have derive from *De triumphis Ecclesie* itself, though clues are scattered throughout John’s works.

Paetow admirably explains the confusion about John of Garland’s identity, which lasted until the mid-nineteenth century. From the beginning of the fifteenth\(^9\) through Boston of Bury to the mid-eighteenth century, John was believed to be an Englishman who flourished c. 1040. In 1747 Dom Rivet, author of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, asserted that he was a Frenchman who lived c. 1000-1081, and crossed to England with William the Conqueror.\(^10\) Meanwhile across the Channel in 1748, Thomas Tanner firmly identified an English John of Garland as a significant author of the first half of the thirteenth century; but he also concluded that this was a different John of Garland from Boston of Bury’s,\(^11\) listed separately by Tanner as ‘Johannes Grammaticus’. It was only in the mid-nineteenth century, with the ‘discovery’ of MS Cotton Claudius A x that Thomas Wright and Victor Le Clerc resolved the matter. As John himself made clear:


\(^6\) This is apparent from the wealth of printed editions from the end of the fifteenth century.

\(^7\) On rhetoric, see Copeland & Sluiter (2009), 639-56; for music, see 26 and nn. 81-84 below.

\(^8\) See Paetow, *MS*, Intro., 82-96, and, for example, Saiani, *EBVM*, Intro., 9-13; Marguin-Hamon, *CC*, Intro., v-vi; Lawler (2004), xi-xii.

\(^9\) Tanner (1748), xxxiii, 309-10 & 434.

\(^10\) Rivet (1747), 83-98

\(^11\) Tanner (1748), xxxiii
Anglia cui mater fuerat, cui Gallia nutrix,

Matri nutricem prefero marte m eam.\(^{12}\)

Since then there has been a broad academic consensus that John was born in England around 1190-95, coalescing around 1195. The approximate date is tenuously based on John’s statement that he was a young man (‘\(\text{iuvenis}\),’ i.e. at least fifteen years old\(^{13}\)) studying under John of London\(^{14}\) ‘\(\text{hoc in tempore}\).’ This reference point in time is King John’s submission to papal authority in 1213, the event both preceding and following this autobiographical digression, which places John’s birth no later than 1198-99.

In fact close examination of this text and of John’s other works does not even allow us to be certain that John studied at Oxford at all, or that his teacher was incontrovertibly from London. John writes:

‘\(\text{Effectus laïcus fuit hoc in tempore doctor}\)

\(\text{Oxonie; viguit sensibus ipse tamen,}\)

\(\text{Omni litterula privatus scivit; et ivit}\)

\(\text{Ut laïcus, sero vir Plato, mane rudis.}\)

\(\text{Hic de Londoniis fuerat, dictusque Iohannes,}\)

\(\text{Philosophos iuveni legerat ante mihi.}^{15}\)

This means, ‘At this time as a layman he was made a doctor at Oxford; despite (\(\text{tamen}\)) being a layman he was intellectually full of energy. He had understanding, though deprived of any literary education; he went [there] as a layman, a man who was unsophisticated at the dawn of his life, a Plato in its

\(^{12}\) \(\text{DTE, 3.405-06, \text{‘To whom England was mother and France nurse; I prefer my nurse to my mother in matters of war.’ John also names his country of birth in \text{Exempla}, 94, see n. 25 below.}\)}

\(^{13}\) Earlier authorities and canon law agreed that ‘\(\text{pueritia}\)’/boyhood ends at fourteen. Augustine and Isidore stipulate that a man becomes \(\text{iuvenis}\) only after \(\text{adolescentia}\), when he reaches twenty-nine. But by John’s time both poetic and philosophical convention considered \(\text{iuventus}\) to last from boyhood to the onset of old age from the late forties onwards. See De Ghellinck (1948) for a thorough study of medieval terminology regarding age.

\(^{14}\) \(\text{DTE, 3.223. For ‘John of London’, see Paetow, MS, Intro., 83-84 and n. 20.}\)

\(^{15}\) \(\text{DTE, 3.223-28}\)
twilight. He had been in London, and was known as John. He had lectured on the philosophers to me before when I was a young man.’

Regarding John of Garland, therefore, we can conclude nothing beyond the fact that he was a ‘young man’ some time before 1213 or thereabouts, and that as such he had been taught philosophy by Johannes de Londoniis, perhaps still a Master, before he became a Doctor at Oxford. There is no other contemporary evidence linking John of Garland with Oxford, though it has been reasonably assumed on this evidence and the assertions of the early bibliographers that the lectures on natural science that John describes were delivered there. De triumphis certainly reflects John’s continuing interest in science, notably in astronomy, weather and the sea. Elsewhere in the poem he shows familiarity with medical language, of which he probably acquired a knowledge at Paris or Toulouse.

So the name ‘Johannes de Londoniis’ offers little help in clarifying details of John of Garland’s youth. An even more shadowy figure than John of Garland himself, he was identified (Jo. London,) by Roger Bacon as one of the two true ‘perfecti’ mathematicians of his age. He is demonstrably not the John of London who, confusingly, was an able pupil of Bacon, active in the 1260s; he has also been variously identified with John of Basingstoke, John Peckham, and with the donor of some eighty books to the Library of St. Augustine’s, Canterbury. Nicholas Vincent however writes ‘he [John of London] can now be identified with some confidence as [Peter, bishop of Winchester] des Roches’ familiar, bishop’s official c. 1206-12, master of St. Cross, Winchester and canon of St.Paul’s.’

Vincent noted an entry in the bishop of Winchester’s pipe roll for 1212 recording ‘Mag[ist]ri Joh. de Garland’ as guest of Peter des Roches, at the manor of Knoyle. The bishop’s guest was already called Magister by 1212, and would

---

16. The MS reads ‘delondoniis.’ ‘This is invariably rendered as ‘of, or from, London’. It is however worth remembering that there was also a Norman aristocratic family De Londoniis, named from Lundin in Fife, recent ancestors of the Fitzalans of Arundel. The city of London was spelt variously, usually ‘Londinium,’ but often ‘Londonie’ (plural).
17. E.g. Tanner (1748), 434, in relation to Johannes Grammaticus.
therefore not normally have started his ‘university’ education later than 1206, to allow for the usual six years needed to qualify as a teacher.  

He was also called ‘de Garland’ in the Winchester roll. If we are to take John himself at face value, he must therefore already have moved to Paris, since by his own testimony his name, variously spelt in manuscripts and early sources, derived from the location of his residence there.

‘Anglia, processi de te, cui cesserat orbis

Angulus; accessi Parisiusque fui.

Parisius vici cum sit Garlandia nomen,

Agnomen florens contulit illa mihi.’  

Here the consensus view on the meaning is clearly right. John says he derived his toponym or surname from the Clos de Garlande, a recently developed green area of Paris which had belonged to the Garlande family, originally from Brie. The present-day Rue de Galande, in the old university area, perpetuates the name.

If the single reference in the Winchester pipe roll is to the same John of Garland we can therefore conclude that he was probably at least twenty years old in 1212, assuming that he was unlikely to have been a student in Paris (or, for that matter, Oxford) before the age of fourteen. This is entirely consistent with his having been a ‘young man’ before 1213. We cannot rule out that John had moved to Paris as early as 1209 and obtained his Master’s degree there after many scholars left Oxford following serious disturbances. 

John tells us that he was not high-born (so not a member of the Garlande family), but had found a niche in more well-to-do circles:

‘Est inter magnos modicis locus, et mihi magnus

Cedat eques: propero longius ire pedes.’ 

---

24 Even this is conjecture, since ‘Magister’ could be used as a courtesy title.
25 PP, 6.184-87, Exempla, 94-97.
26 CM, 2.525-26. See also Brundage (1993), 23-24 for comment and full bibliography.
27 EBVM, 8.697-98. ‘There is a place for those of modest means among the great; and let the mighty knight give way to me, since I am a foot-soldier in a hurry to go further.’
In *Morale Scolarium*, John claims his just deserts as a priest, despite his lack of royal or high clerical connections:

‘*Non sum regalis sanguis, non pontificalis,*

*Vendico set talis heres bona spiritualis.*’

I have however a new proposal for John’s birthplace. In *Clavis Compendii*, 967, he tells us ‘*Gingia dumosa genuit me*’/ ‘Wooded Gingia gave me birth.’ This was first noticed by Saiani, who identified the place as probably Gingia in Berkshire, listed in the Domesday Book as ‘East Ginge’ and ‘West Ginge.’ Subsequent scholars have agreed. There is however a persuasive alternative. ‘*Ginga*’, or Margaretting/Mountnessing/Ingatestone in Essex, also appears in the Domesday Book. Both are mentioned in the Red Book of the Exchequer. DTE, 1.179-80, praising Luke of Essex, may imply that John was born in Essex, and John singles out the bowmen of Essex elsewhere (3.501) for no obvious reason.

Furthermore, *Epithalamium*, 10.185-88 reads as follows:

‘*Me tibi Plasseti viderunt confraga densi*

*Primitias studii composuisse mei;*

*Sed modo Parisius studiosa fractus in urbe*

*Ad te [Virginem] suspiro, quam paradisus habet.*’

Saiani quotes the gloss on ‘*Plasseti*’ from the version of *Epithalamium* which precedes *De triumphis* in MS Cotton Claudius A x, ‘*proprium nomen ville*’ and a gloss from another manuscript, ‘*confraga*’/ ‘thicket.’ He argues in the introduction to his edition that *plassetum* refers to the wooded state of John’s

---

28 *MS*, 215-16. ‘I’m not of royal or papal blood, but as an heir to the spirit [i.e. a priest] I lay claim to its gifts.’

29 *EBVM*, 10.


31 ‘The thickets of wooded Plassetum witnessed me putting together the foundations of my commitment (*studium*) to you (the Virgin). But now, crushed in Paris, the city of students, I sigh for you, who are in Paradise.’ Saiani however translates lines 185-6, ‘*La selva del folto Plasseto mi vide comporre per te l’inizio del mio lavoro.*’ The translation of *‘studium’* is clearly important. See also *PP*, 6.89-90, ‘*Sum de Plasseto; placido mihi corde placeto.*’
early home in the Clos de Garlande, reflected in the *Dictionnarius*,\(^{32}\) and contrasted here with the relatively urban environment in which he completed *Epithalamium* around 1248.

*Plassetum* however was also the present-day Pleshey, a village in Essex only 11km. from Gingia, and site of a castle,\(^ {33}\) briefly held by Savary de Mauléon, who captured it for King John in 1215. It is also worth noting that a Geoffrey de Garland witnessed a deed recording business in Ingatestone in 1224; the surname was already established in Gingia.\(^ {34}\) John enjoyed juxtaposing his French and English connections, and would have relished the conceit of his real name being the same as his Parisian toponym. Both the Essex and Berkshire theories are more persuasive than Dossat’s suggestion that John was born around Hereford, on the grounds that his possible patron was a local landowner, Hugh de Lacy.\(^ {35}\) We do not know when John moved to Paris. It could have been as early as 1209 (See p.18 above). Paetow examines the question in detail.\(^ {36}\) Previous theories\(^ {37}\) that he was there as early as 1204 were based on a faulty text of *Carmen de Misteriis Ecclesie*, 649-50, amended by editors since Otto (1842). Paetow thought it unlikely that he went to France before Prince Louis signed the Treaty of Lambeth in 1217, at the beginning of the reign of Henry III. This reasoning was presumably inferred from the turmoil of the times, but is inconclusive.

There is scant evidence on this elusive date. John’s *Dictionnarius* provides some help. It lists the words for the various items produced by tradesmen in Paris. John was clearly teaching there when he wrote it. He was also still young, though not quite so young as he suggests, ‘*Pene puer, pueris ostendi nomina rerum*’\(^ {38}\) He was, in the words of the gloss, ‘*iuvenis*’, and refers to himself several times in the *Dictionnarius* itself as ‘*magister*’. He was already producing teaching materials.

\(^{32}\) *Dictionnarius*, 75-78.

\(^{33}\) Red Book of the Exchequer, vol. 2, 498, ‘*Comes Essexae, Plissetum.*’ For Savary, see *DTE* 4.489-94 & n.125. He took the castle from Geoffrey de Mandeville, who died in a tournament in 1216. Geoffrey’s mother Beatrice was daughter of William de Say, mentioned in despatches as a crusader by John, *DTE*, 3.507-10, alongside John Berners, whose family held estates within walking distance of Gingia, at Roding Berners.

\(^{34}\) Chelmsford, Essex Record Office, MS D/DP T1/1550.

\(^{35}\) Dossat (1970), 185; see also n. 68 below.

\(^{36}\) Paetow, *MS*, Intro. 85-86 and n. 23.

\(^{37}\) Tanner (1746), 309 & Wright (1856), vi.

\(^{38}\) *AL*, 1500, a clear reference to the *Dictionnarius*, in a list of John’s works. Dickson (2007), 33-34, suggests a liberal interpretation of the age (legally 7-14) indicated by ‘*puer*,’ here clearly ironic.
There is no reason to doubt the scholarly consensus that the *Dictionnarius* was written around 1220. It refers to the death of Simon de Montfort at the siege of Toulouse (1218). Intriguingly, John says he personally saw the paraphernalia of the siege *‘nondum sedato tumultu belli.’* 39 This suggests that he might have made an early visit to Toulouse, perhaps even in response to a papal appeal in 1217.40 Even if, as Paetow believed, John did write the dictionary in Paris and its glosses in Toulouse, it does not follow that these references in the *Dictionnarius* were interpolated later. The paragraph is a dramatic and natural way of introducing a list of words related to sieges, especially if John had just been to Toulouse. Even if this were a later interpolation, why would John fabricate an earlier visit?41

In any case, at the time John wrote the *Dictionnarius*, he was established in his house in the Clos de Garlande with its garden and orchard.42 He became a teacher in Paris of the *trivium*, rhetoric, grammar and logic, though his prime emphasis was clearly on the first two. As well as the *trivium*, as a Master of Arts he would also have studied the *quadrivium*, comprising philosophy, mathematics, music and astronomy.43 His works, not least *De triumphis*, demonstrate that he developed a wide interest in all seven liberal arts.

In 1229 there was a strike at the *studium* of Paris, and a substantial exodus of scholars. John was selected by Élie Guerin, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Grand Selve, for a teaching post at Toulouse, at a *studium* newly established under the Treaty of Paris at the expense of the defeated Count Raymond VII of Toulouse.44 The purpose of the new *studium* was to counter the influence of the Cathar heresy through rigorous and intellectually advanced instruction45 in a Christian academic community. John was however forced to flee the city and its hostile citizens with the rest of the faculty in 1232, returning by a hazardous route to Paris. He resumed teaching in the Clos de Garlande. He made at least one

39 *Dictionnarius*, 49.
40 See p. 61 below.
41 See Hall (2013), 155 for further examination of this point. Holtz (2012), 289, pertinently asks why John would have sought permission of the legate at Bourges in 1225 to lecture on the *Epithalamium* in Toulouse if he was not already teaching there.
42 *Dictionnarius*, 75-79.
43 See Leff (1992) & North (1992), with their bibliographies, for the *trivium* and *quadrivium* respectively.
45 John points out that in Toulouse, in contrast with Paris, Aristotle could be freely studied.
voyage to England,\textsuperscript{46} and may have been a private tutor there.\textsuperscript{47} The latest dateable events in \textit{De triumphis} took place in 1252, and John’s last known writing can be pinned to 1257-9.\textsuperscript{48} The date of his death is unknown, though he probably died soon after that. Roger Bacon’s reference in 1267 to having heard John opine on a point of grammar means no more than that; there is no doubt that they overlapped in Paris, but the Latin does not allow us to conclude with Wright\textsuperscript{49} that John was alive then; still less to accept Paetow’s inference that he ‘probably was still alive in Paris about 1272.’\textsuperscript{50}

John identified himself throughout his works as a cleric, but we do not know if he was a member of a religious order. In Toulouse he came under the influence of the prominent Cistercians, Élie Guérin, abbot of Grand Selve, and Fulk, bishop of Toulouse.\textsuperscript{51} He also clearly knew and worked closely with the Dominicans during their early years there. He draws for inspiration several times on St. Bernard, but also cites SS. Benedict and Francis.\textsuperscript{52} These references show no more than an eclectic approach, and in the absence of defining evidence from his works it is probable that he was a lay cleric.

John explicitly had no noble sponsor for \textit{De triumphis}.\textsuperscript{53} Yet whatever his place in the hierarchy of the Church, he clearly had influential ecclesiastical contacts, sponsors and perhaps patrons, in England as well as France. It seems possible that as a young \textit{magister} he knew Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester and the most powerful of Henry III’s advisers at the time.\textsuperscript{54} In Toulouse, as well as the Cistercian bishop and the abbot of Grand Selve, he was evidently on good terms with Romano Bonaventura, the papal legate. He accompanied Romano on his retreat to the monastery of Our Lady of Rocamadour (near Quercy, Lot), and read the \textit{Epithalamium} to him at the Council of Bourges, on 30 November, 1225,

\textsuperscript{46} MS, 603.
\textsuperscript{47} See Paetow, \textit{MS}, Intro. 94 and nn. 53 and 54.
\textsuperscript{48} See p. 25-26 below.
\textsuperscript{50} Paetow, \textit{MS}, Intro., 96.
\textsuperscript{51} Guérin, \textit{DTE}, 5.271-74, 305-06; Fulk, 5.257-70, 6.15-16.
\textsuperscript{52} On Bernard of Clairvaux, see \textit{DTE} 4, nn. 70 & 87, 5, n. 28, 7, n. 101, 8, nn. 108, 192. Benedict, 1.103-06 & n. 40, 8.118 & n. 42; Francis, 1.47, 4.315-16.
\textsuperscript{53} \textit{DTE}, 8.21-22.
\textsuperscript{54} See pp. 17-18 above.
eliciting approval and the suggestion that he read it in Toulouse—as he later did.\footnote{55} In various works, John praises William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris (1228-1249),\footnote{56} as well as three chancellors of the University of Paris, Philip the chancellor (1218-36), Petrus Parvus (c. 1244-46) and Gautier of Château-Thierry (1246-49). Of itself this indicates little beyond paying respect to the ecclesiastical authorities, but use of their names suggests a degree of comfort on their part to be associated with John’s work. John Blund, Chancellor of York (\textit{flos pridem Parisiensis}) is fulsomely praised in \textit{Morale Scolarium} (1241), as is Fulk Bassett, later Bishop of London from 1244 to 1259.\footnote{57} There are glowing references in the last of John’s surviving works, \textit{Exempla honeste vite}, to Sir John Mansel (Maunsell), a favourite of Henry III who occupied several high ecclesiastical and secular offices; Philip Lovell, Henry’s treasurer (1252-58); Henry Wingham, chancellor (1255-60); and Peter de Rivallis, a relative of Peter des Roches.

It is more difficult to discover John’s contacts in the secular aristocracy. He specifically denies sponsorship in \textit{De triumphis}. It however interesting to note which magnates he praises. Prominent in their relevant contexts are Raymond VII of Toulouse (founder of the University of Toulouse) and Hugh X de Lusignan. Hugh especially is highly praised, ‘\textit{Non est Enea nec Diomede minor’}.\footnote{58} John condemns both men’s opposition to the king of France, but shows personal approval and some sympathy for their causes. Notably he records their deaths and laments their absence from Louis’ crusade, and commemorates their forebears’ honourable crusading records.\footnote{59} He remarks on the lineage of the Lusignan kings of Cyprus.\footnote{60} His \textit{Commentarius} (1246) appears to have been written for Aymer, Henry III’s half-brother and son of Hugh X de Lusignan and Isabella of

\footnote{55} \textit{DTE}, 5.275-78 & 6.25-28. See also Saiani, 25-26 and \textit{EBVM}, Prologue, 73-85, where John dedicates that work to Romano with flattering verses. The episode of the repentant Scholars (\textit{DTE} 6, n. 11) would have offered a good opportunity at Bourges for John to provide a counter-example). As Saiani points out, this was well before John’s appointment at the Toulouse \textit{studium}, and clearly relates to an early version of \textit{Epithalamium}. John took up Romano’s suggestion during his three years at the \textit{studium}, \textit{DTE}, 6.27-28.\footnote{56} For William, see \textit{Stella}, 496-501, \textit{DTE}, 8.79, \textit{MS}, 309; for Philip, \textit{CG}, 1.43-45; for Petrus, \textit{De misteriis}, 46, \textit{DTE}, 8.80; and for Gautier, \textit{Stella}, 913-915.\footnote{57} \textit{MS}, 89-90 & 629-36 respectively. For Fulk, see also \textit{De Misteriis}, 1-9.\footnote{58} \textit{DTE}, 1.287-88, 3.529-40.\footnote{59} Hugh IX and Hugh X, \textit{DTE}, 2. 41-42; Raymonds IV and VII, 2, 131-36\footnote{60} \textit{DTE}, 3.123-24.
Angoulême.\textsuperscript{61} The Lusignan family were well-placed to open doors in the English court. John singles out Simon de Montfort and his sons, Amaury and Simon, for their valour in the Albigensian Crusade.\textsuperscript{62} John and William des Barres, and Ralph Fitznicholas and his father receive similar treatment.\textsuperscript{63}

In his edition of Compendium Gramatice, Haye makes a strong case on internal evidence that Gilbert (1194-1241), third son of William Marshal who became Earl of Pembroke in 1234, may well have been the ‘Gilbertus’ named in that poem as John’s friend and probable patron.\textsuperscript{64} Gilbert died in a jousting accident in 1241. John does not mention him in De triumphis, but praises William Marshal\textsuperscript{65} as saviour of England from Prince Louis’ invasion. He inveighs bitterly against tournaments.\textsuperscript{66}

Also given honourable mention for valour, either in crusades or other wars, are Nicola de la Haye, Richard of Cornwall, William Longespée II, Hugh de Lacy, Roger Bigod, William de Say, John Berners, Henry of Hastings, Olivier de Termes and Robert of Artois. There is a more ambivalent reference to Richard de Clare.\textsuperscript{67} Dossat notes that Hugh de Lacy is the only crusader apart from the De Montforts singled out for praise in John’s account of the Albigensian Crusade, and may therefore have been a patron.\textsuperscript{68}

**John of Garland’s oeuvre**

This new edition relates De triumphis to many of John’s other works. Both Hauréau and Paetow have produced detailed catalogues of these, compendiously

\textsuperscript{61} Paetow (1923), 131.
\textsuperscript{62} For Amaury, see DTE, 5.53-56, 7.177-78, and for the younger Simon DTE, 3.455-56 & Exempla, 295.
\textsuperscript{63} DTE, 3.409-18 & 429-32.
\textsuperscript{64} CG,13-15. History of William Marshal, 14890-92 describes Gilbert as ‘Clers fu, de boen senz renommez / De bones mors, de boen afaire / Franz et gentilz et debonnaire.’ Henry III initially blocked Gilbert from inheriting his estate, but then relented, CM, 3.292, on the advice of Edmund of Canterbury, who is singled out for praise by John, DTE, 7.185-210.
\textsuperscript{65} DTE, 3.280-84.
\textsuperscript{66} DTE, 2.503-22. 2.283-84 is more sympathetic.
\textsuperscript{67} DTE, 3.445-46.
\textsuperscript{68} Dossat (1970), 185.
annotated. More recent scholars have made relatively minor modifications to their conclusions.

The *Dictionnarium* is generally regarded as John’s first work. Paetow places this as early as 1220, allowing for poetic exaggeration of John’s youth. Marguin-Hamon suggests the later 1220s, but before John’s move to Toulouse in 1229. She also places the *Parisiana Poetria* in these early years. This shows the influence of earlier ‘poetic-rhetorical’ writers such as Matthew of Vendôme and Geoffrey of Vinsauf. Saiani argues persuasively on literary and textual grounds that the *Epithalamium Beate Virginis Marie* also belongs to this period, against the previous consensus that it was at least begun in Toulouse. This long devotional poem is written in elegiacs like *De triumphis*.

After John’s return to Paris, he produced over the next two years or so a battery of grammatical works intended like most of his written work (though not *De triumphis*) for classroom use: *Ars Lectoria Ecclesie (Accentarius)*, in Paetow’s view John’s most influential grammatical work, *Compendium Grammatice*, comprising some 4000 hexameters, and *Clavis Compendii*. The influential *Integumenta Ovidii*, which offered allegorical interpretations of Ovid, also belongs to this period.

Thereafter, as far as we know, John’s output slowed. *Morale Scolarium*, a satirical guide in verse to student behaviour, was written around 1241; in *De Misteriis Ecclesie* (1245), John developed the symbolism of the physical church and of the liturgy. The *Commentarius* (1246), so far inedited, is a glossary of vocabulary relevant to the lives of the aristocracy and clergy. *Stella Maris*, or *Miracula Beate Marie Virginis*, (1248-9) is an 1155-line verse anthology of sixty-one traditional Marian myths and miracles. *Exempla Honestae Vitae* can be dated internally to 1257-59. It is a short verse account of rhetorical figures, and

---

69 Hauréau (1877), *MS*, Intro., 107-45. Also helpful is *CC*, Intro., vii-ix.
70 See pp. 20-21 above.
71 *CC*, vii.
72 *CC*, vii.
73 *EBVM*, 26, nn. 55, 56. See also n. 10 to *DTE* 6.27.below.
74 Paetow, *MS*, Intro., 12.
75 See Coulson (2011), 48-82.
76 Paetow, *MS*, Intro., 152.
77 *De Misteriis*, 639-42.
79 Wilson, *Stella*, Intro., 79.
John’s latest dateable work. Paetow regards references to Fulk, dean of York, and Sir John Mansel, chancellor of England (1246-48), as adding to ‘our indirect evidence that John of Garland may have taught the sons of English nobles during his visit(s) to England some time between 1232 and 1241.’

There is no dispute among scholars that John was the author of the works so far listed, and a broad consensus on their rough order of composition. There are a number of other works of more doubtful attribution, and I will now briefly evaluate these issues.

Authorship of two influential musical treatises attributed to John of Garland, *De plana musica* and *De mensurabili musica*, remains contested amongst experts. No-one doubts the name of their author. Waite identifies him with John of Garland the grammarian and poet, on several grounds including his enthusiasm for and technical knowledge of music, and stylistic similarities between the works in question and *De triumphis Ecclesie*. There is however a strong body of musicological opinion that these works must by their content be dated too late in the thirteenth century to have been written by the same John of Garland. In *De triumphis* John does not show a specialised knowledge of music beyond that he would have learned from Boethius’ *De institutione musica* during his studies as a Master. He does however show passion for music –though he reveals he did not sing well-- and allocates it a central role in the Toulouse curriculum. Jeserich and Marguin-Hamon independently, and for me persuasively, demonstrate the close link between John’s thinking on rhythm and metre in verse in the *Parisiana Poetria* and Boethius’ framework of music theory.

Further grammatical and lexicographical works have sometimes been attributed to John. He was so prolific and eminent in these fields that the archivists of manuscripts tended to credit him with works of doubtful authorship. In this category are *Cornutus or Distigium, Merarium, Equivoca, Synonima, Tractatus de...*
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80 Paetow, MS, Intro., 128.
81 W.G. Waite (1960), E. Reimer (1972), P. Whitcomb (1999), helpfully summarised by Duhamel (2012). The position is well put by Jeserich (2008, English version 2013), 261-62, ‘It has been debated whether the author of the *Parisiana Poetria* is identical with the music theoretician of the same name, similar birth and death dates, and same place of activity’…… ‘Research currently tends to assume that two different people were involved.’
82 *DTE*, 5.147-52 & 6.49-60.
84 Marguin-Hamon (2010b).
Aequivocis, Unum Omnium and Dictionarius Metricus. Three further poetical works popular in the Middle Ages and attributed to John were Facetus, Floretus and De contemptu Mundi, but his authorship was rejected by Hauréau and Paetow, whose view has not been challenged since. Paetow also doubted that John had commented on and revised the Doctrinale by Alexander de Villa-Dei, or the Grecismus of Eberhard of Béthune, popular grammar text-books of which he was highly critical. Colker and Grondeux respectively have however shown that he did in fact provide commentaries and revisions of both.

I would add to this ‘doubtful’ list Assertiones fidei, Gesta Apostolica and Georgica Spiritualia. Paetow used DTE, 6. 73-76 and 153-54 to support the case for their existence as separate works. The Assertiones and Georgica are otherwise attested only by thirteenth century glosses to MS Bruges 546. John in these lines of De triumphis appears simply to be describing his preaching materials, without any hint of additional works by himself. For the first two, the more prosaic explanation, that John is referring to a standard preaching manual and to the Acts of the Apostles -- or conceivably the section of De triumphis about the Apostles which follows -- would be the natural interpretation. As for the Georgica Spiritualia, the case for John’s authorship must rest only on Wilson’s ingenious research, without the support of DTE, 6.153-54, which appears to refer to the adjacent rubric about St. George and the following lines. It is altogether possible that the gloss itself was based in the first place on these lines of De triumphis.

John was very probably also the author of two now missing works on, respectively, the computus (calculation of the date of Easter), and on medical matters (Memoriale). John claims the Memoriale himself, and ‘in many manuscripts and almost all the old bibliographies’ he is credited with a work on computus. Although earlier scholars regarded this as a confusion with Gerlandus, yet another near-namesake of the twelfth century, De triumphis offers substantial evidence of John’s interest in this area, and suggests that he wrote
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86 Colker (1974); Grondeux (2000).  
87 Paetow, MS, Intro., 107-08, Marguin-Hamon, AL, 298.  
88 DTE, 6. 77-152.  
90 AL, line 1509, ‘Urine signa, morbos, medicamina scripsi.’ See also n. 19 above.  
91 Paetow, MS, Intro., 141. See DTE, 5, n. 31.
separately on the subject.\textsuperscript{92} He is however clearly not the author of Gerlandus’ work.

For the sake of completeness and to avoid confusion, Paetow lists a further seventeen variously attributed or mis-named works.\textsuperscript{93}


\textsuperscript{93} Paetow, \textit{MS}, Intro., 143-45.
Section 2: The manuscript tradition and previous scholarship

MS British Library Cotton Claudius A x

The only extant manuscript of *De triumphis Ecclesie* is London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius A x, ff. 68r-113v. It is probably French, but could be English. It is of parchment, comprising 115 folios, mostly double-sided, each 250 x 180 mm. Folios 1 and 2 are respectively medieval and early modern end-leaves. The contents are listed twice on f. 2. The first *catalogus* has been crossed out. Clearly in error, it lists the *Epithalamium*, followed by items numbered 2-5, *Orationes virtutum, De benevolentia, de triumphis Ecclesie* and *De Bellis Ecclesie contra Albigenses et de causis eorum*. A later hand has listed as the second item ‘Libri 8 Elegiacis versibus conscripti in quibus agitur de bellis Christianorum. de triumphis ecclesie. De cruce suscipienta. de expeditione Richardi primi Regis Angliae et Philippi Regis Francorum ad terram sacram. De bellis civilibus temporibus Regis Iohannis. De bellis Ecclesiae contra Albigenses haereticos et de causis eorum. De tractione studii Tholosani, etc. Autore nescio quo Iohanne qui viderit (sic) temporibus Regum antedictorum.’ At the top of f. 3 of the manuscript, which bears the signature of Robert Cotton (1571-1631) at its foot, the correct description appears, ‘*Epithalamium B. Mariae Virginis: autore Johanne de Garlandia. Eiusdem de triumphis Ecclesiae libri 8,*’ after deletion of ‘*De triumphis Ecclesie,*’ written in a different hand.

The first sixty-five substantive folios comprise one of the four extant versions of John’s *Epithalamium Beate Marie Virginis*, also in a single, different, mid- to late-thirteenth century hand. For *De triumphis*, the text and cramped instructions for rubrics are in a single hand, French or perhaps English, of the second half of the thirteenth century. Some draft rubrics are incomplete because at some point the folios have been trimmed. Rubrics were added in red perhaps towards the end

---

94 I am grateful to Tessa Webber and to Julian Harrison for their guidance on the provenance and dating of the manuscript. Wright also attributes it to the late thirteenth century.

95 For Saiani’s description of the first half of MS Cotton Claudius A x and the other MSS of the *Epithalamium* see EBVM, 207-29.
of the fourteenth or even early fifteenth century. Rubrication was not completed in the last book, and there are only a few original instructions in black, with black rather than red script in the later hand of the rubricator. There are only three explanatory glosses, and apart from the rubrication no evidence of contemporary or later use of the manuscript before the seventeenth century. The British Library catalogue describes the MS as ‘intact’; but folio 67 has suffered minor damage. This means that an important section of the Preface, lines 51-72, is impossible to reconstruct with confidence. The text is tightly and carefully written, with generous margins. It includes occasional corrections, probably by the scribe, full punctuation and a few graffiti, presumably by readers.

The margins of the text of De triumphis contain seven illustrations, some in black ink, others in colour. These are contemporary with the text, some at least probably by the same hand, and all are reproduced here (see list at p. 8).

John of Garland himself cannot be ruled out as the scribe. He clearly took a close interest in the instructions for rubrication, or capitula, and refers to the chapter headings in the text of the poem. The manuscript could well have been written in his lifetime. The text is, however, almost certainly not an autograph. In a few instances the scribe has made errors through not knowing the story; John would have been unlikely to get them wrong. These are most likely due to misheard dictation, whether by the author or by someone else. There are however several obvious instances and other possible cases where the lines are in the wrong order. This suggests that the scribe made errors in splicing together sections of written text produced at different times.

The colophon of the manuscript of De triumphis is in Latin incorrectly transliterated into a mixture of Byzantine Greek minuscule and majuscule script. This is a flourish by the scribe or the rubricator, or perhaps a reader, to celebrate
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96 One can only guess why rubrics were added so much later, perhaps amidst enthusiasm for the Nicopolis campaign (1396), when the bibliophile Duc de Berry, also count of Poitou, commissioned ‘Mélusine’ or ‘La noble histoire de Lusignan’ to revive the heroic crusading memory of the extinct Poitou line of the Lusignans (1392)? See Paul (2012), 88.

97 At DTE, 2.674, 4.362, 8.499.

98 See Preface, n. 3.

99 See DTE, 6.154 & nn. 50 & 51.

100 See for example emendations to DTE, Prologue.53 & 127, 1.95, 1.138, 3.652, 5.148 below, with footnotes.

101 See DTE, 3. 229-30 & 283-84, and 7.61-64, with explanatory footnotes.
finishing a long manuscript and to show off his learning (See Plate 10, p. 404).
There is no evidence that John himself understood Greek.

Nor is there any evidence of where this manuscript was, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth or seventeenth century. Saiani, following Wilson, considers that at least the Epithalamium section of this manuscript formed part of the library of St. Augustine of Canterbury, but there is no conclusive evidence that this was bound with De triumphis at that time. Thomas Minton, whose name appears on f. 115 v. may have been an early owner. What is now known as MS Cotton Claudius A x was previously the property of Henry Savile of Banke (1568-1617), a Yorkshire collector of manuscripts, and acquired from him by Sir Robert Cotton. Although it was recorded as missing from Cotton’s library in 1703, it clearly found its way back. Cotton’s library formed one of the founding collections of the British Museum in 1753.

The Rev. James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, and a friend of Cotton, mentions De triumphis Ecclesie by name in a work of 1613, and quotes extensively from it. There is a record of its loan to him in 1621 from Cotton’s library. Paetow does not mention Ussher’s interest. But he noted that the English bibliographer Thomas Tanner listed the work as John’s in 1748. Tanner summarises it from a reading of the rubrics. Other bibliographers both before Tanner, such as Leyser (1721) and after him, such as Fabricius (1754), reported finding John of Garland’s Epithalamium in Cotton Claudius A x, but did not also list De triumphis among his works. Nor did Rivet (1747). On the basis that De triumphis was not attributed to John in the manuscript itself until Cotton’s time, and then merely on an inside page of Epithalamium, only writers who looked beyond the end-leaf contents page would have made the connection.

Thomas Wright’s edition of 1856 and nineteenth century reactions.
Thomas Wright, a respected English scholar and antiquarian, ‘discovered’ the manuscript of De triumphis in the British Museum and shared it with other
scholars in 1842.\textsuperscript{106} He did not mention Ussher or Tanner. This same year, an edition of \textit{De misteriis Ecclesie} was published in Germany; this was clearly identified as written by John of Garland and could be dated internally to 1245.\textsuperscript{107} In 1846, Wright demonstrated that \textit{De triumphis} was also by John of Garland and written in the mid-thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{108} He provided Victor Le Clerc in Paris with a copy and the two enjoyed a competitive collaboration. Wright’s edition was published in 1856 by the Roxburghe Club.\textsuperscript{109} Wright mostly transcribed the manuscript accurately, and my debt to him is enormous. But he left many unintelligible passages unamended; often his errors occurred when he changed the text unnecessarily. His introduction and relatively few notes are often informative, but cannot be regarded as a full edition.

Further work on \textit{De triumphis} continued mainly in France. Le Clerc updated Rivet’s \textit{Histoire littéraire} even before Wright had published the text.\textsuperscript{110} Wright and Le Clerc established that there was a single ‘John of Garland,’ author of most if not all the grammatical and poetic works attributed to him.\textsuperscript{111} Forced to concede John’s Englishness, Le Clerc heavily criticised the style, composition and historicity of \textit{De triumphis}. Adolphe Gatien-Arnaud helpfully and more sympathetically pulled together in 1866 what was known about John of Garland in the Toulousain context.\textsuperscript{112} In 1877, Barthelémy Hauréau produced his compendious review of John of Garland’s works.\textsuperscript{113} He took account of the \textit{Exempla honestae vitae}, discovered in France in 1856, but was mostly content to rely on Le Clerc’s earlier work and critical judgments, particularly on \textit{De triumphis}.

\textbf{Louis J. Paetow}

The American historians influenced by Haskins and Munro interested themselves in the rediscovery of the classics (‘medieval renaissance’) in the thirteenth

\textsuperscript{106} See also the review by ‘Sylvanus Urban’ of ‘Middle Age Latin poetry,’ in \textit{The Gentleman’s Magazine}, 1838, 500-04, for a ‘leaked’ early reference.\textsuperscript{107} F. G. Otto (1842) ed., \textit{Johannes de Garlandia de mysteriis Ecclesiae: Commentarii critici in codices Bibliothecae Academicae Gissensis}, (Giessen, 1842). See now \textit{CME}, 640-43.\textsuperscript{108} Wright (1846), vol. 1, 176-217.\textsuperscript{109} A bibliophile society, established in 1812. This volume was published at the initiative and expense of the Earl of Powis.\textsuperscript{110} Leclerc, (1847), 369-72, and (1852), 11-13, 77-103, 948-50.\textsuperscript{111} For a useful account of confusions over John’s identity, see Paetow, \textit{MS}, Intro., 96-98.\textsuperscript{112} Gratien-Arnault (1866).\textsuperscript{113} Hauréau (1877).
century, and their perceived relevance to their own post-war world. John of Garland fascinated Louis J. Paetow, a pupil of Munro.\(^{114}\) In his splendid commentary to *Morale Scolarium*,\(^{115}\) he collated the known facts about John’s life, and reviewed the works attributed to him, greatly advancing earlier French scholarship. Paetow’s central theme was John’s defence of the humanities against the growing influence of more commercially-oriented subjects, especially law. In *The Crusading Ardor of John of Garland*, published in 1928, he examined *De triumphis Ecclesie* from the viewpoint of a crusades historian.\(^{116}\) This perceptive review has been regarded ever since as definitive.\(^{117}\) Paetow recognised however that his work on *De triumphis* was incomplete: ‘Before the poem can be fully utilised for historical purposes it must be re-edited with an abundance of linguistic, literary and historical notes. This can probably best be done after we have critical editions of all the inedited works of John of Garland.’\(^{118}\) That condition is not yet wholly satisfied, but enough progress has been made to attempt an edition and to place the work in context.

Notwithstanding Paetow’s efforts to rehabilitate *De triumphis Ecclesie*, its off-putting Latin, Wright’s sometimes unintelligible text, and nineteenth-century French derision have deterred subsequent study. To make matters worse *De triumphis*, as a limited Roxburghe Club edition,\(^{119}\) was itself a rare book until it became digitally available.

**More recent scholarship**

Modern interest in John’s work has been largely in his contributions to the development of pedagogy, lexicography and rhetoric, and to Marian literature. Excellent modern texts have emerged (often with translations) of many of his other works. Ghisaberti’s *Integumenta Ovidii* appeared in 1933, Wilson’s *Stella Maris* in 1946, Reimer’s *De Mensurabili Musica* in 1972, Lawler’s *Parisiana Poetria* in 1974, Saiani’s *Epithalamium Beate Virginis Marie* and Haye’s *Compendium Gramatice* in 1995, Marguin-Hamon’s *Ars Lectoria Ecclesie* and *Clavis Compendii* in 2003 and 2008 respectively, and Könsgen’s *Carmen de*...
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\(^{114}\) Munro was ‘the founder of crusade history in the United States,’ Bird, Peters & Powell (2013), xi.

\(^{115}\) Paetow, *MS*, 69-258.

\(^{116}\) Paetow (1928).

\(^{117}\) E.g. Jackson, 6, n. 24.

\(^{118}\) Paetow (1928), 209.

\(^{119}\) See, however, Jackson (2007), 175-76, for brief translated extracts.
Misteriis Ecclesie in 2004. Marguin-Hamon usefully listed extant manuscripts of John’s works in 2006.\textsuperscript{120} Three years later, she published with Grondeux a review of John’s grammatical works, opening up new thinking on the modus operandi of the Paris schools.\textsuperscript{121} Although it takes no account of De triumphis, Holtz’ essay of 2012 takes a strongly positive view of John’s work, ‘Dès ses premières œuvres, il se révèle un poète, un penseur ayant une vision large et synthétique de l’histoire et de la place de la culture dans l’histoire, bref, une vision humaniste fondée sur une foi profonde.’\textsuperscript{122} Rachel Fulton Brown is currently working on an English translation of Epithalamium.

The major surveys of medieval Latin poetry, notably those of Faral, Raby and Rigg, all took account, not always favourably, of De triumphis in Wright’s edition.\textsuperscript{123} Smith looked in detail at the ‘prospectus’ for the University of Toulouse (\textit{DTE}, 6.365-435) in 1958.\textsuperscript{124} Dossat usefully reviewed the evidence on John’s life and works in 1970, observing that ‘Le \textit{De triumphis Ecclesie} est sans doute l’œuvre maîtresse de Jean de Garlande.’\textsuperscript{125} Yet despite the recent popularity of crusades studies, \textit{De triumphis Ecclesie} as a whole has received scarcely any attention. A notable exception was the late Professor Paul Gerhardt Schmidt, who for many years planned a critical edition.\textsuperscript{126} He did in fact publish an edited text of the ‘Toulouse prospectus’.\textsuperscript{127} Gregory Hays has generously made available to me his recent unpublished work on the manuscript and on John’s use of Vergil and Lucan in \textit{De triumphis}. Yet because of its continuing inaccessibility, this poem has remained more widely unfamiliar.

\textsuperscript{120} Marguin-Hamon (2006).
\textsuperscript{121} Grondeux & Marguin-Hamon (1999).
\textsuperscript{122} Holtz (2012).
\textsuperscript{123} Faral (1924), 41, Raby (1953), vol. 2, 385-389, Rigg (1992), 174-76.
\textsuperscript{124} C. E. Smith (1958), 1-55.
\textsuperscript{125} Dossat (1970), 188.
\textsuperscript{126} He wrote several short articles, which show a lively understanding of the work. These are listed in the bibliography.
\textsuperscript{127} Schmidt (1998a).
Section 3: *De triumphis Ecclesie*

**Summary of poem**

*De triumphis Ecclesie* is a Latin elegiac poem of 4602 lines (plus the prose ‘Toulouse prospectus’), in eight books of varying lengths. A summary follows:

**Preface.** The poem is dedicated to the praise of Christ, the Virgin and Cross, and to the victory, kingdom and glory of the Church. It is a heroic chronicle of the deeds (*gesta*) of the Cross, and of its champions, the kings of France. Lasting peace is elusive. It is postponed by fighting amongst Christians, especially between France and England. They should be united against Muslims and heretics. The innocent suffer in conflicts, but just war and martyrdom against enemies of the Cross are glorious. Righteous leaders are traduced by slanderers and turncoats. The world is beleaguered because of mankind’s inherent sinfulness, but the Church is on its way to victory.

**Prologue.** John loosely describes the contents of the poem and his literary technique.

**Book 1.** John denounces territorial wars, and traces Anglo-French hostility to disputes between Kings Richard I and Philip II (*Augustus*) at Acre, and the revolt of Hugh X de Lusignan against Louis IX. Queen Blanche seeks peace, but Christendom and the Church are assailed by their enemies. There is a call to arms in defence of the Holy Land. Muhammad will pay the price for his sins. John digresses on the signs of the zodiac.

**Book 2.** There are further appeals to the kings of England and France to stop fighting each other and attack the Infidels. Tracing recent disharmony, John returns to Hugh de Lusignan’s rebellion, supported by Henry III, and his submission to Louis IX (1241-2). He empathises with the sufferings of the rural population, and denounces corruption in the Church. The book contains a fragmented ‘exhortatio de cruce suscipienda’, and *exempla* of English and French saints. There are digressions on the weather and on English and French national qualities.

**Book 3** examines tensions between Richard and Philip during the Third Crusade (1189-91). John focuses on Richard’s exploits, capture and death. He then briefly remembers his former teacher, John of London, before reporting the unsuccessful
alliance between the Emperor Otto and King John against Philip II, and the battle of Bouvines (1214). King John’s excommunication, campaigns and death are followed by the invasion of England by Prince Louis and his defeat by William Marshal at the siege of Lincoln (1217). The poem returns to Henry III’s Poitevin campaign and the battles of Saintes and Taillebourg (1242).

**Book 4.** John moves on to the Albigensian Crusade, which spans Books 4 and 5. He uniquely recounts the alleged murder by Roger II Trencavel of the bishop of Albi, for seducing his wife. He describes the ‘martyrdom’ of Peter of Castelnau (1208), and laments the diversion of resources needed to recover the Holy Land. John criticises the Crusaders’ capture of Béziers and Carcassonne and the death of Raymond-Roger Trencavel, Roger II’s successor. The battle of Muret (1213) is treated as a set piece featuring Simon de Montfort’s heroism and the death of King Peter II of Aragon. John vividly describes the siege of Toulouse (1218). Book 4 also touches on the Cathar and Waldensian heresies.

**Book 5** gloomily invokes the Virgin and continues with the siege of Toulouse, ending with de Montfort’s death (1218). The death of Louis VIII and Louis IX’s accession (1226) follow. Raymond VII commits under the Treaty of Paris (1229) to take the Cross and endow the *studium* of Toulouse. There are digressions on the *computus* and on Charlemagne. John includes a biography of Fulk, bishop of Toulouse, and tributes to the other founders of the *studium*, Élie Guerin and the Legate Romano. The book ends with the prose ‘prospectus letter’ for the *studium*.

**Book 6** covers John’s three years’ teaching in Toulouse (1229-1232). He records his completion of *Epithalamium* and reading it to the legate at the Council of Bourges (1225); and describes the curriculum at Toulouse. He notes the establishment of the Dominicans in Toulouse and the decline of the *studium*. John escapes from Toulouse in 1232, and after a hazardous journey returns to Paris. Then follow the papal interregnum of 1241-3, Frederick II’s harassment of the bishops, and the election of Innocent IV as pope (1243). The Mongol invasions of 1241-42 are presented as divine punishment for man’s original sin.

**Book 7** catalogues Mongol excesses, aided by the Cumans and Jews. John notes the death of Edmund of Canterbury (1240). The Council of Lyon (1245) and Innocent IV’s deposition of Frederick II follow; John recounts Louis IX’s final
reconciliations with opponents in France; his fever and taking of the Cross (1244) with his two brothers; the building of Sainte Chapelle; and popular enthusiasm for a crusade to recover Jerusalem, sacked in 1244.

**Book 8** reminds the reader of John’s classical forbears, and his unworthiness as a poet, as a preface to Louis’ Egyptian expedition. John warns of hazards lying in wait. He recounts the fleet’s departure from Aigues Mortes, wintering in Cyprus, and Louis’ occupation of Damietta; his defeat at Mansourah, followed by capture, imprisonment, ransoming and miraculous release. He praises Louis’ subsequent consolidation in the Holy Land, and speculates on a possible alliance with the king of Egypt against the Sultan of Aleppo. The narrative ends hoping that the kings of Spain and England will carry on Louis’ fight. John calls for a new crusade and looks forward to glorious victory at the Apocalypse. The poem ends with a summary of ten numbered points.

**Date of composition**

*De triumphis Ecclesie* was not a single continuous piece of writing. It appears to comprise material written throughout John’s adult life. In the *Ars Lectoria*, firmly dated 1234, he refers to his fourth ‘*libellum*’ as ‘*gesta revolvens / Ecclesie, celebresque Deo sub rege triumphos*’, undoubtedly an earlier version of *De triumphis Ecclesie*. It was not uncommon for John to revise works he had already ‘published.’ Where John leaves clues, the footnotes to this edition examine the evidence for dating particular sections.

Apart from references to the distant past, and occasional mention of the first two crusades, the events in *De triumphis* occurred during John’s lifetime. The Third Crusade, and the reigns of Richard I and John, took place while he was a boy. He refers to ‘*mirandaque mundo / Gesta crucis nostri que meminere senes*.’ This could still refer to Third Crusade veterans if written in the 1220s, and the possibilities multiply if it was composed later. Certainly John’s account of that crusade and of Richard’s reign appears self-contained and based on the same or

---

128 *AL*, 1505.
129 Echoed in *DTE*, Prologue.85.
130 E.g. *Dictionnarius, Epithalamium, Parisiana Poetria*, all of which have been difficult to date. See Wilson (1933), 361, n. 2, Lawler, *PP*, Intro., xv. These poems were all named with *De triumphis* in this same passage of *Ars Lectoria*, as John’s first four (youthful) books.
131 *DTE*, Prologue.17-18
similar Latin and Old French sources as we rely on today. Only the Albigensian Crusade seems to owe anything to personal testimony. John says little about domestic developments in England or France unless they also relate to the other country. He probably wrote his account of the Third Crusade and the deeds of Richard I early in his career and before French influences grew stronger. His coverage of selected events from the reigns of Philip II and John, together with the first references to Frederick II and the pope, can also be tentatively dated to this period.

John’s account of the Albigensian Crusade is likewise continuous and self-contained and mostly reflects other written sources, both Latin and vernacular. On the other hand, his coverage of the siege of Toulouse in 1218 is vivid and seems to reflect recent first-hand observations—perhaps heard on a visit soon afterwards (see Introduction, 20-21). This section may well have been written before John taught in Toulouse from 1229-1232. So too perhaps were some of the exempla covering the lives of the saints and apostles, used as preaching material in Toulouse. The prose ‘prospectus letter’ has been generally assumed to be John’s work, and there is no reason to disagree. It was composed in 1229 or shortly after. John’s lively coverage of his years in Toulouse, his denunciation of heretics and innuendo-ridden account of his journey back to Paris were probably written shortly after his return.

There is extensive coverage of the years 1241-42, suggesting intensive writing around that time. John deals with the Mongol incursions (1241-42) in Books 6 and 7, and with Henry III’s invasion of Poitou (1242) in two sections, in Books 2 and 4. He revisits the papal-imperial dispute to cover the seizure of the bishops in 1241 and the papal interregnum, as well as Louis IX’s purchase of relics from Constantinople and construction of Sainte Chapelle to house them. John himself tells us he was writing De triumphis in Paris at around the time of the Council of Lyon (1245), and there are obvious new elements which he appears to have added then, not least a partial account of the Council itself. Clearly a substantial portion of the poem was written in the first half of the 1240s.

132 Principally, but not exclusively, the Itinerarium. These are cited as appropriate in the footnotes to the edition.
133 DTE, 8.69-70.
134 DTE, 7.479-90, 8.77-80.
The earlier books lead up to John’s narrative of Louis IX’s illness, crusading vow and preparations for the Seventh Crusade (1244-48). Much of the writing is triumphalist and anticipatory of victory. John clearly expected to record Louis’ recapture of Jerusalem. But from the landing in Damietta onwards there are hints of Louis’ looming defeat.\(^{135}\) John deals rapidly with the battle of Mansourah and ends his historical account on an upbeat note. Queen Blanche, who died on 27 November 1252 was still alive. Louis IX was in the Holy Land when John stopped recording new events. All this suggests that he ended work on this poem in 1252 at the latest.

*De triumphis* contains two separate *excitationes*, appealing for support for a new crusade. One comes early in the work,\(^{136}\) and appears in fragmented lines and couplets which obviously form part of it over much of Book 2. It has only minor affinities with the *excitatio* in *Parisiana Poetria*,\(^{137}\) a rhetorical exercise which Lawler relates to the Fifth or Sixth Crusade. *DTE*, 2.285 refers to ‘*Ludovicum,*’ and this *excitatio* best fits the years prior to the Seventh Crusade when Louis IX was distracted by wars and then seeking allies. *DTE*, 8.531-34 picks up the same theme, addressed to preachers, and refers to the same countries as potential recruiting grounds. It seems to be about the Seventh Crusade but to have been left unaltered after the king’s defeat as an appeal for fresh support in Egypt.

In short, John probably wrote the text we have in bursts of activity in the early 1220s, in Toulouse and soon after his return to Paris (1229-34), leading to a first version; and then a further phase in 1241-1245, and thereafter as events unfolded from 1248 to 1252, when he abruptly stopped. The concept of definitive ‘publication’ is unhelpful.

**An unfinished work**

Thus, even though many sections are elaborately crafted, in some respects *De triumphis Ecclesie* shows signs of haste and is clearly unfinished. Take, for a start, the number of books. John praises the special quality of the number nine, and tells

\(^{135}\) *DTE*, 8.204-05.

\(^{136}\) *DTE*, 2.275-90. See Book 2, n. 81.

\(^{137}\) *PP*, 4.207-84.
us that the poem has nine books. The scribe’s draft rubric for the heading of Book 7 gives its number unequivocally. The third line of the next book, eighth and clearly final, introduces it as the ninth. The remaining initial draft rubrics are cropped illegibly. The books have been numbered consecutively by the later rubricator, from first to eighth. In Book 8, however, space was left for an embellished initial capital and book title, but with no draft rubric. So it is possible that the real Book 8 is missing. John may have planned to insert it, but in his rush failed to do so. This could also explain why there are only a few draft rubrics in the last book—the scribe was awaiting the penultimate book before rounding off his work. Another, less likely hypothesis is that the Exhortatio ad Crucem suscipiendam, with no apparent initial draft rubric, but given its title by the rubricator, was intended to be Book 3, given that the scribe left space for a capital letter to start.

There are various relevant topics a missing book might have covered. It is no surprise that except en passant John omits the First and Second Crusades; his plan was to focus on the events of his own lifetime. In the Epithalamium, John says he intends elsewhere to give a full account of the Fifth Crusade. There is however no such description in De triumphis, or elsewhere in John’s works. John may indeed have planned such a book, which would have fitted well as a precursor to the Seventh Crusade. He hints at writing a more universal history, but only the first few lines of Book 6 show any hint of this. Major domestic events in England and France such as Magna Carta (1215) and the Crusade of the Pastoureaux (1251) are omitted, but lacked John’s Anglo-French focus. The end of Book 7 describes the contents of the various books. After Books 1 and 2, ‘Ordo sequens prelia seva movet. / Sanctorum monstratur his victoria, mundi / Corruptela, scelus, pompa, ruina, dolus. / Historiis satiras et gesta tragedica iunxi, Hec ut
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138 DTE, Prologue.119. On this aspect of Robert the Monk’s Historia Iherosolimitana, the most widely read account of the First Crusade, see Sweetenham’s translation, Intro., 63-64.

139 This would not escape the problem posed by the draft rubric for Book 7.

140 EBVM, 4.103-04, ‘Hec alias alio dixi pede plenius aptans / historiam, causas in nova bella canens.’ This implies however that he had already written an account in hexameters, not the distichs (couplets) of both Epithalamium and De Triumphis.

141 Except the brief moral tale at DTE, 7.165-76.

142 DTE, Prologue.99-100, & n. 37.

143 John defines satire, ‘in qua recitantur malefacta, causa correctionis,’ and tragedy as ‘carmen quod incipit a gaudio et terminatur in lactum,’ both subdivisions of ‘historicum,’ PP, 5.359-66, with Lawler’s notes.
venturi singula vera legant.’ / ‘the following sequence sets fierce battles in
motion; through these are displayed the victory of the saints, and earthly
corruption, crime, pride, destruction and deceit. I have conjoined satires and tragic
deeds with these historical accounts, so that people to come can read these true
facts one by one.’ 144 This could indicate a missing eighth book of further
anecdotes of the saints and their adversaries. The opening of Book 8 does not
provide the answer: ‘Est liber hic nonus qui cum preeuntibus octo/ Ecclesie
laudes, bella, tropeha canit.’ 145 Reading ‘novus’ for ‘nonus’ does not help.

There are numerous passages, identified in footnotes to the text, which contain
internal evidence of having been written at different times without any attempt at
overall synchronisation. The section headed Exhortatio de cruce suscipienda, and
what appears to be a tribute to William Marshal, 146 are in fragmentary form,
though this could be due to errors of transcription rather than editing.

The poem contains three separate and inconsistent versions of its contents. The
Preface and Prologue taken together provide its accessus. The Preface points
forward to a ‘summa libelli,’ presumably the Prologue, to enable the attentive
listener (‘auditor docilis’) to grasp the whole work and John’s reasons for writing
it. He immediately offers a brief high-level synopsis in lines 33-50 of the Preface,
emphasising the role of the kings of France as Christian champions and the
debilitating effect of internecine disputes. A much fuller description, ‘with the
headings and the paragraphs corresponding to them’ takes up most of the
Prologue (11-126). This is accompanied by the Arabic numerals 1-16 in the
margin of the manuscript, in a fourteenth century hand, perhaps that of the
rubricator. They relate only loosely to the subject matter and order of the poem,
but contain a good deal about John’s literary and stylistic approach, as well as
some events outside the poem’s scope.

The summa at the end lists points numbered (i) - (x) in Roman numerals, probably
also in a fourteenth century hand. 147 This second numbered list could be an earlier
catalogue of books John intended to include in a poem planned to celebrate Louis
IX’s anticipated victory in the Holy Land. Counting the first numbered point as

144 DTE, 7.495-500.
145 DTE, 8.3-4.
146 DTE, 3, nn. 71 & 88.
147 DTE, 8.571-90.
corresponding to the *accessus*, these could have been John’s nine books. He may have intended longer treatment in separate books of the relics and Sainte Chapelle, listed as points (ii) and (iii), which were key elements of Louis’ preparations for crusade. John’s long digression on the sea emphasises the risks involved in mounting a maritime expedition. Numbered points (iv)-(x) follow the order and subject matter of books 3-8. Neither the numbering of the points in the two lists nor the selection of topics coincides.

Some earlier episodes, notably Henry III’s invasion of Poitou in 1242, are repetitive. And while many component parts are carefully honed, clearly time was not taken to edit them into a seamless whole. The content suggests further possible reasons for haste. John hints at his own mortality, failing health and uncomfortable old age, though in the event he lived at least to write *Exempla Honeste Vite* in 1258. We also know from other sources that Louis IX’s defeat led to questioning of faith and to serious popular unrest, manifested in 1251 in the crusade of the Pastoureaux.

As already noted, several passages read as though they were written in anticipation of Louis IX’s confidently expected victory in the Holy Land. The king’s defeat was a sudden as it was unexpected, and John’s account of it was written in some haste. The king and the Church lost no time in trying to explain events. The political imperatives of Louis’ debacle emerge strongly in John’s poem, though we do not know whether he was officially encouraged to finish quickly. *De triumphis* puts the most optimistic face on this contemporary catastrophe which jolted French society. It is an appeal for refreshed faith and renewed crusade, urgently overlaid on the unifying didactic theme -- that the continuing weakness of Western Christendom lay in its chronic divisions, as well as its sinful state.

**John’s audience**

It is worth asking to whom *De triumphis* is addressed. Only one manuscript survives; it is ironic that a work on which John expended such pains throughout his life should have been so little read or commented upon. It made no apparent
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148 *DTE*, 2.17, 7.403-04 & 491-92, 8.493-94 & 569-70
149 See Jackson (2007), 175-77. On the Pastoureaux, see Barber (1984), and Jackson (2007), 179-93.
impact on John’s contemporaries and the unedited text lay undiscovered for so long. There are no references to it outside John’s own writing until the seventeenth century. The manuscript has only three very minor glosses. As noted above, no individual addressee is identified in this poem.150

John addresses his readers several times, as either ‘lectores’ or ‘auditores.’151 On one occasion he harangues ‘Doctores legis,’ / ‘teachers of canon law,’152 to go and ‘spread the words of the Cross.’ In the Exhortatio he is appealing to potential crusaders, referred to as ‘Crucesignati’ or ‘Crucis baiuli.’ The crusading theme is supported throughout by passages on the imagery of the Cross.153 John says he is writing to enlighten his ‘socios’ / ‘friends’ on ‘res ignota’ / ‘unfamiliar subject matter,’ at their persistent request.154 It is impossible to rule out a purely rhetorical intent; but much of this is written with real passion. John’s outrage at the excesses of war and at Western Christendom’s inability to unite suggest a need to be heard. A similar sense emerges through his indignation at the scant rewards for his literary efforts and from his passionate religious outbursts.155

Perhaps the explanation lies in the text itself; even by contemporary standards, its style and language were accessible to few. The words are contrived and often archaic, and the messages, especially where candour might be unwise, are often ambiguous. In this regard, John hints that he is sailing dangerously near the wind. He compares himself with Ovid, Seneca and Boethius, who suffered official disfavour for their writings.156 The poem is packed with literary allusions, and John’s writing never wholly escapes that of the grammatical and rhetorical handbook. Versus retrogradi, leonines, rhetorical figures, and laborious etymologies do not make for fine poetry. It is in short addressed to the well-
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150 See pp. 22-24 above.
151 For ‘lectores’ see n. 234 below; ‘audire’ was another word for ‘studere,’ Weijers (1987), 283-86. John clearly expected his audience both to read his work, and to have it read to them. On the medieval expectation of listening rather than silent reading, see Clanchy (2013), esp. 268-72.
152 DTE, 8.532.
153 e.g., DTE, Preface.11-14, Prologue.13-14, 1.45-50, 2.580-600 and 862-93, 4.255-60, 8.117-18 & 147-65. See Gaposchkin (2017), 55-59 for the importance of the imagery of the Cross in crusading liturgy, and the role of that liturgy sustaining the momentum of crusading itself.
154 DTE, Prologue.1. ‘Socii’ may just mean ‘friends’ or ‘academic colleagues,’ but in an academic context ‘socii mei’ are often ‘fellow students,’ Weijers (1987), 168-69, 265-66.
155 DTE, 8.21-30
156 DTE, 8.115-16, 123-34.
educated and politically aware. It seeks to reassure and exhort, but also to entertain John’s peers, clerics and fellow-scholars.
Section 4: Literary influences and sources

Just as the events in John’s own life and in the world around him helped shape the content and composition of *De triumphis*, so the changing literary and cultural environment influenced its style.

The medieval epic tradition

Several major Latin epic poems were written in the late twelfth century. Now regarded as the most accomplished of their authors was Joseph of Exeter, whose *Bellum Troianum* was written in the 1180s, in hexameters of a pure late Silver Latin style. Other important examples were Walter of Châtillon’s *Alexandreis* (*c.* .1178-79), Alan of Lille’s *Anticlaudianus* (*c.* .1182) and John of Hauteville’s *Architrenius* (*c.* .1184), a celebrated account of the poverty of scholars.\(^{157}\) Clerical writers in the thirteenth century were well-versed in the epic tradition of Vergil, Ovid, Statius and Lucan. They also knew the works of Homer via free adaptations into Latin.\(^{158}\)

There was also a robust vernacular epic tradition. This began with the *Chanson de Roland*, though John’s knowledge of that particular story seems to come exclusively via the Latin version *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi* (Pseudo-Turpin).\(^{159}\) This tradition continued with stirring accounts of the First Crusade, like the *Chanson d’Antioche*. Several Latin epics also covered the First Crusade. Gilo of Paris wrote the *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane* largely in hexameters early in the twelfth century, and there were other First Crusade epics through the twelfth century.\(^{160}\) After returning from the Third Crusade in the 1190s, Joseph of Exeter wrote a crusade epic, *Antiocheis*, now mostly lost. Other Latin poems were also written about the Third Crusade.\(^{161}\) So too was the Old French ‘*L’Estoire de la Guerre Sainte.*’

---

\(^{157}\) See bibliography for editions of these works.


\(^{159}\) DTE, 3.327-36, 5.181-95. Another medieval Latin account of the Roland story was the anonymous thirteenth century *Carmen de proditione Guenonis*, written in distichs.

\(^{160}\) E.g. Metellus of Tegernsee’s *Expeditio Ierosolimitana* in mid-century, and Gunther of Pairis’ *Solimarius*, *c.* .1186.

By the time of John’s longer poems, the literary tide had turned. ‘The middle ages produced only one Joseph of Exeter’, Raby tells us, ‘We have reached the beginnings of the thirteenth century……… The truth is that Latin secular poetry had no longer any real reason for existing.’162 The vernacular languages became the usual medium for large-scale poetry. *De triumphis Ecclesie* was already out of tune with evolving literary tastes. Its very form and style were a self-conscious defence of classical culture which John felt to be under threat in the schools of Paris.163 Rhythm and rhyme were replacing the strict rules of classical prosody, and even the grammarian John of Garland did not rigorously follow the rules of scansion.

John was not a lone voice. Egidius Parisiensis presented five books of Latin hexameters, the *Karolinus*, to the future Louis VIII in 1200. It offered Charlemagne as an ancestor and model to the young prince. In 1225, William le Breton, chaplain to Philip II, produced the *Philippide*, an adulatory Latin epic in twelve books of hexameters. It is however difficult to discern direct literary influence of these works on *De triumphis*, or homage to their authors.

**An elegiac epic**

John clearly thinks of *De triumphis Ecclesie* as an epic. His analogies are with Vergil’s Aeneid, and with Homer.164 In *Parisiana Poetria*, John describes in some detail the late classical ‘rota Virgilii’,165 which prescribes and illustrates different styles, roughly equating to the ‘Aeneid’, ‘Georgics’ and ‘Eclogues’; ‘high’, ‘middle’ and ‘low’ to portray respectively ‘curiles’/‘courtiers,’ ‘civiles’/‘city dwellers,’ and ‘rurales’/‘country folk’. He sees ‘De triumphis’ as properly a ‘carmen grande’166 and its subject matter as ‘reges et bella’,167 The tragic Muse, Melpomene, draws him on to describe such glorious deeds, but he nevertheless chooses to write in elegiacs rather than hexameters, traditional for epic poetry.
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162 Raby (1957), vol. 2, 341.
163 e.g. MS, 223, DTE, 4.343.
164 See Marguin-Hamon (2010) for a fuller account of parallels between *De triumphis* and the ‘Aeneid’, as part of her analysis of John’s writing against the yardstick of his own ‘principles of style’.
165 PP, 2.116-27. See also *Ad Herennium*, 4.8.11, for the rhetorical classification into three styles, ‘unam gravem, alteram mediocrem, tertiam extenuatam.’
166 DTE, 3.690-92.
John’s reasoning is that the unpleasantness of internecine war debases heroic deeds. Elegiacs limp along with long and short lines, and are more suited to events which are sad, rather than tragic. John’s tone is altogether more nuancé than William le Breton’s, who saw hexameters as the only possible style for the heroic deeds he believed he was narrating. De triumphis breaks the rules comprehensively, containing as it does epic tales from Arthur’s England and Charlemagne’s France, current descriptions of rural life and court intrigue, and the almost slapstick account of John’s encounters with low life during his escape from Toulouse.

Yet within this chosen metre and hybrid style, John injects variations in apparently random fashion, incorporating lines from songs and hymns, and from other works of his own. Leonine verses (with double internal rhymes) appear, along with versus retrogradī / palindromes. A section of prose is consciously introduced as a diversion for the reader at the end of Book 5. The combination of verse and prose had influential precedents, notably Alan of Lille’s De Planctu Nature, (1160s) but also the early Cosmographia (1140s) of Bernardus Sylvesteris. Alliteration and puns are commonplace. So too is the whole range of rhetorical figures. They serve to provide variety and demonstrate the poet’s virtuosity. These conventionally include Diminutio / understatement; John disparagingly compares himself with the most popular classical poets, Vergil, Ovid, Statius and Lucan ‘as a dwarf following the footsteps of Hercules, perhaps as terebinth aping ivory.’

**John’s literary sources**

John knew these four classical epic poets intimately, and had recourse to the full range of the works of all four, especially Ovid and Vergil. As with medieval biblical references, ‘quotation’ is too strong a word for a process sometimes close
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168 DTE, 3.3-4.
169 Philippide, 1.17-18.
170 DTE, 2.691-711; 3.13-26; 5.147-228; 6.241-42. For a technical explanation of leonines, see Wright’s introduction to The ‘Historia Regum Britannie’ of Geoffrey of Monmouth (Woodbridge, 1988-96), vol. 5, xciii-xcvi.
171 DTE, 2.715-19, 7.79-82 & 83-86.
172 DTE, 5.364-65.
173 PP, 6.71-393 is John’s own catalogue of figures. See also the ‘Index of Latin terms’ in Copeland and Sluiter (2009), 922-37 for a useful list with definitions.
174 PP, 6.329-31
175 DTE, 8.19-20.
to the often unconscious use of biblical or Shakespearean phrases in modern English. The following table lists the frequency of references\(^{176}\) which I have identified to the works of classical authors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Works/Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ovid (59)</td>
<td>Metamorphoses (20), Fasti (14), Tristia (7) Amores (7), Remedia Amoris (3) Heroides (3) Elegiae (2) Epistolae ex Ponto (2) Ars Amatoria (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergil (41)</td>
<td>Aeneid (29), Georgics (8), Eclogues (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucan (22)</td>
<td>De Bello Civili (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace (10)</td>
<td>Odes (4), Ars Poetica (3), Sermones (2), Epistolae (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius (8)</td>
<td>Thebaid (6), Achilleid (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero (6)</td>
<td>De Inventione (2), De Finibus (1), Aratea (1), Pro Ligario (1), Paradoxa Stoicorum (1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suetonius and Seneca (4 each), Claudian (3), Juvenal and Curtius (2 each), Ammianus Marcellinus, Martial, Phaedrus, Propertius, Prosper Aquitanus, Livy, Persius Flaccus, Plautus, Pliny, Sallust and Valerius Maximus (1 each).

Not surprisingly, Biblical references also abound. John quotes from many of the books of both Old and New Testaments and Apocrypha. He also shows familiarity with Boethius and with the Church Fathers, quoting several times from Augustine, Eusebius, Gregory the Great and Bede, as well as from legal texts. The text shows recurrent traces of the liturgy, including hymns by Venantius Fortunatus.\(^{177}\)

For his material on saints and martyrs John would have had a wide range of source material, either in original form or in florilegia. Many of his exempla show close correspondence of subject matter and language to the Dominican Jean de Mailly’s *Abbreviatio in Gestis et Miraculis Sanctorum*, one of the hagiographies.

---

\(^{176}\) There are must be many more!

\(^{177}\) See Gaposchkin (2017), 55-56.
consolidated into the *Golden Legend*. This is dated by Maggione at 1243, though it is likely to be based on material already circulating.\(^{178}\) Bartholomew of Trent is another probable source on saints’ lives. On the early English and Irish saints, John sometimes used separate sources, here identified in footnotes.

John’s debt to the encyclopedist, Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636) is evident.\(^{179}\) Isidore was widely read throughout medieval times. His thirteenth century successor, the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais was John’s close contemporary. Close to Louis IX, he was writing at the Cistercian abbey of Royaumont when John was in Paris in the 1240s. He was assisted by both Benedictines and Dominicans.\(^{180}\) In that Vincent literally sought to encapsulate human knowledge, some overlap of subject matter was inevitable. At least for contemporary events there is little indication that John used his work, though at some point in the evolution of this text, probably early on, John considered writing *De triumphis Ecclesie* as a universal history.\(^{181}\) If he ever started it, only the first few lines of Book 6 remain, uncharacteristically cataloguing the events and natural phenomena of 1229 like a Chronicle.\(^ {182}\)

Although John once misquotes Gildas, in fact referring to Nennius,\(^ {183}\) he relied mainly on Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae*\(^ {184}\) for substantial digressions on the early history of England, particularly the reign of King Arthur. This was written in the early twelfth century, and was hugely popular in France and England. He will also have known the anonymous *Gesta Regum Britannie*, a Latin verse paraphrase. For early French history, he used the widely-circulated twelfth-century forgery *Turpini Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi*,\(^ {185}\) now known as Pseudo-Turpin.

John acknowledges his debt to Alan of Lille, whom he questionably rates ‘greater than Vergil and more reliable than Homer.’\(^ {186}\) John opens the poem with a foretaste of its contents and the trick to be worked by his couplets, *‘Gaudia*

---

\(^{178}\) JdeM, Intro, xi.
\(^{179}\) *DTE*, 1.395-96, 4.147.
\(^{180}\) See Le Goff (2009), 475-478.
\(^{181}\) *DTE*, Prologue.99-100.
\(^{182}\) *DTE*, 6.1-14
\(^{183}\) *DTE*, 2.617.
\(^{184}\) See Bibliography.
\(^{185}\) See Bibliography.
\(^{186}\) *DTE*, 4.205-06.
succumbunt lacrimis, risusque dolori.’ John pays Alan the literary compliment both here and at DTE, 8.40, of closely paraphrasing the incipit of De Planctu Nature, ‘In lacrymas risus, in fletum gaudia verto.’ His account of ‘Venus’s chimera’ derives directly from the same work.\textsuperscript{187} There are references elsewhere to Alan’s works, and echoes of his attacks on heretics and Jews, though remarkably given the many targets of John’s spleen, not on homosexuals. Geoffrey of Vinsauf’s Nova Poetria was a powerful influence on John’s Parisiana Poetria, but he was not a contemporary and there are no signs of his direct influence on De triumphis. Of this earlier generation of schoolsmen, John also refers to John Beleth (c. 1135-82), and uses his works.\textsuperscript{188} In the Epithalamium\textsuperscript{189} he acknowledges the influence of Thomas of Chobham and William of Auxerre on his poetry. His interests also extended to science and philosophy. He pays lavish tribute elsewhere to another Paris contemporary, Alexander of Hales, an English theologian and philosopher who died in 1245.\textsuperscript{190}

John was undoubtedly also familiar with vernacular poetry. The Occitan Cansó de la crozada clearly informed his account of the Albigensian Crusade, although his own anecdotes of the lecherous Bishop of Albi and of his adventures on the Garonne are lively and self-contained, reflecting the vernacular tradition of fabliaux. In Parisiana Poetria too he uses the fabliau ‘Guinehochet,’ and quotes it in Old French. He uses another Old French fabliau as model for his example of Latin tragedy in the same work.\textsuperscript{191}

\textbf{History and rhetoric}

John saw himself as historian as well as poet. He adopts Clio, Muse of History, as his Muse for non-historical writing as well,\textsuperscript{192} and claimed to be writing for posterity.\textsuperscript{193} He conventionally\textsuperscript{194} describes his approach in the Prologue, ‘I give

\textsuperscript{187} See 65 below.
\textsuperscript{188} DTE, 1.411, 2. 583 & 880.
\textsuperscript{189} EBVM, 10.477-82.
\textsuperscript{190} De Misteriis, 641-58. For a biographical list of theology Masters contemporary with John in Paris, see Young (2014), 216-31. Marenbon (2007), 205-30 offers a valuable account of the increasingly Aristotelian (despite the ban) intellectual climate in the Paris studium.
\textsuperscript{191} PP, 4.422-61 & 7.28-153 respectively. See also R. Bonvicino, ed. & trans. (Italian), Due lotrice di Giovanni de Garlandia, in F. Bertini ed., Tragedie Latine del XII e XIII Secolo (Genoa, 1994), 283. For Fulk, see DTE, 5, n. 76.
\textsuperscript{192} MS, 223.
\textsuperscript{193} DTE, 2.771-72, 7.500.
priority to what is before our eyes, rather than the many events of the past; to what
I have witnessed rather than heard about, certainties rather than things that are in
doubt, evidence-based rather than vague. In practice he witnessed only a tiny
proportion of the events he narrates. His stated intention is to use history to
demonstrate the inevitability of the Church’s victory. He will use many examples
to clear the fog which obscures this (‘res ignota’). Although the classical
Roman historians were available, it is overwhelmingly the poets whose language
he borrows. John jumps disconcertingly from event to event, but as Rigg points
out, this may be deliberate compliance with rhetorical theory that strictly
chronological accounts are boring. The result is confusing, but ‘the real problem
is that contemporary history is unfinished.’

History, like poetry, was not taught as a separate subject in the medieval
syllabus. Each was a sub-set of rhetoric; hence John approached both in that
context. He defines history as ‘an act remote from the memory of our age.’ It
employs transitio, which John defines as, ‘a figure whereby the mind of the
listener with the aid of the preceding narration understands what is to come.’ So
history has both a didactic and a predictive purpose. For John, it can be stretched
to include events well within living memory, even contemporary. ‘Historia’ must
be distinguished from ‘argumentum,’ or ‘realistic fiction,’ which narrates
‘fictitious events which could nevertheless have happened’ and ‘fabula’ /
‘fiction’, which ‘contains events which are neither true nor give the impression of
truth.’ ‘Narratio’ / ‘narrative’ is ‘an account of events which have taken place
or seem to have taken place.’

Classical rhetoric was another important influence, and John draws heavily on its
principles, without making De triumphis Ecclesie a text-book model of any of its
specific strands. He undoubtedly sets out to teach (docere), and to do so

194 See, for example, William of Tyre’s Prologue, Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis
195 DTE, Prologue.95-96.
196 DTE, Prologue.1.
198 Considerations of space preclude a full analysis of rhetorical aspects. Kempshall (2011)
explains excellently how rhetorical theory evolved to classify and order historical writing.
200 For John’s definitions of the three types of narrative see PP, 5.317-330.
201 Lawler’s translation of PP, 4.197-98, itself a direct paraphrase of Cicero, De Inventione,
1.19.27. See DTE 3.473-74 & 512 where John admits to fabricating battle scenes.
effectively by moving (movere) and pleasing (delectare) his readers.\textsuperscript{202} In accord with the principles of rhetoric, John sets out in the Preface to ‘render the audience benevolent, attentive and teachable.’\textsuperscript{203} Teaching comprised both explaining events and their underlying causes,\textsuperscript{204} and providing morally improving material. To these ends, John explicitly uses frequent digressions (‘excursus,’ ‘digressio’) and case studies / ‘exempla,’ ‘Digression is perceived as adding piquancy to serious tales of morals, just as flavouring spices the courses of a meal.’\textsuperscript{205}

In his historical analyses, John shows his grasp of all three branches of rhetoric: judicial, demonstrative and deliberative.\textsuperscript{206} The long sections devoted to Henry III’s Poitou campaign are on the face of it a historical account, but also a case study of judicial rhetoric, weighing the rights of the Lusignans against the claims of the French crown and Alphonse of Poitiers, in a search for what is fair / equum. The account of the Albigensian Crusade similarly compares the rights and grievances of the Trencavel family, and later of the Counts of Toulouse, against the moral and legal authority of the crusaders. In both cases John shows understanding and sympathy to the defeated party, whilst clearly coming down on the side of the victors.

Demonstrative rhetoric was the art of praising or denigrating individuals.\textsuperscript{207} There are short, laudatory passages on Richard I of England and King John, Philip II, Louis VIII and IX, William Marshal, John of London, Edmund of Canterbury, Alan of Lille, Peter of Castelnau, Simon de Montfort, Bishop Fulk of Toulouse and the legate Romano. John is reluctant to condemn people without showing some sympathetic understanding for their weaknesses. Traditional villains of Capetian literature, notably Raymond VI and Raymond VII of Toulouse, the Emperor Frederick II, Hugh X de Lusignan, King John and King Peter of Aragon are presented in a nuanced way. Their virtues are recognised. Popes, notably Honorius III and Innocent IV, and heroes, even Richard I and Louis IX are occasionally criticised. The only named male characters to receive heavy unmitigated criticism are Reginald of Pons and Louis IX’s brother Alphonse. The

\textsuperscript{202}Kempshall (2011), 8-9 and n. 21. See also PP, 4.195-97.
\textsuperscript{203}See Preface, n. 5. For a list of authorities, see Kempshall (2011), 190, n. 264.
\textsuperscript{204}DTE, Prologue, 29-31.
\textsuperscript{205}DTE, Prologue, 115-16: See also DTE, 4.201-02.
\textsuperscript{206}Ad Herennium, 1.1.2.
\textsuperscript{207}Kempshall (2011), 138-71.
un-named bishop of Albi in Book 5, and other anonymous bishops, flatterers, and charlatans are harshly berated.

John takes similarly robust views on the women in his narratives. The Virgin and the female saints are beyond criticism. He treats Blanche of Castile with profound respect, but sees Eleanor of Aquitaine and Isabella of Angoulême as troublemakers. Berengaria, Richard I’s wife, and Louis IX’s wife Margaret, who accompanied their husbands on crusade, receive no more than a passing mention. Nicolaa de la Haye is uniquely commended for her valour at the siege of Lincoln.

The *Exhortatio de cruce suscipienda* (as well as the similar passage in *Parisiana Poetria*) is a clear example of deliberative rhetoric, strongly advocating crusade. Indeed its underlying theme of Christian disunity and Anglo-French rivalry arguably turn the whole poem into a case study—passionate advocacy of political and military policies, culminating in an appeal to rally to Louis’ aid in Outremer.

**Matthew Paris**

John also used many contemporary sources for the events of his lifetime which form the historical substance of *De triumphis*. I examine these for the most part by topic in Sections 5 to 9. Matthew Paris, however, merits separate consideration.

I have established strong circumstantial evidence from *De triumphis Ecclesie* of a close link of some kind between Matthew and John of Garland, or perhaps more accurately, between the *Chronica Maiora* and *De triumphis Ecclesie*. Either they had a common source, or John had access to Matthew’s chronicle, directly or through a third party. I rule out Matthew depending on John.

The intuitive explanation would be that Matthew had lived in Paris (hence his name, *Parisiensis or de Parisius*); that he and John knew each other at least as students; and that Matthew had excellent contacts at the French court (hence his

---

208 *DTE*, 1.191, 8.169-70. John must have been aware of Blanche’s alleged indiscretions, but does not refer to them, Grant (2016), 86 & n. 44; *CM*, 3.119. This is unsurprising in view of his proximity to the legate Romano.

209 *DTE*, 3.132, 1.296-300.

210 *DTE*, 3.276-78.

211 *PP*, 4.207-44
embassy from Louis IX to King Haakon of Norway and his access to French official documents). There is sadly no evidence for or against any such conclusions.

John and Matthew were close contemporaries. Vaughan’s evidence for dating Matthew’s birth around 1200 is that he died in 1259 and ‘sixty must have been a ripe old age for a medieval monk.’ He also says ‘it seems probable that ……he did not receive his education at Paris, or indeed any other, university. His interests are not those of a university-educated clerk.’ [and he would therefore have gone straight into the monastery aged 17]. The last year covered by the *Chronica Maiora* was 1259; John’s last-known writing was in 1258. Matthew joined the Benedictine Abbey of St. Albans as a monk in 1217 and replaced Roger Wendover as archivist in 1236. 212 His ‘characteristically British’ outlook in no way precludes a Parisian education if his period of study was short and he returned to England from the Schools. Matthew’s Latin suggests a reasonable knowledge of the classics. As for his age, many scholars over the last century have accepted the idea of Paetow’s 213 eighty-year-old John of Garland without a murmur. Notwithstanding all this, the case for direct personal acquaintance cannot be proven. Nor indeed can a link through common ecclesiastical or aristocratic networks, though this remains a perfectly feasible explanation.

There are nevertheless numerous instances from the period 1236-52 where John and the *Chronica Maiora* uniquely report an incident, where their language and attitudes are very similar, especially where they pick out the same individuals for praise or censure. It is hard not to conclude that these cases are too frequent to be coincidental. They are referenced individually in the footnotes to this edition, and not catalogued here. The connection appears strongest during the main episodes covered by John in the later part of the narrative, the Saintonge War and the Mongol invasions, both in 1241-42, and the Seventh Crusade.

Some of these cross-references are striking. In their respective accounts of Henry III’s invasion of Poitou, both John and Matthew single out for mention the bravery of Ralph Fitz-Nicolas, Roger Bigod, William Longespée II and Simon de

---

212 For Matthew’s life, see Vaughan (1958), 1-11.
213 See p. 22 above.
Montfort in the battle of Saintes. Both refer to the treachery of Reginald of Pons and the bishop of Saintes, and to the curious story of Richard de Clare’s horse (and his absence from the battle). Both too recount the exchange of Henry of Hastings for William des Barres. Many other details tally, not least descriptions of Hugh X de Lusignan’s defensive measures against the French, his personal qualities, and his death at Damietta in 1249.

In their lurid descriptions of the Mongols too there are many points of similarity, though both refer to clerical eye-witnesses and could have worked from mutual clerical sources. The most striking example is the alleged Jewish collaboration with the Mongols, which is mentioned only by John and Matthew, together with reference to Jewish anticipation of the Messiah. Both also refer to a victory over the Mongols on or near the Danube in 1241; both say the Mongols came from the North.

For his account of the Seventh Crusade, John appears to have had access to the ‘Letter from Gui, household knight of the Viscount of Melun, to Master B of Chartres’, included in the Additamenta to the Chronica Majora. John and the letter say that Louis IX’s destination was Alexandria and not Damietta, and that only one crusader, Hugh X de la Marche, died in battle at Damietta. Both respectively describe the opposing forces as ‘piratica turba’ and ‘piratae,’ and Damietta as ‘vacuata.’ Both John and Matthew refer glowingly to the courage of William Longespée II, hacked to pieces at Mansourah; another letter in the Additamenta, the so-called ‘Letter from a Templar,’ hails him as a martyr. John makes a virtue of the fifteen-year truce made in 1251 between Louis and the Egyptians against the Sultan of Aleppo, reported in another letter in the Additamenta, dated 6 May 1252, and also recorded by Matthew. Matthew himself relies extensively on the documentary evidence of these letters in his

---

214 DTE, 3.429-30, 455-60.
216 DTE, 3.624.
217 DTE, 1.287-92, 3.530-43 sq.; 1.325.
218 On the ‘Jewish plot’ see DTE, 7.89-94, and Introduction, 93-94. On clerical sources, see DTE, 7.32 & CM, 4.270-77 (Ivo of Narbonne), MGH SS, 29 547-67 (Rogerii Miserabile Carmen), Thomas of Spalato also wrote in graphic language, MGH SS, 29, 585-95.
chronicle. We do not know how he obtained them, though they are not now extant elsewhere. For the Seventh Crusade at least John could theoretically also have had direct access to them, rather than via Matthew Paris.

There are other similarities to the Chronica Majora. Both John and Matthew give extensive coverage to the life and death of Edmund of Canterbury, including miracles effected by his *pallium*. John singles out Hugh de Lacy for mention in the Albigensian Crusade; Matthew later gives him the epitaph of ‘*bellator nominatissimus*.’ They have a common interest in tournaments and both refer to ‘*mensa rotunda*’ as a type of tournament. Both confidently expect campaigning by the English and Spanish against the Muslims after the Seventh Crusade. But while the cumulative evidence strongly suggests a link, it must remain speculative.

*De triumphis Ecclesie* as literature

*De triumphis Ecclesie* is not great literature, but as I shall argue it has its good points. Even before Wright’s edition, Le Clerc concluded that the poem was entirely lacking in literary merit. Nevertheless:- ‘Les futurs historiens des croisades feront bien de ne point négliger ces récits, dont nul n’a encore profité……..Parmi tous les défauts du temps, ……ils trouveront du moins quelques échos de l’opinion contemporaine,’

Wright himself wrote:- ‘The style of John de Garlande is ambitious and pedantic, and displays the schoolman vain of his accomplishments. His language, though now and then we have a few good lines, is far inferior to that of the scholastic Latin poets of the preceding century, and is full of grammatical conceits and puns, and plays upon words and rhymes. Its author affects, above all things, a great facility in the use of all the quaint and fantastical embellishments of Latin metre …these defects of style often render the meaning obscure, while, as a whole, the poem is broken, and confused by frequent digressions.’

---

221 *DTE*, 7.185-206; *CM*, 4.72-73 & 324-29.
222 *DTE*, 3.284; *CM*, 5.318.
224 Le Clerc (1852), 81.
225 Wright (1856), xi.
After Wright’s edition, scholars continued to excoriate John’s style, especially in *De triumphis Ecclesie*. Hauréau remarked, ‘Mais on ne comprend pas Jean de Garlande qui, pour avoir longtemps affecté d’être obscure, en a contracté l’habitude.’ Even an admirer such as Paetow finds *De triumphis* ‘confused and bizarre’.

More recent scholars have tried to place John’s literary style and composition in a broader context. Raby said in 1953 that John was ‘above all else a teacher.’ Rigg observed: ‘Modern preferences for simple diction and coherent stories are inappropriate in the case of a writer whose principal aim was to introduce vocabulary and recherché expressions’. John was quite evidently a grammarian and pedagogue, wholly committed to perpetuating classical learning. He tried to combine the subject-matter and epic sweep of Vergil with the versification of Ovid and the rhetorical techniques of Cicero in describing contemporary events and religious passions and prejudices. By the time he committed all this to parchment the central event it was meant to celebrate had turned into a disaster. It is small wonder that John’s ambitious poem fizzles out limply, and that his execution fell short of his own models of excellence. I have however through new interpretations, emendation, repunctuation, and reordering greatly reduced the obscurity of the text.

That said, Wright had a point. Now and then John does have a ‘few good lines’, even for a modern reader. His descriptions of rural desolation and of poor people on crusade (however historically unsound) are written with genuine emotion. His coverage of the Albigensian Crusade has several moving passages, including the capture of Béziers and Carcassonne, the death of Peter of Aragon at Muret, the dramatic siege of Toulouse and death of Simon de Montfort. The grotesquerie of the Mongols is graphic, if not unique, just as John’s escape up the Garonne in 1232 is entertaining and oddly risqué. Some of the digressions catch the reader’s imagination, such as the vivid description of the hazards of sea voyages, or John’s chilling medical analyses of old age and the epidemic which struck Louis IX’s

---

226 Hauréau (1877), 71.
227 Paetow, *MS Intro.*, 110.
228 Raby (1953), 386.
229 Rigg (1992), 163.
230 *DTE*, 7.437-42.
army at Blaye (1242).\textsuperscript{231} The sincerity of his feelings, whether religious devotion, outrage or petty spite, still shines through.

Section 5: John’s teaching and preaching

Unlike John’s other works, part of De triumphis Ecclesie is directly autobiographical. He gives extensive coverage in Books 5 and 6 to his time in Toulouse, during the years 1229-1232, including unique material on the new studium there. John’s working life covered the period when organisations recognisable as universities were emerging as important institutions in medieval Europe. This section places John’s career in that wider context.

Studia generalia and the medieval curriculum

‘The university of Paris grew; it was not founded.’232 Like similar groups of scholars in Bologna and Oxford, the collectivity (‘universitas’) of Scholars and Masters in Paris gradually coalesced over the second half of the twelfth century. These centres, or studia generalia, could attract scholars from all over Europe, and offered the possibility of pursuing advanced studies in some or all of theology, canon law and medicine. 233 The core curriculum comprised the trivium of classical times, grammar, logic and rhetoric, along with the quadrivium, mathematics, music, geometry and astronomy, together comprising the seven liberal arts.

The studium in Paris received its first charter from Philip II in 1200. Statutes, now lost, were formulated before 1208-09. The statutes of 1215, promulgated by the papal legate, Robert Coursan, established that before a Scholar could teach as a Master of Arts, he must have attended lectures for at least six years and be at least twenty-one years old. Licences to teach were granted by the Chancellor of Notre Dame Cathedral, and the new statutes attempted to provide fair selection. Masters committed to teach for at least two years. A Scholar must be attached to a particular Master, and Masters lived from students’ fees in a competitive environment.234 Before becoming a Master himself, a Scholar must first become a Bachelor of Arts. The statutes also prescribed the syllabus for the arts faculty and prolonged the episcopal ban of 1210235 on the teaching of Aristotle’s works on metaphysics or natural science. They imposed rules for the good behaviour of

235 CUP, 1, 70-71.
Scholars and Masters, and responsibilities on the *studium* to enforce them, as well as granting legal rights and protections. It was increasingly possible to pursue a career of teaching in this more structured environment, and there was a steady demand for Masters in the growing centralised bureaucracies of Church and state.\(^{236}\) We do not know whether John qualified as a Master under the 1215 statute or earlier,\(^ {237}\) or whether he held any clerical post in Paris to supplement his fee income.

Within the *studium*, an untidy matrix of other corporate entities was developing. From at least the 1220s, Masters and Scholars from France, England, Picardy and Normandy formed national communities, called *nationes*.\(^ {238}\) Again, we do not know whether John was a member of the English *natio*. Membership criteria were not rigid, and he may have felt thoroughly French by the time he returned to Paris from Toulouse in 1232. The Faculty of Arts itself evolved as a legal entity, with responsibility for maintaining a list of approved regent (teaching) Masters. In other poems too\(^ {239}\), notably *Morale Scolarium*, John attacks it for its neglect of the classical languages. We have no evidence, from either before or after John’s time in Toulouse, that John was an approved member of the Faculty’s list of regent masters. Grondeux and Marguin point out that nowhere among John’s works or attributed to him is a commentary on either Priscian or Donatus, the only two writers prescribed in the grammar curriculum.

Stability was only relative, and tension remained high between the academic community and the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. John notes the attack on the legate Romano in 1225; he records laconically the bar fight in 1229 which led to violence, intervention authorised by the regent Blanche of Castile, and the exodus of Masters and Scholars. ‘The Paris *studium* was bloodily dispersed.’\(^ {240}\) Many of them went to Angers and Orléans, where new academic communities were formed; John pays tribute to the classical tradition of Orléans.\(^ {241}\)

---

\(^ {236}\) See Baldwin (1982).

\(^ {237}\) See 16-18 above.


\(^ {239}\) For John’s contempt of current teaching, and of the vernacular, see e.g. *MS*, 340-44, *DTE*, 3.191-92.

\(^ {240}\) *DTE*, 6.3.

\(^ {241}\) *DTE*, 6.5-6, *AL*, 1515-20.
restored in Paris until 1231. Gregory IX’s bull ‘Parens scientiarum’ reaffirmed the rights, responsibilities and authority of the Masters and Scholars and made explicit what may have already been the status quo, that there was a direct link between the educational process and preaching the Christian faith.

The studium at Toulouse

Unlike those in Angers and Orléans, the studium generale in Toulouse242 was set up by political decision, as a condition imposed on Raymond VII of Toulouse by Louis IX in the Treaty of Paris.243 The defeated count was obliged to fund this new institution intended to counter the influence of heresy in the city and surrounding area. Under the supervision of the papal legate, Romano, Élie Guerin, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Grand Selve, selected Masters from Paris—conveniently available on account of the strike—to teach in Toulouse. Fourteen posts were to be remunerated by Raymond for ten years, four theologians, two canon lawyers, six Masters of Arts and two regent Masters in grammar.244 Pope Honorius had made an earlier appeal in 1217 to the universitas of Masters and Scholars in Paris to go to Toulouse ‘qui causam Dei agentes ex animo lectioni, predicationi et exhortationi vigilanter insistant,…..ita quod populum acceptabilem Deo reddant.’245 On both occasions volunteers were promised full remission of sins, and in 1229 Romano further incentivised them with generous gifts.246 He seems to have taken them in a group, breaking the journey with a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Rocamadour.247

We know that John was one of the salaried masters chosen,248 and it has always been assumed from the subject-matter and pedantry of much of his writing that he was one of the two grammarians, unusually in Toulouse separate from the arts faculty. But he tells us nothing about his own teaching and he could conceivably
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244 The respective stipends (in silver marks) were: theology, 50; law, 30; arts, 20; grammar 10.  
245 CUP, 1, 83-84. See 21 above for the possibility that John had responded to this appeal or had in any case been to Toulouse before. He describes the 1229 studium as new, DTE, 5.270.  
246 DTE, 5. 274.  
247 DTE, 5. 275-302  
248 DTE, 6.197.
have been a teacher of arts more generally.  

The first home of the new clergy was the small church of St. Julian, outside the walls of the Bourg, to the north of the city. John was also familiar with the church of the Dominicans, to which his colleague the theologian Roland of Cremona was attached. John makes clear his admiration for the Cistercian and former troubador Fulk, bishop of Toulouse (1205-31), initially in charge of the studium. ‘Pravos extirpat et doctor, et ignis, et ensis; / Falcat eos Fulco praesul in urbe sacer’/ ‘The man of letters, fire and the sword root out the malefactors; Fulk (‘the reaper’), consecrated bishop in the city, scythes them down.’  

John reports with relish a notorious incident, in which Roland of Cremona burned an alleged heretic’s house, then exhumed his body, carried it through the streets and burned that too.

The verse text of De triumphis describes the curriculum taught at the studium. John’s ‘tree of knowledge’ description is largely replicated in the most ambitious illustration of the manuscript, contemporary with the text. Further details are provided at the end of Book 5, in the prose ‘open prospectus’, of which John is widely believed on stylistic grounds to have been the author, especially since it is signalled in the verse text as a diversion for the bored reader. John describes how instruction (‘doctrina’) cuts back the weeds and revives the roses. Knowledge is divided between eloquence and philosophy; in line with tradition and John’s priorities, eloquence prevails; of its three branches, grammar comes first, then logic and rhetoric (‘the thyme flavouring’). Philosophy is either practical, in the shape of ethics at the level of state, family and individual or theoretical, as theology, mathematics and natural science. John praises theologians (‘divinis’) and commends ‘fisim’/ ‘natural science’ to them. John

---

249 He shows detailed knowledge of computus and music in this part of De triumphis.
250 Roland of Cremona was the first Paris regent Master from one of the mendicant orders, 1229-30, which ignored the strike, Marenbon (2007), 210. He was an Aristotelian expert, Hasse (2000), 36, with an extant ‘Summa Theologica,’ and a likely influence on John. On the geography of medieval Toulouse and its parishes, see Mundy (2006), 10-11. On St. Julian’s and the Dominican churches, see DTE, 5, 303-04, 6.191-94.
251 DTE, 5.259-70, 6.15-16.
252 DTE, 5.257-58.
253 See Book 6, n.22. This episode is also reported by William Pelhisson, a Dominican working in Toulouse from 1230, William Pelhisson, ed. Douais, 88.
254 DTE 6, 33-56, of which lines 49-56 are about music. See Plate 7, p. 314.
255 DTE, 5.363-64.
256 Cicero, De Inventione, 1.1.
sees the other theoretical branch, mathematics, as the base discipline for arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, the elements of the quadrivium, in that order. Music however is unusually given a leading role --‘musica cuncta ligat.’ John further subdivides it along Boethian lines into ‘mundana,’ ‘humana’ and ‘instrumentalis.’ The Toulouse studium appears to have focused on performed rather than theoretical music. Instrumental music (which included the human voice) unites three strands, melody, metre and rhythm; harmony itself comprises the enharmonic, chromatic and diatonic, respectively suited, according to John’s own narrative, to study, dancing and being played on trumpets.\footnote{Jeserich (English, 2013), 264-65 translates lines DTE, 6.31-58.}

The erudite ‘prospectus’\footnote{At the end of Book 5.} has attracted more academic interest than other parts of the poem.\footnote{Gatien-Arnault (1866), Paetow, MS, Introduction, 90-91, C. E. Smith (1958), 1-55. Dossat (1970), 182-83, Schmidt (1998a).} Its description of the friendly local people sits ill with the tough tactics of the clergy and of their eviction from the city in 1232. It does however offer interesting amplification of the academic regime on offer; most notably, the scientific works of Aristotle were to be permitted reading, in explicit contrast to the Parisian regime. Similarly, the study of Roman law was allowed, whilst only canon law could be studied at Paris. Medicine was taught, and Galen read out ‘a lateribus’/‘from the side.’ The northern French musical style of organum\footnote{DTE, 5.414, & n. 121.} was introduced. John also tells us that more soothing strains calmed the passions of the crowd, which had previously favoured the diatonic style best suited to trumpets. The ‘prospectus’ also describes the protections put in place by the count for the members of the studium.

It is impossible to tell from John’s account what the balance was between teaching and preaching. He tells us that the theologians instructed their pupils from pulpits (‘pulpitis’), and the general public at crossroads (‘compitis’). He himself kept a book ‘about hope and faith’, bound together with the Acts of the Apostles with St. Peter on the first page. He used to give them the drift (‘tenorem’), ‘with a certain brevity,’ if we are to believe him. But the heretical people of Toulouse ‘held the saints and holy writ in contempt.’\footnote{DTE, 6.71-76.} John complains that enlightening exempla such as he includes in the poem elicited sniggering and
desecration from the local people.\textsuperscript{262}

For whatever reason, the \textit{studium} failed. John reports that the payment of salaries became unreliable and ‘\textit{cuncta negans livor cepit habere locum.}’ \textsuperscript{263} He says this immediately after noting the arrival of the Dominican Raymond de Falgar as bishop after Fulk’s death in 1231. The community of the thriving \textit{studium} slipped away, and John was an early leaver. William Pelhisson bears out John’s account, ‘For just at the moment when the Church thought to have peace in that land, heretics and their believers girded themselves more and more for numerous ventures and stratagems against her and against Catholics, with the result that the heretics did more harm by far in Toulouse and that region than they had even during the war.’\textsuperscript{264} William observed that the \textit{studium} was ‘ineffective in uprooting heresy; rather, heretical individuals, regarding them with hostility and hearing unfamiliar things, mocked at them in manifold ways.’ In fact in 1233 Pope Gregory IX re-established the \textit{studium} under Dominican responsibility.\textsuperscript{265} Whether the Dominicans themselves undermined the earlier \textit{studium} it is impossible from existing evidence to know.

\textbf{Tall tales on the Garonne}

John describes his escape from Toulouse in graphic and lurid language.\textsuperscript{266} This short passage is unique in his works, and strongly reflects the spirit, if not the metre, of the vernacular fabliaux, with their humour, sexual content and double entendre. John writes of the chimera of Venus in a way which suggests that his audience was already familiar with the good and bad Venuses of Alan of Lille’s \textit{De Planctu Nature}. He denounces adultery, but does not echo Alan’s pervasive homophobia. He also brings a light touch to Alan’s moralistic prurience, even if ultimately John turns his anecdote too into a homily. These lines feel like a separate poem, written at the time or shortly after and later incorporated in the main text.\textsuperscript{267}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{262} \textit{DTE}, 6.189-90.
  \item \textsuperscript{263} \textit{DTE}, 6.198.
  \item \textsuperscript{264} William Pelhisson, ed. Douais, 83-84.
  \item \textsuperscript{265} Fournier (1890-92), vol.1, no. 506.
  \item \textsuperscript{266} \textit{DTE} 6.200-254.
  \item \textsuperscript{267} See \textit{DTE}, 6. nn. 74 & 75.
\end{itemize}
John successfully boarded a boat on the Garonne, hoping to go northwards to Moissac, a small port where pilgrims to Santiago de Compostella visited the abbey and crossed the river. The boatman however tried to divert to Castelsarrasin, where John feared the attentions of an ‘impia turba.’ John, surely even he tongue in cheek, paralysed the boatman for an hour by pointing to a shield-shaped cloud and claiming it was a sign of God’s avenging presence. This was long enough for returning pilgrims to rescue him and secure his passage to Moissac. An ‘impia manus,’ perhaps the same one, robbed and set fire to some cottages next morning.

At this point it does seem that John may have been inveigled into a scam, perpetrated by a thief and his female accomplice. Whatever might or might not have happened, John unleashes a violent and obscene denunciation of the ‘chimera of Venus,’ and of the wickedness of adultery, very closely modelled on the opening passage of Alan of Lille’s ‘De Planctu Nature.’ These lines might be no more than a generic attack on the same ‘bad Venus’ as Alan’s. But lines 6.239-40 and 251-52 in particular strongly suggest that this was a personal experience, or at least an account of what John witnessed. The best protection from temptation, John tells the reader, is to look and to be godly, and to strum one’s lyre. Whether he was a victim, or just highly suggestible, we may never know. We are however told that after a trying journey John arrived safely in Paris with the pilgrims, presumably some time in 1232 or even 1233.

---

268 See also DTE, Preface.1. John obviously greatly admired De Planctu Nature.
Section 6: ‘Arma crucemque cano’: Church and Crusade

De triumphis Ecclesie as a devotional work

Whatever his earthly audience, John also wrote this poem to satisfy his inner needs, and turned it into a religious offering, pitched at his own salvation. ‘Praise for Christ, praise for Mary, praise for the Cross, the victory of the Church, its crown, its glory, [all] compel me to write.’

He writes, ‘Blessed Mary, look at me, John, in my wretchedness. Hear me, give me new life, wash me, wipe me dry, keep me warm.’

‘Clio cannot concoct overblown eulogies for heroes, but I seek my consolation through frequent praise for the holy Cross. That will be my reward, and the joyful laurel wreath for my work (‘studium’).’

The intensity of some devotional passages, especially those addressed to the Virgin Mary, indicates that this was a personal offering of devotion, reinforcing his earlier *Epithalamium* and *Stella Maris*. John’s reward is to have sung the praises of God, the Virgin and the Cross. Mary is the antithesis of Eve, blamed conventionally by John for the inherent wickedness of women. Several female saints and martyrs nevertheless feature in John’s numerous *exempla*, many with French associations.

Yet the immediacy of the later writing covering the Seventh Crusade and its focus on the future, as well as John’s analytical approach to the past causes of present ills, reinforce the conclusion that this poem’s prime focus was external.

Pope, cardinals, bishops and priests

John’s intense spirituality does not cloud a pragmatic and sometimes critical view of the contemporary Church. Most notably, he sees clearly the steady moral and spiritual leadership which the pope should display. At the outset John announces the crusading cause as that of ‘*pape solliciti*’ (Innocent IV). He tells us that the pope holds the keys of St. Peter and the sword of St. Paul, whilst commanding Peter’s barque and holding it on a steady course; ‘breaking up the

---

269 *DTE*, Preface.33-34.
270 *DTE*, 5.5-6
272 Holtz (2012) admirably brings out John’s devotion to the Virgin in the *Epithalamium* and *Stella Maris*. Much of what he says applies to *De triumphis*, especially on John’s use of language.
273 See *DTE*, 8, n. 181.
274 On the basis of the amended lines 3-4 of the Preface. See Preface, n. 3
storms, he seeks out safe shores by his strenuous efforts." \(^{275}\) 'We are asleep in the boat so long as he [the pope] is at the helm;' \(^{276}\) 'The fathers of the Church cannot go wrong provided they follow the path of wisdom,' and it is the pope's duty to 'defend the rights of Christ.' \(^{277}\) The cardinals' task is likewise to steer the course of the ship and of the condition ('\textit{statum}') of the Church. \(^{278}\) Equally it is the role of knights, not churchmen, to use military force to protect the Church when spiritual weapons fail. \(^{279}\) The pope and the Church should strive for peace. But the pope must not be afraid to wield the sword of canon law and convene military force against the enemies of the Church.

John does however criticise Innocent IV directly for weakness and lack of preparedness in dealing with the threat of the Mongols, using the pejorative \textit{Paterculus} /'Popeling.' Again the language is ambiguous but John clearly suggests that the pope is asleep on the job and giving priority to his own interests by fighting Frederick II rather than mobilising Christians against the Mongols. \(^{280}\) He is critical of how bishops were selected, on the basis of pedigree, backed up by wealth and military force, all in preference to learning. \(^{281}\) And John urges the pope to resist the criticism of the uninformed and malicious by rejecting ill-based territorial claims.

Elsewhere in \textit{De triumphis} John comments on the Church as a working institution. Its triumphs are of course his theme. The true hero of his epic is not the papacy, or Innocent IV, or Louis IX but the Cross, a proxy for the institution of the Church itself; \textit{Arma crucemque cano.}' / 'I sing of arms and the Cross.' \(^{282}\) John extends the loose analogy with the \textit{Aeneid} by treating the Virgin as a guardian deity, just as Vergil portrays Venus. His elaborate descriptions of the symbolism of the Cross in \textit{De triumphis} can be seen as complementary to his short treatise on the physical symbolism of the church itself, \textit{Carmen de misteriis Ecclesie,' written}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{DTE}, 1.243, 8.545-46.
\item \textit{DTE}, 2.10.
\item \textit{DTE}, 5.213-16.
\item \textit{DTE}, 8.547-49.
\item \textit{DTE}, 4.261-66.
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\item \textit{DTE}, Preface.11.
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in 1245 during the Council of Lyon.\textsuperscript{283} They are also paralleled in the *Epithalamium*.

John acknowledges a few other outstanding leaders of the Church and pays tribute to them. They are, in no particular order, the legate Romano, Bishop Fulk of Toulouse and St. Edmund of Canterbury (1180-1240). He clearly knew the first two personally whilst he was in Toulouse from 1229 to 1232. He may also have known the third, Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1233 to 1240, who taught in the schools of Oxford and Paris. He writes affectionately about him as teacher and priest.\textsuperscript{284} The murdered (martyred) legate, Peter of Castelnau, whose death ostensibly sparked the Albigensian Crusade, receives a conventionally fulsome epitaph.\textsuperscript{285}

John does however have harsh words for bishops more generally. He holds the un-named bishop of Albi,\textsuperscript{286} accused of seducing the crusading Count of Béziers’ wife, as ultimately a cause of the Albigensian Crusade; both allegation and interpretation are unique. At the beginning of the Saintonge war in 1242, John accuses the bishops of collectively failing to stand up to the kings in resisting the ravages of war on the people and the Church. Certain bishops were guilty of using their power to enrich themselves, profiting from fomenting war. John denounces one anonymous bishop for corruptly dispensing largesse, with a total lack of taste and judgment (including neglect of the arts!). The same bishop happens to attack the English, but the bishops in general are susceptible to flattery, and taking sides in the war.\textsuperscript{287} Even after the battle of Saintes, John again accuses them of standing in the way of peace.\textsuperscript{288}

John roundly attacks ‘the clergy’/ ‘clerus’, by which in the context he clearly means the Church hierarchy, at the time of the Santonges War and the capture of the bishops by Frederick in 1241. John accuses them of ‘arguing the toss’

\textsuperscript{283} *CME*, 649-54. For extensive references to the Cross see, e.g., *DTE*, 2.862-92, 8.153-168.

\textsuperscript{284} *DTE*, 7.185-210.

\textsuperscript{285} *DTE*, 4.59-66.

\textsuperscript{286} *DTE*, 4.29-30. See also 86-87 below.

\textsuperscript{287} *DTE*, 2.543-68

\textsuperscript{288} *DTE*, 3.681-682.
(‘causatur’), and the rich of indulging their own stomachs. Who is guarding over the pope?\textsuperscript{289}

John portrays the Church itself and its working clergy as long-suffering and dedicated. He sees it as a principal casualty of Anglo-French feuding and military depredations, however Church-loving the two kings may be. Heresy and war were emptying the churches; war diverted the Church’s revenues and drove priests into exile before Louis IX came to its aid.\textsuperscript{290} John sums up its role. ‘It comforts the down-hearted, visits the sick, prays, preaches, and comes out on top of insults, blows and threats’.\textsuperscript{291} Providing confession too is a crucial role, especially in war. Reluctance can be overcome by a gentle confessor who must, unsurprisingly, be a well-educated man.\textsuperscript{292} ‘The priest himself softens fears to tears’/ ‘\textit{fletu temperat ipse metum}’—perhaps a hint at John’s own style as a priest.

**John’s use of exempla**

John tells his readers, ‘Through examples, I have wanted to make hard men more gentle, to make uncultured folk better informed, and to bend disagreeable men with my words.’ He also uses them to add piquancy to the narrative.\textsuperscript{293} The saints are moreover an important element in John’s faith. He calls on St. George to look favourably on his work.\textsuperscript{294} He used the Acts of the Apostles and the writings of Paul as part of his preaching repertory.\textsuperscript{295}

Although the passages on saints are usually confined to short biographical incidents, almost always miracles or martyrdom, more than 11\% of the poem is dedicated to these \textit{exempla}. To quote John again, ‘Beyond a certain number I lack the capacity to catalogue which, how many and how great miracles shine forth for which saints.’\textsuperscript{296} The full list of references to saints, grouped and in alphabetical order, is as follows:

**Apostles:** Andrew, Barnabas, James the Greater, James the Less, John, Jude, Matthew, Mathias (chosen to replace Judas), Paul, Peter, Simon, Thomas.

\textsuperscript{289} \textit{DTE}, 5.197-201.
\textsuperscript{290} \textit{DTE}, 2.541-43, 4.87, 3.11-12
\textsuperscript{291} \textit{DTE}, 1.79-80.
\textsuperscript{292} \textit{DTE}, 7.329-31.
\textsuperscript{293} \textit{DTE}, 6.155-56.
\textsuperscript{294} \textit{DTE}, 6, 158-59, and Book 6, n. 50.
\textsuperscript{295} \textit{DTE}, 6.73-74, 4.349-50
\textsuperscript{296} \textit{DTE}, 4.325-26.
Early saints and martyrs: - Catherine, Christopher, George, Helena, Julian of Antioch, Lawrence, Leonard, Margaret, Mary of Egypt, Nicholas, Stephen, Sylvester, Vincent.

Early English and Irish saints: - Alban, Amphibalus, Brendan, Cuthbert, Dunstan, Edmund, Germanus, Guthlac, Kentigern, Lupus.

Traditional French saints: - Amator, Denis, Eligius (Éloi), Fronto, Geneviève, Giles, Honoratus, Julian of Brioude, Julian of le Mans, Lazarus, Martin of Tours, Martha, Mary Magdalene, Nicasius, Saturnin (Sernin).


Many of these were martyrs, offering constant reminders of the martyr’s death awaiting those who died on crusade. Of the French saints, some had associations with Paris (Geneviève, Denis) or the South West (Fronto, the two Julians, Lazarus, Martha, Mary, Sernin). No exempla punctuate the final book on Louis’ crusade, where no rivals to Louis’ sanctity are offered.

War, peace and crusade: John as a critic of Western priorities
Throughout De triumphis John is critical of the pursuit by the magnates of the Christian West of internecine warfare. ‘But I can also weep of the upheavals which bring chaos to very many kingdoms. Would that peace might bind kingdoms and their leaders together. I lament the battles which have arisen between Christians, and I urge them to turn their wars against the savage Parthians.’

Again, of the Saintonge War, he says, ‘If the crowd of unbelievers had died by these swords, I would have rejoiced. I grieve because it was a multitude of believers who died.’

He narrows his target in the Prologue, ‘My urgings against war condemn it by many examples, unless it is lawful (‘legitimum’), in line with legal rights and the faith (‘iura fidei sequens’). John’s argument runs into difficulties. He is particularly hard from the outset on those who make war in pursuit of territorial gain.

---

297 DTE, Preface.37-40,
298 DTE, 3.515-16.
299 DTE, Prologue, 10.
300 E.g. DTE, 1.1.
the counter-evidence that Louis planned to establish a permanent Christian presence in Damietta.\textsuperscript{301} He also claims that Henry III had no desire for more territory, notwithstanding his designs on former Angevin lands. Yet at the same time he sympathises with the right to defend territorial claims (\textit{iura}), and accepts that ‘though there may have been just wars (‘\textit{prelia iusta}’), disharmony oversteps the mark and goes beyond what is reasonable’.

\textbf{De triumphis as an excitatio}

The sub-heading \textit{‘Exhortatio ad crucem suscipiendam’} appears on f.76v of the manuscript, between lines 270 and 271 of Book 2, in the much later hand of the rubricator. There is no sign in the margin of a draft in the hand of the scribe, but a space had been left for an enlarged initial capital, duly inserted in red. The initial subject-matter bears no relation to the recruitment theme, though soon the elements of a separate continuous section encouraging men of all nations and their kings to join the crusade under Louis IX appear, interrupted by a long digression about the weather and the sea.\textsuperscript{302} It is altogether possible that a poem rallying support for Louis’ planned crusade was one of the elements written and incorporated into \textit{De triumphis} while John was working on it in the early 1240s. \textbf{In preference to the implied major disruption of the order of the lines, the text of what was probably this original Exhortatio is italicised.}

John invokes the crusaders’ recapture of Acre in 1191 as a successful model for the expedition Louis IX is planning.\textsuperscript{303} Just as Acre had divided the kings, so Louis’ campaign could unite them again. And like the Third, the Seventh Crusade was an expedition to recapture Jerusalem for Christendom after it had been recently seized by the Muslims.

In the earlier \textit{Epithalamium}, John shows his sense of the continuity of crusading and of his underlying moral doubts.\textsuperscript{304} His historical view is defined by successive efforts to recover the Holy Cross captured by Saladin, first by Philip II and Richard I in the Third Crusade, then by Innocent III and Honorius in the Fifth. It is not therefore surprising that John chooses to liken Louis IX’s planned crusade to the Third Crusade, rather than giving detailed accounts of the First and Second.

\textsuperscript{301} \textit{DTE}, Preface.45-46, See Preface, n.19 for counter-evidence.
\textsuperscript{302} See \textit{DTE}, 2, n. 79.
\textsuperscript{303} \textit{DTE}, 8.47-48.
\textsuperscript{304} \textit{EBVM}, 4.71-109.
In John’s call to arms there are echoes of Peter of Blois’ *exhortatio* before the Third Crusade, *Tractatus de Hierosolymitana peregrinatione acceleranda*, and of earlier crusading language.  

305 John mostly designates ‘crusader’ by ‘Crucisignatus.’  

306 It began to be used around the end of the twelfth century, as the language of pilgrimage and crusade became more differentiated.  

307 He also uses the older formula ‘baiulus crucis’ / ‘Cross-bearer,’ who should be ‘chaste, say his prayers, and be humble, strong in his faith and prepared to suffer.’ Put another way, the Cross brings a ‘strong character, firm faith and unwavering dignity.’  

308 In *Parisiana Poetria*, John proposes a similar formula, ‘Iusque modumque tene, pietate fluant tibi vene ……Nil dextre poterunt ubi mentis prelia deerunt.’  

309 His point is that military superiority is not enough to defeat the Church’s enemies.

The concept that Christendom was being made to suffer for the collective sins of mankind was not new. Alan of Lille’s ‘Sermo de Cruce Domini,’ in all likelihood preached in 1189, vividly presents the crusader as a penitent and the Cross as symbolising that.  

310 Siberry notes that in *De triumphis* John of Garland was the first to link defeat in the Seventh Crusade explicitly with the behaviour of the crusaders in the Holy Land, a theme which continued to resonate.  

311 John says he prefers to pass over in silence the ‘dedecus Ecclesie regisque.’

In the final book John reverts to recruitment, and there are further allegorical passages about the Cross as well as a characterisation of the ideal crusader and glorification of the martyr’s crown which he would earn. After describing the defeat in Egypt, John takes up the crusading theme. ‘Go to it, doctors of the law,

305 Like John, Peter of Blois, an eminent cleric in England and adviser to Henry II, criticized the tardiness and lack of religious fervour of the Christian kings in not avenging the defeat at Hattin (1187).

306 *DTE*, 2.801, 3.69. 4.22.

307 See, for example, Markowski (1984), Tyerman (1998), 26-29. On the significance of the Cross to crusaders, see Housley (2008), 49-52.

308 *DTE*, 8.53-54, 334.

309 *PP*, 70-71.


312 *DTE*, 8.357.
spread the words of the Cross. Let the energy of the Romans, Danes, Spanish, English, Germans, Illyrians take up the weapons of the Cross.’ This is addressed to John’s fellow teachers in the Schools and to Doctors of Theology elsewhere, surely his intended audience for this poem. John, like the magnates of the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1254, had high - if unfulfilled - hopes that Henry III would renew Louis IX’s efforts against the Muslims, after the English king took the Cross in 1250. His hopes of succour from Spain were similarly disappointed. We do not know whether John lived to see the Mameluk attacks on the remains of the Crusader States in the 1260s. But Louis’ abortive crusade proved to be the last serious attempt to win back the Holy Land.

313 See 42-44 above.
315 See DTE, 8, n. 175.
Section 7: The main political sub-plots

The central theme of *De triumphis* is the need for Christendom to carry the fight to its enemies, with a view to their ultimate elimination or conversion, and specifically to recapture the Holy Land and liberate Jerusalem. John’s accompanying *leitmotiv* is that this cannot be achieved without Christian unity in the Latin West. This section considers the two main strands of that theme.

First, John addresses the continuing conflict between England and France, respectively the countries in which he was born and where he chose to live. He includes the Third Crusade and Henry III’s Poitou campaign of 1242 (the ‘Saintonge War’) as catastrophic examples of their mutual hostility. The second underlying crack in Christian solidarity, less fully explored by John, was the power struggle between successive popes and the Emperor Frederick II (1212-1250).

England and France

*An unending conflict*

The Capetian King Philip II (Philip Augustus) ruled France from 1180 to 1223. At the beginning of his reign, the kingdom of France comprised a small area around Paris and the Île de France. Its influence stretched north and east through Flanders and Champagne, and north-west towards Brittany. The Angevin Richard I of England inherited from his father Henry II not only the English crown, but Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, Poitou and Aquitaine, by longstanding practice and tradition as vassal of the French king. Most of modern France east of the Rhône owed allegiance to the emperor throughout the period covered by *De triumphis*. The Occitan-speaking South-West was controlled by a number of powerful nobles mostly loyal to the counts of Toulouse or the kings of Aragon.

By the end of Philip’s reign, French territory had increased dramatically. King John lost to Philip all of continental France except Poitou and Aquitaine. The French under Prince Louis (Louis VIII 1223-26) invaded England in 1216 at the invitation of dissident barons, but were defeated by magnates loyal to the new

---

316 This is a brief account of the broader historical background. For the fuller picture, see Hallam & Everard (2013), 221-75.
infant king, Henry III. As king, Louis VIII secured the loyalty of the fickle Poitevin lords. Under the treaty of Paris in 1229, the French crown effectively secured control of the lands of Raymond VII, Count of Toulouse. After an unsuccessful foray in 1230, Henry III again invaded Poitou in 1242, with no greater success. Louis defeated him militarily, the Poitevin lords deserted him, and in the aftermath Louis finally overcame any remaining resistance to his rule by French nobles. Under another treaty of Paris in 1259, the English renounced all claims to territory in France except for Gascony, which the treaty conceded to them.

John of Garland appears comfortable with his dual national affiliations during this turbulent period. Although he spent most of his life in France, he seems to have gone back at least once to England, and to have retained senior clerical contacts there. He may have had lay patrons in both countries. He forcefully conveys his intense frustration at persistent Anglo-French wars.

John has no doubt that the French had the edge in war.\(^{317}\) Mostly however he presents a balanced scorecard. He credits the strength of the French to ‘their piety, their chivalry in war and their unwavering faith’. The English on the other hand are distinguished by ‘an abundance of silver, their natural intelligence (\textit{ingenium}), the renown of their clergy and respect for the law.’\(^{318}\) Furthermore they are ‘hard working, capable archers, wholly committed to Christ, generous in their hospitality.’\(^{319}\) John characterises the French (\textit{Galli / galli}) as cockerels and the English as rosbifs (\textit{taurus}).\(^{320}\) The bull cannot stand firm as its horns are rendered useless by the cockerels’ swift attacks. ‘As cocks mount hens, so the French subdue the masses, their land and their animals.’ The English are lampooned as drunkards, while John is enamoured of the subtlety of the French language.\(^{321}\)

\textit{The Third Crusade}

John sees the dispute between Richard and Philip during the Third Crusade as crystallising Anglo-French hostility. The argument runs as follows. Philip II,
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\(^{317}\) \textit{DTE}, 3.405-06.

\(^{318}\) \textit{DTE}, 2.55-58.

\(^{319}\) \textit{DTE}, 4.139-40.

\(^{320}\) \textit{DTE}, 2.670-72 & 745-8.

\(^{321}\) \textit{DTE}, 2.803 & 740.
already insulted by Richard’s jilting his sister Alice in favour of Berengaria\textsuperscript{322} was further offended by his triumphalist behaviour in Sicily, and high-handed eviction of Leopold VI, Duke of Austria, from his quarters in Acre.\textsuperscript{323} ‘The Cross would have been returned, and all the Holy Land subdued, had one or other of the leaders not wanted to be pre- eminent.’\textsuperscript{324} In Book 1, John has already told the reader that ‘The city of Acre had generated the [underlying] causes in the past, when the crusader leaders quarrelled. This long-standing dispute between kings was transmitted to the count [Hugh X de Lusignan],’ via his wife, Henry III’s mother.\textsuperscript{325} Again in Book 2, ‘Acre witnessed the seeds of the long quarrel between King Richard and King Philip. Its root cause flowed across the seas from the Holy Land.’\textsuperscript{326} In the Epithalamium, John could not be more untranslatably tactful: ‘Consortis tamen impatiens, animosa potestas/ Distracto revocat regia corda iugo’/ ‘The pride of power grew weary of sharing and, breaking apart their yoke claimed back the sprits of the kings.’\textsuperscript{327} In the same passage, John wrongly dates the kings’ dispute after Richard’s capture of Jaffa.

It is in any case no accident that John gives a substantive account of the Third Crusade, whilst mentioning only \textit{en passant} the First, Second, Fifth, Sixth and Barons’ Crusades, omitting the Fourth altogether. It was a direct response to the loss of Jerusalem (1187), and the most recent crusade in which major Western monarchs had personally taken part. The crusading armies had travelled by sea and dallied in Cyprus. Most importantly, it was within the living memory of the older generation when John was a young man. Moreover, the reputation, legend even, of Richard the Lionheart was still bright. John presents him in heroic style, as he largely repeats what others have written about the Third Crusade. He has ‘the heart of a lion’; ‘his pre-eminent reputation makes magnificent Richard live for ever, whose long glory can never die.’ John tells us, uniquely, that a comet marked his death.\textsuperscript{328}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{322} \textit{DTE}, 3.129-32. John blames Richard’s mother Eleanor of Aquitaine for his rejection of Alice.
\textsuperscript{323} \textit{DTE}, 3.157-68.
\textsuperscript{324} \textit{DTE}, 3.169-70.
\textsuperscript{325} \textit{DTE}, 1.295-96.
\textsuperscript{326} \textit{DTE}, 2.651-54.
\textsuperscript{327} \textit{EBVM}, 4.89-90.
\textsuperscript{328} \textit{DTE}, 3.64-65, 83-84, 194. On Richard’s reputation, see Gillingham (1999), 254-68.
\end{footnotesize}
Richard emerges with heroic status. His deeds are ‘to be sung about at the
crossroads’. Yet John still manages to use Richard’s achievements as a literary
device to ensure that Louis IX emerges as the inspiring figure of the poem. He
achieves this by playing down the transitory nature of Richard’s feats ahead of his
account of the Crusade. ‘What has Alexander the Great, what has bold Julius
[now]? What has the King with the heart of a lion, whose noble status was the
[underlying] cause of this affliction?’ He even at one point says that Louis was
a greater king than Richard.

John does not throw new light on the Third Crusade, and his account seems
largely based on the Itinerarium, though at times he uses other sources. This
section was probably written during the 1220s.

Philip II, Louis VIII and King John

Philip II is portrayed less glamorously than Richard I, though he is characterised
as ‘magnus.’ His persistent undermining of Richard’s position in England and
the French mainland during the crusade, and his role in Richard’s imprisonment
are not mentioned. John does however say that King John’s lands were lost
through deception, in a very clear implied criticism of Philip. King John gets an
unusually sympathetic hearing. He is praised more than once for his generalship,
and John of Garland makes clear that he regards the Angevins as the rightful
dukes of Normandy. He gives a cursory account of King John’s campaigns with
brief mention of the battle of Bouvines (1214), Philip’s great triumph over the
Emperor Otto and King John, already heavily celebrated by William le Breton in
the Philippide. In death, John alleges by poison, the king is described as generous
and brave. John briefly describes the battle of Lincoln (1216), fulsomely
praising the valour of William Marshal and Nicloaa de la Haye. He draws some
consolation from Prince Louis’ invasion of England in 1216-17, without dwelling
on its failure or Philip’s supporting behind-scenes role. Louis’ reign (1223-26) as

329 DTE, 3.63-64.
330 See n. 344 below.
331 These instances are noted in the footnotes to Book 3.
332 DTE, 2.112.
333 DTE, 3.207-08.
334 E.g. DTE, 2.315-16
335 DTE, 3.265
336 DTE, 2.275-80
Louis VIII is scarcely mentioned, though John gives him a gracious epitaph. He has little or nothing to say about Anglo-French or indeed any other world events in the 1220s and 1230s, a period when he was busy writing grammatical and religious works. Although he starts Book 6 writing about the year 1229 like a chronicler, he swiftly becomes engrossed in his experiences in Toulouse.

**Louis IX and Henry III**

Where John makes comparisons, he presents both Angevins and Capetians in a similar and favourable light. ‘Each of them [Louis IX and Henry III] is benign towards the Church, but fierce in war, has the appearance of righteousness and is in no way neglectful.’ They are both great military motivators. In the Preface he says he will write about the kings of the French as ‘loyal champions of the Church.’ ‘I shall write of the glittering deeds of each of our leaders. One is good, the other pious; one has a sense of fairness (equus), the other pursues justice (justus). Each strives to conform to his own nature.’ John’s model leader, Louis IX by implication, has the martial skills of Joshua, the capacity for prayer of Moses, the patience of Job, the intellect of Odysseus and the generosity of Titus.

John strangely neglects Henry III as an individual, despite at least in 1258 knowing senior members of his court. His character is undeveloped in the detailed coverage of his humiliating defeat in Poitou. Whilst not immune from criticism, Louis on the other hand emerges from humiliation in the final book with honour and glory. And great though Richard the Lionheart had been, Louis’ destiny was even greater. ‘Louis, a greater [king], descended from Richard’s noble stock, will be no stranger to equally great praise.’ Louis is lavishly praised for acquiring relics and building Sainte Chapelle to house them; but although Henry began rebuilding Westminster Abbey in 1245, and acquired the
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338 See 25 above.
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344 *DTE*, 3.95-96.
relic of the Holy Blood in 1247, John does not mention them.\textsuperscript{345} He seems to believe in Henry’s sincere intention to go on crusade,\textsuperscript{346} but Louis is ‘father of knighthood and of peace, a shield for both, recruit to the faith and champion of the Cross.’\textsuperscript{347}

John emphasises throughout the antiquity of both monarchies by drawing repeatedly on Geoffrey of Monmouth and Pseudo-Turpin for historical digressions. He reflects a more general fashion of tracing the Capetians back in direct line to Charlemagne, fostered by the monarchy from Philip II onwards to boost their legitimacy and enhance their reputation.\textsuperscript{348} John reminds his readers of the nobility and influence of both royal lines, of their direct descent from William the Conqueror, and of the spread of Norman power. This is emphasised in the manuscript by the illustration on f. 75r (\textbf{Plate 4, p. 157}).\textsuperscript{349} The narrative also contains stories of King Arthur and the early English kings, but John makes no parallel effort to trace back the lineage of the English kings, and the stories are largely \textit{exempla}, to entertain or divert, reflecting the popularity of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

\textit{The ‘Saintonge War’}

At the beginning of their reigns because of their youth, then perhaps because of their mutual suspicion and spasmodic skirmishing, the kings of England and France were conspicuously not in the Holy Land. They took no part in the so-called Barons’ Crusade (1239-41),\textsuperscript{350} led first by Thibault of Champagne, then by Henry III’s brother, Richard of Cornwall. John mentions it briefly. On the other hand he devotes an eighth of the whole text, to the ‘Saintonge War,’ a brief and undignified invasion of Poitou by Henry in 1242, with other writers largely a non-event. This fiasco made a powerful impression on him, precisely because it exemplified the distractive force of Anglo-French rivalries. Its prominence would

\textsuperscript{345} On this, John does not follow Matthew Paris who prominently covers Henry III’s religious efforts.
\textsuperscript{346} On Henry’s crusading credentials, see Forey (1973).
\textsuperscript{347} \textit{DTE}, 2.61-62.
\textsuperscript{348} Egidius Parisius’ \textit{Karolinus} is a notable example from 1200. See Le Goff (2009), 41-43 for a succinct account of the Capetians’ emphasis on their descent from Charlemagne and the Merovingians before him.
\textsuperscript{349} \textit{DTE}, 2.121-26 & n.31.
\textsuperscript{350} \textit{DTE}, 7.175-84. For a full account of the Barons’ Crusade, see Lower (2005).
however make perfect sense if John did indeed have a sponsor from the Lusignan family. John’s account is spread over Books 1-3, and is awkwardly punctuated by long digressions. It is quite possible that he originally wrote this as a separate poem during the period 1242-45. His coverage feels disjointed and repetitive, and would have benefited greatly from further editing.

The ‘Saintonge War’ occurred just before John’s substantial period of work on *De triumphis* around 1245.\(^{351}\) Despite its apparent irrelevance to the poem’s title and broad crusading theme, it was a perfect case study for John. It devastated the countryside and ruined country people’s lives, illustrating the corrosive effects of gossip and rumour, fickle magnates, meddling bishops and the horrors of war in general. Most of all it distracted the kings, and provided an excuse for the nobles not to commit to the fight for the Holy Land and against the Mongols. John leaves us in no doubt about his passion for Anglo-French rapprochement, and implores Henry III and Louis IX to settle their differences.\(^{352}\)

The war arose because Hugh X de Lusignan invited Henry III, his half-brother, to intervene in his support after he had launched a rebellion against the youthful new king of France, Louis IX. John blames Isabella of Angoulême, mother of Henry III and Richard of Cornwall, now married to Hugh, for inciting him to this.\(^{353}\) Hugh was reacting to Louis’ grant of the county of Poitou to his own brother Alphonse, overriding Richard’s claim. Hugh refused to swear fealty to Alphonse, which triggered a swift attack by Louis on Hugh’s strongholds. Henry saw this as a further opportunity to retake the lands in France lost by his father, despite Hugh’s known political fickleness. Henry and his small invading force were soon abandoned by Hugh and other leading Poitevin magnates, who were induced to switch their allegiance to Louis, but not before Henry’s forces were decisively beaten in the battles of Taillebourg and Saintes. Henry himself was forced to flee and narrowly escaped capture, thanks partly to a severe epidemic among Louis’ troops in Blaye.\(^{354}\) The operation undermined permanently any prospect of English rule in Poitou, as Henry III finally acknowledged in another Treaty of

\(^{351}\) For the war, see CM, 4.179-224 *passim*, William of Nangis, *Chronicon*, 194-95. See also Le Goff (1996), 150-55, (2009), 102-07.

\(^{352}\) *DTE* 7.283-84,

\(^{353}\) See *DTE*, 1. n. 105 & Grant (2016), 125-27.

\(^{354}\) Graphically described in *DTE*, 3.669-78.
Paris in 1259. Hugh retained some of his territory and avoided the harshest penalties, but was forced to accompany Louis on crusade and died at Damietta, like his father before him in the Fifth Crusade. Raymond VII of Toulouse, Hugh’s ally against Louis, was soon forced to surrender in 1243.

John’s writing reveals a conflict of loyalties. He acknowledges the ultimate right of the French king to impose his will on his vassal, Hugh, and the corresponding duty of Hugh not to take up arms against his lord. But he also believes that Louis over-reacted and that Alphonse’s behaviour was arrogant. He praises Hugh’s valour, nobility and probity and presents the two cases as finely balanced—drawing a fine distinction between fairness and rights, though elsewhere in the poem he presents Hugh as an involuntary turncoat. Henry is implausibly portrayed as coming to Poitou with peaceful intentions, and to have been duped by Poitevin magnates, notably Reginald of Pons who had received large subsidies from him. That said, John’s inconsistent tone towards Hugh may simply mean that his views changed over time and that he did not have time to edit them.

This victory did however provide Louis with the commanding position he needed to pacify his domestic enemies and neutralise the English. By the time he took the Cross in 1244 and his crusade was launched at the Council of Lyon in 1245, he was able to commit himself to careful preparations.

**Papacy and empire**

Equally damaging to the unity of Western Christendom in the first half of the thirteenth century was the continuing hostility between the papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. John understood very well that this seriously damaged the military capability of the West. At the end of a passionate appeal to the English
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355 *DTE*, 3.658-60.
356 D. Abulafia (1988) provides an admirable account of Frederick (1194-1250) and of the events of his reign. It is impossible to do justice here to the complexities of this feud. In brief, Frederick, brought up as a ward of Pope Innocent III, became Holy Roman Emperor in 1215, and was crowned by Pope Honorius in 1220. He soon came into continuous political and sometimes armed conflict with the papacy for complex reasons, but at the heart of the bitter dispute was the pope’s continuing papal resistance to Frederick’s territorial control and determination to retain papal lands in Italy. Frederick was repeatedly excommunicated, for the last time in 1245, when he was deposed by the Council of Lyon on multiple charges including heresy and failure to support crusading efforts. He became king of Jerusalem by marriage in 1225, and led an expedition to the Holy Land in 1227-9 (known as the Sixth Crusade), securing access through negotiation to the holy places and Christian control of a demilitarised Jerusalem.
and French kings to unite under the Cross, John appeals also to Frederick. ‘There are two consecrated kings. One is French, the other English. Each rules in state. The third king should have been available to the holy Church, whom holy Jerusalem is missing because of his savage wars.’

In contrast to his set-pieces on England and France, John’s references to this dispute are more like sections of linking commentary or even asides, often short, allusive and ambiguous. John comes close to narrative about Frederick only when he relates the proceedings of the Council of Lyon. Odd facts, such as references to his Italian wars, are dotted around the text. Some of the passages about Frederick are in leonine verse, suggesting incorporation of lines from a separate poem, mainly in Book 5. The core dispute, however, is a theme running through the whole work, appearing in all books except the fourth.

Unsurprisingly John’s commitment to the papal cause is never in doubt. Innocent IV’s central role in rallying Christians emerges at the outset. The doughty spirit of the present pope has feared neither bloody swords nor threats of martyrdom.’ … ‘the pope is vigorous in his energy.’ … ‘Innocent IV, heir to Gregory, confronts his enemies with the sword of canon law,’ just as Eli had acquiesced in God’s punishment of his sons. Here John is writing at the time of the Council of Lyon and supports Innocent’s firm approach to Frederick, once his ward. He had expected little of Celestine IV; ‘things which are falling cannot stay upright for long.’ But John does not name Frederick, or the mindless gossips who slander the pope. ‘I report what others talk about openly, but I do not testify to its truth. Nobody, rich or poor, suffers harm from my lips.’

One at least of the references to Frederick may have survived an earlier version of the poem and relate to events of the 1220s, though the text does not allow certainty. ‘Insofar as Frederick observes the rules of peace in this matter, he deserves praise and just treatment. If he were to bring succour to captive
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357 DTE, 2.115.
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Jerusalem, victory would bring him a broader empire. But his own reputation is waning, since he is undermining the status of mother Church and harassing the pope. Frederick promises in exchange for a well-founded peace to restore the territory of Jerusalem to that which the popes held in the past. David was a murderer, a deceiver and adulterer, but, in tears, his supreme piety saved him as he wept.\footnote{\textit{DTE}, 2.95-104.} John does however unequivocally identify Frederick’s direct intervention during the papal interregnum in 1241, when he seized a number of legates and bishops at sea and held them prisoner. `The sons of the Church are going beyond civil wars, and harassing the holy fathers and the Church. Some men, who have learned to give nothing to their benign God, derive pleasure from spending their lives in wars.`\footnote{\textit{DTE}, 1.369-70.} Later however John acknowledges that the emperor has released the bishops and implies that Frederick has actively sought to get a righteous / `iustum` (or perhaps `legitimate`) pope elected. John strikes the same querulous note with Frederick as with the land-grabbing of Henry and Louis, in blaming the most recent war on his seizure of the pope’s estates (`predia`).\footnote{\textit{DTE}, 6.270-86.} Frederick is adhering to the rule of law if he attacks heretics and punishes rebellious citizens. The right thing to do would be to establish peace between Innocent and Frederick by `force or love` (`vi vel amore`), though it is the emperor, depicted as the son, who should yield to the father / pope. `This feeble pen rebukes you [both], the written page chides you, the unadorned letters of my text publish the charges.`\footnote{\textit{DTE}, 3.375-80.}

After the Council of Lyon (1245), John’s tone is more mocking, yet still ambiguous. He describes Frederick as `fortis`, which can mean `brave`, as well as `powerful`.\footnote{\textit{DTE}, 7.289.} John refers to Frederick’s nobility (`probitas`), while offering him the example of Constantine. He urges him to return the pope’s land, support the Christians and not worship idols.\footnote{\textit{DTE}, 5.217-22.} Explicitly reporting the Council, John writes cryptically, `Learn of everything which was done on the Pope’s nod. The tearful sign of the crab, which walks backwards, was deposed, and pointed the way to sad times. Though this man was an astrologer, he did not see his deposition in the
stars, and that he himself would yield up his rank. But Leo the Lion follows on from Cancer the Crab. If a lion emerges, he will make strong men shake with fear. The pope will provide the sword, but if anyone misuses it, he who offered the gift should take it away.  

369 John takes pleasure from Frederick’s defeat at Parma in 1248, though at his death in 1250 the emperor receives a gracious enough epitaph.  

Both in regard to the 1220s and the 1240s John’s tone towards Frederick was far less abrasive than that adopted by Innocent IV himself and by the documents of the Council of Lyon. He leaves the impression that he passionately wanted a rapprochement and believed it was possible. It is consistent with his sincere desire for peace and his accurate vision of the need for Christian unity. His vision of a compact between pope and emperor appears first in the *Poetria Parisiana*, in the context of model letters between Pope Honorius and Frederick at the time of the Fifth Crusade or the early 1220s,  

371 and he never lost hope of a reconciliation.
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Section 8: Countering the ‘other’: Heretics, Mongols, Jews and Muslims

The Albigensian Crusade and the Mongol invasions were among the major events of John’s lifetime, and receive full coverage in *De triumphis*. For John, they rank alongside Anglo-French disharmony as causes of procrastination and diversion of resources away from recovering Jerusalem and defeating the main enemy, Islam. Although no war was fought against the Jews, John implicates them in the Mongol invasion, and through usury, links them with the heretics as well. All three groups were enemies of the Church whom John routinely reviles. He does not develop an Apocalyptic theme, though he uses Apocalyptic language to characterise both Mongols and Jews.372

The Albigensian Crusade (1208-29)

Whether or not John had visited the Languedoc earlier,373 it is highly likely that he wrote a verse account of the Albigensian Crusade374 before or during his period teaching in Toulouse in 1229-32, though operations against the Cathars in 1242-44 may have prompted revision as John put together *De triumphis*. There is however no evidence that he ‘published’ it separately. It finds its way into *De triumphis* because of John’s personal engagement in the post-war attempt at rehabilitation of the Languedoc. He presents the crusade to the South as a telling example, like the Saintonge War, of Christians fighting each other or other enemies of the Church, rather than mobilising for an expedition to the Holy Land. Motives deriving from patronage, for example by a member of the de Montfort family, could also have been motivated John to give the crusade so central a place.375

In Toulouse John would have met many with memories of the sieges of 1211, 1216 and 1217-18. He is likely to have been familiar with Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay’s *Historia Albigensis*, effectively an official history, and probably

372 *DTE*, 7.61-64 & 4.391-96 respectively. Compare Innocent III’s language likening Muhammad to the beast of the Apocalypse in the Bull *Quia maior* of April 1213.
373 Evidence of a possible earlier visit is discussed at 21 above. At Louis IX’s insistence, Raymond VII, abandoning his own rebellion, finally crushed armed Cathar military resistance at Monségur in 1244.
375 See 23-24 above.
available soon after 1218, and with widely circulated papal correspondence of the
time. He may also have had access to the earlier chapters of William of
Puylaurens’ Chronica, though this was finalised many years later. William
evidently worked closely with Fulk, bishop of Toulouse, during John’s stay
there. John also clearly read or heard the vernacular Cansó, of which Meyer’s
edition identified three important points which otherwise appear only in De
triumphis Ecclesie. John’s vivid accounts of the battle of Muret and of the
1217-18 siege of Toulouse owe more to eyewitness accounts and the Cansó than
to the chroniclers.

In seeking to analyse the causes of the Albigensian Crusade, John provides a
unique explanation of papal hostility to the Trencavel family. In a fabliau-like
cameo, he alleges that the bishop of Albi seduced the wife of Roger II
Trencavel (viscount of Béziers, 1167-94). Roger, a crusader, had entrusted her to
his godfather, the bishop, while he was abroad, by implication, ‘peregre’ on
crusade; and his murderous revenge had incurred the unrelenting hostility of the
legate and the papacy. Indeed on the basis of it, Leclerc dismissed John as ‘frivole
historien,’ for linking ‘aventures d’amour’ with the gravity of Peter of
Castelnau’s murder. Surely, however, John has confused this story with that of
an earlier legate, Henry of Marcy, who excommunicated Roger II in 1178 for
imprisoning the bishop of Albi, for reasons unknown. John notes that Raymond
V, count of Toulouse (1148-94) did not back Roger, his vassal and son-in-law.
The incident exemplifies John’s sniping at clerical venality. Although John clearly
has his doubts, and tales of lecherous bishops were no doubt frequent, he is not
usually a gossip-monger and the story reads like at least a part of local oral
tradition. This passage further explains, or is perhaps explained by, the continuing
rift between the Trencavels and the counts of Toulouse, and the harsh treatment

376 Sibly & Sibly ed. & trans., Intro., xxi-xxii and xxviii. See also DTE, 5.257-68.
377 See above. La Chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois, commencée par Guillaume de
Tudèle et continuée par un poète anonyme, ed. & trans. (French) P. Meyer, (Paris, 1875), vol. 2,
xxi-xxiii. The points are at DTE, 5.47-48 Simon’s prayer for death or glory; DTE, 5.53 and the
Cansó uniquely mention Hugh de Lacy; and only the Cansó and DTE, 5.77-82 tell us that the
petrary which killed Simon was operated by women.
378 DTE, 4.21-46.
379 See 50 above.
380 Adelaide, daughter of Raymond V of Toulouse.
381 DTE, 4.23.
382 Leclerc (1852), 84.
by the crusaders of Roger’s son, Raymond-Roger (viscount of Béziers, 1194-1209).\textsuperscript{383}

John consistently shows some sympathy with the Southern aristocracy. In his view, Roger II was a returning crusader, doing no more than exacting justified revenge for a betrayal of trust. In the same way his son, Raymond-Roger, resisted the invading crusaders to protect his rights. He was killed by ‘\textit{damna, pudor, carcer, ira, dieta, dolor}.’ Without naming names this is a powerful indictment of his death in prison after his surrender before Carcassonne (1209).\textsuperscript{384}

Raymond V, Roger’s lord, had failed to act, afraid of losing the respect of his kinsman Roger and of the Church.\textsuperscript{385} He helped neither and lost the respect of both. John draws the parallel as he moves seamlessly from Raymond V to his son, Raymond VI (1194-1222). He praises Raymond, exonerating him from authorizing Peter of Castelnau’s murder in 1208. ‘\textit{Saepe facit facinus famulus quod non facit heros / Nec iubet, inde tamen criment habere potest}.’\textsuperscript{386} John introduces Raymond’s son, Raymond VII (1222-49) as ‘\textit{Audax Remundus, Hectora corde gerit},’ lamenting his untimely death which prevented him from joining Louis’ crusade. John praises too his crusader ancestor, Raymond IV (of Saint-Gilles), in a rare reference to the First Crusade.\textsuperscript{387} He fulsomely sums up,\textsuperscript{388} ‘\textit{Remundos igitur animosos alta Tholosa / Gignit, quos partum bellica vita iuvat}.’

John’s account of the Treaty of Paris is relatively even-handed, but hints strongly at Raymond VII’s subsequent non-compliance. He implies that Raymond sympathised with the heretics, whilst allowing them to be burned. Yet he also says that Raymond VII’s noble origins, royal links, financial and military strength and ‘\textit{probitas}’ enhance his reputation.\textsuperscript{389} John again avoids blaming Raymond VII

\textsuperscript{383} Graham–Leigh (2005) does not mention this alleged episode. Nor does Roger of Howden, the only source for Henry de Marcy’s delegation, refer to the incident, RH,156 and 165. I have been unable to confirm that Roger II was in fact \textit{crucesignatus}, though previous generations of Trencavel fought in the First and Second Crusades, Riley-Smith (1997), 103 and n. 145). It is possible that he had ‘crusaded’ in Iberia. Raymond VI abandoned Raymond-Roger, his son-in-law, in 1209, having joined the crusaders, and was present at the sieges of Béziers and Carcassonne.

\textsuperscript{384} \textit{DTE}, 4.413-14.

\textsuperscript{385} \textit{DTE}, 4.53-54.

\textsuperscript{386} \textit{DTE}, 4.57-58.

\textsuperscript{387} \textit{DTE}, 2.129-32.

\textsuperscript{388} \textit{DTE}, 4.509-10.

\textsuperscript{389} \textit{DTE}, 5.255-56.
directly for the murder of the inquisitors in Avignonet (Garonne) in 1242.\textsuperscript{390} It was, of course, he who briefly paid John’s wages in Toulouse.

Despite this strong hint of sympathy for the aristocracy of the Midi, John accuses unnamed ‘\textit{prelustres magnanimique duces}’ of becoming heretics, instead of being baptized.\textsuperscript{391} He avoids criticising their rural populations: ‘\textit{Sunt ibi concives iusti, validique coloni, / Proxima sed puris fex inimica nocet.’ While the Church is arming crusaders against them, it is by so doing postponing ‘\textit{Terre promotio Sacre.’}\textsuperscript{392} Yet John never questions the justice or necessity of this crusade, ostensibly against heresy.

John does not give a detailed account of the lengthy war. He dramatically highlights two pivotal set-pieces, the battle of Muret (1213), and the second siege of Toulouse (1217-18).\textsuperscript{393} He uses them to display Simon de Montfort’s heroic status, in the first by his bravery and skill in battle, the second by his death, tragic despite its bathos. The two episodes are split between Books 4 and 5 at the mid-point of the poem, and are carefully balanced, with Peter of Aragon as the tragic hero at Muret. One year previously he had triumphed over the Moors at Las Navas de Tolosa, but now he was humbled by his own arrogance.\textsuperscript{394} De Montfort displays ‘\textit{virtus altissima},’ scorning ostentation. He is ‘\textit{Symon conformis Achilli.’}\textsuperscript{395} Re-ordering the text of this edition reveals that John was harshly critical of the bloody sack of Béziers, rather than guilty of confusing the sieges of Béziers and Carcassonne.\textsuperscript{396} John’s description of Raymond-Roger’s peaceful surrender at Carcassonne and the fate of its citizens imply criticism of the papal legate but not of Simon de Montfort. Raymond-Roger’s death soon after in prison is not mentioned here, but later, again without naming names, Simon is obliquely called to account.\textsuperscript{397}

\textsuperscript{390} \textit{DTE}, 7.277-80.
\textsuperscript{391} \textit{DTE}, 4.125-26.
\textsuperscript{392} \textit{DTE}, 4.69-70.
\textsuperscript{393} For Muret, see \textit{DTE}, 4.411-4.482, and for the 1218 siege of Toulouse, 5.11-84.
\textsuperscript{394} \textit{DTE}, 4.430. See \textit{DTE}, 4.465-78, a sympathetic obituary, and a tribute to Peter’s successor, Jaime II. Smith (2010), 13-19, assesses the impact of Muret on the kingdom of Aragon. Peter had tried unsuccessfully to mediate at Carcassonne. John attributes his entry to the war to Raymond-Roger’s death in captivity.
\textsuperscript{395} \textit{DTE}, 4.427 & 435. Compare the adulatory treatment in PVC, 104-06, and in the \textit{Cansô}, 35.
\textsuperscript{396} \textit{DTE}, 4.179-82 & nn. 46 & 47.
\textsuperscript{397} \textit{DTE}, 4.413-14.
Apart from the initial invasion of Languedoc and the two battles, John’s narrative is brief and strongly focused on Toulouse itself. He covers the decade between the death of de Montfort (1219) and the treaty of Paris (1229) at the end of the war in two short linking passages, which include Louis VIII’s death (1226). John gives no information about the continuing engagement of the papacy in Languedoc or about civic factionalism in Toulouse. His coverage is selective and mostly based on clerical accounts. Like them, John avoids direct unpleasant truths regarding the crusaders; but in contrast he shows respect and sympathy for the Southern nobility. He makes a few unique observations, and brings a vigour to the battle scenes which suggests contact with recent eye-witnesses and participants. The matching deaths of de Montfort and Peter II of Aragon and the prophecy linking Béziers, Carcassonne and Toulouse are useful literary devices. They enable John to weave his material on the crusade into his broader theme, both historic and literary, and to make his sojourn in Toulouse a natural element of the broader picture.

Heretics

In this poem, ‘heretici,’ ‘heresis’ or ‘scismatici’ usually refer to the so-called Albigensians in Languedoc, though the Waldensians are also so described. The word is applied in practice to anyone suspected of unorthodox Christian views. John attempts no systematic explanation or refutation of heretical beliefs. He pays generous tribute to Alan of Lille, who did precisely that in De Fide Catholica: Contra Hereticos, Waldenses, Iudaeos et Paganos. Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay provided an account of the ‘sects’ and their beliefs, which John had probably read. He recognizes that there were multiple ‘sects’. He usually uses ‘heretici’ to describe adherents of ‘heresis’, but twice uses ‘Waldenses’, without apparently seeming to differentiate, and once only, ‘Albigensis.’ Although John regards

---

398 DTE, 5.235-38.
399 Rist (2009), 219-28, helpfully summarises continuing papal objectives in Languedoc. On rival confraternities in Toulouse, see WP, 15 and Cansó, 47.
400 Apart from the bishop of Albi story, John’s reference to Savary de Mauléon, DTE, 4.489, and some of the details of siege engines are unique to this poem.
401 DTE, 4.155-64 & n. 42.
402 For a succinct account of Cathar beliefs in the Languedoc see Jiménez-Sanchez (2008), 296-304.
403 DTE, 4.203-06.
404 PVC, 10-19.
wars against heretics as a distraction, he does not question that they have to be dealt with, or that victory in the Albigensian Crusade counted among the triumphs of the Church.

He shows some superficial knowledge of Cathar beliefs. He attacks heretics through riddles, paradoxes and debating points, even jokes, reminiscent of preaching or public heckling. He clearly understands that Cathars have dualist beliefs, and do not believe in the Trinity. But his prime focus is on their general disrespect for the Church and its rituals and their alleged usury. John says they reject any pattern in celestial events, believing them to occur randomly. He knows that they spurn the concepts of heaven and hell, and divine judgment. They stand accused of mocking the clergy, ignoring the laws of the Church, despising sacred objects and worshipping idols – they are hypocrites, who commit murders and other atrocities. They ignore the ides, nones and kalends, the Sabbath, Saints’ Days and Holy Days, not from religious belief but to maximize interest on usurious loans.

To describe heretics and heresy, John uses the metaphors of the Church extensively. He refers to heretics repeatedly, throughout the poem, as the worst of all the Church’s enemies, operating secretly under cover of piety. However much sympathy John may have for the Languedocien lords, he shows none whatsoever for heretics. He compares them to a hydra spitting poison, and with thorn-bushes, weeds, burrs and other harmful plants, and with the Jews. While the Church is arming crusaders against them, it is by so doing postponing ‘Terre promotio Sacre’ / ‘recruiting for the Holy Land’. Yet despite much hand-wringing, John never questions the justice or necessity of this crusade, ostensibly against heresy.

---

406 DTE, 4.102-108
407 DTE, 4.91-92 & 103.
408 DTE, 4.113.
409 See also WP, trans. Sibly & Sibly, 35, n. 20, and Mundy (1954), 77, for the association of usury with heresy.
410 DTE, 4.81-82. This type of language is commonplace in anti-Cathar rhetoric, see Sackville (2011), 109.
411 DTE, 4.383-84, 141-42, and 389-90.
412 DTE, 4.69-70
The Mongol invasions (1241–42)

Christian Europe was deeply shocked by the brutal incursions of Mongols from central Asia from 1237 onwards, and John successfully conveys the Apocalyptic horror they instilled.\textsuperscript{413} They devastated first Russia, then in 1241 Hungary, Moravia and Poland. The West offered no effective military opposition, but following the death of the Khan Ögödei in December 1241, the Mongols themselves decided to turn back. By 1245, there were rumours of further Mongol armies massing in the Middle East. It was under Mongol pressure that the Turkic Khwarazmians had been pushed West, capturing Jerusalem and helping the Egyptians to crush the Christian armies in 1244. A ‘\textit{remedium contra Tartaros}’ was high on the agenda of the Council of Lyon in 1245. Western Christendom was concerned with two risks; that the Mongols would attack Europe again, but also that they would intensify pressure to the South, using their tightening grip on Asia Minor to attack the crusader states. Matthew Paris reports that Armenia and the principality of Antioch were paying tribute by 1246, while the Mongols again threatened Hungary.\textsuperscript{414}

Four papal embassies were despatched in 1245 to make contact with the Mongols, including one led by Andrew of Longjumeau. John does not refer to these missions or their outcomes, though he may have seen the \textit{Ystoria Mongolarum} of John of Plano Carpini who reported back to the pope in 1247. But he does warn that while Louis IX was pressing the Mongols to convert, the French army should beware of a trap.\textsuperscript{415} Louis had received a delegation from the Mongol general Eljigidei during his own stay in Cyprus. Encouraged by their information that the Khan Güyüg had converted to Christianity, apparently supported by other independent evidence,\textsuperscript{416} Louis despatched Andrew of Longjumeau on a second mission in 1249 with the gift to the khan of a portable chapel. It may however have been the Mongols’ uncompromising response, reported back by Andrew to Louis in Caesarea in 1251, which prompted John’s warning.\textsuperscript{417}

\textsuperscript{413} For full accounts of the Mongol invasions, see Jackson (2005), 58-86, Morgan (2007), 152-59, Berend (2001), 33-37, 163-71. See \textit{DTE}, 7. 61-64 & n. 19 for his identification of the Muslims’ leader as the Antichrist.

\textsuperscript{414} \textit{CM}, 4.547.

\textsuperscript{415} \textit{DTE}, 8.95-96. See also \textit{CM}, 5.87.

\textsuperscript{416} Vincent of Beauvais, 32.92.

\textsuperscript{417} Matthew Paris did not report the outcome, and we rely on Joinville, 470 & 490-92.
The similarities between John’s account and Matthew Paris’s are discussed at p. 55 above. Both claim their own clerical sources for the graphic descriptions of Mongol atrocities. Widely circulated ‘eye-witness’ clerical accounts at the time have survived. It seems likely that John wrote the sections about the Mongols between 1241 and 1245, and added references to them in the early 1250s in the Prologue and in Book 8.

For John the Mongols were the instrument of the devil, showing his frustration at the triumph of the Church. He does not generally address Apocalyptic themes, but does go so far as to identify the (unnamed) leader of the Mongols with the Antichrist. Importantly, he also sees them as a punishment for the current sins of the ‘plebs mendax’—killing righteous men, harrying the Church, and general lust. In contemporary terms, this must mean the Cathars, again in armed rebellion in Languedoc, and those supporting Frederick II against the pope. The Mongols were another obstacle to effective action in the Holy Land. John well understood the seriousness of the threat they posed. Rather than arguing that they were an avoidable distraction, he complains that neither the pope nor the kings have responded adequately, though the Germans are given some credit for their military efforts. John blames the Cumans for letting the Mongols pass and for undermining the king of Hungary. He sadly observes that if only the French and English kings could work together in perpetuity, not only the Mongols but also the Muslims would be defeated.

John’s account of the habits and atrocities of the Mongols is sensational and designed to shock. They are manifestly a further punishment of mankind for original and recent sin. He otherwise gives a sketchy account of the invasions of 1241-42 themselves. In the last book, John accurately observes, probably in
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418 E.g. *MGHSS*, 29.547-67, 585-95.
419 John’s main account is in *DTE*, 6.353-7, and 7.1-162, with some digressions. The later references are *DTE*, Prologue.79-80 and 8.587-88.
420 *DTE*, 7.61 & n. 19.
421 *DTE*, 7.5-7.
422 *DTE*, 7.160, perhaps more than they deserve. See Jackson (2005), 67, for the view that the German effort, also praised by Matthew Paris, was minimal.
424 *DTE*, 7.265-68. John of Plano Carpini, *Ystoria Mongolarum*, 12 observes that the Christians could only hope to defeat the Mongols if they were unified.
425 John was no stranger to prurient detail, as *DTE*, 6. 217-44 shows.
1251-52, that the Mongols are divided,\textsuperscript{426} and confidently concludes that Christianity will prevail, though the Mongols are still ‘lording it’/ ‘\textit{dominantes.’}

**Jews**

John was writing \textit{De triumphis Ecclesie} at a time when both Louis IX and Henry III were taking active legislative and fiscal measures against Jews.\textsuperscript{427} This was partly a culmination of measures to implement decisions of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215,\textsuperscript{428} and partly driven by appropriation, with papal encouragement, of the interest from usury to finance the forthcoming crusade.\textsuperscript{429} His unremitting hostility to the Jews is neither surprising nor unusual for the time, though it is less dominant a theme here than in the \textit{Epithalamium}. He routinely accuses the Jews of falsely claiming God’s law and consigns them to hell.\textsuperscript{430}

Noteworthy however is his reference to the ‘Jewish plot’ to support the Mongols, otherwise reported only by Matthew Paris, and documented above.\textsuperscript{431} John calls both peoples criminal (\textit{scelerata}) and says that the Mongols performed religious sacrifices like the Jews. He assures his readers that the Mongols are circumcised, though Matthew Paris says they neither spoke Hebrew nor understood Mosaic law.\textsuperscript{432} Matthew alludes to the Jews’ belief that the Mongols were the ten lost tribes of Israel, while John says that the Jews believed their own long-expected Messiah was arriving. John is sometimes so carried away by his indignation that he fails to distinguish clearly between the Mongols and the Jews; in two passages in Book 7 it is difficult to unravel to which of them he is referring.\textsuperscript{433}

\textsuperscript{426} \textit{DTE}, 8.509-14, 587 & n.188.
\textsuperscript{427} See, e.g., Jordan (1979), 85-86, Carpenter (1996), 111.
\textsuperscript{428} Le Goff (2009), 652-56.
\textsuperscript{429} See \textit{CM}, 4.459, Matthew Paris’ account of the canons of the Council of Lyon.
\textsuperscript{430} \textit{DTE}, 4.389-90.
\textsuperscript{431} \textit{CM}, 4.131-33. Menache (1996) & (1997), 143-44 examine the ‘plot’ in detail. Without mentioning this text, she shows that the Jews did indeed expect the arrival of their Messiah around this time and saw the Mongols as a god-given scourge of the Western Christians. However unsubstantiated, this ‘plot’ reflected contemporary views of the Jews and was reinforced by Jewish perceptions at the time. See also Jackson (2005), 143-44.
\textsuperscript{432} \textit{DTE}, 7.83-84 & \textit{CM}, 4.78.
\textsuperscript{433} \textit{DTE}, 7.91-100 & 243-50.
Muslims

John does not attempt characterisation of any individual Muslims, any more than he identifies individual heretics, Mongols, or Jews. Like them, Mohammad is ‘sceleratus’. Like the Mongols, however, Muslims are wild (ferus), bloodthirsty (cruris amor), and expansionist. They reject human customs and are ‘non homo, tigris atrox’. They are ‘fallaces fraudequi pleni, expertes veri’, sexually depraved, sacrilegious, arrogant and cruel. In his account of the Third Crusade, John’s only reference to Saladin is an anecdote about his gift of a horse to Richard, designed as an example of Muslim deceit.

John uses a variety of names to describe the Egyptians and the Muslims generally, more for reasons of prosody than geographical precision. He acknowledges that the Muslims are more civilised than the Mongols, citing two episodes where Muslim leaders had displayed generosity. In the siege of Damietta in the Fifth Crusade the Sultan Al-Adil provided bread to the crusaders to prevent starvation, ‘hostis in hoste pius,’ and in the Barons’ Crusade Amalric, son of Simon de Montfort, was released from captivity in 1241.

John does not try to explain Islamic beliefs, though he comments obliquely on their polygamy. He pours ridicule on their God, making comparisons both with the beliefs of ancient Egypt and the deified vegetables of Juvenal’s Satires.

---

434 DTE, 8.193-94. John does not follow Innocent III’s characterization of Mohammad as the Beast of the Apocalypse in his encyclical of 1213, Quia maior, see Cole (1991), 104-09. For Western Christian perceptions of Mohammad and Muslims more generally, see Tolan (2008).
436 For deceit, DTE, 8.439, 451-52, Prologue.67; depravity, DTE, Prologue.67, 2.247, 8.391, and Tolan (2008), 14; impiety, DTE, 2.248, 8.453-54; cruelty, DTE, 2.251-4.
437 DTE, 3.139-42
438 Arabus, Assyrius, Babylonicus, Casius, Egyptus, Lages, Medus, Palestinus, Parthus, Persis, Pharus, Semiramus.
439 DTE, 7.163-78.
440 DTE, 2.203.
441 DTE, 8.195-96, 276-78. Tolan (2008), xii-xiii & 1-18, argues that even by the early Twelfth Century Islam was increasingly seen as a heresy, rather than paganism. While John is happy to lump Muslims with heretics and Jews as enemies of the Church, his knowledge of Islam is clearly limited.
Section 9: The Seventh Crusade (1248-54)

Preparations

This introduction has already considered John’s portrayal of Louis IX as a king and the similarities between his account of the Seventh Crusade and that of Matthew Paris. I have suggested that at the time of the Council of Lyon John collated various earlier material. He intended to write a major work, culminating in the recovery of Jerusalem and the defeat of the Muslims in Louis IX’s planned expedition in response to the Pope’s call in 1245. We have also considered De triumphis as an excitatio for Louis’ crusade. With the benefit of hindsight, John is able to identify Louis’ acquisition of the Crown of Thorns and the Holy Cross (1240-41) and his construction of Sainte Chapelle (1242-48) to house them as the ‘militie sacre…. praeludia quedam.’ To emphasise the importance of acquiring the relics, John reverts to them in his final synopsis. John brings out the moral qualities required by a crusader, and throughout presents Louis as an exemplary leader, albeit capable of error.

Louis’ crusade is the contemporary back-cloth against which the major events of John’s lifetime are assessed in De triumphis. John sees the Third Crusade as its natural precursor, and the root of conflicts frustrating early action. In sections 7 and 8 above, we have examined further delaying factors, the heretics in the Languedoc, the Mongols, the wars between the pope and the emperor, and Anglo-French hostilities. John understands too the need for Louis to defeat or be reconciled with his enemies and confident of his realm. ‘None of the magnates dared come to the aid of the deserving Church, so long as he feared losing what he possessed’. He noted the settlements with Hugh X de Lusignan, Raymond VII of Toulouse, and the truce with Henry III of England and its renewal. John is particularly full of praise for Blanche of Castile who as Louis’ regent ably governed France despite the absence of the king and his brothers.

John describes Louis’ near-fatal illness in 1244 as ‘felix’, because its direct consequence was that ‘the whole of France took the Cross’ (‘batula facta Crucis’). He says nothing of Blanche’s efforts to dissuade Louis, either then or

442 DTE, 2.63-76.
443 DTE, 8.573-74.
444 DTE, 2.73-74. See also DTE, 3.7.
later. When he took the Cross in December 1244, Louis very probably knew that the Khwarazmians had sacked Jerusalem on 23 August; but it is most unlikely that he could yet have known of the catastrophic defeat of the Latins at La Forbie on 17 October 1244.

Louis’ army probably numbered around 15,000, including 2500-2800 knights, with some 1900 from France. This figure was ‘for the period…a sizeable one.’ John however, again with the benefit of hindsight, consistently plays down the size of the force, and presents it as facing overwhelming odds. Yet at the same time he exaggerates its international composition. It was in fact ‘an overwhelmingly French affair.’ Frederick II stood aside, wholly engaged in defending himself against Innocent IV’s parallel crusade directed against him, latterly in failing health. John records with regret the early deaths of Raymond VII of Toulouse at Marseille and Hugh X de Lusignan at Damietta. He praises the valour of Olivier de Termes, another very recently reconciled southern noble, and of the Englishman William Longespée II, who died at Mansourah. Curiously he does not mention the death there of Hugh XI de Lusignan, so soon after his father’s.

The Crusade

John recounts Louis’ departure from Aigues Mortes, hinting darkly at treachery, and his delay in Cyprus, the rendezvous point with forces from Outremer. Like Joinville later, John dwells on the perils of the sea, implicitly countering contemporary criticism of Louis’ delay on Cyprus. In line only with Matthew Paris, John says that the crusaders’ initial destination was Alexandria, but that they were forced by the weather to put into Damietta. Unable to ride straight out because of the tide, the knights were forced to fight the Egyptian
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445 DTE, 7.405-06. On Blanche, see Joinville, 106, CM, 5.3
446 On the size of Louis’ army, see Jordan (1979), 65-70, Jackson (2007), 63-64, Le Goff (2009),124-25, 133-34.
447 DTE 8.255-56, 455-56.
448 DTE, 8.97-98, Jackson (2007), 23-25. See also Jordan (1979), 29-34. Frederick II stood apart from the crusade despite the presence of a small German force. On the complexities of the Emperor’s position see Jackson (1979), 40-48.
449 DTE, 8.355-56 & nn.117, CM, 5.158.
450 DTE, 8.113-16.
451 See 55 above.
cavalry standing in deep water. All this is described dramatically, including a vivid metaphor from chess.452

Just as in his description of the Albigensian Crusade, John focuses on the two major set-pieces of the campaign, the contested landing at Damietta and the battle of Mansourah. He grapples with the same agonising questions as Eudes of Châteauroux in his two sermons marking the anniversary of Robert of Artois’ death at Mansourah. He had clearly read Eudes’ words.453 The war against the Muslims was a just one, since they had attacked the Holy Land, which belonged to the Christians. The king who led it was deeply pious. Yet the king’s brother and the flower of the French aristocracy and the Templar order had been trapped and hacked to pieces in a squalid Egyptian town. How could God allow this to happen?

John goes further than Eudes in laying the blame on excesses of the occupying army and its leaders, with the notable exception of Louis himself.454 As noted earlier he nevertheless openly refers to the ‘failure’ of the king and to the ‘disgrace’/ ‘dedecus’ suffered by Louis and the Church. John places beyond doubt the whole-hearted support of the French nation for Louis, despite blaming the ‘over-bold’ army for pressing on beyond Mansourah. As usual John does not name names, but by implication holds the king’s brothers at least morally responsible. Eudes blames original sin and the general shortcomings of Christians as the reason for France’s humiliation. Both Eudes and John, following Louis’ letter to his French subjects of August, 1250 455 exalt the martyrdom of those killed as a victory over death itself.456

John’s narrative of events is largely in line with the king’s own version, subsequently incorporated in Vincent of Beauvais’ approved account of the crusade. Despite his close interest in siege engines in the siege of Toulouse, John does not refer to their important role in the critical battles around the River Tanaos, described in Louis’ own letter. John hails the death of the Sultan al-Salih

453 Cole (1991), 177-84, texts at 235-43. Compare, for example, John’s use of the David and Goliath analogy at DTE, 8.489-90.
456 See Cole, d’Avray and Riley-Smith (1990) for an analysis of how defeat was rationalized.
Najm al-Din Ayyub as a miracle, just as Louis had regarded the initial abandonment of Damietta. Also miraculous was Louis’ survival in good health.\footnote{DTE, 8.495.} It was as though God always stood ready to intervene, despite letting the Christians lose. John notes Louis’ fortification of Caesarea, implemented from April 1251, and it is clear that Louis was still in the Holy Land when John stopped work on his text.

**Hopes for the future**

In August 1250, Louis IX had appealed for reinforcements in the Holy Land, supported by appeals from Pope Innocent IV,\footnote{Berger (nos. 4868, 4926, 4927), Annales monasterii de Burton, 1.293-95. Jackson (2007), 197-201, conveniently groups translations of Innocent’s letters.} and was still seeking help from his brother Alphonse in his letter of 11 August 1251.\footnote{Layettes, vol. 3, 139-40.} That same year, a popular movement in France, known as the Crusade of the Pastoureaux, and initially a response to the king’s appeal, became unruly and eventually had to be suppressed by the regent, Blanche. John does not mention it. There was no significant external boost to Louis’ position. A trickle of knights came to Outremer from France, but a crusade planned by Alphonse of Poitiers never materialised. Frederick II remained preoccupied with his own empire and Innocent IV’s intrigues against him until his death in December 1250.

Louis’ setback in Egypt was, John assures his readers, ‘\textit{iactura levis}’ / ‘a trifling loss.’\footnote{DTE, 8.497.} Louis himself would avenge his own just causes. John saw many reasons for optimism. The fortunes of war fluctuated, and John saw a reverse shift in military fortunes. He also took heart from apparently favourable developments. Henry III of England took crusading vows in 1250, though he never embarked for the Holy Land. Ferdinand III of Castile and León also took the cross in that year, but died on 30 May, 1252. Louis agreed in 1251 to ally with the Egyptians against the Sultan of Aleppo, as a condition of release of the remaining prisoners. John expresses no qualms, and tells us that Louis hoped to convert the Egyptian sultan. He hails an alliance lasting fifteen years. In the event the Egyptians and Syrians were reconciled in 1253,\footnote{DTE, 8.520-28.} and John’s optimism remained unfounded.
Section 10. Conclusions

The aim of my work is to produce a text as close as possible to what John of Garland intended and to make this remarkable poem available to scholars in coherent and accessible form. In doing so I have proposed some 180 emendations to Wright’s 1856 version, many restoring the original manuscript readings. I have also extensively re-punctuated it and tentatively suggested new, illustrative text in the lacunae. Several formerly nonsensical passages now make perfect sense through simple transposition of lines. Further major reorganisation, especially of the Exhortatio ad crucem suscipiendam, is suggested, but only by italicisation. This introduction together with the footnotes extends the basis of existing scholarship to place the poem in fresh perspective. In so doing, I have looked more widely at John of Garland and his works, the military and political events about which he wrote, and the academic communities to which he belonged.

_De triumphis Ecclesie_ is not a great work of creative writing or classical prosody. Nor is it a new original source on historical events, though it does contain a valuable first hand account of the early days of the Studium in Toulouse. What makes the poem remarkable is its unfinished urgency despite having taken a lifetime to write, its erudition and ambition, its historical perspective and, perhaps above all, its sheer intensity of feeling, whether devotion to the Virgin and the Cross or denunciation of the many objects of John’s disapproval.

**A rallying cry**

‘For what Catholic, on hearing that such a grave crisis has befallen our dearest son in Christ, the illustrious king of France, his brothers and the Christian army, will not be excessively cast down and burst into lamentation?’

So wrote Pope Innocent IV to Queen Blanche in August, 1250. _De triumphis_ can be given a clear final date of 1252. John of Garland had planned a triumphant finale, celebrating Louis IX’s long-anticipated victory in Egypt and final recapture of Jerusalem. Instead, to explain Louis’ failure, and God’s apparent desertion of His champion, he made late and radical changes. He blames the high command of Louis’ army for incurring divine disfavour through greed and pride, hinting that in

---

doing so he is taking a serious personal risk. Instead of victory in battle, he hails crusading martyrdom as the supreme triumph of the Church; and he passionately lends his voice to urgent appeals for a fresh crusade. There were two clear imperatives for rushing the poem into circulation: the pressing need for manpower in the Holy Land, and to reassure Christians that God had not abandoned them. Both messages are powerfully addressed to John’s clerical colleagues at a time of spiritual wavering and social upheaval in France. Beneath the rhetoric and bravado, the shock of Mansourah can still be felt.

**A contemporary view of the period**

John presents an engaged and consistent if selective and focused account of the period 1189-1252. He tracks Angevin / Capetian resentments, aroused during the Third Crusade, through the reign of King John, and then, he alleges, fanned by Isabella of Angoulême to set Henry III against Louis IX. John never loses sight of the paramount importance of the Holy Land to Christians. The Muslim enemy remains the principal target of Western Christendom, and Jerusalem its main goal. He draws clear parallels between the Third and Seventh Crusades, and between Kings Richard I and Louis IX, and remains an unflinching critic of Christian in-fighting. He sees wars against heretics and the Mongols, though necessary, as additional distractions.

John’s strong support of the papacy and the Church is tempered by criticism of bishops more interested in politics and wealth than in spiritual matters. He clearly admired Louis IX and upheld the rights of kings over their vassals. But he also felt sympathy, obvious in his treatment of the counts of Toulouse, the Lusignans and the Trencavels, for those who fought for their ancestral rights, central to the Southern concept of *paratge*. On the big issues of principle John does not step out of line, but he is independent enough to criticise even the pope and the king of France.

True to his elegiac mode, John does not confine himself to the deeds of the great. He shows a clear empathy with the helpless rural victims of knightly pastimes of warfare and tournaments, and of those who suffer old age, sickness and shipwreck. Here and there too in the poem are everyday schoolmasterly rules for remembering things, like the number of days in the month, the date of Easter, the
sequence of the planets or signs of the zodiac. And never far away is the alienating language reserved for heretics, Jews and Muslims.

A major source on the Toulouse studium.

*De triumphis* has long been recognised as an important source of information about the early days of the university of Toulouse. The prose ‘prospectus’ letter at the end of Book 5, and the description of the syllabus give an orderly and perhaps idealised view of a chaotic and dangerous environment. As well as remission of sins, the Church authorities offered academic freedoms not available in Paris, including access to banned books, to attract striking masters and scholars to a recent war zone. But the *studium* lasted only as long as Raymond VII could or would offer protection and salaries. The Church was swift to shift its focus to the Dominicans and the inquisition as its chosen weapons against dissent.

Unusually, grammar was set up as a separate discipline from the wider arts syllabus. This was probably a measure to combat Occitan both as a spoken and literary language. The emphasis John places on music—‘*musica cuncta ligat*’ 463—and the references in the ‘prospectus’ make it clear that the Paris scholars introduced Northern music and no doubt the liturgies it accompanied as a civilising and proselytising force.

An intellectual tour de force

*De triumphis* is crammed with classical quotations and allusions, rhetorical devices, linguistic rarities and liturgical echoes. No editor will find them all. John pays literary tribute to Vergil, Ovid, Lucan and Statius, and intellectual homage to Horace and Cicero. The poem exudes the biblical learning John shared with his intended readers. It reflects his admiration of the previous generation of schoolmen, Alan of Lille and John Beleth, and displays his familiarity with the Church fathers and hagiographers, encyclopedists and theologians. Perhaps from his Languedoc days, John clearly knew vernacular poetry. He shows too his wider interest in the arts, borrowing the language of medicine, natural science and music.

463 *DTE*, 6.49.
Where John describes historical events he is clearly familiar with many of the sources on which we still rely. I have in particular shown evidence of a close link with Matthew Paris or at least with the Benedictine Abbey of St. Albans.

The poem emphatically did not deserve the dreadful initial reception it was accorded by Le Clerc and Hauréau, partly a consequence of Wright’s confusing and thinly annotated text. Wright himself says ‘The style of John of Garland is ambitious and pedantic, and displays the schoolman vain of his accomplishments.’\(^\text{464}\) *De triumphis* is however, ‘interesting in many points of view…a remarkable monument of the lighter (*sic*) scholastic literature of the age…..full of allusions to contemporary events, given in a tone which conveys more of the general sentiment of the time than we gain from the chroniclers.’ Paetow partially rehabilitated it. John must now speak for himself.

**An intensely personal statement**

John sprinkles clues about himself in *De triumphis Ecclesie*, while telling us tantalisingly little. The main clues to his birthplace lie in other works, but this poem supports the case for Essex rather than Berkshire origins. It provides no help in establishing when John went to Paris or what ecclesiastical offices he may have held. It offers strong pointers to his possible aristocratic allegiances, without offering proofs. It strongly cautions second thoughts on some of the works attributed to John, and about whether John the Grammian really was a different person from John the Musician.

John brings to life the muscular Christianity of post-war Toulouse and the hazards of long-distance travel, but disappointingly he describes rumbustious events in Paris as an observer rather than a participant, and does not discuss here his own Parisian life at all. He rails at his contemporaries’ disdain for the arts, stinginess towards their practitioners, and respect for wealth. John’s humanity shines through the constraining metre of *De triumphis*. He hints at old age and failing health, but we know that he lived until at least 1258. Louis Holtz\(^\text{465}\) has shown the intensity of John’s religious devotion to the Virgin in the *Epithalamium*. That same fervour and penitence are repeatedly present in *De triumphis Ecclesie*, expressed in language just as passionate. It is fair to conclude that this poem was

\(^{464}\) Wright, xi.

\(^{465}\) L. Holtz (2012).
intended by John as his literary and spiritual testament, bringing together the events of his lifetime, the skills of his professional life, his confident hopes for the future of Christianity and his deep religious commitment. It is a sad irony that, for whatever reason, he did not complete it, and virtually no-one has read it…..until now.
Guide to the text

Orthography

The highly abbreviated medieval script of the manuscript been expanded into a continuous text. Orthography has been further harmonised as follows:

‘i’ for ‘y’ and ‘j’.

‘e’ for classical diphthongs, ‘oe’ and ‘ae’.

Standardisation on some classical forms, e.g. ‘mi(c)hi’, ‘ram(p)nus,’ ‘re(l)ligio,’ ‘(h)abundo,’ ‘imprimo’ (not ‘inprimo’), ‘opprobium’ (not ‘obpromium’).

Annotation of text

{ …….} lacunae in which the editor has interpolated text.

[…] folio numbers in MS London British Library Cotton Claudius A x.

< …> page numbers in Wright’s edition, used by all existing secondary literature.

Order of lines

In some cases, the scribe of Cotton Claudius A x has jumbled the lines. In three very clear instances, 3.229-30, 3.283-84, and 4.179-82 in this edition, these have been clearly annotated and re-ordered to restore sense. Elsewhere, especially in the Exhortatio ad crucem susciendos, radical reordering would create a continuous narrative, but would also render cross-referencing with the manuscript and with Wright’s edition (and hence with all previous scholarship) very difficult. The editor has therefore relied on footnotes and on italicisation of the text to signal other instances.

Translation

Usually Latin but often English is used for direct quotations from De triumphis, but rarely both, on account of constraints on word numbers.
Plate 1. MS London British Library Cotton Claudius A x, f. 68r, *Incipit to De triumphis Ecclesie.*
Gaudia\(^1\) succumbunt lacrimis, risusque dolori\(^2\) [68r.]

Cedit, dum bellis gratia pacis obit.

Plangite, compassi cuni, quos congrua p\(\{\)ape\}\(^3\)

Solliciti mesto pro grege causa move\(\{t\}\).

Mestis palma dabit plausum. Post tempora br\(\{\)me\}

Successus veris gratior esse solet.

Cui non flere vacat\(^4\) dum belli seva procella

Ingruit et latum grandinat orbis agrum?

Audiat omnis homo placide qui diligit illum,\(^5\)

Est qui de sacra Virgine natus homo.\(^6\)

Arma Crucemque cano qua dux superatur Averni,\(^7\)

Et qua succumbit vulgus inerme suum.

Christi victrices aquile que sunt Crucis ale

\(^1\) Rubric in left margin ‘Praefatio libri et benivolentia’. The initial ‘G’ of ‘Gaudia’ is enlarged and coloured in contemporaneously with the rubrics. The right margin of f. 68v down to line 25 has been carefully torn off to leave the text legible, perhaps to remove an illustration. See Plate 1, p. 105 for the first page of MS.

\(^2\) ‘In lacrymas risus, in fletum gaudia verto’, is the opening line of Alan of Lille’s Liber de planctu naturae. Alan (c.1128-1203) was a prolific scholastic writer whose works influenced John’s writing and thinking, though it does not appear that they could have been contemporaries in Paris. See also DTE, 4. 203-10 & 8.40, and PP, 4.241-42, ‘Sterne Mahometum, da leto, destrue letum,’ / ‘Risus in fletum verte.’

\(^3\) Only ‘p’ is clear in the MS. Wright interpolates ‘pacis’. ‘Pape’ fits both grammar and context, introducing the crusading theme. We know the MS was already torn here in 1802, Planta (1802), 190. Gregory Hays independently concurs with the restored text.

\(^4\) Statius, Achilleid, 1.936, ‘cui vix flere vacat.’

\(^5\) The rubric reads ‘Benivolentia.’ The rhetorical aim of the prologue is to ensure that the audience is well-disposed (benevolent), attentive (attentus, line 41) and receptive (docilis, line 31). On history and poetry in the medieval educational framework, and for further reading in this area, see Introduction, 50-52.

\(^6\) ‘De sacra virgine natus homo,’ Prosper Aquitanus, Epigrammata, 62.10.

\(^7\) Vergil, Aen, 1.5, ‘Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris...’
Demonis et mundi carnis et arma domant.  

15 Primus homo pacem fregit, natisque reliquit

Nil nisi bella suis, flere dolere mori.

Heu, quotiens iustus cruor est a sanguine iusti

Fusus Abel, quotiens sevit in orbe Chaim,

Defleo. Cum causis pugnas describere cunctas

20 Non valeo, totus quas modo mundus habet.

Hinc in Teutonicos Mars fulminat, hincque rebelles

Sevit in Ausonios martius ense furor.

In nos armatur Babylon, Cartagoque sevos

25 Occurrunt pauci sed fortes sub duce Christo

Quos sacra lex armat et tua, Christe, fides.

Dans intellectum lectori, summa libelli

Preludit, totum parte patescit opus

Legis tutores prime legisque secunde

---

8 P. Abelard, *Expositio orationis dominicae. Petitio sexta*. PL, 178, col. 617, ‘*Tria autem sunt, quae nos tentant, caro, mundus, diabolus.*’
9 Adam.
10 Cain, Abel and Seth.
11 This passage could well have been written in 1248 about the Emperor Frederick II’s unexpected defeat by Italian rebels at Parma (18 February), with lines 25-26 referring to Louis IX’s army. But it could also refer to the Mongol threat to Germany, Frederick’s operations in Italy and the second phase of the Barons’ Crusade under Richard of Cornwall (1240-1241).
12 ‘*Babylon*’ is Cairo, used for ‘Egypt’ or ‘the Egyptians’ (see also n. 18 below); ‘*Carthago*’ refers to the Moors of North Africa and by extension Iberia.
13 Rubric in right margin ‘*Docilitas hic adquiritur.*’
Notificare iuvat et memorare probos.\textsuperscript{14}

Auditor docilis summam cernat honestum

Tractatum, stabilis constet ut ipse fide.

Scribere me cogit laus Christi, lausque Marie,

Laus Crucis, Ecclesie palma, corona, decus.

Francorum reges pugiles fulsisse fideles\textsuperscript{15}

Ecclesie letor gesta canendo sua

Sed motus mihi flere licet qui plurima regna

Turbant. Pax utinam regna ducesque liget.

Inter Christicolas lamentor prelia mota,

Hortor et in Parthos vertere bella feros.

Attentus lector speculetur qualiter exit

A tempestatis turbine cimba Petri.\textsuperscript{16}

Francigenas armat crux Christi, gaza, potestas,

Et socios illis proxima regna\textsuperscript{17} dabunt.

Rex studet ut salvet animas. Non Partica\textsuperscript{18} regna

Querit\textsuperscript{19}, cui servit Gallia dives opum.

---

\textsuperscript{14} John of Salisbury, Polycraticus, 4.6, ‘Describet ergo Deuteronomium legis, id est, secundam legem, in volumine cordis: ut sit lex prima, quam littera ingerit, secunda, quam ex eo misticus intellectus agnoscit.’ Polycraticus is a manual for the education of princes.

\textsuperscript{15} An early reference to John’s recurring theme of the Capetians as the champions of Christendom.

\textsuperscript{16} St. Peter’s barque, symbol of the Church.

\textsuperscript{17} i.e. Spain and England.

\textsuperscript{18} ‘Egyptian’ is variously designated Babylonicus, Parthus, Assyrius, Perss, Semiramis, Palestinus, Lageus, Casius.

Argenti venas coquit Anglia, nec cupit agros Rex suus Assirios, immo trophea Crucis.

Sit fortuna licet miscens adversa secundis, Hiis tamen occurrit mens animosa ducum.

{Ri}sum qui siccet lacrimas mihi, Christe triumphants, [68v.]

{Reddas, et} vati pande trophea tuo.

{Maria Virgo}, fave; pigmenti cella favoris

{Lasc}ivum purga pectus et ora michi.

{Ductores} defende tuos, confunde turannos

{Qui vexi} lla Crucis precipitare volunt.

{Sepe potest} reges detractio ledere iustos,

{Alter c}um laudes certat habere suas.

<3> {Iniusto} rum laude miser mittetur in ignem.

{Imperiu} m regum stabit honorque suus.

---

20 England’s richness in precious metals was proverbial, e.g. GM, 1.5.26-27, ‘omni etiam genere metalli fecunda.’
21 Wright reads ‘lum’. ‘Risum’ is consistent with the MS and a credible echo of the opening lines.
22 The first few syllables are missing from the torn manuscript in lines 51-72. The editor’s interpolations are consistent with the MS and offered with diffidence. The new text is unavoidably speculative. The missing letters are important because the Preface sets the tone for the whole poem.
23 Read ‘vati’ / ‘poet’ with MS, not variant reading ‘nati’ with Wright.
24 See CG, 1.54-56, ‘…Maria / Virgo, fave, condire favo mea dicta favoris, / Et mea facta velis.’ See also DTE, 5.4 below.
25 Wright has ‘linum’. An attractive possibility, equally consistent with the MS, is ‘lascivum’, a rueful allusion to Marbodus of Rennes’ Mens mea tristatur: ‘Lascivum pectus non debet habere senectus,’ Werner (1905), 89-90, no. 201.
26 The text here has been tentatively restored as a denunciation of corrupt clergy and nobles, themes to which John returns. DTE, 1.203, & 2.550-54. For ‘detractio,’ see DTE, 2.677-79. ‘Manicas’ / ‘sleeves/maunches’ were detachable garments, which even in the thirteenth century could carry armorial bearings. The word ‘turncoat’ literally derives its meaning from the medieval custom of turning clothes inside out when transferring allegiance from one lord to another.
27 Matth. 7, 19, ‘Omnis arbor, quae non facit fructum bonum, exciditur et in ignem mittitur.’
{Tentat vox v}ulgi verum  pervertere rectum,

{Iustum d}eterius dicere, curva sequi.  

{Famam nunc qu}idam vatum grassantur, amaro

{Ecclesia}m morsu dilacerare student.  

{Iustorum} laudanda trahunt, formosaque damnant,

{Manus inte}ntant appropriantque sibi.

{Armis}qui manicas sibi scindunt ex alienis,

{Alterius}tergo quod fuit ante suunt.  

{Veter}a si renovo vel si nova scribere tempto,

{Vergili}ique meo carmina scribo stilo,

{Hec Clio} mea Musa gemit, gemituque represso

{Suspir}at, clamorem temperat egra suum.

Justus et iniustus clamore locantur in isto

Ut primo meritum noscat  uterque suum.

---

28 Read ‘verum’, with MS, not ‘unum’ with Wright. Ovid, Met, 15.607, ‘vulgi vox eminet una.’
29 ‘curva sequi’, Lucan, 5.459.
30 John often scans the second syllable of ‘Ecclesia’ as long.
31 The reconstructed text then denounces detractors who claim credit for others’ good deeds. John makes a disingenuous analogy with his own attempts to emulate the ancient poets.
32 Elsewhere, e.g. MS, 223, Paetow notes that John seems to view Clio as the muse of literature in general, not just history.
33 ‘Noscat’, with MS, for Wright’s ‘noscit’. The sense is obscure, and the text may be wrongly restored, but John seems to be saying that even though his Muse expresses modified rapture at his puny efforts, when reputations are stolen, she cannot differentiate between the original and his imitator.
Explicit prologus et sequuntur capitula libri principalis

Me socii rogant quia res ignota refertur. Quod caligo rei clarificetur eis.

Prologus ante venit, sequitur distinctio certa
Cum titulis operis peragraphisque suis.

Clarifico metrice capitaia membra, biformem
Reddit enim faciem dissona prosa metro.

Effundo fletum cum flentibus ut tamen ipsos
A fletu retraham, letitieque traham.

Pluribus exemplis bellum dissuasio damnat
Sit nisi legitimum, iura fidemque sequens.

(1) Vulnura nature primo sunt dicta libello
Impia fraus, heresis feda, cupido gravis.

---

1 There is a break in the text and the initial ‘M’ has been coloured in later to indicate the break between Preface and Prologue. Arabic numerals in the left margin from 1-16 suggest an attempt by a fourteenth century reader or readers (the numerals 12-16 are in a different style or hand from 1-11) to annotate the themes in the Prologue (see Intro. 51-52 above). ‘Socii’ may just mean ‘friends’ or ‘colleagues,’ but in an academic context ‘socii mei’ are often ‘fellow students,’ Weijers (1987), 168-69, 265-66.

2 Perhaps a reference to the prose section in DTE, 5. 365-446. Maybe John intended more substantial prose elements. Or maybe, and more probably, he is contrasting this verse synopsis with the prose rubrics or chapter headings.

3 Rom. 12,15, ‘gaudere cum gaudentibus, flere cum flentibus.’

4 ‘Pluribus exemplis,’ see also DTE, 2.195.

5 Here John introduces the concept of the just war; he roundly condemns wars, unless they are lawful, in line with [canon] law and the [Christian] faith. See also DTE, 1.214.
Prologue

(2) Vitricis vexilla\textsuperscript{6} Crucis de more per hostes

Prosilient. Victrix hec fuit, est et erit.\textsuperscript{7}

Intitulata patent papalia iura, rebellæ

Hostes Ecclesie succubuisse dolent.\textsuperscript{8}

<H> Hec probo per casus multos, mirandaque mundo

Gesta Crucis nostri quae meminere senes.\textsuperscript{9}

Francorum turmas, Anglorum signa marinos

Casus cum signis temporis ordo tenet.

(3) Sanctorum palmas adiungo, qui sibi celi

Menia, regna, iubar, organa, serta metunt.

Laude triumphali variis meruere kalendis

Idibusque nonis ad sua festa coli.

Patris virgo parens primum mediumque serenat

Et finem, sine qua marcida metra iacent. [69r]

Idola, phana, deos impugno, diesque nefastos,

Nam sacer est opifex tempora sacra movens.

(4) Naturas rerum lector legat hasque revolvat

Attentus. Res est ardua, prisca, nova.

Diversas belli causas evolvo cruenti.

\textsuperscript{6} *Vexilla Crucis.* This originally referred to the battle standards themselves, portraying the Cross, but came by this time to be equated with the cloth badges sewn on to the shoulder of crusaders’ outer clothing. See Gaposchkin (2013b), 55-58, (2017), 57-59 etc..

\textsuperscript{7} A close reflection of the formula in Rev. 1, 4, etc., *qui est et qui erat et qui venitur est.*

\textsuperscript{8} Probably a reference to Innocent IV’s excommunication of Frederick II in 1245.

\textsuperscript{9} A hint that John drew on oral accounts by veterans of past Crusades.
Fortia nec tantum bella,¹⁰ sed orta mala.¹¹

Sunt hereses cause scelerum, violencia, fastus
Insidie, livor, fraus, dolor, ira, pudor.

Temperat adversis Deus huius prospera mundi,
Mens quia leta diu luxuriare solet.

(5) Phebus supreme rapitur vertigine sphere
Et duodena secat tramite signa suo.

Sed procul iniusti fugiunt a tramite recti,
Iustus in hiis igitur fidere nemo velit.

Crescit materia scelerum modo tanta quam¹² illam
Vix tango; numquam plura fuere mala.

Attentus maneat igitur qui vincere mundum
Hunc cupit, et sancte baiulus¹³ esse Crucis.

(6) Insidiis Parthi pugnant furtoque fugaque¹⁴,
Unde sibi caveat iusta caterva Crucis.

Strage Toresmini¹⁵ terram lactisque favique

---

¹⁰ Ovid, *Rem.*, 373, ‘Fortia Maeonio gaudent pede bella referri’ / ‘Wars bravely fought take joy in being recounted in Maenonian metre (hexameters).’
¹¹ Sallust, *Cat.*, 51.27, ‘Omnia mala exempla ex rebus bonis orta sunt.’
¹² ‘quam’ for Wright’s ‘quod.’
¹³ i.e. a crusader.
¹⁴ It was a *topos* of medieval texts to accuse the Egyptians (or Turks) of unfair tactics in battle, see also Book 1, n. 52.
¹⁵ The Khwarazmians, a tribe driven eastwards by the Mongols, sacked Jerusalem and in alliance with the Egyptians destroyed the Christian forces at La Forbie in 1244, *CM*, 4.299-311. See Humphreys (1977), 275-76.
Fedant, quos\textsuperscript{16} Babilon\textsuperscript{17} Assiriique iuvent.

(7) Dum vastata iacet Ierosolima sancta, potentes

Plures qui servant plurima plura petunt.\textsuperscript{18}

\textless 5\textgreater  Sed vos, o iusti, causas assumite iustas,

Assit larga manus, ausa, diserta, potens.

Quando pepercit Agag\textsuperscript{19} hosti vindicta Saulis,

Offendisse pium dicitur ipse Deum.

(8) Fas est iniustos armis conpescere iustis,\textsuperscript{20}

Multi sed spreto iure sequuntur opes.

Preda tamen rerum perit, et procedit honestas.

Et qui ius temptat spernere iure cadit.

In bellis, Josue, Moyses prece, Job patiendo,

Sit princeps,\textsuperscript{21} Itacus pectore, dando Titus.\textsuperscript{22}

Hoc duce nocturnam superat rosa leta procellam,

Et fuscum redimit vespera clara diem.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16}‘quos’ for Wright’s ‘quas’.
\item \textsuperscript{17}‘Cairo’, and shorthand for ‘Egypt’.
\item \textsuperscript{18}Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, 1.212, ‘et, cum possideant plurima, plura petunt.’ Another barb against the warring nobles and kings of the West.
\item \textsuperscript{19}Read ‘Agag’ not ‘Achaz’ in MS and Wright, and ‘vindicta’ with MS, not Wright’s ‘vindicia’.
\item \textsuperscript{20}Agag was spared by Saul contrary to God’s orders (I Samuel. 15, 7-33). The righteous men of Christendom should likewise not spare the Muslims.
\item \textsuperscript{21}The adjective ‘iustis’, normally applied to men, is applied here to weapons, and example of the rhetorical trope \textit{antonomasis}.
\item \textsuperscript{22}‘Itacus’ = ‘Ithacan’, i.e. ‘Odysseus/ Ulysses’. On Titus’ reputed generosity see, e.g., Suetonius, \textit{Titus}, 8, and \textit{DTE}, 1.373-4.
\end{itemize}
Sepe viris iustis sors intonat aspera cuius
Vim frangit subito palma beata Crucis.

Arma pudicitie Cruce fulgent, gaudia mestis
Emergunt, portum post mare nauta capit.

Perfida sed Persis Machometi fraudibus errat
Illecebras carnis dum studiosa colit.

(9) Predictis partes capitales partibus addo,
Sicut declarat carminis ordo sequens.

Grecia succumbet tandem, vincentque Latini,
Illie Romanum servet ut ara modum.

Mars et mors parili processu federa servant,
Et crescit gemitus undique causa mei.

(11) Hinc se Christicole perimunt, hinc Parthus in illos
Hinc furit hereticus. Iustus ad astra studet,
Iustus in adversis non frangitur; immo coronam
Maiorem meritis gaudet habere suis.

(12) Tartaree gentis excessus exprimo diros

---

23 Read ‘viris’, for Wright’s ‘iuris’.
24 Read, with MS, ‘Emergunt’ for Wright’s ‘Et mergunt.’
25 See also line 45 above. The alleged lasciviousness of Muslims was a further topos, as here. See Introduction, 94, with notes.
26 This appears to refer to the Greek rite generally, though it may be about current Greek military pressure on the Latins, who had seized control of much of the Byzantine empire, including Greece, in 1204. The Latin Empire sought Western help at the Council of Lyon in 1245, when John tells us he was working on De triumphis, DTE, 8.70. The Greeks recovered Constantinople in 1261. Harris (2003), 173-74.
27 ‘Astra’ means ‘heaven’ here.
28 In MS, the scribe has corrected ‘duros’ for ‘diros.’ For John’s coverage of the Mongol invasions, see DTE 6.287-7.162.
In nos quam diram tartara dira movent.\textsuperscript{29}

Ecclesie pacem turbat dum turba rebellis

Surrepens heresis hinc violare studet.

Cum ratione caro, fervor cum frigore, celum

Cum terra, purum cum lue, bella gerit.

\textless 6\textgreater  Das tamen ecclesie celebres, rex Christe, triumphos,\textsuperscript{30}

Hancque triumphali premia ferre manu.

(13) Regi Ricardo dederas regique Philippo

Parthorum densos extenuare globos.\textsuperscript{31}

Regi Castelle se subdit Corduba,\textsuperscript{32} ferrum

Ferrardi recolit Hispalis ampla ferum.

Hospita Francorum Cypris\textsuperscript{33} Ludovitica signa

Iam capit; in Pharios transvehit arma, duces.

Tempore luserunt longo gentilia scripta;\textsuperscript{34}

Deposcit tempus hoc sibi vera fides.

\textsuperscript{29} Note the play on words. ‘\textit{Tartareus’} / ‘Mongol, Tartar’, and ‘\textit{tartarus’} / ‘infernal,’ pertaining to hell’. It is impossible to convey this in English.

\textsuperscript{30} John first introduces the title theme, ‘\textit{Ecclesie… triumphos’}.

\textsuperscript{31} In the Third Crusade (1189-90), Richard I of England and Philip II of France recaptured Acre from the Muslims and won other territory.

\textsuperscript{32} Muslim-held Cordoba surrendered to Ferdinand III of Castile in 1236, and he captured Seville in 1248. N.b. John’s passion for puns and alliteration, with ‘\textit{Ferrum… Ferrardi… ferum’}.

\textsuperscript{33} Typically John chooses the rare, poetic form ‘\textit{Cypris’}, signifying ‘Venus’, the goddess always associated with Cyprus, rather than the usual ‘\textit{Cyprus’}. Marguin-Hamon suggests that this may be an allusion to the underlying Aeneid. Louis IX wintered with his fleet in Cyprus between September, 1248 and May, 1249, en route to Egypt, \textit{DTE}, 8.209-18. John appears to have written the Prologue around this time in anticipation of victory. Only lines 123-30 show any awareness of Louis’ defeat in 1250, and were presumably added later.

\textsuperscript{34} ‘\textit{gentilia scripta’}, Theodulf of Orléans, \textit{De libris quos legere solebam}, 9, ‘\textit{Legimus et crebro gentilia scripta sophorum’}. This leads on to line 95, in saying that he is giving priority to Christianity’s wars of today over the entertaining battles of classical literature.
95 Profero\textsuperscript{35} preteritis multis presentia, visa

Auditis, dubiis certa, probata vagis.\textsuperscript{36}

Claram fuscavit heresis pro parte Tholosam;

Cuius purgatrix Crux mihi carmen erit.

(14) Addo terrarum conquestus orbis ab ortu

Distinguens annis singula queque suis.\textsuperscript{37}

Cur et quid scribam tetigi; monstrabitur inde

Forma stili; forme convenit ordo suus.

Quantum differtur terre promotio sancte

Hereticis claudis carmina clauda docent.\textsuperscript{38}

100 Versibus imparibus expirat synchisis,\textsuperscript{39} umbra

Effugit, emergit lux ratioque patet.

Is modus est, elegos parit hic Elegia.\textsuperscript{40} Rium

Proscribit, lacrimas evocat, ora rigat\textsuperscript{41}

Post risum. Plorat fallacia, ridet amena

\textsuperscript{35} Read ‘Profero’ with MS, not ‘Praefero’ with Wright.

\textsuperscript{36} A standard claim by historians of the period, e.g. William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum et Anglorum, 16-17, ‘quicquid vero de recentioribus aetatibus apposui, vel ipse vidi vel a viris fide dignis audivi.’ See Introduction, 50-51.

\textsuperscript{37} An ambitious and unfulfilled objective. John seems to have been contemplating a universal history or chronicle, on the lines of Isidorus or Vincent of Beauvais. The only conceivable trace of such a plan is DTE, 6.1-14, where John lists events of the year 1229 in chronicler’s style.

\textsuperscript{38} ‘carmina clauda’, ‘versus imparres’ = ‘elegies’, see Ovid, Tristia, 3.1.11, ‘clauda quod alterno subsidunt carmina verso.’ N.b. John’s juxtaposition of the literal and figurative meanings of ‘claudus.’ Here he blames distractions like the Albigensian crusade and the papal dispute with Frederick II for delay in tackling the Muslims in the Holy Land.

\textsuperscript{39} Read, with Hays, ‘synchisis’ / ‘hyperbaton’ or ‘deliberate reordering of normal order of words,’ for MS and Wright, ‘synchresis.’ On the use of elegiacs, see also 127-30 below, DTE 3.1-6, & 690-92.

\textsuperscript{40} The editor, unlike Wright, personifies Elegy as appropriate, cp. Ovid, Am., 3.1.7.

\textsuperscript{41} A savage echo of Vergil, Aen, 11.698, ‘vulnus calido rigat ora cerebro.’
Sponsa Dei. Queritur ista,\textsuperscript{42} sed illa canit.

Quid deceat, quid non pandunt exempla vicissim,

Vere virtutis ut teneatur iter.

(15) Pristinaque gestis intersero gesta modernis;

Dant lavacrum nostris antidotumque malis.\textsuperscript{43}

Historias condire graves disgressio morum

Cernitur ut condit fercula secta sapor.\textsuperscript{44}

Planctus multiplicat primus, causasque secundus

Fert liber. Effectum publicat ordo sequens

<7> Est numeri ratio triplex ternarius impar,\textsuperscript{45}

Res incorruptas perpetuasque notat.

(16) Ecclesie sacre stilus exerit\textsuperscript{46} iste triumphos\textsuperscript{47}

Dans ex materia nomen habere libro.

Qui mundi pompam conculcat in urbe triumphans\textsuperscript{48}

Celesti stabiles victor habebit opes.

Ad Stiga soldani missi, Damiatcia damna,

Strages alterne, castra cruenta patent.\textsuperscript{49} [70r]

\textsuperscript{42} Horace, \textit{AP}, 75, identifies ‘querimonium’ / ‘complaint/lament’ as the main subject-matter of elegy.

\textsuperscript{43} Tit. 3, 5, ‘...salvos nos fecit per lavacrum regenerationis et reninventionis Spiritus Sancti.’

\textsuperscript{44} Digressio was a well-known technique of rhetoric, designed for example to entertain or persuade by analogy, Cicero, \textit{De Inventione}, 1.19.27.

\textsuperscript{45} John’s reference to the special quality of the number nine indicates that he planned the work with nine books. See also \textit{DTE}, 1.111 & n. 42 and \textit{DTE}, 8.3. For the actual number of books, however, see Introduction, 39-41.

\textsuperscript{46} ‘Exerit,’ more usually ‘exserit’ / ‘reveals.’

\textsuperscript{47} This indicates that John intended the title ‘\textit{De triumphis Ecclesie.’} See also \textit{DTE}, Preface.85.

\textsuperscript{48} See n. 33 above. Lines 123-30 look like a late addition to the Prologue.

\textsuperscript{49} A reference to the Seventh Crusade, covered in Book 8.
Dicit Meonides\textsuperscript{50} pectinem cognoscere quedam

Per que lucescant altera certa magis.

Sic gravis emergit elegia; querere planctu

Plausum, non planctum plausibus illa docet.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{50} Read ‘Dicit’ and ‘pectinem’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘Vicit’ and ‘petimus.’ Read also ‘Meonides’ (Homer) for ‘Aristoteles’ in MS and Wright. This is a reference to Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, 2.120-48, which expresses Ovid’s diffidence at using elegiacs, and describes the misdeeds of Augustus’ predecessors so as to glorify his own reign. Ovid’s lines 120-21 read ‘vellem, Maeonide, pectus inesse tuum / dum canimus alterno pectine Nonas.’ In the same way frank narration of wrongful deeds in the crusade show the nobility of Louis’ behaviour.

\textsuperscript{51} See \textit{DTE}, 2.515-16 for an example.
Book 1

Incipit opus principale

Quis furor, o miseri mortales, bella movere\(^1\)

Pro terra? Terram terra tenebit homo.\(^2\)

Est terre morsellus homo. Sed celica solum

Qui sapit ad celum pervenit absque solo.\(^3\)

Que mens est homini cumulare dolore dolores

Continuo cuius vita labore labat.

Est tamen Ecclesiam iustum defendere sanctam,

Ut pereat sancte gens inimica Crucis.

Presbiteros aramque Baal destruxit Helyas\(^4\)

Ut simili facto nos imitemur eum.

Hebreus gladio Mathatias truncat Hebreum\(^5\)

Dum colit Anthiochi sacra nefanda metu.

Athlete fidei reges concurrite cuncti,

\(^1\)This line starts with a coloured, enlarged, capital after a space, and marks the beginning of the main body of the poem. The marginal rubrics read ‘Incipit opus principale’ and ‘De elegia
cupiditatis et de labore et dolore in bellis ad tirendum et dissuadendum a bellis motis et movendis
contra ecclesiam victricem.’ On line 1, see Lucan, 1.8, ‘Quis furor, o cives, quae tanta licentia
ferri?’ Lucan goes on to reproach the Romans for pursuing civil war while Crassus lies unavenged in the East, a parallel with unavenged Jerusalem.

\(^2\)A reference to Gen. 1, in which God creates creatures, including man, from the earth.

\(^3\)Wright’s punctuation is amended. N.b. John’s onomatopaeic repetition of ‘terra.. terram.. terra,’ and use of ‘solum’ in different senses. The figure extends to the next two lines, ‘dolore.. dolores’ and ‘labore..labat.’ This multiple polyptoton, or repetition of the same word with different cases, is an elaborate form of ‘ornatus’ (embellishment), part of the rhetorical armoury. See, e.g. PP, 7.878-80.

\(^4\)Elijah, I Kings. 18, 38-40.

Quantum quisque Deum diligat, ense probet.  
15 Non retrahat validos labor ullus, sit licet ingens

In Parthos reprobos bella movere labor.

Sunt comitata duo labor et dolor ordine bellum,

Que proprio presens ordine margo tenet.

Si labor est iustus, sunt premia iusta laboris;

Iniusto iuste pena labore datur.

<8> Cesaris imperium quid habet nisi ferre laborem?

Vix poterit noctis tempore quiete frui.

Qui caput est mundi Cesar gentem capit unam,

Altera conatur in caput ire suum.

Est princeps regum terre qui regnat Olimpo

Christus, qui reges altaque colla domat.

Vinci non poterit qui terre pondera librat.

Calcitrat in stimulum quisquis acerbat eum.

Quanto maior erit descendere forte coactus

Culmine de summo, turpius ima petit.

Si quis deprimitur sed iuris agone resurgit

Illi pro palma gloria maior erit.

6 ‘probet,’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘probat.’
7 Cicero, De finibus, 1.32, ‘nonnumquam eiusmodi tempora incidunt, ut labore et dolore magnam aliquam quae rat voluptatem.’
8 Read ‘unam’ with MS and sense, for Wright’s ‘imam.’
9 An untranslatable and complex pun on ‘caput,’ which can mean ‘master’ and ‘capital city’ as well as ‘head’. ‘Caput mundi’ was a well-known description of Rome. This looks like a reference to the Emperor Frederick II, menaced by the Mongols as he struggles to subdue parts of Italy.
10 Act. 26, 14, ‘durum est tibi contra stimulum calcitare.’ ‘It is hard for you to kick against the pricks.’
Primo commendo iustos in agone fidelis

In quo papa prior premia victor habet.\textsuperscript{11}

35 Non est pauperibus iniuria cognita tantum

Sed subito turbat divitis illa statum.

Dum rex Arthurus Rome sibi regna subegit

Perdidit oceani regna nepote suo.

Occidens fratrem Galvanum clam ferus iste

40 Nomine Modredus sprevit\textsuperscript{12} habere modum,

Proditor in bello cecidit. Proh! Lesus ab illo

Rex tumuli modicam victor habebat humum.

Anni quingenti quadragenique duoque

Virginis a partu preteriere sacre.\textsuperscript{13}

45 Sub Cruce qui patitur mundana pericula pauper, [70v]

Eius in eterna pace triumphus erit.

Pulcra figura tau\textsuperscript{14} Crucis est res mira; figura

Mira figurata cernitur esse magis\textsuperscript{15}

Agno Paschali Christo. Quasi limina frontes

50 Crux signat, signo munit ab hoste\textsuperscript{16} domum.

\textsuperscript{11} A reference to the pope’s continuing dispute with Frederick II, possibly specifically to the victory of the Italians and the pope over Frederick at the battle of Parma (1248).

\textsuperscript{12} ‘sprevit’ for Wright’s ‘spernit’; the text is capable of either reading.

\textsuperscript{13} See GM.178, for these events and the date.

\textsuperscript{14} Read ‘tau’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘tali’. The Greek letter ‘T’ was widely used as symbolising the cross, particularly by St. Francis. The tradition is older. See Ez. 9, 4, ‘et signa thau super fronte virorum gementium et dolentium,’ which was frequently quoted. John refers to tau again at 2.877 below.

\textsuperscript{15} Wright’s punctuation is modified here.

\textsuperscript{16} ‘the Devil’.
Sub Pharaone lutum lateresque trahebat Hebreus

Sed tandem Pharia liber abivit humo.

Leta Maria\(^1\) soror Moysi nova cantica provisit

Hostibus absorptis cum Pharaone mari.\(^2\)

\(<9>\) Veri pastoris pastoria sponsa Maria

Salvat oves, servat septa fugatque lupos.

Celi prepositus Michael animas legit illas

Mittendas orco separat, hasque polo.\(^3\)

Ne desperetis, presto solacia vobis

Qui sancte geritis fortiter arma Crucis.

Cum volet Omnipotens, gens convertetur iniqua,\(^4\)

Et pauci subdant plurima regna Deo.

Expurgat iustos tribulatio, mundat ut aurum

Fornax, et sicut grana flagella probant,

Ferrum lima domat, taurus simulatio, prelum

Uvas, burnellum sarcina, chamus\(^5\) equum.

Mundi deliciis ad celi gaudia nemo

Transit, sed celi pena laborque dabunt.\(^6\)

Orbis opes huius miserum est cumulare, tenere,

\(^{17}\) Miriam, who appears as ‘Maria’ in Ex. 15, 20.
\(^{18}\) Read ‘provisit’ for Wright’s ‘promsit.’
\(^{19}\) The Archangel Michael traditionally determined the destination of the souls of the dead.
\(^{20}\) Here John looks forward to the eventual conversion of the Muslims and conquest of their lands for Christianity.
\(^{21}\) ‘chamus’/‘halter’ is a rare, non-classical, word used only in ecclesiastical Latin, e.g. Ps. 31, 9.
\(^{22}\) John refers back to his digression on effort and pain. He agrees with Cicero that neither is an end in itself. Both are needed for the pursuit of the ultimate joy of heaven.
Poscere; vir vacuus surgit ad alta levis.

Dic ubi sit Priamus, ubi magne gloria gentis,23

Aut ubi sit Troie nobilis urbis apex?

Saturnus Crete rector fuit a Jove nato

Expulsus,24 miseros quos ferus orcus habet.

Cernitur, O reges, magnos precedere pauper

Parvus, paupertas quem moderata premit.25

Suffert Ecclesia varios operosa labores

Nunc huc, nunc illuc, sedula mittit opem.

Tristes confortat, egrotos visitat, orat,

Predicat, exsuperat probra, flagella, minas.

Hac in valle miser misera pro posse laborat

Hospes homo,26 Varia condicione tamen

Fortis, cismaticus27, iustus, terram, Styga, celum

Protegit, intrat,28 habet, robore, fraude, fide.

Paulus pro celo vite dispendia sensit,

Per mare, per terras, victor ubique tamen.

24 Priam and Saturn are offered as further examples of the futility of riches.
25 John is contrasting the vigour of the Church in responding to the challenge in the Holy Land with the kings’ reluctance to mount an expedition.
26 This difficult and laboured passage may allude to Ps. 83, 7, ‘in valle lacrimarum’. See also EBVM, 9.519, ‘misera de valle’. ‘Hospes’ most likely refers to man’s temporary stay on earth as a ‘guest’.
27 A less usual variant of ‘schismaticus’, here meaning ‘heretic’. Lines 83-84 are a particularly elaborate example of ‘distributio’/‘accumulation’, with three sets each of corresponding subject/object/verb/ablative.
28 Read ‘intrat’ with MS for Wright’s ‘mirat.’
Nudis Ecclesie tribuens eraria\textsuperscript{29} flammas, 

Laurenti,\textsuperscript{30} superas craticuleque rogos.

\textless 10\textgreater  Presentis pape sic mens robusta cruentos 

Non metuit gladios martiriique minas.\textsuperscript{31}

Francorum princeps, nulla formidine belli

A Christo resilit militiaque Crucis.\textsuperscript{32}

Christi nulla Crucis gravis est elegia iusto

Qua vite fructus dulce pependit onus.\textsuperscript{33}

Papa vigore viget; cecidit quasi\textsuperscript{34} vertice fracto [71r]

Hostis Ely pueros per pia verba suos,

Gregorii quartus In papa Nocentius heres\textsuperscript{35}

Hostibus occurrit canonis ense sui.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{29} With Wright, read ‘eraria’ for ‘erraria’ in the text.
\textsuperscript{30} St. Lawrence, here addressed in the vocative case, an example of\textit{ apostrophe}. St. Lawrence was reportedly martyred by roasting on a gridiron in Rome in 258 for distributing Church wealth to the poor instead of surrendering it for confiscation by the state, JdeM, 298-300.
\textsuperscript{31} This is probably a reference to the pressures from Frederick II, which led Innocent IV to flee Rome in disguise in 1244, prior to the Council of Lyon.
\textsuperscript{32} Louis IX took the Cross in 1244. These lines appear to have been written between the Council of Lyon and the start of the Seventh Crusade.
\textsuperscript{33} Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, 2.760. ‘\textit{deque viri collo dulce pependit onus.’} Neither John nor his readers would be unaware that this passage of Ovid immediately precedes the rape of Lucretia, and touchingly describes Lucretia herself hanging as ‘a sweet burden’ round her husband’s neck.
\textsuperscript{34} Read ‘quasi’ for Wright’s ‘quia,’ and ‘pueros….suos’ for ‘pueris….suis’ in MS and Wright.
‘John likens Innocent IV’s robust attack on his enemies, notably Frederick II, with Eli’s devout acceptance, I Sam. 3, 18 – 4, , 18, that his sons must die in battle. Eli himself broke his neck. John urges Innocent IV not to shrink from full severity towards Frederick II. Wright’s punctuation is amended.
\textsuperscript{35} John splits ‘\textit{In-nocentius}’ because the word will not otherwise scan. See Geoffrey of Vinsauf, \textit{Poetria Nova}, 1-3, ‘\textit{...si dixerо Papa Nocenti / Accephalum nomen tribuаm; sed I caput addam Hostis erit metri,}’ and \textit{EBVM}, 4.97.
\textsuperscript{36} Innocent IV was an expert in canon law and used it as his weapon against Frederick II.
‘\textit{Canonis}’ is also hard to scan, with three short syllables. John glosses over this difficulty here and in line 214.
Celestinus enim presedit tempore parvo.\textsuperscript{37}

Quid mirum? Nequeunt stare caduca diu.\textsuperscript{38}

Spiritui labor incumbit caro dum rationi

Obstrepit, et ratio fortia frena capit.

Spinis urticisque sue Benedictus\textsuperscript{39} abegit

Carnis pruritum, demoniique stilos

In specie merule sanctum stimulaverat hostis,\textsuperscript{40}

Sed contra stimulum spina ferebat opem.

Pro fidei palma Katerine nobile corpus

Machina contorsit; vicit at illa rotas.\textsuperscript{41}

Trinus et unus eis dat pro mercede triumphum,

Hos cum ter trinis glorificando choris.

Nunc pro terrenis homines mactantur, \textsuperscript{42} Olimpo

Postposito, passi bella, flagella, stragem.

Hactenus ostendi comitantes arma labores;

Nunc quid agant hominum crimina flere vaco.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{37} Pope Celestine IV, pope for 17 days from 25 October-10 November 1241. \textit{CM}, 4.172. \textit{virum moribus praeditum et scientia, sed in aetatem senilem jam declinantem et debilitatum.}

\textsuperscript{38} John acknowledges Innocent IV as Gregory IX’s true heir (\textit{heres}) by the double entendre of ‘\textit{caduca}’, meaning both ‘frail, falling’ and also ‘\textit{bona vacantia}’.

\textsuperscript{39} Read ‘\textit{Benedictus}’, with MS, for Wright’s ‘\textit{vindictus}’.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{In specie merule}, see Bartholomew of Trent, 86.18-20. ‘\textit{Hostis}’ means ‘the devil’.

\textsuperscript{41} St. Catherine of Alexandria, fourth century saint and martyr, by tradition beheaded after her miraculous destruction of the wheel on which she was being tortured, JdeM, 485-89.

\textsuperscript{42} ‘\textit{terrenis}’, a play on ‘\textit{ter trinis}’. See also Prologue, n. 45, & 1.132. John laments the priority given to wars between Christians over the holy war against the Muslims. N.b. ‘\textit{Olimpi}’, meaning ‘heaven’.

\textsuperscript{43} ‘flore vaco’ See also \textit{DTE}, Preface.7.
Exemplis variis probitatis sepius ortor,

Ne validi teneant improbitatis iter.

Suspiro dampnis que gignit iniqua cupidō,

Qua fragiles artus mors animasque rapit.

Elatus, livens, irascens. segnis, avarus,

Ventrosus, petulans, in sua damna ruunt.

Humani generis excessus prodit ab illis,

Sicut in his elegis fert mea Musa prius.

Nullus in orbe novo utros diviserat hostis,

Nullus adhuc gladios qui fabricaret erat.

Glandes et fructus nemorum pro fruge legebant.

Non aurum, gemmas tunc sitiare viri.

Funestos belli casus incurrere debent

Alterius terras qui sine iure petunt.

Succubuere Gothi; defecit Vandalus, Huni

Vici senserunt fortia septra Crucis.

Mendax hereticus, caro lubrica, plebsque fidelis

In se Marte ruens, tres tria bella movent.

Fine tamen vario certant, pugnat quia iustus

44 ‘Probitas’ is difficult to translate. Its meaning lies on a spectrum between ‘pedigree’ and ‘integrity.’ See Paul (2012), 23 & n. 10.

45 Read ‘utros’ for Wright’s ‘murus.’ Correction by scribe in right margin, replacing ‘murus.’

46 A reference to the mythical Golden Age, Ovid, Met., 1.89-112.

47 Read ‘septra’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘sceptra.’

48 See line 110 above; there are repeated references to ‘tris tria,’ the ‘triple Trinity’, a number with mystical significance. There were also nine choirs of angels and nine is the square of three. Here it denotes ‘endless’ rather than a specific number.
Ad pacem, pretium mortis iniquus habet.

135 Ecclesie quidam\textsuperscript{49} fortès, pro pace statuti,

Offendunt iustum sanguinis ymbre Deum.\textsuperscript{50}

Prelia non cessant per partes quatuor anni,

Ut plus possideat Memphis avara sitis.\textsuperscript{51}

In Christum nescit incredula credere turba

140 Que delira Deo saxea corda gerit.

Hostis nature ferus est Machometus et omnis

Qui contra genii federa plura sitit.\textsuperscript{52}

Omnia temperiem servant\textsuperscript{53} sed cordis hyatus\textsuperscript{54}

In voto finem non reperire potest.

145 Oppositus cancer capricorno lapsus et ortus [71v]

Roges ex alto cernit abire gradu.\textsuperscript{55}

Inter se praestant sibi mutua munera menses,

Et celeste bonum participare volunt.

Frigus et humiditas sibi fervida siccaque placant;

\textsuperscript{49} Read ‘quidam’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘quidem’.

\textsuperscript{50} Rubric in right margin, opposite lines 136-38 reads, ‘\textit{De temperantia et ordine mundialis machine et de excessu in hominibus}’.

\textsuperscript{51} Read ‘Memphis’ for ‘mentis’ in MS and Wright on grounds of sense. The scribe has mistaken a proper noun for a word more familiar to him.

\textsuperscript{52} A further accusation against the Muslims, that contrary to the rules of nature, they are always hungry for the territory of others. See also Prologue, n. 25, and Introduction, 119-120 above.

\textsuperscript{53} ‘Temperatio’, ‘mingling, mixing’ was perceived as the mean towards which the natural state tended. It had close etymological ties with ‘temperantia’, the human virtue of moderation. Both concepts are used extensively by Cicero. There follows (lines 145-72) an astrological digression to prove the point.

\textsuperscript{54} ‘...ubi temperiem sumpsere umorque calorque’, Ovid, \textit{Met.}, 1.430.

\textsuperscript{55} A vivid physical metaphor, ‘a yawning gap in the heart’/ ‘a deep yearning in the spirit’.

John tells us in similar language that the Emperor Frederick II was excommunicated under the sign of Cancer, \textit{DTE}, 7.483. This looks like an oblique reference to that event.
Fedus in oppositis fervor et humor agunt.

Istam temperiem fecit mirabilis auctor

Qui tempus
statuit; tempore factus homo.

Dum solem vite fontem iubet ire planetis

Sex medium, fructus ducit inesse novos.

Ut Ptolomee, doces, complexio signa catenat,

56 'tempus' with Wright, 'tempore' in MS. It is impossible in English to convey the pun 'temperies' / 'tempus'.

57 An illustration of the signs of the zodiac is in the left margin of the MS (Plate 2, p. 130). Uniquely this folio has two marginal illustrations, see also n. 74.

58 Wright’s punctuation is amended, with the sense.

59 Ptolemy held that there were seven ‘planets’; the moon, Mercury, Venus, the sun, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn, which were believed in medieval times to rotate around the Earth. His principal works on astronomy (Almagest) and astrology (Quadripartitum) were translated into Latin in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. John’s thought process here is that the sun by spreading its heat evenly amongst the other planets gives them light and warmth.
Plate 2. MS London Cotton Claudius A x, f. 71v.
The signs of the Zodiac, *DTE*, 1. 157-60.
Et pacis nexus hac brevitate\textsuperscript{60} patet.

Ignea sunt Ari., Sa., Leo; sed Scor. aquatica, Pis., Can.

Terrea Tau., Capri., Vir.; aëra dant A., Ge., Li.

Ad pacem distant Aries, Scor.; Pis., Leo; Can., Sa.

Urnaque\textsuperscript{61} Vir., Taurus, Libra; Caprique Gemi.\textsuperscript{62}

Est Aries veris, Taurus Geminique, gradusque

Servat terdenos ordine quisque trium.

Sol bis sex signis peragratis perficit annum,

It, redit assidue, continuatque gradus.

Estati dantur Cancer, Leo, Virgo; calorem

Tempore disponunt pluvia minusve suo.

Autumnus librat, post pungit, et inde sagittat,\textsuperscript{63}

Sed tribus hiis frigus temperat ipse suum.

Excedunt hyemi Capricornus Aquarius arma

Et Pisces, donec tempora vere virent.\textsuperscript{64}

Dulce bis equidium, bis solsticiale iuvamen

Signis oppositis tempora sole novant.

Contendunt homines marcescere tempore veris

Quando festinant per sua bella mori.

\textsuperscript{60}‘Brevitas’/ literally ‘shortness’; here meaning ‘condensed version’. This is translated ‘mnemonic’—a teaching tool John has borrowed from the classroom.

\textsuperscript{61} John uses both ‘Urna’ and ‘A’ to denote Aquarius, and provide variation.

\textsuperscript{62} John’s use of mnemonics reflects the pedagogic approach to his grammatical works (e.g. \textit{Clavis Compendii}).

\textsuperscript{63} i.e under the signs of Libra, Scorpio and Sagittarius.

\textsuperscript{64} Wright’s punctuation is changed here.
Diversis none sanctis, idusque kalende

Sollemnes lucent, gens tamen arma capit.\(^65\)

Quanto maius erit festum, maius scelus instat,

Dum funestatur per scelus alma dies.

Flos in naturis Lucas Essexia florum\(^66\)

Patria quem genuit certius\(^67\) alta sapit.\(^68\)

Stellarum leges lapsus assignat et ortus.

Noscere sed sapiens quis vaga corda potest?

Facta pace mali pacem confringere gaudent.

In bello bellum pacificare petunt.\(^69\)

Sed reges nostri pacem tutantur,\(^70\) et arma

Si capiunt, causam iuris habere putant.

Non tamen hoc satis est; caveant ergo sibi reges,

---

\(^{65}\) John reverts to his denunciation of the Egyptians broken off at line 142 above.


\(^{67}\) Read ‘certius’ for Wright’s ‘tertius’.

\(^{68}\) Lines 179-81, ‘Lucas’: a personal reminiscence spurred by the astronomical digression. John attributes his education in astronomy to Luke. This passage could offer further support to the view that John was born in Essex, on a natural reading of ‘patria.’ (see Introduction, 19-20). Wright, p. 145, note on p. 12, line 23, comments ‘I cannot discover that this writer, who is mentioned again as a distinguished mathematician in p. 26 (2.217-18), is otherwise known than by the allusion to him by John de Garlande. He is an addition to the list of early worthies of the county of Essex.’ See now Book 2, n. 61, suggesting that this second reference is not to Luke at all.

\(^{69}\) John makes a pun on the poetic meaning of ‘pacificare’; ‘They seek to assuage war through war’.

\(^{70}\) John’s reference to ‘reges nostri’ suggests that the scene has shifted to France and England, and that this passage was written during a truce between the French king and Henry III, broken during the first regency of Blanche of Castile (1228 –c. 1234). Truces were declared in 1226, 1231 and 1235. Henry broke the 1226 truce with his abortive invasion of Poitou in 1230, in an effort to recapture what he had lost to Louis VIII in 1224. Because of the reference to Blanche, it is unlikely that the reference is to the 1235 truce, again broken by Henry’s invasion in 1242. Weiler (2006), 24, puts the point well, ‘Although truces were frequently declared, they were viewed as an opportunity to prepare for war, not as a step towards peace.’
Ne sibi mens fuerit conscia\textsuperscript{71} facta mali.

Post treugas regum redit orbiculare flagellum,

\textit{Pugnaque plus ledit iuribus\textsuperscript{72} aucta novis.}

\textless 13\textgreater  Blanca tamen regis mater iustissima pacem

\textit{Poscit sanctarum sedulitate precum,}

\textit{‘Stella parens solis concepte filia prolis\textsuperscript{73} }

\textit{Pacem de celis mittere, virgo, velis.’\textsuperscript{74}

Trux Amalec Iosue doluit succumbere palmis [72r]

\textsuperscript{71} Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, 1.485, ‘Conscia mens ut cuique sua est, ita concipit intra / pectora pro facto spemque metumque suo.’

\textsuperscript{72} Read ‘iuribus’ for Wright’s ‘viribus.’ Either could be correct.

\textsuperscript{73} See \textit{Stella}, line 10, ‘Hec est stella, mater solis / Sol de sole, nata prolis / Lux regina glorie.’

\textit{‘Prolis concepta’ is the legitimate offspring of a marriage.}

\textsuperscript{74} The leonine lines 193-94 are incorporated into an illustration in the left margin of the MS, depicting Blanche of Castile praying to the Virgin and child. (Plate 3, p. 134). John singles out Blanche for her piety.
Plate 3. MS London British Library
Cotton Claudius A x, Blanche of Castile, the Virgin and Child, DTE, 1. 193
Erectis Moysi praesidiisque precum.\textsuperscript{75}

Cum clangore tube Gedeon fractisque lagenis

Inruit in Madian, inpuleratque fuge.\textsuperscript{76}

Est tuba sermo Dei, corpusque lagena paratum

Martirio. Victrix hec gerit arma fides.

Belli consultor, iuris dissuasor, amoris

Hostis in occulto seminat omne malum

Transfuga permutans dominos hos fallit et illos;

Est quia cum vento mobilis empta fides.\textsuperscript{77}

Polluit Allecto mentes, linguasque venenat

Thesiphone; foedat torva Megera manus.\textsuperscript{78}

Pax de militibus, de clero regula iuris,

Heu, de plebe fides clamitat\textsuperscript{79} ante Deum.

Sed quasi sol oriens nocturnas effugat umbras,

Sic nova tristitiam gaudia saepe fugant.

Est quasi nox heresis, fastus, Venus, ambitus, ira.

Iustus purgabit sol tamen ista mala.

\textsuperscript{75} Ex. 17, 8-15. See Gaposchkin (2017), 42-43 for the central role of this episode in crusading liturgies.

\textsuperscript{76} Iud. 7, 16-20.


\textsuperscript{78} In Greek and Roman mythology, Allecto, Tisiphone and Megera were the three Erinyes, or Furies, who avenged wrongs. John identifies them individually with thought, word and deed. See also \textit{Integumenta}, 199-200 and Marguin-Hamon (2010c), 17.

\textsuperscript{79} John lists the three tiers of society, knights, clergy and laity, and says that each is in breach of its guiding moral principle, respectively maintaining peace, upholding the principles of canon law, and holding to the Christian faith. ‘\textit{Regula iuris}’ was a guiding principle of canon law, or one of eleven specific principles introduced by Gregory IX in 1234.

\textsuperscript{80} Ovid, \textit{Amores}, 1.8.13, ‘hanc ego nocturnas versam volitare per umbras / suspicor…’
Nature leges heresis predicta molestat,

Sed monstrum perimunt canonis arma sacri.

Hiis tactis adversa loquar miserosque tumultus,

Quos fert Ecclesia suppeditatque potens. 81

Europe paucos 82 equites ferit Africa tota.

Barbaries Asie latius urget eos, 83

Signum contempnit Aniceti 84 nobile pape,

Quo prius in clero clerica tonsa fuit.

Virgo sed Ecclesiam pugillo 85 surgit in hostes,

Eminus hos terret, cominus ense domat,

Gentes externas et bella domestica tandem

Vincet, et attinget litora cimba Petri.

Allicit adversis hominem Deus, aëra purgat

Imbribus et mittit gaudia sole novo.

Temperiem gignunt contraria, mitigat aura

Estatem, brumam lenit amena dies.

81 This seems to refer to Frederick II’s hostility to the pope.
82 Louis’ army was in fact a powerful and well-equipped force, see Introduction, n. 446.
83 ‘Barbaries Asie’ refers to both Muslims and Mongols.
84 The MS reads ‘anatheti’ and looks like a corruption, again (See e.g. line 138, n. 51 above) because the scribe was unfamiliar with the proper noun. Wright reads ‘Anacleti’, stating (p. 145, note to p. 13.29). ‘St. Anaclet is pretended to have been pope from the year 100 to 109, and to have first introduced the tonsure.’ This should read ‘Aniceti.’ It was Pope Anicetus (c. 153-166) who was claimed to have introduced the tonsure as ‘signum purioris vitae,’ in a forged decree recorded by Pseudo-Isidorus, PL, 130, 117-8. The current reference seems to refer to contempt for the clergy from Mongols and Muslims despite—or perhaps because of— their obviously tonsured heads. ‘Signum’ plays on its two meanings, ‘seal’ and ‘distinguishing sign’.
85 Read ‘Ecclesiam,’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘ecclesia.’ ‘Surgit’ is a rare, transitive use. John makes a pun on ‘Pugillum’ / ‘handful’, on its literal meaning of ‘fist’. 
Depuratur\textsuperscript{86} aqua ventis et sole per altum

230 Aëra\textsuperscript{87} dulcescit quae modo salsa fuit.

Cum nox est media nobis tellure sub alta

Exequat mediam lux radiosa diem.

In luctu quidam gaudent, in gaudia quidam

Lugent. Sunt quidam qui sine fine dolent.

Primi sunt gazis hylares, sanctique secundi,

235 Hinc desperantes qui sine fine gemunt.

Inconstans simul inpatiens delabitur omne

In vitium cordis, bella nephanda gerens.

Divitibus cum pauperibus nociere flagella

Ista duo, miserios que sine fine premunt.

240 Ecclesiam divina tamen clementia servat,

Que franget nutu colla superba brevi.

Papa Petri claves et Pauli publicat ensem;

Hec duo cum stabili gaudia pace dabunt.

245 Ecclesie virtus tandem Babilonis habenas [72v]

Curtabit, laxant quas aliena mala.

In Babilone tumet fastus regnatque cupidó

Sevit et impietas luxurieque lues.

248 Grex\textsuperscript{88} brevis obsessus balat, rabiesque lupina

\textsuperscript{86} John uses the medieval form '\textit{depuratur}', rather than the Classical '\textit{depurgatur}.'

\textsuperscript{87} Accusative form, used by Cicero and others.

\textsuperscript{88} Read '\textit{Grex}' with MS, for Wright's '\textit{Rex}.' Vergil, \textit{Georg.}, 1.272, '\textit{balantunque gregem}.'
Introitum querit, exstimulante fame.

‘Atat!’ femineus clamat timor. ‘Armiger ohe!’ 89

Victor, io, saliens, hei mihi!’ Morte ruens,

Captivos Babilon includit, verberat, urget,

Detruncat, laniat impietate pios. 90

Vexatam gemit Ecclesiam prior iste libellus91

O quantas pugnas indicat ordo sequens!

Festinate duces Crucis et succurrite sancte

Terre que vestram capta requirit opem.92

<15> Mestis compatiar, letis conformis habebor

Sperans letitie non procul esse diem.

Conqueritur Templum Domini, plangitque Sepulcrum.

Nazareth et Bethleem flent, Josaphatque gemit.93

Quisque sed ut proprio letetur, non alieno

Gaudeat, est pape cura Crucisque labor.

Damnant linguosi papam, punguntque bilingues.

89 ‘Atat!’, ‘ohe!’, ‘io!’ and ‘hei mihi!’ are all interjections found in classical Latin comedy. N.b. also Vergil, Aen. 2.274, ‘Ei mihi, qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo.’ See CG, 2.1634, in a section on interjections. “Expressiva metus vox est, ‘atat’ probat illud.” / “The sound expresses fear, and ‘atat’ shows that.”

90 This seems to refer to the siege of Damietta and to the hostages from Louis’ army still held by the Egyptians, and is therefore one of the later references in De triumphis, from 1251-2.

91 An indication that this first book is intended to set the scene of an embattled Church, to be followed by detailed accounts in subsequent books of the fighting involved. John shows a sense of continuity of crusading.

92 A passionate call to the West’s leaders to come to help the Holy Land.

93 EBVM, 4.1-70 has a fuller description of Jerusalem and the Holy Land. The Valley of Jehosaphat was widely seen as the site of the Last Judgment, e.g. St. Bernard, De Laude, 227-28, Schein (2005), 152-53.
Elingues lacerant, qui ratione carent.\textsuperscript{94}

Fons et origo mali sitis est quae cuncta vorare,

Cuncta tenere sibi, cuncta negare studet.

Discordant varie gentes habituque locoque;

Mos\textsuperscript{95} est sepe suus Martis\textsuperscript{96} origo novi.

Delicias caperent breviore labore supernas,

Ima quibus donat summus averna labor.

Morbus, mors, vitium, putredo, labor, dolor, error

Hanc miseram vitam sunt comitata brevem.

Gens Euri, Zephiri, Boree discordat et Austri.

Ha! Quid erit? Quid agam? Quo dabo terga fuge? \textsuperscript{97}

Hec mundi prior est elegia, quod bona paуча

Paucis sufficiunt dosque modesta Dei.

Ad speciale vocor, sed non generale relinquo,

Dum commune bonum pandit honesta via.\textsuperscript{98}

Iura iubent animam celestia poscere, terras

Appriuant homini lex ratioque fori.

\textsuperscript{94}Rubric in left margin, ‘Planctus elegiacus de eo quod propria bona paucis sufficiunt et ideo vendicant aliena.’

\textsuperscript{95}‘Mos’ means the totality of a culture—principles, customs, laws, traditions.

\textsuperscript{96}Read ‘Martis’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘mortis’.

\textsuperscript{97}John invokes the dramatic closing chapter of the Aeneid. Turnus speaks to his disguised sister before going heroically out to his death at the hands of Aeneas, ‘Nam quid ago?..’ / ‘For what am I to do?...’(12.637), ‘Terga dabo, et Turnum fugientem haec terra videbit?’ (12.645). John and his readers will also recall the immediately following passage, in which Saces tells Turnus that the Latins’ hopes reside in him.

\textsuperscript{98}Justinian, Inst., 1.1.3, ‘Iuris praecepta sunt haec: honeste vivere, alterum non laedere, suum cuique tribuere.’ John is distinguishing here between the dictates of natural law (‘ius’) and the legal system (‘lex’).
Hac ratione comes cui Marchia cedere debet

Arma novat, firmat oppida, frenat equos.\textsuperscript{99}

Vires quas debent Christo consumere certant

Inter se proceres seque suosque gravant.

Vir validus vultute virens\textsuperscript{100} prelustris et armis

Marchio defendit castra vigore suo.\textsuperscript{101}

Linguas mordaces mutilat mea Musa, sigillans\textsuperscript{102}

In formam iustam facta venusta viri.

Quid virtus comitis valeat, fera Francia sentit

Quam\textsuperscript{103} feritate pari fervida pugna ferit.

<16> Urbs Acron belli causas produxerat olim\textsuperscript{104}

Dum cruce signati discrepuere duces.

Ad comitem venit regum dissentio longa, [73r]

Nobilis uxoris causa movebat eum.

Bella viro nupsit Isabella parens tua, rector

Anglorum, patris morte soluta tui.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{99} For a detailed note on Hugh X de Lusignan, count of La Marche, see n. 105 below.

\textsuperscript{100} A notable example of alliteration.

\textsuperscript{101} CM, 4.179, ‘castra sua armis et armatis necnon et alimentorum copia communivit.’ John appears to use ‘marchio’ as a title synonymous with ‘comes.’ See also DTE, 2.43.

\textsuperscript{102} ‘Sigillare’, ‘to seal’, is not a classical form. Here it probably refers to the legitimisation of his marriage to his father’s former betrothed, and possibly to other amorous activities.

\textsuperscript{103} Read ‘Quam’ for Wright’s ‘Quod.’

\textsuperscript{104} Acre. See DTE, Prologue, n. 31 & 2.651-4. The latter reference explicitly traces back the causes of Anglo-French friction to resentments bred at Acre.

\textsuperscript{105} Line 295 more fully introduces Hugh ‘le Brun’ X de Lusignan, count of la Marche, and central character in an important sub-plot. John sees the tension between Philip II of France and Richard I of England at the siege of Acre (1189-91) as the major underlying cause of the failure of their countries to unite under the crusading banner. Hugh X is presented as a valiant if vacillating pawn as the dispute plays out. John identifies the reason for the initial rift as Richard’s jilting Philip’s
Ista propago potens que terras vendicat armis.  
Innumerous faciet fata subire viros.

Inter se certant nostri concurrere reges,
Quos metuit solos gens inimica Deo.

Sed tamen excessu nostro quandoque per arma
Succumbunt celi qui dyadema petunt.

Heu quotiens reges pugnant, hinc Gallicus, inde
Anglicus, Ecclesiam pugna propinqua gravat.

Seva Philisteis immisit brachia Sampson,
Contra Christicolas brachia nostra valent.

Ecclesiam semper foverunt hec duo regna.

Sed modo flens clamat, ‘parcite, le dor enim.’

sister, Alice. Isabella of Angoulême had been betrothed to Hugh’s father, Hugh IX, but had married John, king of England in 1200, when she was still aged only twelve. John failed to pay compensation to Hugh. John died in 1216, and Isabella married Hugh X (himself betrothed to Joan, daughter of King John) in 1220. She was the mother, by John, of Henry III of England and Richard of Cornwall. Hugh X supported Louis VIII against Henry III in the conquest of Poitou in 1224. He rebelled after Louis’ death but made peace with the regent, Blanche of Castile, in 1227. He did not back Henry III’s invasion in 1230, but encouraged him to invade again in 1242. This followed Louis IX’s investiture of his own brother Alphonse as count of Poitou, from whom Hugh retracted his homage. Hugh switched sides again, and Henry retreated ignominiously after the battle of Saintes. Hugh initially kept most of his lands, though on strict terms, but his castles were demilitarised and he was effectively eliminated as a threat to Louis. See Book 2, passim, and 3.322-679 for John’s account of the campaign. Hallam and Everard (2013), 168-275 give a useful account of the confusing period from 1200 to the Seventh Crusade. For a close examination of Isabella’s motivations, see N. Vincent (1997). In lines 296-97, addressed to Henry as a rhetorical apostrophe, readers would understand perfectly well that it was not the death of Henry’s father, John, in 1216, but of Hugh X’s father, Hugh IX, in 1219, which really set her free to marry Hugh fils. Isabella’s strong feelings are attributed to her belief in the superior claims of her sons over those of Alphonse to the county of Poitou, see CM, 4.178-79. John’s rhetoric around Hugh’s behaviour mirrors Matthew’s. See Introduction, 55.

106 A further echo of Vergil, Aen. 12. 827, ‘sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago’. John’s reference is to Henry III.
107 i.e. the Muslims.
108 ‘excessu nostro,’ ‘original sin.’
109 Iud. 16, 29-30.
Rex Dachus pugnax et rex Norvegius audax

Bellis alternis mutua regna petunt.

Ascribit cupide menti plebs bella moveri,

Pars licet affirmet omnia iure geri.

Turbatur pax Ecclesie bellique procellam

Sentit pauperibus mota procella nocet.

Dum generale fleo sic damnum, dum speciale,

Pax ubi sit stabilis non reperire queo.

Risum proscribit luctus, ludum dolor, ira

Mensuram, somnum clamor, agenda stupor.

Fama trucis belli Parthos extollit et armat,

Quos ad bella vocat libera facta via.

Si gladiis istis incredula turba periret,

Gauderem; doleo quod pia turba perit.

\[110\] Wright correctly identifies the Danish king as Waldemar II (1202-1241). His Norwegian opposite number was Haakon IV (1217-1263). This particular passage was most likely written around 1224. At that time, Henry III and Louis VIII were fighting over Poitou, and both Scandinavian kings were in conflict with other claimants of their respective thrones. Professor Kurt Jensen urges me not to abandon the linguistically more obvious interpretation, that this refers to fighting between the kings of Norway and Denmark. This might have been Norwegian mischief-making after Waldemar’s death, but there is no obvious contemporary incident, perhaps making this a general observation about their mutual hostility.

\[111\] ‘Pax Ecclesie’ was introduced in Southern France by the Church in the late tenth century as an attempt to protect society from local wars between lords. It spread geographically and was reinforced by the Council of Bourges (1225), but largely superseded by the *Treuga Dei*, the ‘truce of God’ which strictly limited the periods during which acts of warfare were tolerated. The phrase is not here to be taken literally, but to remind the reader of the Church’s view of local wars.

Elsewhere in this poem, John emphasises neglect of the injunction against fighting on Sundays and saints’ days, e.g. hostilities at Taillebourg on the feast of St. Mary Magdalene, *DTE*, 3.350-51.

\[112\] Read ‘sit’ with MS, omitted by Wright.

\[113\] i.e. by Louis’ expedition against Hugh.
Marchius Hugo comes regem comitando feretur\footnote{Louis IX forced a number of his previously rebellious nobles, including Hugh, to accompany him on crusade. John uses the future tense, suggesting that this section was written between 1244 and 1248, between the attack on Jerusalem and the launch of the Seventh Crusade. Hugh X was killed during Louis IX’s landing at Damietta on 6 June 1249, just as his father, Hugh IX, had died there in the Fifth Crusade in 1219. ‘Feretur’ is used poetically to mean ‘will be carried forth to burial’, cp. Ovid, \textit{Tristia}, 1.3.89. See the letter from Gui, \textit{CM}, vol. 6 (\textit{Add}), 155, trans. Jackson (2007), 89. In line 326 Wright has ‘\textit{Menfiticos}’ while noting correctly that it ‘should no doubt be ‘\textit{Menfiticos}’ (as in MS). ‘\textit{Vi dominante}’ may carry the meaning that he did not go of his own free will, or may reflect his reckless valour reported by Gui, a reaction to his countrymen’s lack of trust.}

Contra \textit{Menfiticos} vi dominante duces.

\begin{itemize}
\item Multi sunt dubii quis iustius induit arma,
\item Rex quia ius trutinat, vendicat equa comes.
\end{itemize}

Non decet oppositum domino certare clientem

\begin{itemize}
\item Sic quia concludi sentiet ipse sibi.\footnote{John places the balance of right with Alphonse, rather than with Hugh.}
\item Non decet armari dominos ad damna suorum
\item Qui dominis parent, iuraque sponte parant.\footnote{John plays on the words ‘\textit{parent}’/ ‘obey’ and ‘\textit{parant}’/ ‘acquire.’ By ‘\textit{sponte},’ he means that the Lusignans’ claims in Poitou were derived directly through Hugh’s wife Isabella, and not by the grant of the French king.}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item Metitur vires proprias athleta disertus,
\item Et studet ut iuris regula ducat eum.
\end{itemize}

Sed ius sepe cadit, pietas emarcet, honestas

\begin{itemize}
\item Languet, honor dormit, lex iacet, alget amor.
\end{itemize}

Quid valet imperium, quid mundi larga potestas\footnote{Damaged rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{De exces\{su et ruin\}a.’}

Unde ruunt, tabulata struunt sublimia multi,
Dum mens illorum nescit habere modum.  

Sunt quadringenti deciesque quater simul octo

Sunt anni peperit ut pia Virgo Deum,

Fortes ad validos Angli venere Britannos

Qui gladiis regnum supposuere sibi.

Anno milleno sexageno data sexto [73v]

Rex sacer Eduardus celica regna capit.

Sceptra nepos eius Heraldus fortis habebat.

Sed Normannorum dux superavit eum.

Iura sub alterius domini possessio transit

Nunc vi, nunc pretio, nunc prece, nuncque nece.

Rex fuit Assirius excessu bestia factus.

Et cecidit proprio saucius ense Saul.

Hos pacem servare decet, salvareque iura,

Sunt quibus a iusto tradita sceptra Deo.

Rex fuit Assirius excessu bestia factus.

Et cecidit proprio saucius ense Saul.

Hos pacem servare decet, salvareque iura,

Sunt quibus a iusto tradita sceptra Deo.

Est labor ergo bonus quando sine Marte laborant

---

118 ‘Nescit habere modum vanis mens dedita curis.’ John is referring to Versus ad Hunaldum 8, widely attributed to St. Columba (521-597).
119 Bede, Hist. Ecc., 1.15 has this date as 449, Geoffrey of Monmouth gives no date.
120 Here John begins a digression to demonstrate the transitory nature of power and the necessarily shifting pattern of allegiance.
121 1066, the death of Edward the Confessor
122 With Wright, read ‘sceptra’ for ‘septra’ in MS. Heraldum = Harold.
123 An instance of John’s disapproval of Philip II’s seizure of Normandy. See also DTE, 2.315.
124 Dan. 4, 33. The Assyrian king is Nebuchadnezzar.
125 I Sam. 31, 4.
126 Matth. 26, 52: ‘Omnes enim qui acceperint gladium gladio peribunt.’
Reges et populi fine decente mori.

Sed modo cum clero populus formidine belli

Pallet, ubique facit mortis imago metum.¹²⁷

<18> Sedes morte patris spatio Romana bienni

Muta silet, nec adhuc proxima bella silent.¹²⁸

Sed contra claves celii¹²⁹ celesteque¹³⁰ regnum,

Non infernales praevaluere fores.¹³¹

Corpora defendit turris¹³² regalia sed non

Exutas animas illa tenere potest.¹³³

Urbs dolet Ecclesie cuius civilia cives

Bella movent,¹³⁴ frater ad arma vocat.¹³⁵

Ecclesie nati plusquam civilia tractant,

Qui sacros patres Ecclesiamque premunt.¹³⁶

In bellis evum gaudent consumere quidam¹³⁷

Qui dare propitio nil didicere Deo.

¹²⁷ Vergil, Aen., 2.368-69, ‘crudelis ubique / Luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago.’
¹²⁸ This refers to the interregnum from the death of Celestine IV on 10 November 1241 to the election of Innocent IV on 25 June, 1243. Supporters of the Emperor and of the papacy fought for control of Rome during this period.
¹²⁹ The keys of St. Peter.
¹³⁰ Surely a play on the name of Celestine IV, whose reign, following the death of Gregory IX on 22 August 1241, lasted only 17 days.
¹³¹ Matth.16,18, ‘super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversum eam.’
¹³² Horace, Odes, 1.4.13-14, ‘Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas / regumque turris.’
¹³³ Hugh of St. Victor, Dogmatica, PL 176, col. 0584.
¹³⁴ i.e. Rome.
¹³⁵ Matth. 10, 21-22, ‘tradet autem frater fratrem in mortem.’
¹³⁶ ‘Plusquam civilia,’ Lucan, 1.1, ‘Bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos,’ i.e wars in which related parties—the kings of France and England, and Frederick II and Innocent III (his childhood guardian) fought each other.
¹³⁷ This would have been the logical point at which to begin Book 2.
Amisisse diem Titus\textsuperscript{138} qua nil dedit, inquit

Romanis. Annum perdimus.\textsuperscript{139} Heu! quid erit?

Ter centum luces decies sex perdimus et sex

Si bisextilem dicimus ire diem.\textsuperscript{140}

Annis in multis aderit miserabile damnum,

A bello paucos\textsuperscript{141} quod revocare solet.

Est qui\textsuperscript{142} firmate dissolvit federa pacis

Cognatosque duces ad nova bella trahit,\textsuperscript{143}

Qui pretio\textsuperscript{144} proprios studet expugnare parentes,

Qui nullum metuit eris amore nephas.

Ista probant fratres uterini.\textsuperscript{145} Mobilis errat

\textsuperscript{138} Roman emperor, 39-81 CE. Suetonius, Titus, 8. 1 ‘Amici, diem perdidi!’ See also DTE, Prologue.60 above.

\textsuperscript{139} This passage is obscure but John seems to be saying that whereas Titus saw a day without giving as a day lost, Christendom squandered whole years (and leap-years), during which potential crusaders were deterred from enlisting. This may be a specific reference to the year lost through Henry III’s abortive invasion of Poitou (1242).

\textsuperscript{140} John shows a recurring close interest in the calculation of dates. He is credited with a book on the Computus, and shows a detailed knowledge of it. See DTE, 5.117-40, 6.17-24, Introduction, 27.

\textsuperscript{141} ‘\textit{Pauci}’ means ‘the few’, in the context of war against the Muslims. John’s point is that the longer these domestic distractions continue, the more likely are the kings to resile from war against the Muslims.

\textsuperscript{142} i.e. Hugh X de Lusignan. The truce referred to was between Henry III and Louis IX in 1235, and broken by Henry’s invasion in May 1242.

\textsuperscript{143} See also DTE, 2.43-44.

\textsuperscript{144} Hugh was persuaded to change sides by the relatively lenient terms apparently on offer from Louis, CM, 4.215-16. ‘\textit{Parentes}’ means ‘ancestors’; by finally submitting to the French crown he is abandoning support for Angevin claims to Poitou.

\textsuperscript{145} The contemporary pair, though not \textit{fratres uterini}, who obviously fit this description were Isabella’s son Henry III and Hugh X de Lusignan, son of her former betrothed, Hugh IX. John uses Mordred and Gawain simply to illustrate betrayal by close family members for material gain.
Unus, dum stabilis desidet alter ei.

Monstrat Modredus Galvanum fraude necando

Quod fratrem regni frater amore necat.¹⁴⁶

Condoluisse pater potuit Loth, mater et Anna,

Que soror Arthuri principis Anna fuit.

Arthuri sponsam Guennoram regnaque fallax

Dum potuit, tenuit et diadema sibi.

Prodigione sua perit, sic ergo peribit

Qui pacis franget federa fraudae sua.

Instuduere bonis quidam meruereque laudem

Exemploque fuit femina virque bono.

<19> Carmentis notulas Gedeonis tempore nostras [74r]

Invenit, mulier Greca futura canens.¹⁴⁷

Filius illius Evander tecta paravit

Illic parva prius, est ubi Roma modo.¹⁴⁸

Troia destructa tunc temporis equore vectus

Eneas Latium subdidit ense sibi.¹⁴⁹

Expulit a Creta Saturnum filius armis

¹⁴⁶ GM, 176-78.
¹⁴⁷ Vergil, Aen. 8.336 establishes Carmentis as mother of Evander who was exiled with her from Greece to Latium. See also Ovid, Fasti, 1.467-52. She was a prophetess, credited with introducing the Latin alphabet in Isidore of Seville Etym., 1.4.1, 5.39, who places this event, like Gideon’s rule, during the Third Age of Man. See also CG, 1.321, ‘Carmentis notulas invent callida nostra.’
¹⁴⁸ Evander was believed to have founded Pallantium, on the Palatine Hill in Rome. It was named after his great-grandfather, Pallas (Vergil, Aen., 8.54). Romulus’ twin brother Remus wanted to locate the city on the Aventine Hill, and Romulus named it after himself after killing Remus in the ensuing dispute. John shared the Romans’ love of etymological explanations.
¹⁴⁹ Aeneas’ conquest of Latium after the fall of Troy is the subject of the Aeneid.
Hic ubi delituit est Latiale solum.\(^{150}\)

Urbs Pallanteum sonat a Pallante parente

Evandri. Romam Romulus inde tulit,

Fratris cede nocens. Hic semper vixit in armis,

Quem tandem cives enecuere sui.\(^{151}\)

Exemplum sceleris Iulianus apostota sepe

Ponitur, exuerat qui monachale decus.

Huic monacho mulier cista\(^{152}\) commiserat aurum

Sed texus sparsus splendida frusta cinis.

Asportans aurum monachus sua claustra reliquit.\(^{153}\)

Sed consul Rome munere factus erat.

Imperio functus tandem scelus omne peregit

Cuius in excidium tota gehenna coit.\(^{154}\)

\(^{150}\) In Roman mythology, Saturn, driven out of Crete by his son Jupiter, was an early arrival in Latium during the Golden Age., Vergil, Aen. 8.319-23.

\(^{151}\) See Ovid, Fasti, 4, 813-46, for Remus’ death. Classical accounts of Romulus’ death vary. Most sources say that Romulus ascended into the sky as a god, but John has chosen the alternative version of his death, probably based on Val. Max. 5.3.1. See Bremner & Horsfall (1987), 45-47. John refers to this again, DTE, 3.57-58.

\(^{152}\) Read ‘cista’/‘box,’ for ‘cesta’ in MS and Wright’s ‘testa.’

\(^{153}\) Julian the Apostate, Roman emperor 361-63 CE. See also DTE, 4.397-402, 7.451-66. Wright notes, p. 146, ‘I have not been able to discover from whence this singular legend relating to the cause of Julian’s apostasy is taken.’ However, according to John Beleth, Summa, ch. 125, John’s probable source, Julian, Constantine’s half-brother, had taken refuge with the Church when his brother was murdered. A woman entrusted her gold to him. Julian stole the gold and hid it at home, then denied he had it. He was threatened with exposure by a demon, whom he pledged to worship.

\(^{154}\) Read, with MS, ‘excidium’ for Wright’s ‘exitium’.
Book 2

Incipit secundus liber De triumphis Ecclesie

<20> Belli quoque decet finem prenosse potentes,\(^1\)

Dedecus, excessus, damna, pericula, metus.

Lamentis causas et dira pericula belli\(^2\)

Iungo, que bellum sunt comitata ferum.

5 Vulnra fert iustus, sed plausu militat, et spem

Dirigit ad palme premia danda sibi.

Prostratum vulgus volucesque canesque revellunt,

Et miseris animas forsitan orchus habet.

Succurrit vigilans domini prudentia pape;

10 In rate dormimus dum regit ipse ratem.

Non hec attendunt quamplures, sed quasi ceci

Et quasi palpantes in sua vota ruunt.

Hiisne Syon gaudet? Non, sed dol.

Estne per illos

Libera? Nequaquam.\(^3\) Serva sed esse gemit.\(^4\)

15 Talibus exemplis licet ammonuisse renatos

---

\(^{1}\) In the right hand margin are the caricature of a face and traces of other notes, perhaps by a reader, including a faint drawing of a hand.

\(^{2}\) 'pericula belli,' Vergil, Aen., 11.505.

\(^{3}\) The first of several examples of *subiectio*, or hypophora, defined by John 'quando querimus quid debeat dici, et illud subicimus,' *PP*, 6.192-93.

\(^{4}\) The MS has 'serva' twice, with the first underlined with a dotted line, the scribe’s usual way of correcting the script. It is difficult to be sure of the target of John’s barbs. It may be the Emperor Frederick and his crusade of 1228-29, the Khwarazmians who sacked Jerusalem in 1244, the various ‘unofficial’ crusades, or, perhaps most likely, the unruly nobles of England and France.
Fonte sacro populos ut Crucis arma ferant;

Sed Sarracenos referam si vixero\textsuperscript{5} victos

Victricisque Crucis magnificabo duces.

Si gemitus causasque suas ex ordine promo,

Sic ex proposito continuatur opus.

Ethica confinis bello latet. Exeat ergo

Nunc hoc, nunc illud cum ratione sua.\textsuperscript{6}

Prelia iusta licent fuerint, discordia sevit

Ultra quam debet, egrediturque modum.

\textless 21\textgreater  Fletibus et trenis nostros deterreo reges

Ut mutent animos accipientque Crucem.

Causa prior gemitus est fracte lesi pacis,

Causa sequens Babilon hereticumque nephas.\textsuperscript{7}

Pro patria pugnare licet, sed parcere Parthis

Cernuntur reges dum sua bella gerunt. [74v]

O dolor! O luctus! Hiis planctibus addo labores

Pictavie, probitas cuius ad arma viget.

Occurrit Francis comes audax,\textsuperscript{8} arma retardat

\textsuperscript{5} ‘Si vixero,’ an intimation of mortality. I Reg. 20,14, ‘et si vixero facies mihi misericordiam Domini.’

\textsuperscript{6} John means that some wars are right and some wrong.

\textsuperscript{7} Babylon was the Sultan’s capital, Cairo. This section seems to have been written in 1241. The Egyptians had occupied Jerusalem (1240) following expiry of the truce agreed with Frederick II; they were fighting Richard of Cornwall (1240-41), and Raymond VII of Toulouse was unsuccessfully besieging the Cathars at Monségur.

\textsuperscript{8} Hugh X de Lusignan, comte de la Marche, See Book 1, n.105.
Armis, opponit confraga densa viis

Que tenet in castris; confidit fortia, quorum

Unum Crussanna\(^9\) nomine rupe sedet.

Agmina Crussanna multos cruciabit in annos,

Si defensor opem clausus habebit opum.

Vallis in amfractis tendit, sed turris in astra,

De Stige terribili quam nigra cingit aqua.

Patrum magna gerens Hugo Brunus nomina patres

Exprimit; in simili prole patrissat honor.\(^{10}\)

Provocat ad bellum cognatos marchio reges,

Quorum stirps mundi climata Marte domat.

Francis opponit clipeos, sed dicere restat

Qua sibi pace liget rex Ludovicus eum.

Ante tamen dicam crucis instrumenta beate

Parisius posita reliquiasque sacras.

Ha! Brevis iste stilus, non regum sufficit altis

Laudibus; in laudes nititur ille tamen,

Nam regum titulos amborum gestaque clara

Experiar generis enucleare sui.

\(^9\) Wright identifies Crusanna with ‘Crosantum’ in *Grandes Chroniques de la France*, 4, 276, n. 2, probably the modern Crozant (Creuse). The château there matches John’s description. William of Nangis, *Gesta*, 558, singles it out as one of Hugh’s three strongest forts which Louis took when he surrendered.

\(^{10}\) These lines hint at a possible Lusignan sponsor, see Introduction, n. 96 & *DTE* 1, n. 114.
Nobilitas servire Deo preclara tenetur,
    Sic quia nobilior nobilis omnis erit.

55 Quod Francos fortes faciat, patet ordine rerum,
    Religio, belli gratia, firma fides.

Anglos argenti defendit copia,11 gentis
    Ingenium, cleri gloria, legis amor.12

<22> Sed si colligerent fidei pro robore vires,

60 Trenos abicerem carmina leta canens.

Militie pacisque pater Ludovicus utrique13
    Est clipeus, fidei tyro, Crucisque pugil.

Militie sacre peragit preludia quedam
    Quam contra Parthos rex peregrinus aget.

65 Parisius posita probat istud sacra corona,
    Quam Christi cervix immaculata tulit.14

Crux probat hoc et reliquie quas ede sacrata
    Sacras ille colit quas in honore tenet.

---

11 See Preface.47 & n. 20.
12 This is the closest John gets to mentioning Magna Carta.
13 Rubric in left margin: ‘De reliquis Regis francia.’
14 Louis IX bought the Crown of Thorns from Baldwin II, Latin Emperor of Constantinople. It arrived in 1239. CM, 4.75-76 (1240) says it was, ‘Parisius in capella regis reposita veneranter.’ John further refers to the Holy Cross, also bought from Baldwin, for twenty-five thousand librae, which reached Paris the same year. This had been in Muslim hands since the battle of Hattin in 1187. For the solemn installation ceremony, see CM, 4.91-92, & MS, 275-82. The other relics from the same source were fragments of Christ’s cloak, the tip of the lance which pierced His side, the sponge and ‘praeter haec innumerabiles reliquias’. On the significance of the relics, Emily Guerry has an article awaiting publication in the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society.
Spiritus inspirat sacer ut Salomonica regna

Remensis\textsuperscript{15} rector salvet ab hoste suo.

Reliquie tante pretiosa palatia poscunt,\textsuperscript{16}

Publica divitibus pauperibusque Dei.

Ecclesie grate procerum succurrere nullus

Audet, dum metuit perdere quisque sua.

Rex non dimisit pro bello\textsuperscript{17} quin sacra tanta

Afferrì faceret, tempìa pararet eis.\textsuperscript{18}

Instrumenta quibus elegìa summa recessìt

Plausus et accessìt, indicat ordo rei.

Scribo Deo, matrice Dei, sanctisque beatis.

Pauperibus reges mors iubet esse pares. [75r]

Mitìs in ecclesìa, sed in armis acer ute rque

Iustum pretendìt nilque remissus agìt.

Collidunt sese gemìne per bella columne

Ecclesiamque movent hii duo Marte duces.

\textsuperscript{15} The kings of France were traditionally crowned and anointed in Rheims cathedral. See Le Goff (2009) 54-57, for the special circumstances of Louis IX’s coronation on 29 November, 1226. Louis’ installation was the occasion for an amnesty to all the prisoners still held since Bouvines (1214), see DTE 3. 311-14 & n. 99. See also CM, 3.118.

\textsuperscript{16} John refers to the construction of Sainte Chapelle to house all these relics, consecrated in 1248. CM, 4.92, ‘Rex igitur Francorum, non procul a palatio suo, capellam mirifici decoris dicto thesauro regio convenientem iussit fabricari, in qua ipsum honore condigno postea collocavit.’ John’s wording strongly suggests that Sainte Chapelle was at least sometimes open to all.

\textsuperscript{17} i.e. the continuing hostilities amongst the leaders of the Christians.

\textsuperscript{18} Lines 61-76 were clearly written around the time that Louis IX set off on crusade in 1248, and inserted into a passage about the relative qualities of the French and the English and their respective kings.
Vos et divitias vestras exponite reges

Pro Terra Sacra quam fera bella premunt.

Pax utinam constet! Fugiant discrimina, pugna

Discedat, veniat gratia, regnet amor.

Ecclesia pacem siquis perturbat, ad ima

Corruit et nescit quae sit et unde venit.

In multis pro pace bona deferre tenetur

Cesaribus magnis pontificalis apex.

Que vulgant aliqui recito, non assero. Nemo

Dives vel pauper leditur ore meo.

Si servat civile forum Fredericus in isto,

Lauda debetur ei iustitiaeque tenor.

---

19 ‘nescit’ with sense, for Wright’s ‘noscit’. MS is unclear. The grammar here is unusual, with mixed subjunctive and indicative verbs after ‘nescit.’

20 ‘pace bona,’ ‘Bona’ here means ‘durable’, ‘in good faith.’

21 Frederick II sent troops to the Fifth Crusade (1218-21), but did not himself participate. In 1225 he became king of Jerusalem through marriage to Isabella, daughter of John of Brienne. He was excommunicated in 1227 by Honorius III ostensibly for reneging on his crusading vows, but the next year he set sail for Acre regardless. None of the Western kings took part in the Barons’ Crusade of 1239-42. It is difficult to be sure whether lines 91-104 were written in the late 1220s ahead of the Sixth Crusade (1228-29), or in 1239-1242. This does read as if it dates from the time of the Sixth Crusade, when Frederick literally added to his empire by adding the crown of Jerusalem. In 1229, under a ten year truce with the Ayubbid al-Kamil, he secured a demilitarized Jerusalem for the Christians without recourse to military force. Except for a short period from 1239-41 (but see Humphreys (1977) 266 & n. 49), they retained it until the Khwarazmians sacked it in 1244. Frederick also restored to the kingdom of Jerusalem traditional Christian sites such as Bethlehem and Nazareth. When he returned to Italy, Frederick defeated a papal army under John of Brienne, and Pope Gregory VII lifted his excommunication in reluctant acquiescence to the ensuing peace. For Frederick’s crusade, see Abulafia (1988), 174-201, and for his return to Italy, Perry (2013), 141-49.

22 ‘Caesaribus’ and ‘pontificalis apex’ are circumlocutions for Frederick II and the pope.
Hic\textsuperscript{23} si Ierusalem capte suffragia feret,

\begin{align*}
&\text{Latius imperium palma referret ei.} \\
&\text{Illi sed decrescit honor dum matris honorem} \\
&\text{Ecclesie minuit, persequiturque patrem.}
\end{align*}

Promittit pro pace bona se reddere fines

\begin{align*}
&\text{Ierusalem patres}\textsuperscript{24} quos tenuere prius.} \\
&\text{Rex homicida David fuerat, fallax et adulter,}\textsuperscript{25} \\
&\text{Sed pietas flenti summa pepercit ei.}
\end{align*}

Fortune causa titubat dum funebre bellum,

\begin{align*}
&\text{Se cum plebe duces non titubare vident.}
\end{align*}

O reges iusti, quare vexare minores

\begin{align*}
&\text{Temptatis,}\textsuperscript{26} Vobis sufficit amplus honor.}
\end{align*}

Rex, ad bella strepe minus, Anglice! Unaque\textsuperscript{27} strepe,

\begin{align*}
&\text{Sis,}\textsuperscript{28} Franci regis qui bene regna regis}
\end{align*}

Si terras gladio tenet; et pro posse tenebit

\begin{align*}
&\text{Francia conquestum, magne Philippe, tuum.}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{23} Read ‘\textit{hic}’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘\textit{hoc}’. See also MS, lines 335-38, and 497-504 for similar language, used around 1241, expressing the hope that the pope and Frederick II can combine for an expedition to Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{24} Not a reference to Frederick’s own forefathers. John regards the kingdom of Jerusalem as having been held by its kings on behalf of successive popes.

\textsuperscript{25} Frederick wrote of himself as in direct succession to David as king of Jerusalem. See for example his letter to Henry III of 1229, CM, 3.175.

\textsuperscript{26} A reference to Frederick’s constant harassment of the Italian cities, and perhaps also to Louis’ provocation of Hugh X of Lusignan by granting the county of Poitou to his brother Alphonse.

\textsuperscript{27} Read ‘\textit{unaque}’, for Wright’s ‘\textit{vernaque}.’ This tricky passage is probably corrupt, open to other interpretations. Here, it is taken as referring to Henry III’s attempt to occupy Poitou in support of Hugh X de la Marche, which Philip II had seized from King John.

\textsuperscript{28} ‘\textit{Sis}’ = ‘\textit{Si vis}.’
Sunt duo sacrati reges; est Gallicus unus, 

Anglicus est alter. Vivit uterque potens.

115 Tertius Ecclesie sacre deberet adesse

Quo sacra Ierusalem per fera bella caret.

Legifer hanc Moyses petiiit tribubusque subactam

Bissenis Isu e distribuisse datur.30

Crux aliquos poscit zephiri de parte potentes,

120 Quorum sint signis libera regna Bethel.

Occupat hec arbor mundum quam Neustrica vidit

In somno domina se peperisse suo.

Filius huius erat Guillelms clarus in armis

Dux qui submisit Anglicia regna sibi.

125 Supplicat huic stirpi Gallus, Romanus, Hibernus,

Anglicus et Saxon, Grecus ad arma potent.32

<24> Sanguine vicinus istis Ludovicus habebit

Hos secum facto federe, pace rata.

---

29 i.e. Frederick, following the Khwarazmian invasion of 1244.
30 Ios. 13-21. In line 116, Jerusalem is used as a proxy for the whole of the Holy Land.
31 Herleva, mother of William the Conqueror. Rubric in left margin ‘De stirpe regum.’ A picture in the right margin (Plate 4, p. 157) shows Herleva’s dream of giving birth to a tree (literally ‘this tree’. i.e. the one in the picture, indicating that the illustrations are contemporaneous with the text) which would encompass ‘mundum’ / ‘the world’. Benoît de Sainte Maure, Chronique des Ducs de Normandie, ed. C. Fahlin, 33550 has the tree covering England as well as France. In Wace, Roman de Rou, 164-7, pt. 3, 2823-66, it covers only Normandy. See Bates (2016), 29, & n. 55.
32 John is referring to Norman conquests of England (1066), Ireland (1169-1175), Southern Italy, Sicily and Greece (a gradual process over the eleventh and twelfth centuries).
Plate 4. MS London British Library
Cotton Claudius A x, f. 75r,
Herleva’s dream: DTE, 2.121-22
Regum cognatus princeps dominusque Tholose  

Audax Remundus Hectora corde gerit.

Si rex Remensis ultra mare duceret illum, [75v] 

Hostes Ierusalem sterneret ense viri.

Cederet Egypti carcer, secteque perirent 

Que tacite serpunt, Ecclesieque nocent.

Antiochena suus avus quia menia dudum 

Scandit, et obstantes tradidit ense neci.

Si pax heredem perpes Tholosanum haberet, 

Waldensis meritum secta resecta suum, 

Pacem perpetuam cum papa Cesar haberet, 

Si veram regum gratia ferret opem

Pectoris egregii flecti solet ira, leones

---

33 Rubric in right margin, ‘De comite Tolose magnanimo et de avo suo probo.’ Raymond VII of Toulouse was the nephew of Kings Richard I and John of England, and grandson of Henry II. He died in Marseilles in 1249, en route to the Seventh Crusade. Raymond’s ancestor, Raymond IV of Saint-Gilles, ‘was one of the great leaders of the First Crusade, and distinguished himself especially in the siege of Antioch’ (Wright, note on p. 147). In that John is writing in the present tense, and this passage appears to be set in the 1240s, the reference is more probably to Raymond VII than, as Wright suggests, to Raymond V, who was Raymond of St. Gilles’ grandson. ‘Avus’ / ‘grandfather’ does not help Wright’s case, since it also means ‘forefather’.

34 The rare accusative form ‘Hectora’ is used in Ovid’s well-known Tristia, 4.3.75.

35 See line 70, n. 15 above. The use of the subjunctive suggests that John wrote this before Raymond’s death.

36 ‘Tholosanum.’ Wright reads ‘chosb[er]et’ with MS. The line is clearly corrupt. The sense is that Raymond VII would have dealt with the Waldensians and Frederick II would not be in dispute with the pope if monarchs had respected peace.

37 The Waldensian sect was named after Valdes, a Lyon merchant, who began to attract followers in the 1170s. It was critical of the wealth of the Church and still survives in isolated pockets. The sect was excommunicated in 1186 and again at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. For a fuller account, see Biller (2006).

38 Horace, AP, 404, ‘et gratia regum/Pieriis temptata modis.’

39 Ovid, Ex Ponto, 1.6.44, ‘saepe per has flecti principis ira solet.’
Mansuescunt,\textsuperscript{40} rapide tigridis ira cadit.

Imperii causas linquo maioribus; arma
Italie gracilis non capit illa stilus.

Mantua Virgilium petit, et Bononia vatem,

Et Mediolanum pectora, Vare, tua.\textsuperscript{41}

Hos dominos plangam discordes esse ducesque,\textsuperscript{42}

Quorum stirps toto fulget in orbe potens.\textsuperscript{43}

Stirpem diffusam timet hanc occasus et ortus,

Quisquis et arma gerit inter utrumque polum.

Torrida si fieret habitabilis hanc penetraret
Per breve; si posset consona stare sibi,

Cerneret oppositas ita res que diceret illic
Gallica sub pedibus regna iacere suis.\textsuperscript{44}

Sunt gemine zone media fervente nivales,

Et suus affines temperat ordo duas.

Limes ab obliquo solem deducit, ut estum

Dividat a bruma temperiemque ferat.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{40} ‘Leones / mansuescunt,’ Augustine, De genesi ad litteram, 7.10.15.

\textsuperscript{41} Read ‘Vare’ with MS, in preference to Wright’s ‘vate’. Mantua was traditionally Vergil’s birthplace. For Alfenus Varus see Vergil, Ec. 6, 9-12. He was patron of the sixth Eclogue and had unsuccessfully tried to persuade Vergil to cover his achievements in war. Mantua, Bologna and Milan opposed the Emperor Frederick II during the 1240s.

\textsuperscript{42} Rubric in left margin, ‘De potentia regum et situ torride zone et totius mundi.’ An oval diagram in the left margin (Plate 5, p. 162) shows the climatic zones with the sun’s path through the zodiac.

\textsuperscript{43} ‘fulget in orbe potens’ is used of Charlemagne in Epos Karolus Magnus et Leo Papa, 61.

\textsuperscript{44} John may be hinting at the situation in Poitou, and making the point that in reality the Capetians and Angevins are part of one and the same extended French family which controls the world. Wright’s punctuation is changed for lines 151-54.

\textsuperscript{45} For ‘temperies’ see DTE, 1.151.
Non recipit reges ibi fervor et unda repugnans,

Que dum decoquitur vim salis igne capit

Sole vel Oceanus totus percussus acuto

Solis vim patitur, inficiturque sale.

Obvia signa pares ortus lapsusque videret

Exequare, viam si quis haberet ibi. 46

Sed plaga nostra dies decrescere, crescere cernit

Solque signifero tramite girat iter.

Immaculata silet sine bellis et sine motu

Regum quam numquam sumet avara manus.

Dum se Christiano sternunt, pars perditur illa

Terrae parva sacre que modo nostra fuit. 47

Iure triumphales hic celi perdit honores,

Qui plus quam celum certat habere solum. 48

Gentem devicit sceleratam gens scelerata

Utraque nos odit ad scelus omne data.

Marte Coresminos abigunt feritate lupinos

Sevi Tartarei quos movet ira Dei.

---

46 John observes that in the tropical zone days and nights are equal.
47 John refers to the impact of the Mongol invasion on the Khwarazmians, who were driven west and sacked Jerusalem in 1244, with shocking Christian losses. He again blames the disunity of Christendom, singling out the distraction of the continuing fighting between the Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Greeks of Nicaea (line 180). Jerusalem was at the time of the Khwarasmian invasion controlled by the Western Christians, see n. 21 above.
48 This probably refers to Frederick II’s excommunication in 1245.
Damnis vincuntur nostris, dum nostra feruntur

In loca, Jerusalem menia, regna Salem.

Fons rivum, rivus fontem rigat imbre cruento,\(^{49}\)

Dum gens alternat, Greca, Latina necem.

Qui fovet Ecclesiam, qui clerum diligat, et qui [76r]

\(^{49}\) Lucan, 6.224-25, ‘\textit{stetit imbre cruento / Informis facies.}’ John is referring to the inroads the Greeks under John III were making into the Latin Empire of Constantinople in the Balkans and Northern Greece.
Plate 5. London British Library
Cotton Claudius A x, f. 75v, the geographical zones and the Zodiac: 
*DTE*, 2.165-66
Pacem perpetuat, pax sua salvat eum.

Talem prelustris se Constantinus habebat

Rome Silvestro qui diadema dabat.\textsuperscript{50}

Heu mala quot faciunt, odium, suggestio, livor,

Fastus, fraus, heres, rixa, cupidus, scelus.

Affectat mundi pompam gens maxima per quam

Deperit, ut Phinees et pater eius Hely.

Archa Philisteis cessit,\textsuperscript{51} cum Brutus in orbe

Occiduo Troiam iusserat esse novam,

Conditor alter eam Trinovantum dixit et alter

Londinias. Mundi gloria causa fuit.\textsuperscript{52}

Cultores fidei timeo ne gloria mundi

Sternat quos belli pompa caduca levat.

\textsuperscript{<26>} Pluribus exemplis igitur nocentum patescunt

Est oppressa quibus terra beata Syon.

Si reges nostros concordia vera ligaret

Christo curvaret India tota genu,

\textsuperscript{50} A reference to the so-called ‘donation of Constantine’, a document, shown in the later Middle Ages to have been a forgery, purportedly placing Rome under the sovereignty of Pope Sylvester (314-35). For more detail, see Fried (2007), esp. 111-14.

\textsuperscript{51} I Reg. 4, 10-18. John is fond of the story of Eli. See also DTE, 1.95-96. Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{De Bruto qui fundavit Londinias et vocavit eam Troiam Novam.}’ N. b. GM, 1.506-7, ‘\textit{Regnabat tunc in Judaea Heli sacerdos et archa testamenti capta erat a Philisteis.}’

\textsuperscript{52} GM, 1.493-501. Brutus named the new city Nova Troia (New Troy), which over time was corrupted to ‘Trinovantum.’ King Lud changed the name to Kaerlud, to perpetuate his own name.
Ense Machometus meteretur, te Dionisi.\textsuperscript{53}

Caldeus coleret, Angligenamque Thomam.\textsuperscript{54}

Aëre sub gelido virtus inclusa solutos

Estu deiceret carnis amore vagos,

Uni nupta viro foret una. Sed est prior illic.\textsuperscript{55}

Et melior plures siquis habere potest.

Turpis et infelix elegia cederet ista.

Si pax occiduas necteret arcta plagas,

Gentiles caderent mactantes bruta planetis,

Dantes dona deis ditia danda Deo.\textsuperscript{56}

Occasum solis Indi Scotique viderent\textsuperscript{57}

Ortum, quos varios ultimus orbis habet.

Que regina fuit Hibernica nomine Scota\textsuperscript{58}

Saxosis statuit Scotica regna locis

Sed prius Albanos Picti vicere. Subegit

Scotica gens Pictos excidioque dedit.\textsuperscript{59}

Indus ad Andream peregre, Scotusque veniret

\textsuperscript{53} St. Denis (d. c.250 CE) was traditionally the martyred first bishop of Paris.

\textsuperscript{54} Thomas Becket (c.1117-1170). ‘Angligena’ = ‘Englishman’.

\textsuperscript{55} i.e. in the Muslim world. John is referring to polygamy amongst Muslims.

\textsuperscript{56} An extravagant example of alliteration.

\textsuperscript{57} An illegible draft rubric refers to the comparison between Scots and Indians.

\textsuperscript{58} Scota was traditionally the daughter of an Egyptian pharaoh who came to Scotland via Ireland. ‘Albania’ was an earlier name for Scotland. For detailed examination of this story, see Cowan (1984), Broun (1999), 5, n. 29 & 120-21.

\textsuperscript{59} Cowan (1984), 124-25.
Ad Thomam, cuius India templa colit.\textsuperscript{60}

Nature metas Lucas medicator Indis,

Et celeste logos enuclearet Abel.\textsuperscript{61}

Vinces credendo, faciendo, precando, fidelis,\textsuperscript{62}

Si tamen assiduus in tribus esse velis.\textsuperscript{63}

Sed reges nostros turbat discordia, sevit

Sarracena manus, Ecclesiamque premit.

Reges inviti pugnant, sed bella prophano

Consilio quidam lucra sequendo movent.\textsuperscript{64}

Lucri proponam causas, scelerumque priores\textsuperscript{65}

Auctores, cupide mentis ad alta sitim.

Lamec, lentator arcus celerisque sagitte,

Erexit misere perditionis onus.

\textsuperscript{60} St. Thomas the Apostle, who was believed to have visited South India in 52 CE. Andrew and Thomas are presented as patron saints of Scotland and of India. Thomas’ tomb is traditionally in India, JdeM, 29, quoting Isidorus. John means that if only Christendom was united, India would be proselytized.

\textsuperscript{61} Given the MS reading ‘\textit{mathematicus},’ which does not scan, Wright assumed this was Luke of Essex (\textit{DTE} 1.179-81 & n. 68), and that Abel was another of John’s instructors, otherwise unidentified, see Wright, 148, nn. 1 and 2. But Marguin-Hamon has suggested that in this context Luke is the evangelist, patron of medicine, representing the New Testament, and Abel the son of Adam and Eve, from the Old Testament. The scribe probably interpreted as Wright. The text is tentatively amended to ‘\textit{medicator}.’

\textsuperscript{62} A reflection of Augustine, \textit{De Perfectione Iustitie Hominis}, 15.34, \textit{PL}, 44, 310. A large hand is sketched in the left margin, pointing to this line.

\textsuperscript{63} See n. 81 below. Lines 219-20 look like part of an \textit{excitatio}, and closely resemble John’s earlier rhyming rhetorical model in \textit{PP}, 4.207-84.

\textsuperscript{64} John returns briefly to his theme of the 1242 war. He then begins a long digression on the roots of greed.

\textsuperscript{65} Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{De studiis primorum artificium et de lucri causa}.’
<27> Filius illius ferrum variumque metallum\(^{66}\)

230 Exeundit primus et necis arma faber

Argentum coxit de terra, coxit et aurum. [77r]

Et scelerum causas sculptor in orbe dedit.\(^{67}\)

Primo cornipedes Ixion rex Laphitarum

Edomuit frenis fortibus ora ligans.\(^{68}\)

235 Primus Erictonius\(^{69}\) currus erexit ut illis

Se podagrum faceret per sua regna vehi.

Tellurem Leleges\(^{70}\) aratro secuere ratemque

Pro preda Iason currere fecit aqua.\(^{71}\)

Denarios primos argenti fecit Ionas

240 Rector Thessalie, quos numerare dedit.\(^{72}\)

Femineos cultus auxit Cleopatra decora

Et gemmas Rubri\(^{73}\) protulit illa maris.

---

\(^{66}\) Note in small black letters in left margin of MS, ‘tubalcaym.’ See next footnote.

\(^{67}\) Lamech was restricted to wooden weapons (though he did kill a man); but his son Tubal-Cain ‘fuit malleator et faber in cuncta opera aeris et ferri,’ Gen. 4, 22.

\(^{68}\) Ixion was father to the first Centaur, and was condemned by Zeus to permanent torment on a fiery wheel, Lucan, 6,386. He is not usually credited with being the first to tame horses. This extended list of man’s evolution was clearly inspired by Lucan’s account of the history of Thessaly.

\(^{69}\) Erictonius / Erechthonius was an Athenian cult-figure, born of Hephaestos and brought up by Athene. ‘Primus Erichthonius currus et quattuor ausus / iungere equos rapidusque rotis insistere victor’, Vergil, Geo., 3.113-14.

\(^{70}\) Lucan, 6,383.

\(^{71}\) ‘The medieval writers, familiar to a certain degree with the story of the Argonautic expedition, believed that Jason was the inventor of navigation,’ Wright, p. 148.

\(^{72}\) Ionas, Lucan, 6, 402-07.

\(^{73}\) With Wright, amend ‘rubri’ in MS to ‘rubri’. ‘Plena maris rubri spolii, colloque comisque / Divitas Cleopatra gerit cultuque laborat,’ Lucan, 10.139-40. In this passage on Cleopatra’s banquet for
Postibus illius Lucano teste micabant

Iaspides, in tecto cinnamus arbor erat.

Utenti recte bona sunt hec omnia. Sed sunt

Nonnulli quorum damnat abusus opes.

Hec faciunt homines furiosos et sitis horum

Ducit ad interitum Tartareumque chaos.\textsuperscript{74}

Ve natis Eve, quibus hec post tempora penam

Corporis ac anime dira cupidō dabit.

Prīmitus Ixion\textsuperscript{75} equites statuēbat, ab illis

Expulsus regno perfidus exul inops

Pectoris arcani\textsuperscript{76} proscripta pace; negatur

Pax eterna quibus pugna cruenta placet.

Anglicus occeani circumflua brachia classe

Sulcat et hunc recipit finibus Hugo suis.\textsuperscript{77}

Quosdam premittens sequitur rex classe parata\textsuperscript{78}

Contemplans certi tempora clara maris.

Hic locus est elegis, Elegia quos mihi vertit

Tempore de vario fluctivagoque mari.

\textsuperscript{74} ‘Tartareum chaos’, Statius, Thebaid, 12.772.
\textsuperscript{75} Ixion, see n. 68.
\textsuperscript{76} Read ‘arcani’, with Wright, for ‘archani’ (‘archangel’) in MS. Just as Ixion was denied purification from the sin of murdering his father-in-law, those who delight in war will never find inner peace.
\textsuperscript{77} Another brief return to the story.
\textsuperscript{78} Rubric in left margin, ‘De prognosticatione temporis et de periculis maris.’
Protraho materiam parvam perstringoque magnum,

Ut sic lectorum pascere corda queam.

<28> Monstra maris monstro monstravit que mihi nauta;

Alterius dictum postulat esse meum.

Sed dicens aliter illud praemunio quosdam

Ad mare qui salient est ubi rara salus.

Per mare nulla quies, ubi mortem separat assere

A vita, tellus effugit, unda subit.79

A portu pelagus placidum rex laudat; at inde

Se levis irato protulit80 ore Thetis.

Exhortatio de Cruce suscienda81

Tempora nosse maris ratio non denegat ulla,

Illa licet stabilem non habuere fidem.

Quando Crucis populus poscet Salomonica templam,

Nosse volet placidi tempora certa maris.

79 On the perils of the sea see also DTE, 8.221-40.
80 On grounds of sense, read 'protulit' for 'protheat' in MS and Wright. Thetis was a sea nymph in classical mythology, mother of Achilles. Here she personifies the sea itself.
81 This is a subtitle inserted into the MS by the rubricator, with a red initial capital for which the scribe left a space, as at the beginning of a new book, but no draft rubric. This could conceivably have been the incipit for a new Book 3, though this would have left Book 2 very short. The rubricator correctly identifies John’s core passage on recruiting for the crusade, and on balance the editor believes that he followed a draft rubric now lost in a cropped margin (see Introduction, 29-30). Only lines 275-90 could be called a recruiting appeal. The Exhortatio actually begins at line 275, and arguably should contain lines 219-20, as well as lines 489-96, 503-04, 3.363-64. John then begins long digressions before returning to his main historical theme. Further elements of an ‘Exhortatio’ follow at intervals, and are printed in italics. PP, 4.207-44, contains a rhetorical model in the form of an exhortatio. See Lawler’s note at PP, 244-45.
Expugnat superos acies clipeata\textsuperscript{82} gigantum,

\textit{In stragem quorum canone papa tonat.}\textsuperscript{83}

Ad nutum domini pape concurreite, remum

Sumite, remigium flectite, vela date.

\textit{Prefalcat sparos Hispania, planat et hastas}

Anglia, quas comitans Dacha bipennis erit.

\textit{Romani nova pila parant, Germania cudit}

\textit{Enses in Persas, Gallia gesa novat.}

Ergo ducem poscunt tot bellica signa fidelem,

\textit{Si modo se reges pacificare velint.}

\textit{Plura licet tardant Ludovicum bella, iuvare}

\textit{Terram promissam fervet amore Crucis.}

O quotiens captiva iacet Ierosolima sacra?

\textit{Hiis damnis aliqua sunt tamen orta bona.}

\textit{Sic Cruce signatos Deus ad celestia ducit,}

\textit{Quos hoc eventu, quos pietate trahit.}

Rerum naturis cognoscere possumus undas,

\textit{Damno sed augurium, sortilegasque vices.}

<29> Tempora commutans labentis temporis auctor\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{82} ‘\textit{Acies clipeata},’ Quintus Curtius, \textit{De Gestis Alexandri Magni}, 7.37.9. ‘Superos’ = ‘survivors,’ i.e. the Christians who had been in the Holy Land before the Khwarazmian invasion.

\textsuperscript{83} A reference to Innocent IV’s call for a crusade at Lyon in 1245, \textit{CM}, 4.456-62.

\textsuperscript{84} ‘\textit{temporis auctor},’ Propertius, 4.53. In Roman mythology this was Phoebus Apollo.
Cum vult, tranquillat aëra, sedat aquas.

Tempora que statuit Dominus sibi nemo revolvat,

Que rata secretis terminat ipse suis.

Sed sator et medicus et navita tempora servant,

Aut inconsultis terminus error erit.

In nos non solum desevit ventus et ignis

Sed mare consurgit, terraque mota tremit.

Hoc facit excessus noster. Nec cerula solum

In vadunt plebem, regibus immo nocent.

Argenti cupidus, venturi cecus, aquarum

Sulcator, vite prodigus errat homo

Equora dum verrit et terras, equora classe,

Terras quadrigis, amne vel ense perit.\(^{85}\)

Iustior est ventus multis.\(^{86}\) Favet ille tonanti,

Collidens nubes ignis agendo globos;

Concutit inclusus terras et congelat undas,\(^{87}\)

Et pluvias unus destruit, alter agit,

Aëra nunc siccat Boreas, nunc imbuit Auster.

Iste nocet classi, quam tamen ille iuvat.

---

\(^{85}\) There is no shortage of kings who died by the sword; John may well be referring here to Frederick Barbarossa’s death by drowning in the river Saleph in 1190.

\(^{86}\) Read ‘ventus’ with MS, not ‘ventis’, with Wright. ‘Iustior est animo ventus et unda tuo.’ Ovid, *Her.*, 7.44.

\(^{87}\) Wright’s punctuation is changed to give a laboured contrast between the impact on Henry III’s fleet of the North and South winds.
Sic in presenti rex sentit tempore ventos

Instabiles per quos\textsuperscript{88} unda superba tumet.

Anglia transmittit regem quem Neustria\textsuperscript{89} fortis

Patrum iure suum captat habere ducem.

Sepius humanos\textsuperscript{90} horret Natura tumultus,

Sed properat pietas par cere summa suis.

A Plaustrō Boreas ruit, obviat humidus Auster

Alternatque minas ventus uterque suas.

Dum timet ergo minas rex aëris et maris, illi

Temporis et pelagi nauta peritus ait,

‘Dum nubes Boreas dispergit et āera purum

Reddit, parebit debilis Auster ei.

Sed Boree de parte trucis cum fulminat, imbre

Sternitur alta seges, per mare nauta perit.’

<30> Mersus mercator nummosum per mare mordet

Saccum, constringit unguibus, ore tenet.

Hesternum vidi maturtinumque serenum

\textsuperscript{88} The MS has ‘\textit{verba}’ before ‘\textit{unda}’, underscored with a dotted line to indicate deletion.

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Neustria}, see also \textit{DTE}, 2.121, and note. ‘\textit{Neustria}’, a subdivision of Charlemagne’s empire, is a proxy for ‘\textit{Normandy}’. Philip II seized Normandy for the French crown from the Duke of Normandy, King John, in 1202-04. Although some support for the Angevins continued there, they never recaptured it from the Capetians. Henry III formally renounced any claim to the title in the Treaty of Paris, 1259.

\textsuperscript{90} ‘\textit{humanos}’, with Wright, for ‘\textit{humanus}’ in MS. John seems to be saying that Nature reacts violently to human violence, but that their piety quickly rescues very pious men, in this case Henry III. The personification of Nature is another echo of Alan of Lille’s \textit{De Planctu Nature}. 
Solem, nec maculis condidit ipse genas. [77v]

Concordes habuit radios, nec luce vocabat

Divisa ventos discolor ore duos.

Non fuit aurore croceo gena tincta colore

Nec subiecta suus tinxerat arva color.

Cornua non lune vidi confundere nigrum,

Sed fuit a Borea fusa rubore parum.

Ceruleus pluviam sol predicat, igneus Euros;

Ventum virgineo luna rubore notat,

Sed modo cum luna Boream sol monstrat ab alto

Qui tamen imbre carens linthea tensa vehit.

Inter se corvi ludunt, pullosque revisunt

Aëre quos udo deseruisse solent.

Inferius nebule recubant, nec in alta trahuntur,

Ut sic in pluviam massa coacta fluat.

Stellarum fulsit acies in nocte relictà

Non Hyadum timeo Pleiadumque minas.

Tranquillum pelagus promittit puppibus arthos

Lucida cui prepes est Cinosura comes.

Preterea volucres maris in regione marina

Se retinent, alia non elementa petunt;
Alcyones, fulice, mergi non litora poscunt,\(^91\)

Mansio quos propria turbida facta fugat.

Plena voce vocat pluviam preganula cornix

Aëre mutato qui sibi mutat iter.\(^92\)

Sed non hoc signum precedit, non erit ergo

Signatum; tangent litora tuta rates.

Preterea delphin ludendo spargeret undas

Si ventura mari seva procella foret.

Non subitum fugere grues de vallibus imbrem,\(^93\)

Non circumvolitat tristis hirundo lacus.\(^94\)

Motus enim subitus est vite victicus,\(^95\) hostis

Nature, virtus quo regitiva stupet.\(^96\)

Non precauta gerit formica sub horrea victum

Non queritur solito garrula rana\(^97\) magis.


\(^93\) Vergil, *Georg.*, 1.373-7, ‘Numquam imprudentibus imber / obfuit: aut illum surgentem vallibus imis /Aëriae fugere grues.../...aut arguta lacus circumvolavit hirundo.’

\(^94\) ‘motus subitus repentinus inimicus est naturae,’ Peter of Spain, *Questiones super libro De animalibus* Aristotelis, Book 10, Qu. 5.

\(^95\) ‘Vite vitricus,’ Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *De Poetria Nova*, 378. This appears in Geoffrey’s lament for Normandy and for Richard I’s death.

\(^96\) Read ‘Motus’ with MS, rather than Wright’s ‘Notus’. ‘Regitivus’ does not occur in classical Latin. ‘Virtus regitiva’ ‘regulating force’ / ‘governing spirit’ of a species was an important concept in Scholastic scientific thought, e.g. Bacon, *Libri naturalis philosophie de Communibus Naturalium Rerum*, 1.2.7.

Cultor. Causa tamen hunc sua certa latet.

Candele cineres si condensantur, et igne

Non pereunt, humor aëra densus habet.

Scintillare vident oleum cum luce sedentes

Cum sibi conflictus humor et ignis agant.

Tunc volitant palee vento, frondesque caduce,

Aut in aqua motum lucida bulla facit.

In preceps fertur ignis quasi stella, sequente

Tractu ventorum turbine nimbus erit.

Ardea tunc notas sibi deserit ante paludes

Et fugiens alta nube latenter abit. 98

Non equidem credo quod sit prudentia rerum

Hiis brutis, sed in hoc mobilis humor agit.

Vertuntur species animarum, 99 quando serenus

Aër efficitur, vel cumulatur aquis. [78r]

De fluxu quoniam variatur opinio ponti, 100

Causa sui fluctus est varianda mihi;

Ebdomada lune prima decrescere fertur101

98 Lines 371-409 above draw heavily on Vergil, Georg., 1.360-382.
99 Read ‘animarum’ for Wright’s ‘animorum.’
100 Lines 381-414. Interest in the cause of the tides was strong at this time. The Muslim scholar Alpetragius’ theories were translated into Latin around 1220. Robert Grosseteste’s ‘Questio de fluxu et refluxu maris’ expounding similar theories to John’s, was probably published around 1227, see Dales (1995).
101 A gloved hand in the left margin points to this line.
Humor, quem siccat lampade luna nova.

Et tamen, ut dicunt, in se decrescere nescit

Oceanus, quamvis hoc videatur ita.

Humidus est aër primo, sed luce resumpta

Est calor assumptus, quem nova luna capit.

Humoris crescit substantia, deficit illa,

Quando vas laticis plusve minusve\textsuperscript{102} capiit.

A casu crescit, decrescit, vasis ut humor

Ebullit, resiident, condicione foci.

Deficit in prima substantia, crescit in ima

Hebdomada mensis, sed variante modo.

<32> Deficit humoris prima substantia luna,

Cum bene flamigerum sentit adesse iubari.

Hebdomada quarta modicus fervor viget ipsa

In luna, quare contumet humor aque.

Hunc sol hebdomada facit ebullire secunda;

Hoc tamen \textsuperscript{103} a casu mobilis humor habet.

Efficit hoc fervor solis, quem tertia parvum

Dum capiit hebdomada, subsiident humor aque.

Tertia concordat prime, suprema secunde,

\textsuperscript{102} ‘Plusve minusve’, Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, 6.274.

\textsuperscript{103} Read ‘Hoc tamen a casu’ with MS, not Wright’s ‘Hac tamen a causa’.
Et tamen in prima plurimus humor erit.

Hoc facit hebdomade premisse copia cuius
Humor adhuc durat dum nova luna redit.

Sic fluit Oceanus diverso tempore lune;
Plena lunari lampade plenus erit.

Bis quousque die lunari fluctus obedit

Imperio, naves a statione movens?

Est naute ratio quando libratur in alto Cinthia
iam pelago litora plena tument.

Visitat Antipodes Phebe, refluitque fluitque

Pontus, et alternis litora vestit aquis.

Ut Natura iubet, vitant animalia mortem,

Et pro posse suo cuncta nociva sibi.

Siquis forte mari perit intestatus amaro

Infrunitus erit, immemor ante sui.

Non nisi confessus velit occursare procellis

Precautus, veluti sit moriturus ibi.

Non obit in lecto; medicus non consulit illi,
Non pulsum palpat, non labra versa notat.

Carpitur in scopulis corpus, pulsatur arenis

---

104 Ovid, Met., 8.163.
105 Lucan, 8.708-09, ‘Pulsatur harenis / Carpitur in scopulis hausto per vulnera fluctu.’
Styx animam sorbet quam sine fine tenet.

Torquet Styx animam quam non in corpore iuvit

Gratia, contritum cor, comitante fide.

Ipse perit medicus si fluctus inebriot illum,

Equoris hydropisim non medicina fugat.

<Nos tamen in dubio naute speramus, et undas

Spernimus. Audaces liberat ipse Deus. [78v]

Detumet unda, silet Auster, Boreas flat, opacum

Effugit, emergit sol, prope portus adest.'

Hiis dictis animos confirmat nautica turbe

Regula dum pelago concava vela volant.

Est cautela satis tolerabilis illa. Sed ore

Cordeque detestor auguriale nephas.\textsuperscript{106}

Flebilis hinc oritur elegia dum maledictus

Credit quod ratio, quod negat alma fides.

Ingerit hiis vanum quiddam credentibus hostis

Antiquus,\textsuperscript{107} qui eos decipit arte sua.

Credulitate sua moriuntur, et arripit horum

Infaustas animas mors sine morte\textsuperscript{108} manens.

\textsuperscript{106}See also line 292 above.
\textsuperscript{107}‘qui’ as in MS, not ‘quod,’ with Wright.
Quam\textsuperscript{109} ratione caret, quia pendet ab alite felix

Omen, quae nescit retia facta sibi.

Non hec a visco sibi precavet, et tibi, stulte,

Quae sibi non poterit, omina grata dabit.

Obvia bruta dabunt tibi nec bona nec mala; tigrim

Excipe, que prede prodiga cuncta rapit.

Sortis et augurii fallax elegia iustis

Sit procul; hoc bellis omen abesse decet.

Cresus perdet Halim\textsuperscript{110} transgressus plurima regna

Responsum Creso funebre tale fuit.

‘Rex cadet in bello, veniet Ferrandus honore

Parisisus;’ venit regis honore miser.\textsuperscript{111}

Hec absint igitur a nostris regibus, arma

Ius moveat, palmam ius ratioque dabunt.

Rex pro iure suo cum puppibus equora sulcat

Anglicus, et velis litora tuta petit.

\textsuperscript{109} ‘Quam’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘quod.’

\textsuperscript{110} This refers to the Lydian king Croesus’ defeat by Cyrus, following his crossing the Halys in BCE 547; so read ‘Halim’ for Wright’s ‘alim’. Croesus misinterpreted the ambiguous response of the Delphic oracle which foretold that he would destroy a great empire by invading Persia. This was recorded by Herodotus, 1.53, and well-known to classical Latin writers, e.g. Lucan, 3.272, ‘Croeso fatalis Halys.’

\textsuperscript{111} Another misleading prediction, in this case about the battle of Bouvines, 27 July 1214, \textit{DTE}, 3.311-14. See also Wright’s note, p. 148, and Duby (1973), p. 93. William le Breton, \textit{Gesta}, 202, reported that the countess of Flanders received the misleading prophecy that a king would be unhorsed in battle and receive no burial, and that Ferrand, count of Flanders and son of King Sancho I of Portugal, would participate in a grand procession in Paris after the victory. In fact Philip II of France was unhorsed, but rescued, and Ferrand was paraded in Philip’s victory procession.
Scoti preceleres mactant in litore tauros\textsuperscript{112}

De bove viginti fercula danda parant.

Parcas larga manus damnans Albania Scotos

Ponit in exemplum dapsilitate sua.

\textlt<34> Sanctonico\textsuperscript{113} portu defigitur anchora. Regi

Hugo se sociat, consociatque fidem.

Nobilis hic idem reginam duxerat Hugo

Anglorum, nato regna tenente suo.

Mente bona ductus Henricus\textsuperscript{114} trans mare traxit

Ut restauraret perdita castra duci.

Sed voto fraudita suo spes vana vagatur

Et fallit vatem garrula sepe suum.

Non fuerat comitis probitas culpanda fidelis

Mitix cum venit rex sine gente sua;

Gens proba Pictavie sua novit robora, metas

Defendit, bellis invigilare studet.

Miles grassatur, pauper spoliatur, amicus

Ignoratur, agri copia preda datur.

\textsuperscript{112} Ovid, \textit{Met.}, 11.394, ‘stratosque in litore tauros.’ ‘Albania’ confusingly means ‘Scotland’, GM, 2. 23. In classical mythology it was customary to make a sacrifice on arrival on foreign shores.

\textsuperscript{113} Henry landed at Royan in the territory of Saintonge.

\textsuperscript{114} Read ‘Henricus’ with grammar and MS, not ‘Henricum’ with Wright.
O stupor! in mundo maiori\textsuperscript{115} regnat amoris

Gratia, pax stabillis, lex sacra, norma tenax.

Dicere mira Dei nequeo, nec pingere plene

Immo creatoris cogito posse mei. [79r]

Vis prepes mundi velut ‘X’ transponitur alti

Qua movet et salvat omnia forma Crucis.

\textit{Applanos}\textsuperscript{116} occurrit testante Platone planetis

Quos tamen oppositis motibus unit amor.

Luna petit mensem, sol, Stilbons\textsuperscript{117} et Venus annum

Sed Mavors annos vult sibi pene duos.

Dono Iovi bis sex annos, trigintaque patri,\textsuperscript{118}

Ut valeant ciclos hiis peragrasse suos.

\textit{Sed minor est mundus eternis legibus obstans}

\textit{In se dum pacis vincula rumpit homo.}

\textit{Belli subsequitur effectus, damna pudorque}

\textit{Motaque gens, iactans lingua, cupido rapax.}

\textit{Hec Crucesignatis facio preludia, quorum}

\textsuperscript{115} i.e. in the world of the heavens, where the harmonious relationships between heavenly bodies prevail.

\textsuperscript{116} ‘\textit{Applanos}’ (Greek nominative), refers to the fixed framework of which the planets form part, and occurs extensively in Plato’s \textit{Timaeus} available in the Middle Ages through a fourth-century translation into Latin by Calcidius. The term appears in Adelard of Bath’s \textit{Quaestiones naturales}, and in various commentaries, e.g. by William of Conches. Lines 483-88 reflect Calcidius, 73.

\textsuperscript{117} Mercury.

\textsuperscript{118} Mars, Jupiter and Saturn respectively.
Bella \(^{119}\) canam, vita sospite, dante Deo.

Sub Cruce qui moritur vel vivit, probra, susuros,

Prelia non metuit, firmus amore Crucis.\(^{120}\)

<35> Ergo prona malo ceptum plebs damnat Hugonis,

Dissonus et Rumor ruminat acta nova.

Ensi Pictavia succumbit, Marchia metas

Amittit, victrix Gallia castra\(^{121}\) capit.

Hec cadit, hec surgit; hec meret, ridet et illa.

Nox lucem, noctem lux nova sepe rapit.

Pro sancta Cruce pugna gravis fecunda tenetur.

Merces militibus sunt duo, terra, polus.

Nudati lugent rurales qui sibi plangunt

Currus abstractos, farra, boves et equos.

Lugentes clamant, ‘Domini sint tot maledicti,

Reges, prepositi, preco, pedester, eques.

Nos miserī morimur, dum nos mucrone probamus

Ius ducis, asscribat victor ut equa sibi.

Est miles gladium nondum vibrare peritus,

Doctor qui nescit verba Latina loqui.’

---

\(^{119}\) ‘Quorum’ is deleted by the scribe at the beginning of the line.

\(^{120}\) Lines 489-96 and 503-04 seem to be further sections of the Exhortatio, see n. 81 above.

\(^{121}\) ‘petit’ is deleted in the text in favour of ‘capit’.
Sic ruralis adhuc pugnas et equitia damnat, 122

Culpans quorundam pontificale iugum. 123

In tirociniis plausus elegia planctu

Surripit, et tristi funere pompa perit. 124

In bellum versa, belli bacchatur imago 125

Ipsam rem fallax induit umbra rei.

Rurales damnum redimunt, non funera, donis

Que dominis donant sanguine parta suo.

‘Nos facit agrestes agrestis vita, iacensque

Paupertas, positum ius, dominusque gravis’.

Vir generosus erit sola virtute coruscus,

Inguine non vili spermaticaque lue.

Est ex conceptu, partu, victu, gemituque,

Discursu, lapsu, verna laboris homo.

Hec est pernicies belli, quod ver parit, estas 126

Auget, et autumnus perficit, illa 127 metit.

Aureus equales Aries cum ponderat horas

122 Rubric in right margin, ‘De periculis in tyrociniis.’ At this time these mainly consisted of the ‘mêlée’, mounted skirmishing between groups of knights, billeted with their horses on the local population.

123 This is a criticism of the bishops for not preventing tournaments, which were opposed by the Church and eventually banned in France in 1260.

124 See Prologue.129-30.

125 i.e. tournaments as war in miniature.

126 Rubric in right margin ‘De qualitate temporis vernalis, et de tempore belli.’

127 ‘Illa’ is presumably winter.
Et Mars in signo iam movet arma suo,\textsuperscript{128} [79v]

<36> Reges expandunt vexilla ferosque refrenant

Cornipedes. Tondent gramina veris opes,

Cesariem Ceres resecant et brachia Bacchi,\textsuperscript{129}

Cum seges opprimitur, strataque vitis obit.

Pauperis eripitur victus, dum temporá flores

Producunt, miseri marcida vita perit.\textsuperscript{130}

Belli clamulos preco, dolor intonat agris

Evacuatque vias strage, timore, sono.

Regibus est iactura minor si sorbet Avernus

Exutas animas,\textsuperscript{131} membrastructure nuda iacent.

Ecclesie decime pereunt, oblatio crebra

Non datur, emarcet pascua, languet ovis.

Presbiter exul eget. Quis episcopus arguit ipsos\textsuperscript{132}

Reges, quis causam ponderat, equa probat?

Querebant animam Dagoberti regis\textsuperscript{133} Averni

\textsuperscript{128} Respectively the Spring equinox and the sign of Aries.

\textsuperscript{129} Literally 'cut the hair of Ceres and the arms of Bacchus’, i.e. corn and vines. Ceres and Bacchus were respectively the Roman gods of the harvest and of wine.

\textsuperscript{130} See \textit{CM}, 4.197-98, for another account of the count’s preparations against the French in 1242. There are many similarities of language and imagery.

\textsuperscript{131} ‘exutas animas,’ \textit{DTE}, 1.366.

\textsuperscript{132} Another criticism of the ineffectiveness of bishops.

\textsuperscript{133} Dagobert I (c. 603-639). See Wright’s note, p. 149, and \textit{Vita Sancti Dagoberti Regis, MGHS, rerum Merovingiarum}, 2, 509-24. A hermit was said to have seen demons dragging the soul of Dagobert to hell, only to be thwarted by Saints Denis, Maurice and Martin. Rubric in left margin ‘\textit{De iustitia regis Dagoberti, exempli causa.’}
Precones, illam non habuere tamen.

Fecerat ecclesiam quae precensebat\textsuperscript{134} iniquis

Actibus. O reges, templa parate Deo!

Pro templo tibi constructo, sacer O Dionisi,\textsuperscript{135}

Rectius ad libram principis acta vocas.

Quidam prelati propugnant canonis ense\textsuperscript{136}

Quo nummos, mannos, predia, vasa tenent.

Prelati prelata potest elegia dici,

Qui male dispensat tradita dona Dei.\textsuperscript{137}

Nil logico nil grammatico dabit; immodicandi

Garcifero,\textsuperscript{138} populi quem iubet esse patrem,

Burnello calices confert, altaria porco,

Septa lupo, vulpi iura, stolamque capro.

Noctua sub tali fenix est iudice, cornix

Pavo, leo taxus, Caspia\textsuperscript{139} tigris ovis.

\textsuperscript{134} ‘Precenseo’ is given the meaning ‘forewarn’ by Latham, but does not appear in other dictionaries. The context suggests something more like ‘outweigh.’

\textsuperscript{135} Dagobert built the Abbey of Saint Denis (Dionysius), precursor of the Cathedral of Saint Denis in which he and most subsequent French kings were buried. John sees him as a direct predecessor of Louis IX, builder of Sainte Chapelle. The Capetians were keen to demonstrate their descent not only from Charlemagne, but back to the Merovingians. See Spiegel (1983).

\textsuperscript{136} Rubric in left margin ‘De praelatis quibusdam, qui debent niti ad pacem.’

\textsuperscript{137} We do not know which bishop John had in mind. Lines 555-58, which reveal John’s personal grudge, strongly suggest sour grapes.

\textsuperscript{138} ‘Garcifer’ or ‘groom’, is not found in classical Latin.

\textsuperscript{139} Read ‘Capsia’, with Hays, for ‘tapsia’ in MS and Wright. ‘Tapsia’ does not occur elsewhere signifying an animal. Latham’s entry reads ‘a kind of animal (1252)’, presumably referring to this apparently unique instance. ‘Talpa’ / ‘mole’ is also attractive as opposite for ‘tiger,’ with ‘Ovis’ as the first word of the next sentence, but it does violence to the metre.
Vivit adulatrix,\textsuperscript{140} blandaque lambit eos.

Magni doctores rigidi nimis ense minantur

Canonicum ferunt interimuntque bonos.

Hic tonat in cives Ysabelle, non in avari\textsuperscript{141}

idola; periuros preterit, arma, dolos.

Nemo nisi iuret alio vult credere, mundus

Est quia corruptus, et quia rara fides.\textsuperscript{142}

Multi sunt qui non metuunt iurare, nec esse

Periuri, faciunt qui scelus ere\textsuperscript{143} brevi.

Prelia prelati cum sint utrimque securi,

Non est qui pacis dulce resarciit opus.

In se Christicole quia densant prelia, trenos

Plebs iterat querulos funereosque sonos

Olim spreverunt sacri tormenta, tyrannos,\textsuperscript{144}

Iras, blanditias, vim, probra, dona, minas.

Victricis virtute Crucis sunt mira peracta,

Confirmantque fidem facta stupenda sacram.

\enquote{The punctuation of this passage differs from Wright’s to give better sense as a series of grotesque comparisons. For a similar attack on \textit{adulatio}, see John of Salisbury, \textit{Policraticus}, 3, 4-7.}

\textsuperscript{140}‘Adulatrix’ may be corrupted from, e.g. ‘Cathari,’ but could refer to riches and greed as the graven images of misers. Lines 565-66 seem to have been transposed with lines 563-64.

\textsuperscript{141}‘\textit{Avari}’ may be corrupted from, e.g. ‘\textit{Cathari},’ but could refer to riches and greed as the graven images of misers. Lines 565-66 seem to have been transposed with lines 563-64.

\textsuperscript{142}‘\textit{Rara fides},’ Horace, Odes, 1.35.21. In line 567, read ‘\textit{alio}’ for ‘\textit{alii}’ in MS and Wright.

\textsuperscript{143}‘\textit{ere brevi}’ / ‘small reward.’

\textsuperscript{144}Rubric in left margin, ‘\textit{De sanctis prelatis sive pacificis}.’
Gemini regis \(^{145}\) motu fundata libelli

580 Pagina continuat pristina mira Crucis. [80r]

Ut Cruce signentur reges miracula suadent \(^{146}\)

Pro Cruce que fecit omnipotentis amor.

Sicut Beletic \(^{147}\) testantur scripta Johannis,

Sanguineos fluxus fudit imago Crucis.

585 Hanc Iudea domo quadam conspexit et illam

Vidit sanguineam dum violavit eam. \(^{148}\)

Sic fidei robur incredula turba recepit

Nosque docet sanctam magnificare Crucem.

Demonis in phanum Iudeus tempore noctis

590 Venit, et advenit demonis horror ei.

Se Cruce signavit, signatum vas bene demon,

Sed vacuum, dixit. Credidit ergo timens. \(^{149}\)

Nec presul tetigit monialem quam tetigisse

Proposuit, sicut dixerat unus ibi.

\(^{145}\) The MS has ‘Gemini regis’ which makes sense as ‘the two kings’; but the usage is strange, and the line may be corrupt.

\(^{146}\) Rubric in right hand margin, ‘Miranda quedam Crucis.’

\(^{147}\) Magister Johannes Beleth, who taught and wrote in Paris (c. 1135-82). The story of the bleeding crucifix does not appear in Beleth’s Summa. See Hauréau (1877), 71. John seems however to have used ch. 125 of the Summa for his references to Julian the Apostate, and to the legend of the wood of the Cross, H. Douteil ed., Johannis Beleth Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis’ (Turnhout, 1976). See also DTE, 1.407-14, 2.880-84.

\(^{148}\) Variants of this story and language appear in collections of Marian miracles. See Stella, 117 & 177-78.

\(^{149}\) This too is a familiar story. See, for instance, Gregory, Dialogi, 3.7.
Heraclius cultor. Clausaque porta Salem,
Rex humilis factus reseratam venit in urbem.\textsuperscript{150}
Angelus ut monuit edocuitque fides.

Factam Martha Crucem de ligno sancta draconi
Sevo monstravit, qui quasi statab ovis.

Iniecit collo pavido sua cingula tradens
Hunc populo, cuius hunc necuere manus.\textsuperscript{151}
Peccatis hodie, populi, clerique ducumque,
Raro scintillant mira corusca Dei.

Regia vis hodie patres patrat, at Deus olim\textsuperscript{152}
Mirreo dederat te, Nicholae, gregi.
Sanctus Honoratus\textsuperscript{153} prestructus pneumat sancto
Factus de laico simplice presul erat.
Sanctus Germanus piusque Lupus Anglica regna\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{150}Heraclius, Byzantine emperor (610-641) was credited with recovering the True Cross from the Persians, probably in 630. Finding the gates of Jerusalem blocked, on the advice of an angel the emperor removed his royal trappings and dismounted. At this display of humility, the city gates opened spontaneously, JdeM, 382. See Baert (2004), 133-93, for the Legend of the Exaltation of the Cross, and Paul (2012), 190-95 for the resonance of the Heraclius story to crusading.

\textsuperscript{151}St. Martha was the biblical sister of Mary Magdelene. JdeM, 243, ‘\textit{stetit ut ovis et ligavit eum cingulo suo}’ recounts that she reached Provence with Mary and their brother Lazarus, and performed this miracle.

\textsuperscript{152}St. Nicholas (270-343), JdeM, 14-21, was bishop of Myra in Lycia. This section, 605-646, compares the bishops of old with those of the present day, who obtain office through wealth and military power. ‘\textit{Pater}’= ‘bishop.’

\textsuperscript{153}St. Honoratus (c.350-429), Archbishop of Arles, believed to have converted from paganism.

\textsuperscript{154}St. Germanus (c.378-c.448), bishop of Auxerre, visited Britain around 429 with Bishop Lupus of Troyes, where he successfully countered the Pelagian heresy, see GM, 101.
Olim purgabat a satione mala.
Cum quadringentis tunc quinquaginta peracti
Sunt anni peperit ut sacra Virgo Deum,
Tunc Vortigernum fex Pelagiana tyrannum
Infecit; fecem tersit amena fides.

Que tunc vaticinans dixit Merlinus omitto,
Ne seriem rumpant propositumque meum.  
Gildas historicus miracula plurima scripsit
Que tunc per sacros facta fuere duos.
Electus fuit Eligius prestructus in arte
Fabrili, cuius plurima mira patent.
Constantis fidei datur exemplaris imago
Eligius sanctus mirus in arte fabri.
Clotario regi sellam componere iussus
Ex auro fabricat preradiante duas.
Pro pretio geminam sedem componit eodem,
Furtum quod sapiat nil retinere volens.

Discite fallaces aurum quicumque sititis!

---
155 A surprising example of restraint!
156 Wright, p. 149, notes that it was Nennius, not Gildas, who recounted the miracles of Saints Germanus and Lupus, but that Nennius’ chronicle was often attributed to Gildas in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. John probably relied on Geoffrey of Monmouth anyway.
157 St. Eligius (Éloi) (c. 588-660) was the chief adviser to Dagobert I (see DTE, 2.545 and nn. 133 & 135. Before this he worked in the Kingdom of the Franks and performed this commission for King Clothaire II. see JdeM, 12-13 & Vita Sancti Eligii, MGHS rerum Merovingiarum, 4, 672. Note the play on ‘electus’ / ‘Eligius.’
Exuret vestram seva gehenna sitim.

Urbe triumphavit celi post prelia mundi

Christus; ut hec Christo preside sevus agat [80v]

Sanctus Dunstanus, Sathane cum forcipe nasum

Pressit, et a fabrica iussit abire sua. 158

<39> Bacchatur sanctos dum Maximianus in omnes,

Albanus martir Amphibalusque cadunt. 159

Martinus modicus clamidem divisit egenti

Dans partem; 160 dives sit pater ergo dator.

Sancto Gudlaco scuticas gerit Angelus, illis 161

Demonicas acies ut scuticare queat.

Hiis signoque Crucis pulsus, corus ille paludes

Obstruit huic sancto consolidatque locum.

Hii pro militia sancte Crucis alta tonantis

Atria, non fragiles promeruere casas.

Elegit tales olim Deus, at modo presul

Eligitur logica qui probitate preit.

Post nummos venit ad gladios electio sepe,

159 Saints Alban and Amphibolus, see GM, 77. Maximianus, Diocletian’s ‘princeps militae’ in Britain, is accused of persecution of Christians.
160 St. Martin of Tours (c. 316-397), see e.g. Bartholomew of Trent, 337-42, JdeM, 457, ‘...partitam ense clamidem quae sola supererat illi dedit.’
161 St. Guthlac of Crowland, see e.g. Henry of Avranches Vita Beati Guthlaci metrice composite. Guthlac was a hermit in the Lincolnshire fens.
Et sedem validus robore preses habet.

Rustica sic turba verum vel proxima vero

Dixit; sed causas prosequear arte rei.\textsuperscript{162}

Causam pretendit iustum sibi quilibet; armis

Et causis fidit Gallia Marte suo.

Inter Ricardum regem regemque Philippum\textsuperscript{163}

Dissensus longi semina vidit Acron.

A Terra Sacra trans equora fluxit origo;

Hanc et bella liber proximus inde tenet.\textsuperscript{164}

Undique Mars Hodie regnat, divisaque regna

Causas pretendunt Martis habere novi.

Romanos Cesar expugnat. Parthia calcat

Ierusalim, templum gens scelerata tenet.

Sevos Tartareos Germania magna repellit.

Hispani Libicos vi dominante fugant.\textsuperscript{165}

In medio positi reges ad prelia nostri

Causantur gladiis et sua iura probant.

Hinc capit hos Renus, hinc Alpes hinc et Iberi

\textsuperscript{162} Rubric in left margin, ‘De causis belli inter reges nostras.’

\textsuperscript{163} See also DTE, 1.293-94 for causal linkage between Acre and the confrontation in Poitou.

\textsuperscript{164} Rubric in left margin, ‘De discordia generali et de situ Gallie.’ John says he will cover the Third Crusade in the next book.

\textsuperscript{165} The passage clearly dates from the mid-1240s, with references to Frederick II’s battles against Rome, the Khwarazmian occupation of Jerusalem, the Mongol invasions and Spanish successes against the Muslims.
Montes, hinc pelagus oceanusque vagus.

Terminat has metas quedam quadrangula forma
Quam recipit mundi spherica forma brevem.

<40> Magna tamen bellis Pipinos gignit, alitque
Hec Karolos, per quos est sacra tuta fides.

Insultu crebro moventi, menia capta

Sunt gallis.\textsuperscript{166} Taurus robore stare nequit.

In taurum gallus armatur, cornua tauri
Deicit, in tauro vis inimica perit.\textsuperscript{167}

In Frontineium\textsuperscript{168} Martis convertere frontem
Rex sapit, et fossas fronte carere facit.

Non igitur cadit incassum productio belli,\textsuperscript{169}
Quamvis derisum Pictavus hostis agit.

Causas pervertit mordax detractio; virtus
In vitium quadam proximitate cadit.

\textsuperscript{166} In a foretaste of his consideration of the respective merits of the French and English, John introduces the ‘cocks’ (\textit{galli}) of France (Gallia) and the ‘bulls’/ ‘rosbifs’ of England.
\textsuperscript{167} Wright’s punctuation is changed.
\textsuperscript{168} Wright, p. 150, correctly identifies this as Castrum de Frontenay (\textit{CM}, 4.206-07), now Fontenay Rohan-Rohan (Poitou-Charentes). The MS has (most unusually) an explanatory gloss ‘\textit{castellum}’ above ‘\textit{Frontineium}.’ John makes play of the pun on ‘\textit{frons}’/ ‘forehead.’ Despite its double wall and defensive moats, Fontenay fell to Louis in 15 days at the beginning of his campaign to reduce the Lusignan castles. Louis razed the walls and filled in the moats.
\textsuperscript{169} A map of France, with Paris at the centre of the world, is in the right margin (\textbf{Plate 6, p. 192}).
Plate 6. MS London British Library
Nobilium procerum volitat detractio nulla.

Dumus enim pungit, non gena blanda rose. [81r]

Sepius indignos dum laudat vulgus, idemque
Laudando culpat, non timet ista comes.  

Quicquid plebs dicat, animosis patribus ortus

Corda sui generis hic generosa gerit,  

Legitimo domino dum vult herere,  

Heros venatur, iusque fidemque sitit.

Belli causa fuit vigor huius et ardua virtus

Et magnis gestis Gallia clara suis.

Sic regis frater fuerat concausa. Quis ille?

Alphonsus. Quare? Quod petis, illud habe.

Dum subliminatur et Hugoni pretitulatur,  

Bellorum fomes fit novus ille comes.

Marchio munitur, et in hostem tutius itur.

Regis germanus obicit ense manus.

Rex pius armatus, animosus, ad alta paratus,

Sentit quid valeat Marte, quid arte queat.

---

170 For Hugh X de Lusignan, see DTE, 1, n. 105.
171 MS has ‘facit’ deleted before ‘gerit’; Punctuation of lines 683-86 is amended from Wright’s, following the sense.
172 Read ‘herere’ with MS, with dative ‘domino’, not ‘habere’ with Wright. John’s approach to Hugh is inconsistent, to the extent that he sympathises with English claims to Poitou, and pays respect to the Lusignan family; but he is critical of rebellion against his lord, the king of France. He also apportions blame to Isabella and Alphonse.
173 John writes in leonines in lines 691-709. 699-700 and 704-05 are also rhyming couplets.
174 Read ‘in’ for Wright’s ‘vi.’
Hostes munitos invadit, et ense potitos

Fortius ense petit dum sibi cuncta metit.

Sub duce Francorum manus est collecta proborum

Ut queat Anglorum vi superare chorum.\textsuperscript{175}

\textless 41\textgreater{} Gallia commota bello coit undique tota

Vires declarans, bella cruenta pars.

Assunt Campani\textsuperscript{176} iuvenes et vertice cani,

Cum clipeis iuvenes, consiliiisque senes.

Exacuunt enses et cultros Atrebatenses,

Notos Belvacus linquit ob arma lacus,\textsuperscript{177}

Neustria tristatur propio duce quod viduatur,

Corpus habens alibi, non habet hic cor ibi.\textsuperscript{178}

Clam lamentatur Anglis quia bella minatur

Francia, cui pridem novit inesse fidem.

Allobroges aderant qui silvas deseruere.

Biturice properant bella movere fere.

Que movet in clerum bellum venit Aurelianis

---

\textsuperscript{175} An odd use of ‘chorum’ but a contrived pun on ‘chorum angelorum.’

\textsuperscript{176} ‘Campania’ is ‘Champagne’. ‘Vertice cani,’ ‘Intempestivi funduntur vertice cani,’ Boethius, \textit{De Cons.}, 1.1.11.

\textsuperscript{177} A reference to the Étangs de l’Abbaye (Oise).

\textsuperscript{178} Augustine, \textit{Sermones}, 62.17, ‘qui sic volunt intrare in ecclesiam ut hic corpus habeant, alibi cor. Totum intus esse debit.’ Read ‘hic’ for Wright’s ‘hoc’; either reading is possible. John appears to be suggesting that Normandy resents the fact that its dukes were not physically present, and since 1204, Capetian, not Angevin kings.
Motibus insanis sumere prompta merum.\textsuperscript{179}

Parisis proba non pugnat gens; parcere clero\textsuperscript{180}

Provida, non curat perfidiam sua lex;

Lex sua perfidiam curat, non provida clero

Parcere, gens pugnat non proba clero.

Machina muralis, nummi, tentoria, vasa,

Arma coartuntur, que cava plaustra vehunt.

Pictavus insidiis ut mos est diripit ista

Sed vi Francorum preda recepta redit.

Mutuus occursus prede vacuusque recursus

Concipit invidiam, perfidiamque parit.\textsuperscript{181}

Que mala sunt tantum non aggravat emula lingua,\textsuperscript{182}

Immo pervertit que nituere bona.

Omni pro verbo vano responsio debet

Ante Deum reddi, iustaque pena sequi.

Sunt qui pro lucro linguis luctantur acutis,

Et qui decertant ense; sed ense cadunt. [81v]

\textsuperscript{179} This line is literally transcribed from the MS. To make sense, ‘Aurelianis’ has to be read as one of many variants on the name for Orléans. Wright’s note, p. 150, reads, ‘The city of Orleans was noted at this time for the sometimes sanguinary frays between the townspeople and the students in its ancient and celebrated university.’

\textsuperscript{180} Rubric in right margin, ‘Versus retrogradi,’ referring to lines 715-19, i.e. the same words can be read, and make grammatical sense, both forward and backwards, though with opposite meaning.

\textsuperscript{181} Rubric in left margin, ‘De dampnis et de linguis detrahentibus in bellis.’

\textsuperscript{182} ‘emula lingua’, Horace, Ep., 1.19.15.
In medio bello nullus bona predicat hoste

De proprio, quamvis se probet esse probum.

Vulnerat oppositas acies elegia lingue

Elate; plagas mutuat ergo novas.

<42> Prevolat invidia bellum iactantia stulta,

Indignans risus, antiphrasisque tropus\(^{183}\)

Sic omnis regio propriis hostilia linguis

Prelia deridet, gestaque clara premit.

Nomine rhetoric proprio annominat hostes

Gallica lingua decens usa lepore suo.\(^{184}\)

‘Pictavus’ est vere dictus, quia pingit avorum

Facta procax, pictas aut imitatur aves.\(^{185}\)

Est etenim pictus, pulcher, validus; tamen ista

Dicta per antiphrasim\(^{186}\) maxima turba refert.

Gallia transmittit gallos, Gallique furore

Hostes conantur dilacerare suo.

---

\(^{183}\) *Antiphrasis* involved euphemism, the use of a word in an opposite sense to its true meaning.

\(^{184}\) *Annominatio* is a rhetorical figure using homonyms with contrasting meanings. John clearly liked the French vernacular.

\(^{185}\) This is a laboured etymological pun on *Pictavus*, which John presents as derived from *pingere* and either *avus*/*ancestor*, or *avis*, ‘bird’. He presses his point to breaking by repeating the *double entendre* likening the French / ‘Galli’ to ‘galli’ / ‘cockerels.’ This is a very early use of cockerels and bulls as symbols of the French and English, perpetuated perhaps by ‘cock and bull stories’, John Bull and *roshifs*.

\(^{186}\) CG, 3.168, ‘Antifrasim facies, cum derivatio vocis/ non sensus plene faciet.’
Sicut gallinas galli calcant, ita Gallus

Suppeditat vulgus, rura, pecusque sibi.

Menia confringunt Franci, fortesque sibi villas

Submittunt, urbes evacuare student.

Pictavus hec contra; iactatrix Gallia verbis

Propugnat validis, horrisonisque minis.

Talia preludunt epiteta’ miserrima belli.

Cur? Quia gesta canens ethicus esse volo,

Quorum pacificus Deus est; gaudere tenetur,

Firma pace Dei pacificaque fide.

Non sunt marticole modo gentes, numina vana

Cessant, que sancte succubuere Cruci.

Inter linguosos hec est elegia lingue

Sepius ad gladium garrula lingua salit.

Ut quondam Peleus gaudebat coniuge diva,

Sic tanquam diva coniuge Brunus ovat.

Anglorum regina decens denupserat illi;

Castris firma suis, altera diva maris,

Ad natum trahit illa virum qui, victricus ante,

Wright’s punctuation is amended to bring out John’s coarse and direct comparison of the French with cockerels.

CG, 3.145, ‘Est epitheton ubi dicenda notatio restat.’

In direct contrast with ‘Christicoles.’

Peleus married the sea-nymph Thetis, mother of Achilles.

See Book 1, n. 105.
Privigno regi non cupid esse pater.

Gentes promisit sed rex non invenit illas,

Cernit enim cunctos Gallica regna sequi.

<43> Nondum concurrunt reges, sed prelia prima

Exercet partes igne, cruore, fame.

Ut sua venturis populis laus digna legatur,

Sic utriusque ducis splendida facta canam.

Hic bonus, ille pius, hic equus, iustus et ille,

Cedere nature certat uterque suae.

Sed vellem quod uterque suas converteret iras

In Parthes acies Martis agone feri.

Hos animos, tales insultus, sumite contra

Hostes Ecclesie qui spoliatis agros.

Raptores ergo carpit mea Musa, minasque

Non circumspectas, instabilesque viros. [82r]

Tangit avaritie pestem, cupidiquae malignum

Votum spe lucrī\textsuperscript{192} qui nova bella cupid.

Sub Pharaone Ioseph dominus fratrumque patrisque

Beniamin in sacco iussit cratera recondi

Nos vocat exemplis ad pietatis opus.\textsuperscript{193}

\textsuperscript{192} Read ‘\textit{lucrī’ for Wright’s ‘\textit{lucti’.}

\textsuperscript{193} Gen. 41-44.
Ut sublimaret calliditate suos.

Calliditate studet hodie pars maxima mundi

Ut sibi divitias impietate trahat.

Diversos imitans Clio\textsuperscript{194} diversa sequentes

Quicquid opinatur vulgus inerme notat.

Hec est in bello vulgaris opinio; bellum

Turma petens ridet, sed lacrimosa cadit.

Hic populus moriturus abit, iuvenique relinquit

Heredi vites, oppida, rura, domos.

Anglia luctatrix, equitatrix Gallia, cordis

Prelia premittunt anticipantque minas.

Hae populos ad bella trahunt, qui lucra petentes

Morte gravi perdunt que retinere putant.

Brabantina\textsuperscript{195} manus cantando mortis ad horam

Festinat, mortis prodiga bella cupid.

\textit{Si Cruce signatus in Parthos iret, habere}

\textit{Gaudia deberet, mors et honesta foret.}

\textless 44\textgreater  Hec ait, ‘O misera, potatrix Anglia. Per nos

---

\textsuperscript{194} Clio, the Muse of History.

\textsuperscript{195} For the role of bands of mercenaries, known as Brabançons, in service variously with both kings, see Verbruggen (1997, trans.), 130-44. They were a major element of the defeated army at Bouvines, and, though discouraged by the Church, used by the ‘crusaders’ in the Languedoc.
Accipes calicem mortis,\textsuperscript{196} eumque bibes.

In classem silve descendent.\textsuperscript{197} Anglica terra

Nomine dicetur Gallica terra novo.

Hostes colla dabunt, iam nobis\textsuperscript{198} menia nutant.

Angolisma gemit oppida fracta sua.\textsuperscript{199}

Parisius regem victum ducemus, et illic

Rex regis nostri nobilis hospes erit.

Nulli parcemus; pecudes rapiemus et archas

Frangemus, quoniam rebus abundat honor.

Dat comes exemplum nobis; ubi dulcia lucra,

Hic erimus; pauper vilis ut alga iacet.\textsuperscript{200}

Sed minus est culpandus Hugo; Reginaldus\textsuperscript{201} eundem

Decept, donis Gallica signa sequens.

Plus proponit adhuc moriturum vulgus, et hostis

Cautelam nescit, finis apertus erat.

\textquoteleft‘Tu, Reginalde, potes de Pontibus ire per undas

\textsuperscript{196} ‘Potatrix.’ Wright, p. 151, asserts that ‘The English had an early reputation for drunkenness.’ ‘Calicem mortis’ carries an unmistakeable reference to the Communion cup and the service of the Mass.

\textsuperscript{197} ‘In classem silve descendent’ is obscure. Perhaps it refers to construction of Henry III’s invasion fleet.

\textsuperscript{198} Read ‘nobis’ for Wright’s ‘vobis.’

\textsuperscript{199} John seems to be saying that Isabella of Angoulême is lamenting the forts captured by Louis IX.


\textsuperscript{201} Reginald of Pons, see \textit{CM}, 4. 192, 220, 254. Reginald was Lord of Pons, Henry III’s first port of call after landing at Royan; but he surrendered swiftly to Louis. He had been receiving significant payments from Henry. John says he was bribed by the French king to change sides.
Ponti, dum pontes prestruis arte tibi.  

Argenti pontes tibi prestitit Anglia; sed te 

Gallia fallacem nectit in ere rudi.

Argenti sumus heredes, quod contulit illi 

Anglia; mutat enim sordida preda manus.’

Dices quod falli meruit rex Anglicus. Istud 

Ne dicas, iuste rex quia regna regit. 

Pars tamen haec de iure suo non dicitur; immo, 

Huic debet subici Neustria tota duci. 

Quare tot terris privatur? Vis quia pratum

Pascit; et est lucrum dulce decusque decens.’ [82v] 

Plebs ita prima novat belli preludia, verba 

Per mala, sed verbis deteriora facit. 

Rident, derident, saliunt, maledicere gaudent, 

Clamant; amentes crederet esse Plato. 

Iurant, periurant, periuri vendere temptant 

Pro magno pretio quod solet esse nihil.  

---

202 A play on ‘Pons,’ ‘pons,’ and ‘Pontus’. The battle of Taillebourg was fought over a narrow bridge (pons).

203 ‘Ere rudi’, see Pliny. 33.3.

204 ‘Vis pratum pascit, vis damnat saepe probatum,’ is listed as a Latin proverb by Wright (1846), vol. 1, 150.

205 i.e. their loyalty. The translation is speculative, and the reference to Plato obscure and probably corrupt. Saints Peter and Paul traditionally interceded between mankind and God.
<45> Dum ‘Petrus et Paulus,’ dicunt, ‘Non sunt meliores’<sup>206</sup>

Hiis,’ res in villa, fraude relata, latent.

Tales oderunt clerum, talesque sequuntur

Fortunam, tales bella lucrumque petunt.<sup>207</sup>

Primo terga fuge vertunt, dominumque relinquent,

Et neutri parti constituere fidem.

Predam pro parvo pretiosam munere sepe

Vendunt, qui facinus funere sepe luunt.

Rex iustus prohibit raptus, incendia, furta

Fraudes, insidias, iurgia, probra, dolos.

Quilibet ere suo vivit, sua premia certa

Quisque capit, sicut postulat ordo suus.

At rex Anglorum, non pugnaturus,<sup>208</sup> in oras

Pictavie venit, litora pace tenens.

Raptum detestans, nulli damnosus, amorem

Mansuetus meruit hostis habere sui.

Pace petit terram, cognatum pace salutat,

Pace ferens domino debita iura suo.

---

<sup>206</sup> A small mailed hand points to this line in the MS. Read, with MS, ‘dicunt’ for Wright’s ‘dominant’.

<sup>207</sup> ‘Tales’, i.e. the sort of people who spread false rumours.

<sup>208</sup> This is not how Matthew Paris reports the episode. Henry sailed on 15 May 1242, with the queen, Richard of Cornwall, seven other ‘comites’ and around three hundred knights (CM,4.192). Matthew reports that Henry’s army on 20 July at the battle of Taillebourg comprised 1600 knights and 20,000 infantry, and seven hundred crossbowmen, only eighty of them English (CM,4.210). The French king clearly perceived hostile intent (4.195).
Audit pacifice Ludovicus; sed cito surgit Turbo, qui turbat nobile pacis opus.

Dissuadent aliqui pacem, sed si mea reges²⁰⁹

Verba duo caperent, consiliumque pium,

Ambo Crucem caperent et ad oscula mutua leti

Se ferrent, pacis perpetuando bonum.

Victricis miranda Crucis mysteria reges

Discite, post mire sumite signa Crucis.

Crux est vexillum palme, Crux celica scala.

Crux celi clavis, legis et ara nove.

Gloria iustorum defigitur in Cruce Christi,

Vita resurgentium rex quia Christus erit.

Sacre signa Crucis Sarrepte sunt duo ligna.²¹⁰

In qua monstratur gloria, fervor, amor.

Est oleum vidue pietas, divina farina

Trita Crucis fructus, fructificansque fides.

Crux est virga petram feriens qua prosilit unda

Dum reficit Christi nos lateralis aqua.

²⁰⁹ Rubric in the left margin reads, ‘Persuasio ut Christianitas Crucem accipiat, et de mysteria sancte Crucis.’

²¹⁰ Read ‘lingua’, with Hays, for ‘lingua’, MS and Wright. See III Reg. 17, 8-24 for the story of the widow of Sarrepta, or Zarephath, near Sidon. The Vulgate Bible has ‘colligo duo ligna’/‘I am collecting up two sticks’, in John’s imagery representing the two pieces of the Cross. Elijah promised her that neither her oil nor flour would run out until rain should fall.
Eneus est serpens Christus quem pertica portat

Crimina quo sanans est oculata fides.

Crux est currentum stadium, certantis asylum.

Virga viam Rubro perficit ista Mari.

Crux est sacra tau signatum limine, quando

Hec electorum frontibus alta patet.

Gaudia Crux reparat paradisi, Crux pretiosum

Lignum quod celo dulce reformat Adam.

Hoc lignum sapiens Austri regina repulsum

Mitis adoravit, proposuitque sacrum.

Occuluisse solo Salomon rex dicitur illud.

Tandem Probaticie ripa recepit aque.

Hanc amplexat sapiens, hanc quisque fidelis

Diligat, hanc omnis fortis honoret homo.

---

211 Num. 21, 8, ‘Fecit ergo Moses serpentem aeneum et posuit pro signo.’ Snake bites were cured by sight of the bronze snake.
212 Ex. 14, 16, ‘..eleva virgam tuam.....ut gradiantur filii Israhel in medio mari per siccum.’ Moses parts the waters of the Red Sea with his staff.
213 See DTE, 1.47 & n. 14 for another reference to the tau-shaped Cross.
214 John has followed John Beleth, Summa, 151. (PL, 202.152-53), in linking the earlier story of the queen of Sheba, the cedar wood from Adam’s grave, and Christ’s miracle at the Pool of Bethesda (John, 5.2, ‘Piscina Probatica’, literally ‘Sheep pool’). Briefly, Solomon tried unsuccessfully to use timber from Adam’s grave to build his temple. It would not fit and was incorporated in a bridge, which the Queen of Sheba crossed, recognizing the sanctity of the wood. Solomon subsequently buried it and the Pool of Bethesda sprang up on the site. An angel regularly visited the pool, agitating the water, and the first invalid to enter it would be cured. Like Beleth, John does not mention the angel, which features prominently in the Golden Legend. See B. Baert (2004), 289-349 for a full account of the ‘Legend of the Wood of the Cross.’
215 Luc. 11, 31 and Matth. 12, 42 refer to ‘Regina Austri’ as the judge of the generation which rejected Jesus. She is usually identified with the queen of Sheba, III Reg.10, who visited Solomon and was so impressed that she endorsed his God.
216 ‘Hanc’ clearly refers to ‘Crucem’ despite the absence of a recent grammatical appearance.
Ecce Crucis longum, latum, sublime, profundum.

Virtutum species quatuor ista notant;

Longum constantem, latum designat amantem.

Spem pars alta quidem misticat, ima fidem.

Hac vos vincitis, reges. Hanc ergo velitis

Sumere. Victricis tollite signa Crucis.

Pax est ad tempus male precipitata maligno\textsuperscript{217}

Suggestu procerum, quos nova lucra trahunt.

\textsuperscript{217} Line 893 picks up the narrative from line 860. John accuses the magnates of wrecking the Anglo-French peace in 1242, and thus delaying a royal crusade, for reasons of personal gain.
Book 3

Incipit tertius liber cum invocatione facta ad primum motorem

<47> Horrida que scribo detestor prelia, sicut
   Flebilis exequias quas canit odit anus.

Claudicat idcirco mea Musa, nec ordine longo
   Sex vadit pedibus carmen habile mihi.³

5 Nutantes elegi Crucis inclinantur honor
   Vertice cum prono, cum titubante pede.⁴

Intendit regnum Ludovicus subdere paci
   Hinc et in Assyrios bella movere duces.

Regum conflictus alterna pace quiescent,

10 Sub duce Francorum signa ferente Crucis.

Ante tamen, varias ad prelia vestra ruinas,

   Ecclesie planctus, funera, damna fleo.

Motor prime,⁶ fave, ne nutent hec metra prave.⁷

   Firmus cuncta moves, vivificansque foves,

---

¹ See also DTE, Prologue.105-10, 3.689-92.
² Read ‘habile’ with MS for Wright’s ‘erile.’ See Matthew of Vendôme, Ars Versificatoria, 2.8, for a similar description of elegy.
³ John again explains and excuses the fact that he is using distichs, or couplets, rather than hexameters, the usual classical metre for epic poetry.
⁴ Phaedrus, Fab. 1.16.10.
⁵ ‘bella movere’, Ovid, Am., 2.12.21.
⁷ Lines 13-26 are leonines.
Semina qui rerum nectis, genus et specierum

Et species generis absque labore seris.

Te, Deus, inspires menti, tribuens mihi vires.

Celitus irriguum fons mihi funde tuum,\(^8\)

Corpus visibile qui simplice ducis ab yle,\(^9\)

Mundum compositum mirificeque situm.

Circundas gravia levibus, divina sophia,

Constringens media sub breviore via.

De nihilo vere tibi cuncta creatu fuere

Te duo cuncta\(^10\) sumus preside, mens et humus.

<48> Me rege scribentem, reges et bella canentem

Regia\(^11\); pacifero te duce tutus ero.

Ecce modus mundi! volitans discordia pacem

Perturbat. Quod homo credit habere, fugit.

De iusto movet inijustum; se fortiter ultus

Fortius opprimitur, turpius inde cadit.\(^12\)

Virgo Dei mater miseros averte tumultus,

Et nobis pacem perpetuare stude.

---

\(^8\) Lines 18-19 reflect the Prologue of Peter of Blois’ *Tractatus de Sacrosanctis Venerabilis Sacramenti.*

\(^9\) ‘(h)ylye, from Aristotle’s ‘\(\nu\lambda\eta\),’ means ‘matter’ in the existential sense, see, e.g. Augustine, *De natura boni contra Manichaeo,* 18, and philosophical works contemporary with John.

\(^10\) John uses the neuter, ‘cuncta’ meaning that in this respect man is simply part of the universe of things created.

\(^11\) Note John’s playful use of ‘rege,’ ‘reges’ and ‘regia’. Rubric in right margin, ‘Sequitur post invocationem de causa discordie pace negate.’

\(^12\) A reference to Hugh’s brave defence of what he believed to be right.
Heu, heu, quam parvo fugiunt in tempore mortis,
Aurum, terra, fretum, purpura, gemma, merum.

Propositi pars una fuit sociare vetusta [83v]
Gestis gesta novis sub brevitate nova.
Multi glorificos, heu! demeruere triumphos,
Quos torquet cupidos insatiata sitis.
Vidit Alexander habitante Diogene cuppam
Ventis oppositam, versiculosque suos,
‘Cur maiore larem spatio pretioque pararem?’
Protegit a Borea me quia cuppa mea.’
Vidit et invidit que nondum cuncta teneret
Et quod sufficeret concava cuppa viro.

Est decies felix qui non aliena requirit,
Nec tenet iniuste, nec dare danda negat.
Qui tantum terram sapiunt, caligine tecta
Tempore iudicii terra vorabit eos.
In terra populi viventis iustus habebit

Gaudia, qui proprio vivit, amatque Deum.

Diversi diversa volunt, petit hic quia pacem,

13 Read ‘que’ for Wright’s ‘quod’. Either reading is possible, but the sense favours ‘que.’ ‘Vidit et invidit,’ Augustine, Sermo 229.2.
14 ‘aram…. obscura caligine tectam’, Cicero, Aratea, 194.
15 Augustine, De Civitate Dei, 11.25, 15-16, ‘diversi diversa sentiant.’
Hic bellum; rixas iste, sed ille iocos.

    Flumen anas, frondes philomena, domum canis, agnus

Ubera, rana lutum, celica iustus amat.

55 Vix princeps moritur bene; bullitum bibit aurum

    Crassus, Alexander mixta venena mero.\(^{16}\)

Eneas fluvio perit, servilibus hastis

    Romulus, invidie Iulius inde stilis.\(^{17}\)

<49> Sunt octingenti, sunt quadraginta ligati

60 Octonis annis a genetrice Dei,

Neustria succumbit Normannis, a Boreali

    Advenere feri qui regione fera.\(^{18}\)

Magnus Alexander, quid habet? Quid Iulius audax?

    Quid rex Ricardus corda leonis habens,

65 Cuius erat probitas istius causa doloris?

    Et causam discat, discere siquis amat.\(^{19}\)

Gloria prelustris regum terrorque Philippus

---

\(^{16}\) For Crassus’ death, see \textit{DTE}, 3.496. In the Aeneid, Aeneas did not die. His death by drowning and ensuing deification appear in Ovid, \textit{Met.}, 14.566-608.

\(^{17}\) The MS reads ‘\textit{stilis}’. Amend with Wright. For Romulus’ death, see \textit{DTE}, 1.404-06.

\(^{18}\) Lines 59-62 are clearly out of place for whatever reason.

\(^{19}\) John also deals briefly with the Third Crusade in \textit{EBVM}, 4. 82-94, identifying it as a direct response to the loss of the Holy Cross to Saladin. He writes as if he intended to cover events more fully elsewhere, ‘\textit{Quid referam vigilasse dolum captumque Ricardum / Et longum bellum, magne Philippe, tuum?}’ Rubric in left margin, ‘\textit{De peregrinatione Regis Philippi et Regis Ricardi ultra mare, et de gestis eorum, et de igne montis Etne}.’
Vibravit\textsuperscript{20} forti Gallica sceptra manu.

Rex cruce signatus munita gente Micenas\textsuperscript{21}

Venit, ubi flammis estuat Etna suis.

Hic prope sulphureas succendunt flamina venas

Et clauso manes Mulciber igne domat.

Olla Theodoricum Gothorum fervida regem

Huic cuidam sancto visa cremare fuit.\textsuperscript{22}

Baiulus accepte Crucis, expectante Philippo,

Ricardus venit; quos ibi iunxit hiems.\textsuperscript{23}

Christi millenus centenus iungitur annus

Cum nonageno; rex ibi castra locat.

Est veterum regum crux exemplaris imago,

Ut tendant alii per probitatis iter.\textsuperscript{24}

Urbis Ricardum pars hec tenet, illa Philippum,

Dum faveant illis tempora verna maris.

\textsuperscript{20} Read ‘\textit{Vibravit}’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘\textit{Libravit}’, and ‘\textit{munita gente}’ for Wright’s ‘\textit{muni tagnet}’.

This probably refers to Richard’s appointments in England and the mainland to secure his lands in his absence, Gillingham (1999), 120-24.

\textsuperscript{21} Messina.

\textsuperscript{22} Read ‘\textit{Huic}’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘\textit{Hic}’. ‘\textit{Olla}’/‘pot’ here means crater of volcano. For this version of Theodoric’s death, see Gregory I, \textit{Dialogi}, 4.30. Theodoric the Great (454-526), King of the Germanic Ostrogoths is generally believed to have died a natural death in Ravenna.

\textsuperscript{23} Much of John’s account of the Third Crusade could have been derived from ‘\textit{Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi}’ (\textit{IPGRR}) or a another similar source such as ‘\textit{Amboise}’ or Ralph of Diceto. He does however give more detail of Philip’s arrival than these sources. John does not record the fighting between the two kings’ forces in Messina reported by the main sources, e.g. \textit{IPGRR}, 2. 16. For a fuller summary of events, see Gillingham (1999), 130-143.

\textsuperscript{24} ‘\textit{probitatis iter}; ‘\textit{iter}’ is commonly used to mean ‘crusade’ or ‘pilgrimage’. On ‘\textit{probitas}’ see \textit{DTE}, 1, n. 44.
Inclita Ricardum prelustrem fama perennat

    Cuius non poterit gloria longa mori.

Sed per eum monstrare libet, reliquosque potentes, [84r]

    Quod tanquam somnus, est sua vita brevis.

Huius palma fuit Siculus, Ciprus altera, dromo

    Tertia, carvana quarta, sequensque Iope.\textsuperscript{25}

Occisus Siculus, Ciprus pessumdata, dromo

Mersus, carvana capta, retenta Iope.

Huic Siculi victum vetuere, sed ille per arma

    Signatas acies fecit habere cibos.\textsuperscript{26}

<50> Castrum Matagriphum construxerat ipse Micenis

    Quod Siculo regi meta metusque fuit.\textsuperscript{27}

Maior de magna Ludovicus stirpe Ricardi

\textsuperscript{25} John refers to Richard’s defeat of the Sicilians in Messina and imposition of terms on King Tancred (\textit{IPGRR} 2.21, his conquest of Cyprus (\textit{IPGRR} 2. 31-41), the sinking of a large Saracen galley in the approaches to Acre (\textit{IPGRR} 2.42), his capture of a very rich Saracen caravan (\textit{IPGRR} 6.3-5), and his relief and securing of Jaffa (\textit{IPGRR} 6.15-27). He does not include the recapture of Acre amongst the summary of Richard’s triumphs. The fourteenth century MS Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 3792, uniquely contains the following gloss to John of Garland’s \textit{Dictionnarius}, 49 on ‘\textit{Alenancias}’ / ‘dagger’, ‘gallice ‘alesnaz’, \textit{ab Alano inventore, qui primus fuit pirata Ricardi regis, cuius gesta notantur his versibus: ‘Laus tua prima fuit Siculi, Cipris altera, dromo / Tertia, Cornaria quarta, suprema Jope / Repressi Siculi, Cipris pessumdata, dromos / Mersus, Cornaria capta, retenta Jope.’ Al anus, ut dixi, pirata regis, dromonem Sarracenorum cepit, quem perforavit sub aqua natando.’ ‘Ut dixi’ is a possible pointer to publication of an early account of the Third Crusade before John’s time in Toulouse, 1229-32, where he was said to have written these glosses, Paetow \textit{MS}, Intro., 131 & n. 8. On Alan, see lines 133-34 below. I have not inspected this MS, relying on Hauréau (1877), 47.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{IPGRR}, 2. 20-21.

Laudibus a tantis non alienus erit.\textsuperscript{28}

Vere novo classem solvunt in litore reges,\textsuperscript{29}

Hinc rex Ricardus, inde Philippus abit.

Divisas tenuere vias. Tholomaid\textsuperscript{30} primo

Circumdant acies magne Philippe, tue.

Litora vi capiunt Franci, franguntque rebellae

Parthos dum faciunt puppibus ense statum.

In paucos iustos manus infinita movetur,

Quam reprobam iustus solus in arma vocat.

Hec est pugnandi iustissima causa fidelii,

Qua laudes vivus, mortuus astra tenet.

Electi pugiles celi meruere triumphos,

Ima sed eterni carceris hostis habet.

Sanguine Parthorum dum litus inundat, et Acron\textsuperscript{31}

Hos recipit refugos, est via facta Crucii;

Previa tela fugant lesos, gladiique sequaces.

Obsidet et victrix menia clausa phalanx.

Castris Francorum defixis, percutit omnes

Fama Palestinos, corda timore gelans.

\textsuperscript{28} Lines 95-96 assure contemporary readers in the mid 1240s that John rates Louis IX as at least the peer of Richard the Lionheart. John uses the future tense, suggesting Louis’ youth.

\textsuperscript{29} Philip left on 31 March and Richard in mid-April. See Nicholson, p. 174, n. 98 on varying dates in the source material.

\textsuperscript{30} i.e. Acre.

\textsuperscript{31} Read ‘\textit{inundat}’ with Wright, for ‘\textit{inundit}’ in MS.
Menia defendunt clausi, succurrere missi

Qui veniunt magna de Babilone cadunt.

Ad regem redeo Ricardum. Transtulit illi

Anglia munitas per freta longa rates.

Classem proposuit Cipri spoliare tirannus\textsuperscript{32}

Et sponse regis insidiatus erat.\textsuperscript{33}

Hunc rex bis vicit agitans, regnisque tirannum

Privavit propriis, perdomuitque Ciprum.

Hoc facto Ciprus reges\textsuperscript{34} capit hospita fida

Quos, Ricarde, probos stirps tua magna parit.

Nupta Beringaria\textsuperscript{35} fuit hic Hispanica regi

Quam rex adductam fecit adesse mari.

\textless 51\textgreater  Rex regem\textsuperscript{36} duxit secum, Ciprumque relinquuit

Custodi, ceptumque classe peregit iter.

\textsuperscript{32} ‘Cypri...tirannus,’ Isaac Komnenos, who had seized Cyprus in 1184 and was in rebellion against the Byzantine emperor. See Gillingham (1999), 140-54.

\textsuperscript{33} Isaac’s designs against Richard’s betrothed, Berengaria were foiled by Richard’s timely arrival in Limassol on 6 May, \textit{IPGRR} 2.31.

\textsuperscript{34} Richard initially installed Governors, then sold Cyprus to the Templars. They in turn sold it to Guy of Lusignan in 1192 following the collapse of the kingdom of Jerusalem, and the Lusignans ruled Cyprus until 1474. Guy was the younger brother of Hugh IX de Lusignan. He had settled in the Holy Land and married Sibylla, sister of King Baldwin IV, becoming king of Jerusalem in 1186. John’s compliment to the Lusignans as Richard’s kinsmen is further evidence of a possible link between himself and the Lusignan family in France.

\textsuperscript{35} Berengaria, daughter of the King of Navarre, had been brought to Richard in Messina by his mother, Eleanor of Aquitaine. She sailed ahead, becoming separated from Richard’s main fleet. For Eleanor’s role, see Park (2016).

\textsuperscript{36} i.e. Isaac Komnenos, who was taken from Cyprus by Richard and deposited with the Hospitallers at the castle of Margat in Lebanon. He was imprisoned until released as a condition of Richard’s own release from captivity in February 1194.
Sponsam Ricardi suscepit honore Philippus

Contra germane federa facta sue,

Ducere quam propriam promiserat ante Ricardus,

Quam sua dissuasit Alienora parens.\(^{37}\)

Dromonem pro divitiis penetravit Alanus,

Qui pirata ducis trux et acerbus erat.\(^{38}\)

Gazas Parthorum varias carvana tenebat, [84v]

Sed rex collectas ense subegit opes.

Parthica signa Iopem invadunt;\(^{39}\) dextra Ricardi

Hanc tegit et litus in statione tenet.

Quam prius accepit, defendit; et huic Saladinus

Magnum pro magno munere misit equum.

Ad gentem propriam famulum tulit efferus unum,

Sic ipsum regem proripuisset equus.\(^{40}\)

Quando Semiramios campestri marte tyrannos

Confecit, tantos fecit adesse metus

\(^{37}\) Richard was still betrothed to Alice, Philip’s sister. See Gillingham (1999), 142 & n. 5.

\(^{38}\) See lines 87-90 and n. 25 above for John’s speculative etymology. \textit{IPGRR} 2.42 covers the incident of the \textit{dromon}. Alan is not mentioned by name, and the sailors who dived under the ship (more plausibly) tied its rudder. \textit{CM}, 2.23 again does not specify Alan but has the underwater holing version. I am indebted to Stephen Bennett for identifying him almost certainly as Alan Trenchemer, captain of Richard’s royal \textit{esnecca} / fast warship. John’s reference shows he was well-known and that this feat was familiar to his readers. See Rose (2013), 43-45.


\(^{40}\) End sentence at ‘\textit{equus},’ with sense. For this story see \textit{IPGRR} 6.22, and Nicholson’s translation, p. 364, n. 67. The \textit{Itinerarium} treats this as a genuine gift, whereas John has adopted the version in \textit{Eracles}, 140, where it is presented as a trick. It was Saphadin (al-Ádil Sáif al-Dín), not Saladin, who sent the horse. See also Tolan (2008), 88.
145 Quod post facta ducis reducem timuere subacta

Morte venire ducem, seque subesse duci.  

Est a rege dies Francorum fixa Ricardo

Urbis ad insultus, et favet ille libens.

Convocat ergo suos, alios pretio trahit. Illi

Omnibus ingeniis menia summa petunt.

Larga manus victrix mentes irretit avaras,

Excitat et timidas, vivificatque pigras.

Pictavus, Andegavus, Normannus et Anglicus instant,

Vasco, Uvallensis, Cornubieque globus.

150 Implantur fossata solo, dat murus hiatum,

Fitque Machometi victima clausa cohors.

Rex postquam fregit muros Tholomaïdis, intrans

Austricus hanc princeps signa priora locat.

Indignans victor sua posteriora locari

155 Austrica vexilla iussit in antra iaci.  

<52> Sed dicunt aliter alii quod castra removit

41 Richard became a ‘bogey-man’ figure for future generations of Muslims, Eracles, 141, Joinville, 558.
42 After a digression on Richard’s achievements, John returns to the siege of Acre. For a fuller account see Gillingham (1999), 155-71.
43 Read, with MS, ‘alios pretio trahit. Illi...’ for Wright’s ‘aves pretio trahit, illae’.
44 IPGRR says that Philip and Richard amicably divided the city between themselves without acrimony, making no reference to Leopold VI, Duke of Austria. This story appears in Richard of Devizes, 46-47, and others. See Gillingham (1999), 224-26.
Ipse ducis castris ad loca grata suis.\textsuperscript{45}

Istud origo mali fuerat, factumque Philippo

Displicuit, fuerat hic quia summus ibi.\textsuperscript{46}

Toxica qui fingunt alii, mendacia fingunt,

Laudis enim cupidi. Discrepuere duces,\textsuperscript{47}

Nam grossi cunei remanere foramine parvo

Non possunt per quos rimula parva crepit.\textsuperscript{48}

Reddita Crux esset, Iudeaque tota subacta,

Sed procerum voluit quilibet esse prior.\textsuperscript{49}

Gaudia sunt parta Parthis, elegia mestis

Christicolis lacrimas fudit in ora novas.

Ricardi reditu dux Austricus undique ponit

Insidias; tantus non latitare potest.

Rex igitur capitur et venditur.\textsuperscript{50} Ille redemptus

\textsuperscript{45}‘loca grata,’ Ovid, \textit{Tristia}, 1.1.15.

\textsuperscript{46}John seems to be saying that Philip was displeased that Richard expelled Leopold without his agreement. He explicitly treats Leopold’s subsequent imprisonment of Richard as revenge for this episode, and a direct cause of Richard’s energies being diverted away from the Holy Land because of the intensification of his differences with Philip.

\textsuperscript{47}Cp. \textit{EBVM}, 4.89-92. ‘\textit{Urbe quidem capta, quam rumor clamitat Acron, / Perdomitaque iope, discrepuere duces.}’

\textsuperscript{48}Read ‘crepit’ for Wright’s ‘crepat.’ The MS could have either reading.

\textsuperscript{49}See Gillingham (1999), 253, and n. 116, for the contemporary idea that Leopold’s imprisonment of Richard was the reason for the failure to liberate the Holy Land.

\textsuperscript{50}For the capture, imprisonment and ransoming of Richard, see \textit{IPGRR} 6.37. Richard was captured and imprisoned by Leopold VI in Vienna on 20 December 1192, transferred to the custody of Emperor Henry VI, and released on 4 February 1194.
Rothomagum veniens altera bella movet.\textsuperscript{51}

Extendit metas bellis, contraque Philippum

Floret sub tanto Neustria clara duce.

A Bruto dicti Britones timuere Ricardum,

Qui velut Arthuro colla subacta dabunt,\textsuperscript{52}

Scilicet Arthuro qui straverat agmina Rome,

Galvani gladio consilioque probi.

Sunt ex Angligenis concives etheris alti

Et terre domini magnanimique duces.

Concedo sanctos Britonum de gente fuisse [85r]

Multos, sed plures discrepuere Deo.\textsuperscript{53}

Extremo regi Britonum vox celica iussit

Quod non impeteret Anglica regna magis.\textsuperscript{54}

Nomine Cathualadrus Romanam venit ad urbem

In qua felici fine sepultus erat.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{51} Richard landed on 13 March 1194. He lost no time in mopping up pockets of resistance in England and invading France in May. For details of Richard’s campaigns, see Gillingham (1999), 283-320.

\textsuperscript{52} Arthur, Duke of Brittany, was Richard’s nephew and, until Richard was on his deathbed, his heir. After Richard’s death, Brittany declared for Arthur, who had declared allegiance to Philip, rather than to John, the new king. For King Arthur’s conquest of the Roman armies in Gaul, to referred to here, see GM, 9.250-305.

\textsuperscript{53} Read ‘multos’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘multorum’.

\textsuperscript{54} GM, 11.563, ‘vox angelica’. GM 11.563-586 covers Caduallo’s visit to Pope Sergius and death in Rome, reportedly in 689 CE.

\textsuperscript{55} Read ‘felici’ with MS for Wright’s ‘felice’.
Dum quidam Bavius de Bruto carmina ructat,\textsuperscript{56}

Detrahit Angligenis. Cur? Timet, odit eos.\textsuperscript{57}

Non minus in triviis sunt gesta canenda Ricardi

In cuius radiat morte cometa rubens.\textsuperscript{58}

\textit{Anglia, quem calicum thesauris tota}\textsuperscript{59} sacrorum

Ante redemit eum, perdere morte dolet.

Centum mille dedit marchas et mille Ricardus

Sex decies; redimi mortuus ere nequit.

Mirus thesaurus inventus in arce Caluchi\textsuperscript{60}

Hunc domat, ex auro cultor, aratra, boves.\textsuperscript{61}

Hunc dum thesaurum rex exigit, et breve castrum

Obsidet, et turmas in statione locat,

\textsuperscript{56} Bavius, a proverbially bad poet, lampooned in Vergil’s \textit{Ecl.} 3.90-91. John’s contemporary target is probably Layamon, an English priest, whose \textit{Brut} (c. 1215) is a Middle English account of Brutus of Troy’s mythical journey to Britain based on Wace’s \textit{Chanson de Brut}. See also Alain de Lille, \textit{De Planctu}, 9.32, \textit{Carmina dat Bavius, Musa Maronis hebet}. John’s language derides Layamon’s choice of the English language.

\textsuperscript{57} Horace, \textit{Serm.}, 2.1.23 ‘Cum sibi quisque timet, quamquam est intactus, et odit.’

\textsuperscript{58} Vergil \textit{Aen}, 10.272-73, ‘...si quando nocte cometae / Sanguinei lugubre rubent,...’. I have not been able to find other references to astronomical phenomena at Richard’s death. See however \textit{Philippide}, 12.489, where a comet marks Philip II’s.

\textsuperscript{59} The scribe has deleted ‘suorum.’

\textsuperscript{60} The château of Châlus-Chabrol, Haute-Vienne.

\textsuperscript{61} Various versions of the ‘hidden treasure’, allegedly unearthed by a farmer and given to his lord, appear in, e.g. William le Breton, \textit{Philippide}, 5.496-99 & \textit{Gesta}, 98, RH., 4.82. Neither Ralph of Coggeshall or the \textit{Chronica Majora} mentions it. For a full survey of the evidence and a different slant, see Gillingham (1979), who argues that Richard’s motives were political, aimed at punishing disloyal vassals.
Heu, facinus! proprius miles Basilius illum.
   Telo consequitur visus ab arce procul.

Arce tamen capta, moriens sua regna Iohanni
   Tradidit, at felix non dedit omen ei.

Anglorum regno contentus, cetera liquit.
   Gentis fraude levis, magne Philippae, tibi.

Fratrem si fratris audacia fausta beasset
   Non sua terra dolis apocopanda foret.

Inclitus at miles fuerat; Mirabel probat illud,
   Regis ubi mater Alienora fuit.

Illic Arthurus aviam circumdedit, et rex
   Circumdans illum premia solvit ei.

Mons Albanus eum tremuit, quia Vascone multo.
   Hic capto vinculis fortia colla dedit.

Evertit nemora variis Hibernica bellis,
   Ad Stigisintroitus perniciiique lacus

62 On the name of Richard’s killer John follows CM, 2.451. Different MSS of Philippide, 5.577 have ‘Dudo’ and ‘Guido,’ which Delaborde amends to ‘Gurdo,’ to follow RH, 4. 82-83. For ‘heu facinus!’ cp. Lucan 8.604, at the death of Pompey.
63 The ‘n’ in ‘linquit’ is marked as an error in the text. Read ‘liquit’ with Wright.
64 ‘Apocopanda’; non-classical form, from the grammatical term ‘apocope’, dropping a letter at the end of a word. ‘Gentis levis’ is probably a reference to the fickle Poitevin nobles, whose defection helped Philip capture Normandy (1204), Anjou and Poitou.
65 John captured Mirebeau in Poitou in 1202 from his nephew Arthur, who was supported by Philip as legitimate ruler of the Angevin territories in France. (see n. 52 above)
66 Montauban, occupied by rebellious Gascon vassals, was besieged and captured by John in July / August 1206.
67 John’s short but successful Irish expedition was in 1210. See Church (2015), 180-84 for an account of it.
Purgant ut dicunt hic purgatoria vivos,\(^{68}\)

\[220\] Si sint constanti pectora fixa fide.

Viribus Ecclesie Romane fortia bella

Submisit pedibus precipitata suis.

Effectus laïcus fuit hoc\(^{69}\) in tempore doctor

Oxonie; viguit sensibus ipse tamen.

\[225\] Omni litterula privatus scivit; et ivit

Ut laïcus, sero vir Plato, mane rudis.

Hic de Londoniis fuerat, dictusque Iohannes,\(^{70}\)

Philosophos iuveni legerat ante mihi.

De Longo Campo florebat quando Iohannes,\(^{71}\)

Cuius non debet gloria longa mori,

\(<54>\) Predixit populo, prefatus bella futura.

\(^{68}\) St. Patrick’s Purgatory was and is a place of pilgrimage on Lough Derg, where according to legend St. Patrick was able to give a glimpse of hell to the pious souls of the living. According to Le Goff (1981), 193-201 & n. 20, 397-8, this was the first specific geographical designation of purgatory.

\(^{69}\) Read ‘hoc’ with Paetow, for ‘hic’ in MS and Wright.

\(^{70}\) On John of London, see Introduction, 16-17. See also Wright’s foreword, v-vi, and Paetow, \(MS\), Intro. 83-85.

\(^{71}\) Lines 229-30 in this edition were clearly wrongly located by the scribe in the MS, and hence in Wright’s edition. Immediately following the present lines 283-84 in a misplaced block of two distichs (4 lines), they appear in the MS after what is now line 294 in the present edition. In this original position, the identity of Iohannes and the relevance of \(De Longo Campo\) are obscure. There is no identifiable Iohannes Longchamp, and the sentence has no relevance in its original context. John of Garland refers elsewhere to himself as Iohannes in the third person, but that makes no sense here. Relocated, these lines place a time frame on John of London’s relatively advanced years as a master. They suggest that John of London was predicting future wars when ‘Longchamp’ was in his prime. This could be William Longchamp, Chancellor of England, 1189-91. But a more credible candidate is Master Radulphus de Longo Campo (d.o.b. 1153-60), a devotee of Alan of Lille, with French and English connections, scientific interests and connections in Languedoc, J. Sulowski ed., \(In Anticlaudianum Alani Commentum\), vi-xii (Warsaw, 1972). Line 223 says that Iohannes was a doctor at Oxford ‘hoc in tempore.’ Preceding and following lines refer to King John’s submission to the pope (1213).
Discipulis qui dedit hec documenta suis:

Aëre surgentes tenues aliquando vapore

Frigo constrictam constituere nivem.

Aëre largato per Phebi spicula grando

Turget, sic pluvie guta gelata cadit.

Aërias nubes si sol dissolvit et illas [85v]

Inpellit ventus, fit pluvialis aqua.

Nubibus elisis inflammant ethera venti,

Sic aliquando cadens fulmen ad ima venit.

E tellure cava cupiens erumpere ventus

Hanc movet, et motu menia sepe ruunt.

Solis ab opposito se curvat discolor Iris,

Oceanumque bibens nubibus haurit aquas.

Phebus pallescit, obiecto corpore lune,

Terre lunares inficit umbra genas.

Frigidus et siccus ventus vapor est resolutus

Ex terris et aquis; sic Avicenna canit.\(^{72}\)

Accidit alterius forme commixtio ventis

Quam casus confert ex regione sua.\(^{73}\)

---

\(^{72}\) Avicenna’s (c. 980-1037) doctrines were proscribed in Paris in 1210. Many of his works had been translated into Latin in Toledo in the twelfth century. For his philosophy, see Marenbon, 103-14.

\(^{73}\) Read ‘sua’ with MS, rather than Wright’s ‘ista’. John is saying that the weather the wind brings depends on the combination of land and sea over which they have passed.
Coram Pandulpho legato regna Iohannes

Pape submisit, et diadema suum.

Regna per Ecclesiam tenuit, per bella, per equor,

Per que defecit digna perire manus.

Septenis annis tamen interdicta relict

Porticus Ecclesie, plurima damna tuit.

Causa fuit Stephanus primas. Cessante procella,

Ecclesie tandem pax datur, immo brevis.

Nam Ludovicus adest pro libertate tenenda

Baronum; surgit pugna, rapina, dolor.

Sed rex occurrit, armata plebe favente,

Et perit in causa baiulus ipse Crucis.

74 Rubric in left margin, ‘De interdicto Angliae, et discordia baronum.’ John makes no direct reference to Magna Carta, either in its 1215 version or in either of the revisions in 1216 and 1217.

75 John accepted papal terms before the legate Pandulphus in May 1213, and placed his lands under the protection of the pope.

76 ‘per bella, per aequora,’ Lucan, 3.24. The reference to to ‘battles and the sea’ probably relates to Prince Louis’ defeats at Lincoln and Sandwich shortly after John’s death and the ‘army’/‘manus’ is Louis’, which lost support at John’s death. But these lines are difficult to interpret and may be corrupt.

77 ‘militia fuerat digna perire sua,’ Ovid, Am. 2.14.6. See also line 288.

78 John of Garland is counting seven years from King John’s victory at Mirebeau (DTE, 3.211) to his excommunication in 1209, during which he lost the Angevin lands in France except for Aquitaine.

79 Stephen Langton, created archbishop of Canterbury in 1207 by Innocent III and resisted as candidate for the post by John.

80 Rubric in left margin, ‘De adventu Ludowici in Angliam.’ The dissident barons invited Philip II’s eldest son, Louis, to England to assume the crown. He invaded in 1216 and occupied more than half the country. Some of his support wavered when King John died and the nine-year-old Henry III was crowned. As recounted by John, Louis was defeated at the battle of Lincoln through the decisive leadership of William Marshal. His backing in England dwindled rapidly, and he withdrew ignominiously in 1217. On Prince Louis generally, see Hanley (2016). Her note on sources and further reading, pp. 257-61, is most helpful.

81 King John had taken the Cross in 1216, and the papal legate Guala gave the campaign against Louis crusade status, as defence of lands under papal protection. A popular poem in Latin hexameters
Quidam decipiunt regem, quidam Ludovicum,
Sed finem neutra pars capit inde bonum.

<55>Heu, dolus! Hic largus, hic fortis,\textsuperscript{82} tincta veneno
Pessica consumit, et lue ventris obit.\textsuperscript{83}

Sicit de lino tenduntur fila reducto,
Casibus ex variis ethica dicta traho.

Hinc gravis emergit elegia. Nam gladiorum

Officium peragunt toxica mixta cibis.

Sunt ducibus metuenda duo; suggestio prava,
Virus et occultum; mors in utroque latet.

Occidit virus multos, suggestio plures,

Inde per effectus est ea peior eo.

Post mortem regis baronum maxima strages
Subsequitur, domina predominante proba.\textsuperscript{84}

Femina prevalidam Nicolam Lincolnia dicit.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{82} John is notably complimentary to King John here.

\textsuperscript{83} King John died, probably of dysentery \textit{c}. 19 October, 1216. Wendover, \textit{CM}, 2.668, agrees that John ate peaches, but blames his sickness on excess or on the effects of alcohol.

\textsuperscript{84} The singling out of Falkes and Marshal, the reference back to \textit{probita} in line 264, and the use of \textit{domina} suggest that this refers to Nicolaa. Even without this reference, John gives her a more prominent role than other sources.

\textsuperscript{85} Line 277, to restore metre read \textit{prevalidam} for \textit{prevalida} in MS and Wright. Lines 277-78 appear in the MS and in Wright immediately after line 264 of the present edition, out of time sequence and without meaning. They have been relocated to make good sense. The reference is to Nicholaa de la
Stat pro rege suo, vi, probitate, fide.

Illam iuverunt regales, Falco, \textsuperscript{86} comisque

Williermus, \textsuperscript{87} cuius est veneranda fides,

Hic quia Londonias obsedit, fecit et hostes

Viribus hinc regni fortis abire suos.

Eius scutiferum movet Anglos undique plaustrum, \textsuperscript{88}

Tironesque probos mensa rotunda\textsuperscript{89} probat.

Cetera sed taceo, qua condicione recessit\textsuperscript{90}

Gallicus hinc heres, plebs quia novit eam.

Magnanimum quidam Ludovicum quando

relinquunt Contra promissum claudicat egra

manus.

Profuit adventus Ludovici, ne violaret \textsuperscript{86r}

Regia vis proceres, exilioque daret.

Patri succedens Henricus vendicat armis

---

Haye, redoubtable castellan of Lincoln Castle, who defended it on behalf of the infant Henry III against the French, and earlier for Richard against John, RD, 31. See Wilkinson (2007), 13-26, for further information on Nicholaa. John is highlighting the fact that ‘Nicolam’ is an anagram of ‘Lincolnia,’ with the ‘m’ of ‘Nicolam’ equating to the ‘In’ of ‘Lincolnia’ in medieval script. Wright almost spotted the word-play, p. 154, ‘The Normans appear not to have been able to pronounce the name Lincoln, and they call it Nichol.’

\textsuperscript{86} Falkes de Bréauté.

\textsuperscript{87} William Marshal, Earl of Pembroke

\textsuperscript{88} See n. 85 above. Lines 283-84 have been moved from their clearly incorrect place in the MS and in Wright’s edition. They manifestly refer to William Marshal’s prowess as a knight and convenor of tournaments.

\textsuperscript{89} ‘Mensa rotunda’ / ‘round table’ was a form of group combat in tournaments. See CM, 5. 318-19. Matthew Paris uses this same phrase, more usually ‘tabula rotunda,’ to describe a notorious event in 1252.

\textsuperscript{90} Rubric in left margin, ‘De fuga Ludovici.’ Louis received a payment and promised to ask his father to return the Angevin lands in France to Henry. In fact after Philip’s death in 1223, Louis VIII seized Poitou and Gascony in 1224, and Henry hastily sent an army which recovered only Gascony in 1225.
Illa manu forti que Ludovicus habet.

Hic Ludovicus erat Ludovici filius, armis

Cuius succubuit Avinionis honor.  

Disce parentelam regum qui noscere queris,

Heu! Consanguinei non bene Bella movent.

<56> Regis Ricardi magni nupsere sorores

Tres tribus, et gaudent triplus prole sua.  

Regi Castelle datur hec, comitique Tholose

Altera, Saxonie tertia nupta duci.  

Rex genuit Blancam, comitem comes inde Remundus,

Et dux Othonem cui data Roma fuit.

Otho mirificus miles, Paris ore, manuque

Hector, dispargens munera Titus erat.  

Stampas poscebat et Aurelianas,  

---

91 Lines 283-84 and 229-30 followed line 294 in that order in MS, followed by Wright, See nn. 71 and 85. Louis VIII took Avignon after a siege in 1226 (see DTE 5.237-40)

92 This reference to Richard I’s pedigree would also reflect on his kinsmen, the Lusignans.

93 Matilda married Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, Eleanor married Alfonso VIII of Castile, and Joan married first William of Sicily, then Raymond V of Toulouse. Their respective offspring were the Emperor Otto IV; Blanche of Castile, wife of Louis VIII and mother of Louis IX; and Raymond VI of Toulouse.

94 A veritable paragon. John uses commonplace medieval role models, Paris for beauty, Hector for bravery and the Emperor Titus for generosity. Otto’s reported prowess enhances Philip’s victory at Bouvines. IPGRR, 2.5 applies similar classical comparisons to King Richard.
Quas dedit  
ironica voce Philippus ei,

‘Si probus imperii caperet Latialis habenas.’

Sed dedit has illi cum probitate Deus.

Othonis causa murus circumdedit urbem

Parisius; muro cessat agreste solum.

In Gallos agitat gladios obstante Philippo,

Sed multis captis hic nequit hoste capi.

Electos equites dum dissipat ense Bovinis,

Et ferus irrumpit agmina, solus abit.

Post consanguineam duxit Fredericus Othonis,

Que Rome fuerat imperialis honor.

Magnanimo nupsit Ludovico Blanca; parentis

Belligeri nomen filius eius habet.

95 Read ‘Aurelianas’ for ‘Aurelianis.’ Chronica Minora, 2.109, ‘Rex utique Francorum incircumspecto sermone praedixerat et invectivo et yronico quod, quando Otho foret imperator, daret ei tres suas principales civitates, scilicet, Parisius, Estampeiam et Aurelianam; unde imperator eas semper exigebat et vendicabat.’ All three cities housed mints.

96 ‘dedit’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘cedit.’

97 Read ‘Si’ with MS, and sense, for Wright’s ‘Sic.’ Punctuation also varies from Wright’s, with the sense.

98 Philip ordered fortification of the Right Bank in 1190; the wall on the Left Bank was built between 1200 and 1215. John may have witnessed its construction.

99 Lines 311-14; Philip II defeated a coalition, financed by John of England, comprising German forces under the Emperor Otto IV, with English and Flemish armies, on Sunday 27 July, 1214 at Bouvines, near Tournai. John himself led an army northwards from Poitou, but it was held by Prince Louis and never reached northern France. Philip was unhorsed but rescued by his knights. The defeat greatly weakened John, who was forced the following year to sign Magna Carta, and Otto, who lost the imperial crown to Frederick II. John reports the battle in low key, fully aware of William le Breton’s lengthy coverage. See Duby (1973), 314-57, for the sources, Verbruggen (1997 trans.), 239-60, on the battle, and see Baldwin and Simons (2014) for the consequences. See also DTE, 2, nn.15 & 111.

100 Frederick II married Isabella, a sister of Henry III of England in 1235, CM, 3.323-25.
Brennius et frater Belinus, pectore matris

Nudato, firme federa pacis agunt.\(^{102}\)

Pacificant medie generos socerosque Sabine.\(^{103}\)

Sic veniat reges Blanca ligare duos.

Discordant igitur reges quos stirps ligat una,\(^{104}\)

Et mentes quorum fervida pugna coquit.

Quid facitis, reges? Avertite bella rebelles

In Parthos, bellis invigilate Crucis.

Per vos Ecclesia celebres agat alma triumphas,\(^{105}\)

Sicut per Karolum fecerat ante probum.\(^{106}\)

Hinc prope Sanctonica rex est Henricus in urbe,\(^{107}\)

Gallorum proceres hinc Talaburgis habet.\(^{108}\)

<57> Hiis campis quondam tulerant hastilia frondes\(^{109}\)

Horum quos Karolus misit in arma probos.

\(^{101}\) Louis IX, eponymous son of Louis VIII.

\(^{102}\) See GM, 3.1-232 for Brennius and Belinus The brothers were reconciled after a passionate plea to Brennius by their mother, ‘Nudatis .. uberibus.’

\(^{103}\) Livy, 1. 9-13. The Sabine women stood between the Roman and Sabine armies, and unity prevailed.

\(^{104}\) Rubric in right margin, ‘De bello inter reges apud Sanctonas, hujusque dilatione per suas causas praecedentes.’

\(^{105}\) Read ‘alma’ for Wright’s ‘arma,’ with MS.

\(^{106}\) Another invocation of Charlemagne as a glorious forebear.

\(^{107}\) Saintes.

\(^{108}\) Read ‘Talaburgis’, ‘Taillebourg’, not, With Wright, ‘Calaburgis,’ though he notes (p. 155), ‘Calaburgis should be Talaburgis.’ Lines 329-30 briefly resume the narrative of the Saintonge War from \(DTE\), 2.856, before John returns to his historical digression. Henry’s campaign resumes at line 338.

\(^{109}\) Wright, p. 155, quotes this episode at length from Pseudo-Turpin. The spears of Charlemagne’s soldiers destined for martyrdom turned into living trees in a battle against Agolandus, king of the Moors, located between Taillebourg and Saintes, Ps-T,15-16.
Agolandus in his quando victoria campis

Effugit Karoli signa sequentis eum.

335 Quem Pampilonie devictis mille peremit [86v] Milibus, et Domino debita vota tulit.\(^{110}\)

Anglia cui servit et cui vestigia flectit

Vasco levis, paucos convocat, arva petit.

Exponit\(^{111}\) pugnam mediam, sed flumen abhorret

340 Gallicitus, et biduo pignora pacta labant.\(^{112}\)

Anticipant tempore raptorum vota propinquas

Dum superant undas et nova lucra petunt.\(^{113}\)

Federa rumpuntur sed, nolo dicere, bella

In cena\(^{114}\) fiunt; cetera ferre pudet.

345 Vix locus est armis illie, vix Anglicus\(^{115}\) ense

Vix vexilla capit, vix sibi frenat equos.\(^{116}\)

Prelia dum propter aliud describere conor,

Ex his excessus extraho, damna, nephas.

\(^{110}\) Following a truce, Agolandus and Charlemagne engaged in limited combat outside Pamplona. When the numbers reached one thousand on each side, and Agolandus continued to be defeated, he promised to be baptized, but subsequently reneged. He was then killed in all-out battle, Ps-T, 21-25.

\(^{111}\) Read ‘exponit’ for ‘exposcit’ in MS and Wright, and ‘abhorret’ with Wright, for ‘abhortet’ in MS. ‘Pugnam mediam’ = ‘battle line’.

\(^{112}\) An overnight truce was negotiated by Richard of Cornwall, when it became apparent that Hugh X de Lusignan had not delivered supporting troops. The French did not want their access to the battle field to be limited by the narrow bridge over the Charente and crossed the river before the truce expired. See CM, 4,209-12 for an account.

\(^{113}\) Read ‘lucra,’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘lucta’.

\(^{114}\) 20 July was the last Sunday before the feast of St Mary Magdalene.

\(^{115}\) Read ‘Anglicus,’ with Wright, for ‘Angilicus’ in MS.

\(^{116}\) The English took advantage of the truce to retreat in haste to Saintes, pursued by the French.
Pugna fit in festo, sibi\textsuperscript{117} quod solemne quot annis

Magdalena petit pace Maria coli.\textsuperscript{118}

Sunt sacra festa precum, sunt laudis, suntque quietis,

Letitie, venie\textsuperscript{119} largiflueque manus.

Hec bona cuncta miser perdit quicumque labore

Se misero vexat et sine fine gravat.

Si labor incumbens sit honestus, sit moderatus,

Si certis horis, ille beatus erit.

Letifer\textsuperscript{120} in bellis labor est ubi mutua strages

Prosternit populos, et populatur agros.

Virtutes pereunt civiles, cautio, iustum

Spem vigor amplectens, certaque meta modi.

Fortibus occurrunt fortes. Hinc Anglicus, inde

Gallicus, hinc Vasco, Remis et inde furens.

\textit{Christicole semper posita Cruce frontis in alto}

\textit{In bellum veniunt, spe comitante fidem.}

<58> Sed cupidi quidam qui postposuere latenter

Falso iustitiam iure iubente cadunt.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{117} Read, with the sense, ‘\textit{in festo,}’ for Wright’s ‘\textit{Pugna fit infesto.}’
\textsuperscript{118} The battle of Taillebourg took place on 21 July 1242, the eve of the Feast of St. Mary Magdalene.
\textsuperscript{119} Read ‘\textit{venie}’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘\textit{nenie.}’
\textsuperscript{120} Read ‘\textit{letifer}’ / ‘fatal’ with MS and sense, for Wright’s ‘\textit{laetifer}’ / ‘joyful.’
\textsuperscript{121} This couplet, 363-64, reads like another element of the ‘hidden \textit{exhortatio’}. See \textit{DTE}, 2, n. 81.
Celum Burdegale feriunt clangore tubarum,\textsuperscript{122}

Terrificoque sono Lingonis astra quatit.\textsuperscript{123}

Hic pedes oppositus pediti, cum milite miles

Firmus stare cupit, cum pare quique suo.

Non bene fit, reges; liceat mihi querere verum,

Cur estis multis vos duo causa necis?

Vos gladiis ambos decuit decernere causam

Iuris, non partes precipitare duas.

Cesarius et pape\textsuperscript{124} placeat sedare tumultus

Ut cum pace duos federet unus amor.

Vi vel amore duos vos pacificare decebit,

Filius ut dempto supplicet ense patri.

Vos stilus hic parvus reprehendit, cartula iuste

Castigat, gracilis crimina prodit apex.

Vos tamen excusat ratio, partes quia sumunt\textsuperscript{125}

Arma due, nullo bella iubente duce.

Heu quia bellorum tempestas horrea celi

\textsuperscript{122} Lucan, 4.750-1

\textsuperscript{123} Statius, Thebaid, 12.790, ‘femineus quatit astra fragor.’ Lingonae / Lingones were the ancient inhabitants of the area around Langres, Haute Marne. Capitalise Wright’s ‘lingonis.’

\textsuperscript{124} 375-78 clearly refer to the pope and the emperor, in a section about Henry III and Louis IX. Here John is explicit that the son (Frederick II) must submit to the father (Innocent IV).

\textsuperscript{125} John waters down his condemnation of the leaders by the excuse that fighting broke out spontaneously. These lines could apply to either the Saintonge war or the imperial/papal dispute.
Impedit,\textsuperscript{126} et messes destruit ense suas.

Ingruit iniustis inferni seva procella [87r]

Reddere qui nolunt rapta sed arma movent.

Aut hoc aut simili peremit\textsuperscript{127} popularia metu

Agmina, dum reges in sua iusta probant.

Sic in preteritis determino bella futura,

Que simili\textsuperscript{128} fient aut graviore modo.\textsuperscript{129}

Occurrunt acies magno discrimine, plura

Grandine vernali tela coacta volant.

Lancea pectoribus occurrit, cuis in ictu

Milite deiecto, sella relict a vacat,

Vertitur in girum sonipes, magnoque tumultu

Prosilit, et phaleris sevior arva petit.

Frena furens mandit, et spumeus imber ab ore\textsuperscript{130}

Deflu it, et fossus sepius ense cadit.

<59> Calcaris monitu plantas attollit in auras

Et calcat domini viscera fusa sui.

Perstrinxi generale satis, speciale sequatur

\textsuperscript{126} Read ‘impedit’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘impediti’. For ‘horrea celi’/‘the granaries of heaven,’ see Matth. 13, 30. John means that war is damaging the Church’s efforts to attract and retain the faithful.

\textsuperscript{127} Read ‘peremit’ with MS, not ‘pereunt’ with Wright.

\textsuperscript{128} Read ‘simili’ with Wright, not ‘sili’ in the MS.

\textsuperscript{129} Lines 390-400 are a general description of war. John emphasises its unchanging horror.

\textsuperscript{130} Vergil, \textit{Aen.} 4.135, ‘\textit{Stat sonipes ac frena ferox spumantia mandit}.’ See \textit{EBVM}, 8.509-17 for a similar graphic passage.
Certamen. Probitas sit manifesta probi.  

Gallia quid valeat patet hic, quam Martia virtus  

Armis non superat belli potensque globus.  

Anglia cui mater fuerat, cui Gallia nutrix  

Matri nutricem prefero Marte meam.  

Sic utriusque tamen meritis preconia iustis  

Attribuo, niteant ut probitate pares.  

Gallica Barrensis precedit signa Johannes;  

Hostica rimando viscera querit iter.  

Patrissare studet Williamum dum sibi patrem  

Barrensem gladio comprobat esse suo.  

Dudum Ricardo fuit hic a rege secundus  

Quem timuit fortem gens inimica Deo.  

Iuxta Ierusalem geminorum more leonum  

Straverunt Arabes hii duo, morte, fuga.

Filius ergo memor patriae probitatis, in arma

131 There is a hint of irony to line 402. John sets out his intention of demonstrating the valour of heroes from the aristocracy of both sides. See Introduction, 23-24. for the possibility that John is singling out patrons for special mention.  

132 John reveals that he was born in England. See Introduction, 15-20. He declares his neutrality in lines 405-06, whilst acknowledging French military supremacy. The context leaves no doubt that 'Marte' in the MS is correct, rather than Paetow’s 'arte.' The comparison is neat, since William des Barres fought in the English army.  

133 John des Barres was the son of William des Barres, a Third Crusade hero, IPGRR, 4.10. He was captured at Saintes with six other French knights by William de Say, and subsequently exchanged, CM, 4.213. See also DTE, 3.507-10.  

134 Read 'more' with Wright, not 'morte' in MS. The reference to lions reminds the reader that Richard was the Lionheart. This refers to the battle of Arsuf, where William des Barres fought bravely, IPGRR, 4.19.
Anglica prorumpit et metit ense viam.

Motus enim subitus diviserat Anglica signa,

Donec confertos\(^{135}\) moverat ordo viros.

Federe contracto pacis, movet intima corda

Anglorum stimulans hos probitate dolor.

Bella tamen vulgus leve cepit, movit et ambas

Partes, Angligenis damna priora ferens.

Illos spes allata movet nec eos timor aufert

Quamvis sint pauci, sed vigor armat eos.

Precedunt valide baliste, missa sagitta

Prevolat in campum; post probus instat eques.

Henrici regis consultor magnus et audax

Radulphus regis ductus amore preit.\(^{136}\)

Claro patre satus Nicholao nomine teste

In populo victor previa scuta gerit.

\(<60>\) Lancea dum dextram munit pretenta, repulsum

Hostem precipitat, cornipedemque ferum.

Patroclum quondam sic Troie fuderat Hector [88r]

Exultans spoliis nomen habere novis.\(^{137}\)

Ingreditur campum dominans Elegia, pallens

\(^{135}\) Read ‘\textit{confertos}’ for ‘\textit{consertos}’ in MS and Wright.

\(^{136}\) Ralph Fitz-Nicholas, a senior advisor to Henry III, \textit{CM}, 4.213.

\(^{137}\) ‘\textit{nomen}’ = ‘reputation’, a common Ciceronian use.
Atropos\textsuperscript{138}, indignans ira, dolorque recens. 

Immemores multi quid agent in luce suprema 

Mundi, tempestas quos baratralis aget, 

Ad mortem se constimulant. Heu, quantus in armis 

Et qualis sudor agmina densa rapit. 

Ad Crucis arma tamen multos servavit in isto 

Conflictu, celi gratia, velle Dei.\textsuperscript{139} 

Clarensem comitem de Claromonte\textsuperscript{140} coartat 

Ire retro dominus, dum retro nutat equus. 

Flandrenses clipes flammescunt excutiuntque 

Dovorie clipes, acephalantque viros. 

Dum mens propugnat utrimque, quod optat in actum 

Exilit et voto sunt rea corda suo. 

Anteos\textsuperscript{141} fortes et quos argutia ducit 

Anglia producit viribus arte vigens. 

Gallia quadrupedes in eos convertit et hastas 

Et gladios, et eos undique mixta ferit.

\textsuperscript{138} One of the Parcae, or Fates. 

\textsuperscript{139} 'velle' (noun), post-classical, = ‘wish, will’. 

\textsuperscript{140} This obscure line appears to refer to Richard de Clare, sixth earl of Gloucester, who returned to England with Richard of Cornwall in 1242, leaving Henry in France, CM, 4.229. The reference to his horse could be a jocular reference to his apparition of retreating, battle-scarred horses in 1236, CM, 3.368. The whole reference may be ironic; though saved from the battle, he never went on crusade. 

\textsuperscript{141} Antaeus was a classical giant, overcome by Hercules.
Simon de Monte Forti,\textsuperscript{142} mons fortis in hostem
\begin{quote}
Grassatur, fundit viscera, colla metit.
\end{quote}

Rogerus Bigoth cognomine robore fundit
\begin{quote}
Turmas Francorum quas violenter agit.
\end{quote}

Guillelmus longo nomen sortitus ab ense
\begin{quote}
Effundit longo sanguinis ense globos.\textsuperscript{143}
\end{quote}

Anglis occurrunt Galli, Campania stravit
\begin{quote}
Cornubios,\textsuperscript{144} ambos mutua fata trahunt.
\end{quote}

Hic aliquis moritur, moreretur quo Crucis hostis,
\begin{quote}
Vita tenax illi si diurna foret.
\end{quote}

Abbreviant magis arma brevem funebria vitam,
\begin{quote}
Dum mors occurrit et stimulata venit.
\end{quote}

 Pro dominis terre concurrunt turbine vasto,
\begin{quote}
Pro domino celi, quid didicere pati?
\end{quote}

Non metuit gladios iaculo secura volanti
\begin{quote}
Wallia nud pedes, Scotia curta togas.
\end{quote}

Cum perone tamen agilique per agmina cursu
\begin{quote}
Dum quidam volitant, vulnera nulla timent.\textsuperscript{145}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{142} Simon de Montfort, 6th earl of Leicester (1208-65), son of Simon de Montfort (c. 1175-1218).
\textsuperscript{143} Roger Bigod, 4th Earl of Norfolk, and William Longespée II, whose valour and death in the Seventh Crusade are recounted by John, \textit{DTE} 8.351-54. Both are singled out, with Simon de Montfort, for their valour at Saintes by \textit{CM}, 4.213.
\textsuperscript{144} The Cornish are also mentioned in John’s account of the Third Crusade, \textit{DTE}, 3.154. They no doubt accompanied Richard of Cornwall.
\textsuperscript{145} ‘\textit{Vulnera nulla timent,},’ Venantius Fortunatus, 3, \textit{Ad Villicum Episcopum Melitensem}, 24.
Vel sequar hic famam, vel ei conformia fingam.

Confiteor, mendax ne prober esse Deo. ¹⁴⁶

Quidam pro palma pugnant, famamque sequuntur

Multi; pars moritur dum sibi lucra petit.

Orant ex auro vitulum quibus est deus aurum,

Auro pugnantes postposuere Deum.

Tuta Lotoringos invadit Hibernia tenso

Arcu nec longe gesa recurva timet.

Ducens pugnantes pugnat licet otia ducat,

Indignusque piger turget honore probi.

Bolonius comes¹⁴⁷ hinc properat stragemque cruentam¹⁴⁸

Condensat; campum purpurat imbre rubro.

Viribus Hispani vires Leicestrius omnes¹⁴⁹

Obicit; Hispanum deicit usque solum.

Sed citius surgit hostemque requirit; at ille

Prosilit ut sociis robore prestet opem.

Magnanimus cadit in bello, timidum timor aufert

Nec sequitur logice; si cadit, ergo timet.

Barrensem varia gaudentem cede Iohannem

¹⁴⁶ John confesses to embroidering the action, Introduction, 50-51. ‘Confiteor’, first word of the prayer of confession in the Mass. ‘Omnis homo mendax’, Ps. 115.11.

¹⁴⁷ Alphonse, count of Boulogne by marriage, became Alfonso III of Portugal (1248-79). John refers to him as ‘Hispanum’. Not to be confused with Louis IX’s brother, Alphonse.

¹⁴⁸ Read ‘hinc’ with Wright, not ‘hunc’ as in MS.

¹⁴⁹ Leicestrius = Simon de Montfort.
Cancia\textsuperscript{150} non patitur, sed furit hucque volat.

Cor mihi complosis pulsant suspiria palmis

Iugera dum cessant, viscera cultor arat.

Agmina qui sternunt, qui vastant rura, relidant

Sic Carrhas, Memphim, Niliacosque duces.\textsuperscript{151}

Huc agiles Cumbri quos frigida Cumbria misit

Concurrunt; framea munit et armat eos.

Cumbris occurrunt Alpina falce Gebenne,\textsuperscript{152}

Et toto nisu Gallica signa fovent.

<62> Iuxta Londinias arcus Essexia\textsuperscript{153} tendens

Et fundas faciens hic gerit arma sua.

Iuxta Parisius Pontisara\textsuperscript{154} non minor arcus

Arcubus opponit. Dispare fine tamen,

Nam fundis crebris confunditur, immo vigorem

Corbie telis Attrebatique capit.\textsuperscript{155}

Guillelmus Sayus, Bernerius inde Ioannes

\textsuperscript{150} Cancia = Kent.

\textsuperscript{151} Read ‘Carrhas’ for ‘Charras’ in MS, retained by Wright. Carrhae was the battle in which Crassus was killed by the Parthians in 53 BC; it is used as a proxy for any Middle Eastern battlefield defeat. See also DTE, 8.537. Similarly Memphis signifies any Egyptian town.

\textsuperscript{152} ‘Gebennae’ / ‘men of the] Cévennes.’

\textsuperscript{153} A glowing reference here and in line 505 to the archers and slingers of Essex, probably John’s home county. See Introduction, 19-20.

\textsuperscript{154} Pontoise.

\textsuperscript{155} La Corbie and Arras in Picardy.
Barrensi vires opposuere suas.\textsuperscript{156}

Huius in auxilium dux hoc Burgundus adesse

Approperat, Martem fulminis instar\textsuperscript{157} agens.

Aut hoc aut simili certant concurrere pacto.

Est mihi pro facto sepe quod esse solet.\textsuperscript{158}

Hic dolor, hic gemitus, pedes hic occubit equesque;\textsuperscript{159}

Et neutri parti parcere Parcha potest.\textsuperscript{160}

Si gladiis istis incredula turba periret

Gauderem; doleo quod pia turba perit.\textsuperscript{161}

Hebreus dudum legis tentebat in hostes;

Nostrates proprii sanguinis imbre madent.\textsuperscript{162}

Sunt alii pre mente Crucis vexilla tenentes

Qui iam proponunt longius ire Pharon.\textsuperscript{163}

Heu quia dum pugnant acies, inimicus amicus,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[156] William de Say (1190-1271/2), Lord of Berling, John Berners, see Introduction, n. 33. Hugh IV (1213-71) was duke of Burgundy, who later accompanied Louis IX on the Seventh Crusade.
\item[158] Another clear statement of John’s definition of military history, see line 473 and Introduction, p. 51.
\item[159] It is pleasing to see in Petrarch’s \textit{Africa} 3.246, ‘Hic dolor, hic gemitus animarum admissa luentum,’ but sadly there is no proof that he read \textit{DTE}.
\item[160] ‘Parcha’, identified in line 3.437 above as Atropos, one of the three Fates, and responsible for choosing the time and manner of death.
\item[161] John makes clear that he would have no regrets if this slaughter had been of Muslims—or heretics—in a crusade.
\item[162] John justifies war against non-Christians by reference to the Hebrews’ attacks on the ‘enemies of the law’, and to earlier generations of European crusaders.
\item[163] It is unclear to which future crusade John is referring. The ‘Barons’ Crusade’ had ended the previous year. Louis IX’s commitment came in 1244. John is probably anticipating the planning of the Seventh Crusade if he wrote this passage as late as that. Note the reference to ‘Pharon’ a poetic name for Egypt, (e.g. Lucan, 8.564) though literally denoting the lighthouse of Alexandria.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Cognitus ignotus, equus iniquus erit.

Certificare data non est leve vulnera, ferre

Nomina, letales notificare modos.

525 Hos animat sanctus Dionisius et sacer illos

Edmundus. Nutat pendula palma ducum

Qui terram petiere, iacent inhumataque membra,

Lintea non velant, terraque nulla tegit.

Marchio Francigenis obstat, sed casus ut urget

530 Cras Hugo cogetur Gallica signa sequi.

Stat dum stare potest stabilis, qui bella movendo

Non est Enea nec Diomede minor.

Agmina convertunt in eum Ludovitica bellum;

Contos et gladios suiscipit ante, retro;

535 <63> Pugnat utraque manu, dextra, leva; ne feriatur [88v]

Hesitat; instantes pulsat utrimque tamen,

Ut scopulus gemini fluctus maris undique crebros

Sentit, et immotum mobilis unda cavat,

Sic stat hic immotus et densos accipit ictus

164 St. Denis and St. Edmund the Martyr, respectively tending the souls of the French and English dead.

165 Lines 531-40 are a glowing tribute to the knightly virtues of Hugh X of Lusignan.

166 Ovid, Fasti, 5.607, ‘illa iubam dextra, laeva retinebat amictus.’

167 Lucan, 3.628, ‘crebros latus accipit ictus.’
Donec ad hunc nati prosiluere duo.\textsuperscript{168}

In quorum Ricardus opem volat agmine denso;\textsuperscript{169}

Agmen pulvereus monstrat adesse globus.

Regius at sanguis, Robertus, roborat arma\textsuperscript{170}

Francorum. Sequitur Martia turma ducem.

Contra Ricardum properat Robertus; at illos

Nec sanguis nec eos fata coire sinunt.\textsuperscript{171}

Dissuadere nephas et deterrere fideles

A bellis cupio, dum fera bella\textsuperscript{172} cano.

Undique densantur acies, stat in aggere Mavors

Sanguineus; scutis obvia scuta crepant.

Ensibus oblucent enses, et brachia truncant

Et galeas nitidas ferrea clava cavat.

Quando cadunt plangunt sponsas natosque relictos

Archas, vasa, thoros, rura, falerna, domos.

Viscera rimantur cultri, cerebella secures

Et procul ad mortem spicula densa volant.

Quadrupedi quadrupes opponitur, ilia fessus

Tendit sub domino viscera fundit hians.

\textsuperscript{168} Guy, sire de Cognac and Hugh XI de Lusignan, who died in Egypt, just after Mansourah.

\textsuperscript{169} Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III. For ‘agmine denso’, see Vergil. \textit{Aen.}, 9.788, where Mnestheus and Serestus attack Turnus.

\textsuperscript{170} Robert of Artois, brother of Louis IX. Note the pun, ‘roborat.’

\textsuperscript{171} This implies that they avoided direct combat because of their close family relationship.

\textsuperscript{172} ‘fera bella,’ Ovid, e.g., \textit{Fasti}, 3.5.
Si commutatur alicui dextrarius, illi

560  Sepius expatians fata sinistra gerit.

Inter Christicolas dum tantas colligo strages,

Ex oculis properat plurima gutta meis. 173

In tanto strepitu conclamant Vascones, ‘Ista

Strage nova 174 Franci federa fracta luunt.

565  Iustam vindictam pia Magdalena requiret, 175

Hoc scelus in festo triste fuisse suo. 176

Lazarus huic frater Avalone clarus in arce 177

Burgunda sternet Gallica signa metu.

<64> Mittet vindictam Marthe provincia iustam,

570  Ad quam pervenit quaque sepulta iacet.’

In Tarascona pro Martha multa peregit

Mira Deus, clero testificante loci. 178

Indomitum domuit ibi quondam Martha draconem;

Postquam suscepit patria tota fidem.

173 John is reminded by the image of things left behind of Ovid’s moving lines Tristia, 1.3.3-4, ‘Cum repeto noctem qua tot mihi cara reliqui / Labitur ex oculis nunc quoque gutta meis.’

174 Read ‘nova’ with MS, not Wright’s ‘nove’. Delete, with Wright, ‘facta’ before ‘fracta,’ deleted by the scribe. In the next line correct ‘requirit’ for ‘requiret,’ with MS and Wright.

175 Lines 564-584 interrupt the narrative between 563 and 585. John was clearly prompted by invocation of a local saint to produce lines about this miraculous tale, but has not edited the text.

176 See DTE 1.315 & n.11, and 3.350-51.

177 See DTE, 2, n. 151 & Wright’s notes, p.157. According to Ioh. 11, 2, Lazarus was Mary Magdalene’s brother. His head was held to be in the church of Avalon and his body in Autun, both places of pilgrimage in Burgundy.

178 Martha. JdeM, 242-44.
Hanc dominus noster sepelivit, Frontoque presul Petragore, mira condicione tamen.¹⁷⁹

Missam Petragore celebravit Fronto, sed alma
Presulis in cathedra dormiit ipse sedens,
Spiritus exequias quasi verus homo facit, inde

Evigilans presul canonis explet opus.
Sanctus in exequis cirotelas Fronto reliquit;
Dimissus pariter anulus eius erat.
Nuntius est missus. Est anulus inde relatus,
Una relata simul est cirotela sua.

Clamat ad hoc omnis Vasco, maledictio sancti [89r]

Frontonis feriat obvia signa sibi.
Hiis indignatur verbis pars altera, densat
Ictus, exaltat corda, pedesque movet.
Conclamant Franci, ‘Sic terram Vasco requirit.

In quo Vasco iaces, liber habeto solum.’

Hiis invectivis animos pars utraque sumit

Et giro stringit interiore pedes.

Alternando locum sibi cedunt, nunc retrocedunt

¹⁷⁹ This story appears in JdeM, 244, in the life of St. Martha. St. Fronto (or Front) was believed to have lived in the first century and to have been sent with St. George by St. Peter to convert the French and to have been the first bishop of Périgueux, where the cathedral is dedicated to him. On St. Fronto, see Herrick (2010).
Isti, nunc illi, conveniuntque sibi.

Commiscentur ibi dolor et pudor. Ad mare spectat Anglicus, ad fluvium\textsuperscript{180} lumina Gallus habet. Quos Deus in campo salvat, disponit ut illi In Parthos vertant Martia signa Crucis. In mare descendit illic Chirinta propinquum,

Et properat latis impetuosus aquis. Hunc fluvium contra treugas ardentia signa Gallica transierant Martis amore\textsuperscript{181} feri.

<65> Hic retro ferre pedem non sustinet hostis, et inde Continuauit nocti bella cruenta\textsuperscript{182} labor.

Ipsos respexit celestis gratia reges, Incoluim regua qui tenuere sua. Consilio\textsuperscript{183} revocat rex Anglorum signa, satisque Est illis motus opposuisse pares.

Willielmus Sayus Barrensem ducit ad urbem Sanctonicam\textsuperscript{184} secum consociique sui.

Gallicus exclamat furor, ‘O pudor, O dolor, O fraus

\textsuperscript{180} The Charente.


\textsuperscript{182} ‘bella cruenta’, Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi, vol. 1, 12, ‘Bella cruenta silent, ubi caelica milia gaudent / cuncta...’

\textsuperscript{183} ‘Consilium revocat Anglorum’ in MS and Wright does not scan. Amend to ‘Consilium revocat rex Anglorum.’ Matthew Paris reports that it was on the advice of Hugh X de Lusignan that Henry withdrew in disorderly retreat to avoid capture, CM, 4.212.

\textsuperscript{184} Saintes.
O scelus! Abrripitur hinc eques ille probus.

Instimulemus equos, captumque sequamur et urbem

Undique succensam precipitemus humum.’

Curritur ad portas, Francos facit ira recentes

Ad bellum, strages altera crescit ibi.

Simon de Monte Forti pro menibus stat

Et contra fortä fortia bella gerit.\textsuperscript{185}

Vi claudit portas, et noctis subvenit umbra.

Castraque dimissa Gallica turma petit

Redditur interea par pro pare, milite miles,

Servus pro servo conditione pari.

Henricus quidam gladio metuendus et hasta

Est pro Barrensi tiro Iohanne datus.\textsuperscript{186}

Sole reportato motu rapientis Olimpi,

Burdegalas vadit rex equitando suus.\textsuperscript{187}

Nautarum cetus\textsuperscript{188} intrat mare classe pererrans,

Et vastans portus quos seict obesse sibi.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{185}John uses pun, alliteration and a striking hypallage, with ‘Forti.. fortä.. fortia.’

\textsuperscript{186}CM, 4.213. Henry of Hastings was captured with twenty knights and a sizeable infantry contingent. They were all exchanged for Jean des Barres and the six knights with him, captured by William de Say. See Book 3, n.133 above.

\textsuperscript{187}CM, 4.224. Henry III fled on horseback to Blaye, then to Bordeaux, hotly pursued by Louis.

\textsuperscript{188}The word used for the ship’s company in Vergil, Aen., 5.43. Much of the vocabulary from the beginning of Book 5 is used in this section of De Triumphis.

\textsuperscript{189}CM, 4. 238-9. The guardians of the Cinque Ports in England complain of frequent attacks by the French.
Quas procul oceanus absorbet gurgite vasto,

Illuc retrogradas eiaculatur aquas.

Quolibet unda die refluit bis et effluit illic

Effectu lune que dominatur aquis.

Lucani Seneceque fuit sententia talis

Nec que opinantur dicere turpe puto.\(^\text{190}\)

Cinthia\(^\text{191}\), Mercurius, Venus, et Sol, Mars, Iovis astrum [89v]

Saturnus circlos sic habuere suos.\(^\text{192}\)

Dum fluxum tardant\(^\text{193}\) alii dominando planete\(^\text{194}\)

Ordinat effectum cuilibet hora sua.

Des lune primam, des octavam sibi, quintam

Des horam decimam, talis ut ordo petit.

Huic vigena secunda datur, vigenaque summo

Tertia Saturno, quarta sit inde Iovis.

Mars horas lucis sibi vendicat inde sequentis

\(^\text{190}\) Lucan is more doubtful, see 1.412-16; Seneca De Providentia, 1.4.

\(^\text{191}\) The moon.

\(^\text{192}\) The sun and moon, as well as the known planets, were believed from Roman times to be in orbit round the Earth, in this order. Lines 635-646 describe the system of planetary hours of medieval astrology. Each planet was dominant on its own day, reflected in the names of the days. Each day (sunrise to sunset) and each night was divided into twelve unequal hours (except at the equinox), and the whole into twenty-four. The planets’ influence followed the moon’s in reverse order, hour by hour. Thus the moon was dominant in the first and eighth daytime hours of Monday (‘Moonday’), the first day, and on the third (fifteenth) and tenth (twenty-second) of the night. The rigid sequence of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, sun, Venus and Mercury followed from hour to hour, though the days were and are in the order, moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, Saturn, sun. Each planet’s influence was greatest on its named day, and within that day in its own hours, but the power of the planets was seen to be in inverse proportion to their distance from the earth. See Falk (1999), especially table on p. 125.

\(^\text{193}\) Read ‘tardant’ with MS, not ‘tardunt’ with Wright.

\(^\text{194}\) ‘planeta’ is masculine.
Ordine lunari, Mercuriusque sequens.

Ordo planetarum sic scitur, et ordo dierum,

Et quem quisque sibi querit habere diem.

Non mare fit plenum semper lunaribus horis

Dum nautis titubans itque reditque Thetis.

<66> Rostratas ferro sentit Rupella\textsuperscript{195} galeas,

Ruptaque cum rostris hec sua rostra dolet.\textsuperscript{196}

Compatit tur terris mare; strata cadavera cingunt

Dorida,\textsuperscript{197} dum Glauci purpurat ora crUor.\textsuperscript{198}

Dovorie ratibus impulsa Bolonia\textsuperscript{199} damna

Fert et agit; rivum cedis arena bibit.\textsuperscript{200}

Hugo fit Francus, dum presul mobilis\textsuperscript{201} urbis

Claves presentat, Rex Ludovice, tibi.

Est comes exemplo. Male temptat querere plura,

Qui quod habet perdit, factus inermis, inops.\textsuperscript{202}

\textsuperscript{195} La Rochelle, provided with a naval squadron by Louis and given orders to harry the English in 1242, \textit{CM}, 4. 188, 209.

\textsuperscript{196} N.b. the pun ‘Rupella’/‘rupta.’

\textsuperscript{197} Daughter of Oceanus, used by classical poets to mean ‘the sea’.

\textsuperscript{198} Read ‘\textit{Glauci}’, not ‘Clauci’ with MS and Wright. Glaucus, in Greek mythology, was a fisherman, metamorphosed into a seagod, Ovid, \textit{Met}, 13.906. ‘\textit{Glaucus}’ also means ‘bright, sparkling-grey’, contrasting with the colour of blood. The scribe again misunderstands a proper name, see Introduction, 30 & n. 100.

\textsuperscript{199} Boulogne.

\textsuperscript{200} Read ‘rivum’ with MS, not ‘rivam’ with Wright.

\textsuperscript{201} The story reverts to line 624, and the town of Saintes. The bishop of Saintes was Hugh’s envoy, who successfully struck a deal with Louis IX after his unsuccessful rebellion, \textit{CM}, 4.214-15.

\textsuperscript{202} Marbodus (c. 1035 - 1123), \textit{Libellus de ornamentis verborum}, 11, ‘\textit{Solus, inermis, inops, inglorius ecce redisti},’ \textit{PL}, 171, col. 1819. See also \textit{EBVM}, 8.195, ‘\textit{nudus, inermis, inops, deiectus….}’
Non quia perdiderat Hugo cuncta reversus ad illum

Qui pius urbana mente recepit eum. 203

Insidie quid agant demonstrat Blavia silva, 204

Qua strati pedites occuluere vias.

Anglicus hic gladius animas quot miserat Orcho,

Corpora quot terris, non capit iste stilus.

Heu, heu, cur nati fuerant, elegia quorum

Est mortis carcer et baratrale chaos?

Non tamen hos baratro stulte diiudico. Causas

Si iustas habeant, iudicet ipse Deus.

Subsequitur vindictam Dei subitanea pestis,

Aure fetor, aque lesio, febris hians,

<67> Lingua tumens, venter distentus, tabida pellis,

Oris pallor, hebes gustus, anhela205 sitis.

Flumina non nulli credunt infecta veneno,

Fontes et puteos, fercula, vasa, merum.

Hiis causis largas vaga mors extendit habenas.

Inque viis mediis corpora mota cadunt,

Funera vix capiunt tentoria; dum videt ergo

203 i.e. Louis IX. For the terms on which Louis accepted Hugh X’s allegiance, see Joinville, 103.
204 Louis’ forces nearly captured Henry near Blaye. They were then halted by a serious epidemic, which killed many and infected Louis. John recounts that the English took major advantage of this, though Matthew Paris’ account makes no such suggestions, CM, 4.224-25.
205 Read ‘anhela’ with Wright, not ‘hanela’ in MS.
Princeps bellipotens\textsuperscript{206} ista, reflectit iter.

Que secum gessit oloflammea\textsuperscript{207} Karolus olim,

Clara reponuntur, dum nive canet hiems.

Pugnam pontifices\textsuperscript{208} sunt quidam pace seuti

Proscripta, pacem nec reparare student.

De regum bonitate\textsuperscript{209} venit quod pace sequestra\textsuperscript{210}

Armatas acies signa referre iubent.

Parisius rector varios interritus audit [90r]

Rumores, palme spemque fidemque tenens.

Hinc Albigensis, hinc Tartarus arma resumit,\textsuperscript{211}

Et ferus Ecclesiam led uterque sacram.

Enucleatus erit error prius Albius.\textsuperscript{212} Optat

\textsuperscript{206} Louis IX.

\textsuperscript{207} 'Oloflammea,' (here neuter plural) or 'Oriflamme,' the red and gold banner associated with the Abbey of St. Denis and sometimes carried in battle by medieval French kings. The Song of Roland, 3093-95 notes that it was renamed from St. Martin’s banner, carried by Charlemagne. \textit{CM}, 4.210, 'ecce nostri Anglici viderunt oloflamman regis Francorum et eorundem papiliones, cum vexillis,' is the only other reference to its use on this occasion. See R. Jones (2004). See also Gaposchkin (2017), 70-71 & n. 31 for Philip II’s use of the banner before the Third Crusade and linkage of its blessing with the pilgrimage liturgy.

\textsuperscript{208} 'bishops.'

\textsuperscript{209} A five-year truce was agreed in late 1242 and signed on 23 April 1243.

\textsuperscript{210} Statius, Thebaid, 2. 425 'nec sceptra fide nec pace sequestra.'

\textsuperscript{211} \textit{CM}, 4.226, Immediately on returning to Paris, Louis sought financial support for an attack on the Cathars and Raymond of Toulouse, following the murder of Dominican inquisitors at Avignonet. Raymond, deprived of support from Henry III, soon collapsed and was forced to besiege and eliminate the Cathars at Monségur. The Mongol threat was well-known, see e.g. \textit{CM}, 4.112, and Louis was not actively engaged in fighting them.

\textsuperscript{212} i.e. in Books 4 & 5.
Melpomene\textsuperscript{213} tragica promere gesta mihi;

Vertit in exiguos elegos\textsuperscript{214} Elegia carmen

Grande, mihi mundi crimina flere vacat.\textsuperscript{215}

Extirpans heresis radices Gallica virtus

Roborat arma fide, protegit ense fidem.

Est heresis cervix Hidre capitosa, renascens

Herculis ad gladium, sepe sed icta perit.\textsuperscript{216}

Huius origo mali multis ignota modernis;

Exeat, et notulis\textsuperscript{217} nota sit illa meis.

\textsuperscript{213} Muse of tragic and lyric poetry. John means that while he should be writing about the glorious deeds of kings in a poem in epic style, his choice of elegiacs allows his subject matter and emotions to range more widely.

\textsuperscript{214} 'exiguos elegos,' Horace, \textit{AP}, 77.

\textsuperscript{215} John explicitly says that he sees \textit{De triumphis} as a poem in the high style. See Introduction, 46. His use of 'flere vacat' harks back to Statius and \textit{DTE}, Preface.7.

\textsuperscript{216} Hercules' second labour was to kill the nine-headed Hydra of Lerna, which grew new heads every time one was cut off.

\textsuperscript{217} A play on words. 'Notule' is the word usually used for musical notation. Here it means 'notes.' John ends Book 3 with a reminder of his didactic purpose.
Book 4

Incipit quartus liber. Sequitur de bellis Ecclesie contra Albigenses hereticos et de causis eorum

<68> Pace Biterrensis urbs\(^1\) quondam floruit alta,

    Fulsit et Ecclesie gloria, palma, quies.

Sepe sed inflammat minime scintillula litis

    Rixas, et rixe bellica signa movent.\(^2\)

5 Erumpunt crebri querulo de pectore treni

    Dum fleo scismatici facta prophana chori.

Est in permissis regum tolerantia bellis

    Sed fraudes heresum quis tolerare potest?

Dant belli causam potus,\(^3\) lis, ira, libido,

10 Fastus, fur, heresis, fraud, socialis amor,

Copia secura, vis ardua, ludus ineptus,

    Mens iniusta, latens livor, avara siti

O de te Fortuna queror, quia gaudia cernens

    Luges, et rides tristia bella movens.

15 Sed te Crux veneranda domat, calcat tua colla

---

\(^1\) Béziers.


\(^3\) ‘cupido’ is deleted in MS and replaced by ‘libido.’
Representations of Fortuna in the Middle Ages often showed her with long hair at the front and the back of her head bald; this was originally a characteristic of Occasio / Opportunity, and symbolised the difficulty of seizing the right moment to grab her hair. On images of Fortuna, see Battistini (2002), 310-15.

Roger II Trencavel, viscount of Béziers, Carcassonne, Albi and Razès (1167-94). There is no evidence that he went on crusade, though ancestors fought in the First and Second Crusades (Riley-Smith (1997a), 103 & n. 145). He did however support Alfonso II of Aragon in the siege of Valencia in 1185, Cheyette (2001), 334 and could have fought the Muslims earlier in Iberia, or even in the Holy Land. He married Adela, daughter of his lord, Raymond V, count of Toulouse, in 1171. There is no corroborating evidence for this story of his wife’s seduction, but it seems to have been part of local tradition and John appears to believe it. Roger did however imprison a bishop of Albi, William of Dourgne, in 1175, for unspecified reasons, Cheyette (2001), 308-18. He was released only in 1178 after military intervention by the papal legate Henri de Marcy, who excommunicated Roger (RH, 2.156 & 166). In 1179 he was again excommunicated with Raymond V for lack of zeal against the Cathars, under Canon 27 of the Third Lateran Council. Roger shifted allegiance to Alfonso II after this episode. Until the battle of Muret in 1213 (see DTE 4.415-64), the loyalties of Languedoc shifted frequently between the counts of Toulouse and the kings of Aragon. For full background on the complex regional politics, especially the Tencavels, see Graham-Leigh (2005) and Cheyette (2001).
Teste tamen fama, custos cognovit eandem,
\[ O \text{ facinus, rerum copia furta facit.} \]

Dum caro blanditur rationi, ianua cordis
\[ \text{Panditur et ratio iam rationis eget.} \]

Dum ratio carnii succumbit, sol microcosmi
\[ \text{Eclipsim patitur, lunaque lucis eget.} \]

\[ \text{Est caro luna, iubar solis\textsuperscript{6} non invenit; immo,} \]
\[ \text{Excecas ipsam,\textsuperscript{7} ceca palude iacet. [90v]} \]

Multi non credunt fame, sed frivola gentis
\[ \text{Heretice dicunt de patre ficta probo.} \]

Rogerus rediens scelus expiat ense, gravisque
\[ \text{Summi pontificis planctus in aure strepit.} \]

Ultio subsequitur, legatus mittitur, ensem
\[ \text{Exerit Ecclesie canonis ense potens.} \]

Canone percutitur parricida Rogerus et eius
\[ \text{Fautores, sequitur ultio digna Crucis.} \]

\[ \text{Non etenim licuit parricide sumere talem} \]
\[ \text{Vindictam, poscit quam sibi sacra Syon.\textsuperscript{8}} \]

\[ \text{Idem Tholose comitem\textsuperscript{9} legatus habebat} \]

\textsuperscript{6} ‘iubar solis,’ Suetonius, \textit{Augustus}, 94.5
\textsuperscript{7} Read ‘ipsam’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘ipsum’.
\textsuperscript{8} Roger had broken the law by murdering the bishop, but to go on crusade would have been a more appropriate punishment than to be crusaded against.
\textsuperscript{9} Raymond V, count of Toulouse
Suspectum quadam condicione loci.

Mansit homo comitis Rogerus, nec tamen illi

Contulerat plenam robore maiore opem,

Iure nec Ecclesie matris surrexit in illum.

Idcirco subiit canonis arma\(^{10}\) comes.

Perplexus fuerat quo vergeret. Hostis haberi

Cognati timuit Ecclesieque sacre.

Hic aliquo non rege minor, generosus et audax,

Non mala permisit quae potuere geri.

<70> Sepe facit facinus famulus quod non facit heros\(^{11}\)

Nec iubet, inde tamen crimen habere potest.

Concilio medio sevus rapit arma satelles

Legatumque ferit, interimitque pium.

Lanceat huic pectus sacrum dum mortis in hora

Profert ista, ‘Deus sit benedictus, amen.’\(^{12}\)

Nomine vir Petrus Petri fuit ille beati

Nuntius, et Christo se dedit ipse petre.

De Castro fuit ille Novo, de pectore castrum

Fecerat Ecclesie stans in agone pugil.

\(^{10}\) ‘Crucis’ is deleted in the MS and ‘comes’ is substituted. ‘arma’ here signifies excommunication.

\(^{11}\) John now jumps to 1208. Raymond V’s son, Raymond VI, was now count of Toulouse (1194-1222).

\(^{12}\) For the murder of the papal legate, Peter of Castelnau, see Pope Innocent III’s letter seeking support for a campaign against Raymond VI to avenge it (PVC, 56-65: Sibly & Sibly n. 2 for evidence of its wide dissemination). John’s verses closely reflect its language.
Istis auditis insanit Roma, cruorem

Ulcisci fusum Papa suique student.

Heu quoniam cessat Terre promotio Sacre,

Armat dum populi pectus imago Crucis.  

Sunt procul exciti variis de partibus orbis quos

Cruce signatos ducit ad arma fides.

Istis preficitur abbatus Cistercius et dux

Burgundus; comites signa tulere sua.

Excludit cunctos clausa statione Biterris.

Carcassona tenet menia clausa sua.

Hostiles cuneos munita Tholosa repellit,

Robore consentit urbs Agenensis ei.

Ne dominus terre dominatum perdere possit,

Obstat defendens ius quod habere putat.

Sunt ibi concives iusti, validique coloni,

Proxima sed puris fex inimica nocet.

---

13 The pope’s letter offers remission of sins for those who campaign. The crusade’s supporters wore the cross (PVC, 81). Compare John’s implied criticism in line 69 with Innocent III’s language, ‘hereticam inde studeatis perfidiam abolere, sectatores ipsius, eo quam Sarracenos securius quo peiores sunt illis, in manu forti et extento brachio impugnando.’

14 Read ‘abatus’ with MS and scansion, not ‘abbas’ with Wright.

15 Arnaud Aimery, papal legate and abbot of Cîteaux was in overall command. Philip II of France was unwilling to participate, but sent the duke of Burgundy and the count of Nevers, with 500 knights. Other counts in the campaign against the Tencavels were Saint-Pol, Montfort, and Bar-sur-Seine, with Raymond VI joining the crusade—ostensibly against him in the first place—after his humiliating reconciliation with the Church on 18 June 1209 (PVC, 77).

16 John is referring collectively to the overlords in Languedoc, Raymond VI and Peter of Aragon, as well as to the nobles who owed them fealty.
Muros balistis corroborat Albia; castra

Cetera quid dicam fortia queque situ.

Fortia castra comes Fuxensis, fortia claudit\(^{17}\)

Qui Convenarum colligit arma comes.\(^{18}\) [91r]

Ecclesie clause multos siluere per annos,

Et sic hereseos crevit inepta seges.

Non tamen in cunctis habitat, sed sub saliunca\(^{19}\)

Flet rosa, sub lappa lilia lesa dolent.

Quod viget in trino Deus unus, trinus in uno,

\(<71>\) Invida, ceca, rudis, devia turba negat.

Grossa superficies tua lumina, rustice, cecat,\(^{20}\)

Palpatus paries quem sine luce necat.

Tu si sis iustus, est ergo ramnus\(^{21}\) oliva,

Corvus olor, curvus linea, terra polus.

Sic solecismus est sermo congruus, et sic

Entimema nihil curvat in arte sibi.\(^{22}\)

Sectis heretici variis hesere, sed omnes

In nos armantur, Ecclesiamque premunt.

---

\(^{17}\) Raymond-Roger, count of Foix (1188-1223).

\(^{18}\) Bernard IV, count of Commignes (1175-1225).

\(^{19}\) Vergil, Ecl. 5. 16-17, ‘\textit{Lenta salix quantum pallenti cedit olivae / Puniceis humilis quantum saliunca rosetis.}’ A favourite image of John’s; see, e.g. \textit{EBVM}, 8.656.

\(^{20}\) Read ‘\textit{lumina, rustice,}’ with MS, not Wright’s ‘\textit{rustice lumina}’. Lines 93-94 are obscure.

\(^{21}\) See \textit{DTE}, 7.61-64 & n. 19.

\(^{22}\) ‘\textit{Solecismus}’ is a grammatical error, and ‘\textit{entimema}’ an incomplete and ‘rhetorical’ syllogism.
Invitans unus alium fert fercula, dicens,

‘Hoc natura mihi contulit absque Deo.’

Alter ait, ‘Fecit malus hoc Deus.’ Hospes at illum

Ieiunum propere cogit abire domo.

‘Ex quo composuit mea dona diabolus?’ inquit, 23

‘Non comedes pravi fercula prava Dei.’ 24

Fecis uterque sue sic expuit atra venena

In faciem summi largifluique boni. 25

Adicerem sectas varias; sed virus earum

Pollueret metri schemata pura mei. 26

Omnia de nihilo fecit Deus, 27 omnia facta

In seriem redigens et seriata regens.

Non tangit rerum series incredula corda,

Fervida non estas, non glacialis hiems,

Non terre subita que Phebe pallet ab umbra, 28

Obstat dum Phebo linea lucis egens.

Eclipsim solis casu, non corpore lune

---

23 MS has ‘diabulus.’ Amend with Wright to ‘diabolus,’ scanning second syllable long.
24 MS has ‘dona’ deleted for ‘prava.’
25 The humour of this exchange is not immediately apparent. John is poking fun at dualist beliefs, and at their irrationality in accepting food, one of the single God’s principal blessings, but which, as a bodily need derives from the ‘bad’ God.
26 Rubric in right margin, ‘De mirabilibus operibus Dei contra hereticos.’ John does however refer to the Waldensians at DTE, 2.138.
27 ‘Omnia que fecit, quia ex nihilo fecit...’, Augustine, De natura boni contra Manichaeos, 1, PL 42, 551.
28 Read ‘subitaque’ for Wright’s ‘subita quae.’
Subiecto fieri pars ibi magna putat.

Pars inimica Deo, Sathaneque domestica, sectas

Fingit et in fictis\textsuperscript{29} pectora fixa tenet.

Perstringunt elegi quedam philosophica mesti,

Que veterum fudit vaticus ampla stilus:

Inter signa duo que sunt distancia, quorum

Hoc cadit, hoc surgit, crescit in orbe malum.\textsuperscript{30}

<72> Heretici fiunt hodie, baptisma petebant

Olim prelustres, magnanimique duces.

Lucius accivit rex ad baptisma Britannos\textsuperscript{31}

Primitus, et patrios fecit abire deos.

Regis Eleutherio festinat epistola pape

Ut legatus ei dogmata sacra ferat.

Anno centeno nonagenoque beati

Partus, templa Dei per sua regna novat.

Floruit ergo fides medio tunc tempore longo

Sed Vortigerni tempore lesa fuit.\textsuperscript{32}

Hengistus Saxon fidei corruptor ab hoste

\textsuperscript{29} The MS has ‘\textit{fictis}’ as a correction of ‘\textit{fixis}’.

\textsuperscript{30} In both instances read ‘\textit{hoc}’, with the grammar, rather than ‘\textit{haec}’, with Wright. Wright’s punctuation is also revised.

\textsuperscript{31} Lucius, a probably mythical king of the Britons in the second century CE, asked Pope Eleutherius to receive him as a Christian. Missionaries were sent, the people proselytised, and the pagan temples converted into churches. Bede, \textit{Historia}, 1.4; GM, 4.72. See A. Smith (1979) for the Lucius myth.\textsuperscript{32} Vortigern, a fifth century king of England, GM \textit{passim}. 


Aurelio captus decapitatus obit.\textsuperscript{33} [91v]

Uter\textsuperscript{34} et Arthurus, fidei duo menia sacre,

Exemplum dederant et speculare iubar.

Inter eos crevit gens Anglica, dura labori

Corde capax,\textsuperscript{35} Christo dedita, larga cibis.

Herba nocens sensim surgit que ledit amaro

Succo, que segetem sternit inepta bonam.

Extincte fuerunt flamme, viguit tamen inter

Extinctos cineres concitus ignis edax.\textsuperscript{36}

Impia Waldensis secte doctrina latenter

Tholose repsit, pollueratque fidem.\textsuperscript{37}

Hic rexit Gothos Alaricus\textsuperscript{38}; expulit armis

Hos Clodoveus ad baratrale chaos.

Angolisma suos vidit descendere muros

Regis in adventu, regis aperta fide.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{33} Hengist’s beheading, GM, 125.
\textsuperscript{34} Uther Pendragon.
\textsuperscript{35} ‘corde capax,’ ‘capable archers.’ ‘c(h)orda’ = ‘bowstring.’
\textsuperscript{36} ‘ignis edax’ / ‘consuming fire’. Vergil, Aen. 2.758.
\textsuperscript{37} For the Waldensians, see Book 2, n. 37.
\textsuperscript{38} Alaric II, king of the Visigoths, was defeated and killed by Clovis at the battle of Vouillé in 507. See Isidore of Seville, Historia de regibus Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum, ch. 36.
\textsuperscript{39} According to Gregory of Tours, Hist. Franc. 2.37, the walls of Angoulême miraculously collapsed at the sight of Clovis’ religious devotion in 508. I can find no suggestion that this happened when Charlemagne took Toulouse, though Pseudo-Turpin tells the story about both Pamplona and Lucerna, Ps-T, 2-3.
Karolus intonuit et eo veniente cadebat\(^40\)

Murus Tholose, precipitante Deo.

Per vicos gladius effudit sanguinis undas,

Et gentis lavit exitiale lutum.\(^41\)

Hoc\(^42\) expectat adhuc forsan locus urbis. Ut olim

De Cudo domina vaticinata fuit,

‘Urbes tres video perituras. Prima natabit

Sanguine; nudatas altera reddet aves;

<73> Tertia nobilior, de qua plus tristor, habebit

Grana, sues, paleas, hec tria danda neci.’\(^43\)

Urbe Biterrensi cruor ut fundatur habete.

Ut Carcassona cernite reddat aves.

Grana, sues, palee pretendant quid sibi nondum

Sentit Tholosa; sentiet illa tamen.

Pars Saturnini sancti suffragia sperat

Qui tauro mitis a truce tractus erat.\(^44\)

\(^40\) Rubric in left margin, ‘De rege Karolo ibi pugnante.’
\(^41\) Read ‘exitiale’ with Wright, not ‘excitiale’ with MS.
\(^42\) Read ‘Hoc’ for Wright’s ‘Hic,’ and in line 156, ‘Cudo’ for ‘cudo’. This is a reference to Alpaise de Cudot (1150-1211), a holy mystic known to Philip II’s first wife Isobel of Hainault, and mentioned by Vincent of Beauvais, 30.23. See Stein (1995), 91, nn. 80 & 81. John’s comment relates to the continuing fears of the alleged heretics in Toulouse.
\(^43\) The prophecy relates to the fate of Béziers, Carcassonne and Toulouse in the Albigensian Crusade. John writes with the benefit of hindsight about Toulouse, finally reduced by scorched earth tactics in 1228.
\(^44\) Saint Saturninus (Saint Sernin), third century martyr and first bishop of Toulouse, dragged through the town by a bull, JdeM, 489-90.
Ecclesia primam vigilans exercitus ambit,\textsuperscript{45} 
Expulsat muros machina crebra suos; 
Emittunt saxa cives, incendia, tela. 
\textbf{170} Ad partes ambas mors dominata volat. 
Hic custoditur, sed per se vulgus in urbem 
\qquad Densatur, cunctos vi ferit, ense furit. 
Qui potuere mori moriuntur. Quelibet etas 
\qquad Hic moritur, mortem sexus uterque subit, 
\textbf{175} Dum nulli parcit gladius. Medicina vagatur, 
\qquad Dumque perit gladio cum lue pura caro, 
\qquad Aras Ecclesie cruor altus inebriat, urbis 
\qquad Per vicos torrens imbre rubente fluit. 
\textbf{180} In altera\textsuperscript{46} pacis prudens legatus pacem\textsuperscript{47} 
\qquad Constituit, partes fedus utrasque ligat. 

\textsuperscript{45} Though well-fortified, Béziers was unexpectedly seized by the crusaders’ camp-followers (‘vulgus’). The townspeople had refused to identify the ‘heretics’ there, and were indiscriminately burned in two of the city’s churches, and many others killed in the streets. For accounts of these events, see PVC, 84-91; WP, 13; Cansò, 16-23; Arnaud Aimery and Milo’s official report, PL, 216, 137-141. 

\textsuperscript{46} Read ‘\textit{In altera}’ for ‘\textit{Interea},’ grammatically following the sequence from ‘\textit{primam},’ in line 167, and ‘\textit{legatus}’ for ‘\textit{legatio},’ both in MS and Wright. The original lines 171-74, now lines 179-82, clearly refer to Carcassonne, not Béziers, and have been transposed. This passage then makes perfect sense. This is a more satisfactory explanation than the view taken by earlier scholars, e.g Wright (1856), 158, that John had simply confused two such well-known events. This is a damning account of the siege of Béziers. There is an asterisk of uncertain date in the margin of new line 171, suggesting awareness of a textual problem. 

\textsuperscript{47} For accounts of the capture of Carcassonne see PVC, 92-98, WP, 14, Cansò, 24-33. John fails to mention here that Raymond-Roger died in the custody of the crusaders shortly after he was seized in breach of his safe conduct. DTE 4.413-14 attributes the the King of Aragon’s military intervention to Raymond-Roger’s death, but does not apportion blame. The legate was Arnaud Aimery, see line 73 and n. 15 above. John’s calls him ‘\textit{prudens},’ perhaps an irony given the well-known breach of the truce. See DTE, 8, n. 187.
Extra legato presente Rogerus ab urbe

Exit et ad pacem tendit utrasque manus.

Inplumes emittit aves, nudos\textsuperscript{48} sine rebus

Carcassona viros. Spe volitante leves,

\begin{align*}
\text{Armis dimissis, abiere per avia, vite} \\
\text{Munere contenti; nec reriere viri. [92r]}
\end{align*}

Hiis Cruce signati gestis ad propria tendunt;

\begin{align*}
\text{Uxores, natos, rura, laresque}\textsuperscript{49} petunt. \\
\text{Sed remanet Symon comes hiis Leycestius}\textsuperscript{50} horis,
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Huius mons fortis de dicione fuit.}\textsuperscript{51} \\
\text{Ecclesie sacre decreto sarculat herbas}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Messibus Ecclesie que dominando nocent.} \\
\text{<74> Heretici clerum derident, iura relegant}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Ecclesie, spernunt sacra, prophana colunt.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Quos capiunt mutilant, excecant, clam vel aperte}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Occidunt; et in hoc se meruisse putant.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Sanctos pretendunt aliquos foris, intus abundat}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Limus, et in limo pectoris Hidra latet.}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{48} The consensus of surviving accounts is that the men were allowed only their shirts and breeches.

\textsuperscript{49} ‘\textit{Lares}’ / ‘household gods’ of the Romans is a proxy for ‘home.’ Most of the crusader army returned home after the fall of Carcassonne.

\textsuperscript{50} Simon de Montfort the elder, a relatively obscure French lord, assumed Raymond-Roger’s titles and lands. His claim to the earldom of Leicester was upheld by King John in 1205, who nevertheless seized it in 1207. His claim was revived by Simon de Montfort the younger who was granted the title by Henry III in 1239.

\textsuperscript{51} John points out that Simon’s name means ‘strong mountain.’
Vis anime\textsuperscript{52} cordi, cor lingue linguaque servit

Palme, palma facit, factio cuncta probat.

Si bona multa loquor, et multis devio sanctis,

Quid prodest? Hominem nobile salvat opus.

Flandria quem genuit vates studiosus Alanus\textsuperscript{53}

Contudit hereticos, edomuitque prius.

Virgilio maior et Homero certior idem

Exauxit studii Parisiensis opes.

Crure suo leso populi venientis in arcto,\textsuperscript{54}

Crus lesum posuit mox sibi thema suum,

‘Dum Fortuna nocet, et adest Elegia, livor

De damno gaudet, de bonitate dolet.’

Conveniunt sacri doctores; silva recedit,

Et succedit ager, semina sparsa capit.

Parisius urbis quidam\textsuperscript{55} commoverat istis

Doctor collectis saxea corda viris.

Dudum mollierant multos miracula, terror

\textsuperscript{52} ‘Vis anime’ is a ‘faculty of the soul,’ a concept derived from Avicenna. Interestingly Roland of Cremona, John’s colleague in Toulouse, devotes book 2 of his \textit{Summa} to ‘vires animae.’ See Hasse (2000), 36–42 on Roland’s philosophical works. Roland also writes about human ‘bona.’

\textsuperscript{53} Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{De praedicatoribus et eorum persuasionibus contra hereticos}.’ ‘Alanus’ is Alan of Lille, see also Introduction, 45 & 47, and \textit{DTE}, Preface.1 & 8.40.

\textsuperscript{54} ‘\textit{arcto}’, a variant of ‘\textit{arto}’, ‘a confined space.’

\textsuperscript{55} This is an early reference to Élie Guerin, \textit{DTE}, 5.271, who staffed the \textit{studium} at Toulouse with Doctors from Paris in 1229. This passage strongly supports the view that John wrote it while teaching in Toulouse.
Regum quos fervens duxit in arma fides.

Discordes fidei rex Constantinus\(^{56}\) agebat

Ad mortem, reliquos pacificare studens.

Sancto Silvestro\(^{57}\) presente iubebat Hebreos

Plenam si possent promere legis opem.

Bis sex electis conclusit papa magistris

Inter quos Zamri prefuit arte magus.

Indomiti tauri quidam distillat in aereum

Demonicum nomen; mors rapit ergo pecus.

Vivificare pecus rex nomine iussit eodem;

Non potuit. Tota clamat Hebraea manus,

<75> ‘Nomine si Christi Silvester suscitet illud,

Christus baptismi nos renovabit aqua.’

Silvester prece premessa spe fervidus inquit,

‘In Iesu Christi nomine surge pecus!’

Pacificus surgit taurus, nullique molestus

Armenti factus dux pius arva petit.

Gentiles simul Hebrei certamine magno

Gaudent baptismo se renovare sacro.

Philosophi duo Zenophilus Cratonque diserti,

\(^{56}\) The Emperor Constantine.

\(^{57}\) St. (Pope) Sylvester (314-35). John’s account of these ‘miracles’ is a much abbreviated version of JdeM 64-66.
Censure veri, crisma fidemque ferunt.\textsuperscript{58} [92v]

Serpentem populi precibus Silvester in antro

Claudit, et ora ligat clausa vigore Crucis,

Ferali flatu Rome qui polluit urbem.

Expectat clauso iudicis ore diem.

Post, Constantinus regni diadema reliquit

Silvestro, retinens Dorica regna sibi.\textsuperscript{59}

Romanus domitor Constantius\textsuperscript{60} orbis Hiberi

Suscepit Britonum tradita regna sibi.

Regna Coel natamque suam conesserat illi,

Que claro cleri dogmate clara fuit.

Hec Constantinum peperit; pater hinc Eboraci

Decessit, nato dans ea regna suo.

Vi capiens Romam, factus fuit ille monarca

Mundi, quo Christi crevit in orbe fides.

Sancta parens Helena regis, Cruce leta reperta

Ierusalem, sacram sic probat esse Crucem.

Languens extremis mulier contacta duabus

\textsuperscript{58} This reference is to Constantine’s conversion to Christianity, and the origin of the tradition of anointing kings with chrism. See \textit{DTE} 2.70 &n.15 in relation to Louis IX.

\textsuperscript{59} See also \textit{DTE} 2.183-4 & n. 50 for this further reference to the ‘Donation of Constantine.’ Its contemporary relevance lay in the fact that it legitimized the papacy in its temporal power in Rome and the West. John takes an expansive view of its extent.

\textsuperscript{60} Constantius I, Roman emperor 293-306. According to GM, 78, he inherited the kingdom of King Coel of the Britoni and married his daughter Helena, Constantine’s mother.
Non surgit cruculis, sed Cruce tacta Dei.61

Quis regum vel que dominarum maxima mundi
Tanto mirifice fervet amore Crucis?

Fervet avaritie dominante cupidine pectus
In multis, fervet insatiata sitis.

Christum siquis amat, armet Cruce pectus; ad istam

Vocem concurrunt ad Crucis arma probi.62

<76> Pravis rex Sabaoth pedites opponit et armat

Qui cordis carnem cordaque lege ligant.63

Opponit pedites alios, quorum bene quisque

Predicat et verbi militat ense sacri.

Adiuvat hos ferri gladius gladiare tot hostes,

Quos poterunt gladii vix resecare duo.

Quicquid silvescit secat ensis, doctus arator

Divini verbi vomere sulcat humum.

Stirpes distortos, sterilesque vorax domat ignis,

Radicesque malas indomitasque cremat.64

Mira Dei poscit vulgaris opinio, gentem65

---

61 On the Legend of the Finding of the Cross (Inventio Crucis) by Helena, mother of the Emperor, see B. Baert (2004), 15-53. It was first recorded by Ambrose, De obitu Theodosii, PL. 16, col. 1400.
62 i.e. by becoming crusaders / Crucesignati.
63 N.b the play on words, ‘cordis’ / ‘corda.’
64 Rubric in left margin ‘De miraculis Dei pro sanctis, non pro hereticis.’
65 The heretics.
Mittit in hanc miseram summa flagella\textsuperscript{66} Deus.

Hiis igitur dixi, ‘Quid vos movet?\textsuperscript{67} Unde furoris
Horribilis stimulus? Unde ruina mali?

\textit{Est Deus in sanctis mirabilis; ergo videte,}
Mentis discussa nocte notate diem.\textsuperscript{68}

Proximus a Christo Stephanus protomartir Olympum
Per lapidem meruit martirique stolam.\textsuperscript{69}

Corpora sanctorum fulgebunt, fortia, sana,

Libera, pulchra, cita, letaque semper erunt.\textsuperscript{70}

Sensus, amicitia, concordia, plena potestas,
Pax, honor, hec dotes sex animabus\textsuperscript{71} erunt.

Sanctus Silvester obstruxerat ora draconis
Rome, clavigeri iussa sequendo Petri.\textsuperscript{72}

Victricis virtute Crucis sunt mira peracta,
Confirmantque fidem sanctam stupenda sacram. [93r]

Mortuus et vivus Leonardus vincula sanctus

\textsuperscript{66}‘\textit{summa flagella},’ i.e. his best preachers.
\textsuperscript{67}Anselm, \textit{Oratio X, ad Sanctum Paulum}.
\textsuperscript{68}John notes elsewhere that the Cathars ignore saints’ days, \textit{DTE}, 5.93.
\textsuperscript{69}St. Stephen is commemorated on 26 December, the day after Christmas. For the stoning of Stephen, see Acts. 7.57. Members of the crowd stoning him placed their cloaks at the feet of Saul (Paul).
\textsuperscript{70}Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{De Contemptu Mundi}, 1.55-56, ‘\textit{Pulchra, citissima, fortia, libera, deliciosa / sana, vigentia…’}
\textsuperscript{71}‘\textit{animabus},’ form used only in later Latin. Lines 279-82 are closely based on Hostiensis, \textit{Summa Aurea, De penitentii et remissionibus}, 5.47.
\textsuperscript{72}Lines 283-84 might be misplaced from following line 239, but more likely are a brief recapitulation because Sylvester’s saint’s day, 31 December, is also close to Christmas. Sylvester rid Rome of a dragon following St. Peter’s instructions, JdeM, 65
Dempsit captivis, eripuitque viros.\textsuperscript{73}

Christoforus vincit flamas, vincitque sagittas

Vincit probra, minas, sed gladiatus obit.\textsuperscript{74}

Lycia non verbis hunc blandis non Aquilina

Flexit, sed credens utraque martir erat.

Vir dominam celi monstraverat esse Mariam,

Iunonem Samiam demonis esse genus.

\textless 77\textgreater  Inclite Vincenti, victor terraque marique,

Te Deus exaltat, arida, pontus, avis.\textsuperscript{75}

Portator capitis Dionysius innuit intus\textsuperscript{76}

Se portasse Deum, se placuisse Deo.

Exsectum caput Edmundi clamaverat, ‘Her! Her!’\textsuperscript{77}

Hic, hic sum,’ capitis vox sonat illa gravis;

‘Christi centenos trahis in bis quatuor annos

Dans septem decies, rex cadit ense,’ dico.\textsuperscript{78}

Sancto Ieronimo leo trux, monarcha ferarum,

\textsuperscript{73} St. Leonard freed numerous captives miraculously in Clovis’ time, JdeM, 431-35.
\textsuperscript{74} Traditionally, St. Christopher was martyred in Lycia in the third century. He was said to have converted two prostitutes, Niceta / Kallinike and Aquilina, sent to tempt him. Both died as martyrs, JdeM, 258-59. Wright does not treat ‘aqulina’ as a proper name.
\textsuperscript{75} St. Vincent, another third century martyr. The emperor Dacian was unable to dispose of his body, which a huge crow rescued from a wolf, JdeM, 106-07.
\textsuperscript{76} St. Denis / Dionysius, third century martyr and bishop of Paris, believed to have carried his own head, JdeM, 429.
\textsuperscript{77} St. Edmund the Martyr, king of East Anglia 855-869, object of the cult of St. Edmund at Bury. His severed head was reputedly found calling out from a wolf’s paws. See also DTE, 7.185-208; CM, 1.400.
\textsuperscript{78} Read ‘dico’ with MS ‘dco’, rather than Wright’s ‘Deo,’ and re-punctuate.
Servivit, pecoris spesque fidesque sui.\textsuperscript{79}

Kentegernus homo sanctus pro semine terram

Dispersit terre, terraque farra dedit.\textsuperscript{80}

Silvestres aratro cervos coniunxit at unum

Illorum rapuit enecuitque lupa.

Cum cervo remanente lupam vir vinxit, et ambos

Terre cultores fecerat esse novos.

Egidium cerva sanctum silvestris alebat\textsuperscript{81}

Cui lac submissa poplite prona dabat.

Cuthbertus gelida venerem domitaverat unda,\textsuperscript{82}

Quem tersit cauda bestia missa Deo.

Pavit Franciscus volucrum ieiunia sanctus\textsuperscript{83}

Dum sparsit verbi semina larga sacri.

Sexu debilior pia Margareta draconem\textsuperscript{84}

Vicit, quem fregit fortis agone Crucis.

\textsuperscript{79} St. Jerome, third to fourth century Church father, frequently portrayed with a lion, having reputedly removed a thorn from its foot. Following this the lion lived in the monastery, guarding its donkey, thus offering spiritual inspiration, JdeM, 415-16.

\textsuperscript{80} Also known as St. Mungo, sixth to seventh century Scottish saint. This relates to Kentigern’s miraculous resuscitation of a baker by sprinkling earth from his grave on the ground. This episode is described in Jocelin of Furness’ life of Kentigern, ch. 7.

\textsuperscript{81} St. Giles, eighth century hermit, whose cult was popular in Provence, JdeM, 364.

\textsuperscript{82} St. Cuthbert, seventh century Northumbrian monk. He reputedly immersed himself in the sea every night, and was licked dry by two otters, Bede, \textit{Vita Sancti Cuthberti}, 10.

\textsuperscript{83} St. Francis of Assisi (1181/2-1226). Francis was canonised in 1228. There are many legends about St. Francis’ communication with birds, see e.g. Peter of Celano, \textit{Tractatus de Miraculis S. Francisci}, 4.20 (written in 1230).

\textsuperscript{84} St. Margaret, virgin and martyr, executed in Antioch c. 304. She was allegedly about to be swallowed by the devil in the form of a dragon, but he recoiled seeing the Cross, JdeM, 233.
Ungue leo Phariam studuit sepelire Mariam;\textsuperscript{85}

Mansit in officio trux fera blanda pio.

Delet aperta graves Genovefe gratia pestes,\textsuperscript{86}

Sicut Parisius sepe videre licet.

Sanctorum meritis defunctis est data vita

Et virtus egris officiosa redit.

Que, quot, quanta, quibus pro sanctis mira coruscant

Sub certo numero non recitare queo.

Emollire malos nequeunt miracula Christi

Que pro matre sua Virgine sepe facit.

\textless 78\textgreater Nec reticere volo nec possum quod mihi vere

Contigit ad laudem, Virgo beata, tuam.

Ardens Parisius bene Bernardus\textsuperscript{87} bonitatem

Ardendi\textsuperscript{88} monstrat deficien
tente fide.

Sectas hereticas et turres turbo procelle\textsuperscript{89}

Altas incussit, precipitesque dedit.

\textsuperscript{85} St. Mary the Egyptian, patron of penitents. A lion helped St. Zosimas to bury her, JdeM, 518.

\textsuperscript{86} St. Geneviève, a 3–4\textsuperscript{th} century nun, for whom Clovis I established a convent. She miraculously overcame a serious illness, JdeM, 170-72. Her relics were housed in Paris, of which she is patron saint. They were carried in procession there and believed to have halted an epidemic in 1129. This tradition continued.

\textsuperscript{87} St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 1090-1153. John refers to Bernard’s vigorously critical visit to the Paris schools in 1139, see Ferruolo (1985), 47-49. St Bernard successfully attacked heretical sects in a preaching visit to Languedoc in 1145-46. John cites Bernard as a role model for his own onslaught on heresy. John quotes St. Bernard several times.

\textsuperscript{88} The scribe has deleted a redundant ‘di’ after ‘ardendi.’

\textsuperscript{89} ‘turbo procelle,’ Venantius Fortunatus, \textit{Vita Martini}, 3.484. See also \textit{DTE}, 5.51.
Sustulit a terra me ventus in aëra, sed vox

Tunc mea mota maris stella canebat ‘Ave!’ [93v]

Felix porta poli dum dixi me levis aër

Ad terram posuit stansque canensque fui.

Hiis alisque bonis tibi laus, tibi gloria, Virgo,

Permaneat perpes palma, perennis honor.

Sic ergo nec supplicium nec mira remulcent

Hereticos, qui ferrea corda ferunt.

Eloquii video male fundamenta labare;

Inscius hereticas incoat inde vias.  

Verba poetarum laudo, sed destruo sectas

In quibus erroris semita curva latet.

Vecta giganteis humeris, gens nana moderna

Perspicuis oculis ulteriora videt.

Ad nostram dicta doctrinam carmina cuncta

Paulus ait; Pauli verba fidemque sequar.

---

90 Lines 335-40 are an invocation of the Virgin Mary, awkwardly introduced here.
91 Mary is still known as ‘Stella maris.’
92 Rubric in left margin, ‘De malis ignorantie.’ Read ‘eloquii’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘eloquis.’ John rails at contemporary neglect of the trivium.
93 Read ‘inscius’ with text, not Wright’s ‘insciis.’ Repunctuate accordingly. Rubric in left margin, ‘De malis ignorantie.’
94 A commonplace, first attributed to Bernard of Chartres by John of Salisbury, Metalogicon 3.4, ‘quasi nanos gigantium humeris insidentes’ / ‘like dwarves sitting on the shoulders of giants’.
‘Ulteriora’ may mean ‘the future,’ but ‘the last days’ fits the context better.
Non mala vitantur nisi cognita;\textsuperscript{95} post mala nota
Grata magis Christi vera sophia placet.
Non sunt calcandi porcorum calce saphiri;\textsuperscript{96}
Alliciant iuvenes vatica dicta prius.

Scrutantes verum sibi defecere vetusti
Sed sub nube tamen exseruere viam.
Illis debentur laudes, gratesque merentur,
Quos ignorantes detinet umbra Stigis.

Tullius eloquio probus, et Maro maximus, artem\textsuperscript{97}

Eloquii dederant quos imitamur. In hoc

Sunt bene credentes Hodie, sed fallit in arte
Multos barbaries,\textsuperscript{98} garrulitasque nova.

<79> Excrescit fatua ficus, ficulnea mundi,

Quam paris, hanc urit flamma, gehenna cremat.

Latrantesque aves direpta cadavera rostris

\textsuperscript{95} CC, 308, ‘Non mala vitantur nisi cognita,’ John uses the same phrase to caution readers against the errors of rival grammarians.
\textsuperscript{96} An early version of ‘casting pearls before swine.’
\textsuperscript{97} Marcus Tullius Cicero and Publius Vergilius Maro, acknowledged by John as excelling in rhetoric and epic poetry respectively.
\textsuperscript{98} ‘barbaries’ or ‘barbarismus’ denotes errors of e.g. spelling or pronunciation.
\textsuperscript{99} Gloss in left margin, ‘De morte hereticorum mala.’ See Haskins (1902), who sees this as a reference to the literal burning of heretics as a punishment. John’s readers would have understood the untranslatable pun in line 363, especially in the context of the previous line. ‘Ficus’ / ‘fig’ could mean ‘piles’ or ‘haemorrhoids’. ‘Cum dixi ficus, rides quasi barbaras verbas’ / ‘When I mentioned piles, you laugh as if I’m using foreign words’ (Martial 1.65)
Asportant, animas nigra caterva legit.\footnote{100 Statius, \textit{Theb.}, 12.111.}

Vitis amara nimis, quam primus amaricat hostis,

Qui vindemiat hanc cum legione sua.

Per partes Rome, per Gallica regna, per omnem

Spargitur Ecclesiam que nocet herba latens.

Messor celestis dispersas colligit uvas

Et spicas raras huius in orbis agro.

In firmamenti centro pars parvula mittit\footnote{101} Fructum. Tu centri percipe quinque plagas.

Nostra tenet gentes habitabilis equora, silvas

Rupes. Est minima parte beata seges.

Est corrupta tamen gentilibus hec segetella,

Et Sarracenis hereticisque feris.

Partis pars alia sterilis perit; Africa tota

Desipit; Europe pars tenet una fidem

Sunt hac parte tamen mechi, fures et avari,

Et mercatores artificesque mali.

Hereticus peior cunctis; velut Hidra venenum

Fundit in occulto, vulnera dente gerit.

\footnote{101 Rubric in left margin, ‘De philosophica consideratione pro paucitate Christianorum respectu aliarum gentium.’ John shifts his theme, but continues his horticultural metaphor.}
Flagra, creatoris nobile posse negat. [94r]

Ergo concurrunt in eum tormenta gehenne

Ultio nature mirificique Dei.

Ad quid Iudeos referam quos sorbet Avernus,

Divinam legem qui sine lege legunt? 102

Heu quot Leviatan sibi iunget carmine, penis 103

Blanditiis, bellis, munere, fraude, minis?

Obstabunt Enoc et Helyas quos tamen ipse

Impius occidet; neuter inultus erit. 104

Ultio fulmen erit prius, et post flamma Gehenne,

Que tempestabit tota procella Stigis.

<80> Ierusalem templum Iulianus apostata cogit 105

Condere Iudeos, sed vorat ignis eos.

Fundamenta iacent operis dispersa, fidemque

Multi confessi signa Deumque timent.

Vestibus illorum sacra Crux in nocte sequenti

---

102 An extraordinary claim, considering the origin of the Old Testament.
103 Rubric in right margin, ‘De Antichristo.’
104 Enoch and Elijah. One tradition is that they are to be the two witnesses of the Apocalypse, Rev. 11, 3, on the basis that they were each admitted to heaven without having died. Rev. 1, 7 reveals the witnesses’ death. The devil would be finally entombed for a thousand years, Rev. 20, 7.
105 Julian the Apostate, see DTE 1. 407-14, and n. 153. Julian ordered the Jews to rebuild the Temple in 363, but according to Ammelius Marcellinus, Res Gestae, 23.3, rebuilding efforts were prevented by mysterious fireballs, variously explained. Julian was seeking to provide alternatives to Christianity. This whole story is virtually a précis of Golden Legend, 125.
Est inventa quibus est data firma fides.¹⁰⁶

Hec docuere sequi regis vexilla superni,¹⁰⁷

Ecclesie turmas conspicuosque duces.

Impia magnates iniuste bella moentes

Ad Stiga quando cadunt, agmina multa trahunt

Heu quia tot pereunt! Hec est elegia summa,

Nulla dies miserós quod revocare potest.

Tempore iudicis surgent, sed iudice viso

Tantum damnandis pro Stige terror erit.

Tholose princeps Aragonica regna movebat¹⁰⁸

Regis et auxilium fecit adesse sibi.

Cur? Quia cognatum comitis necuere Rogerum¹⁰⁹

Damna, pudor, carcer, ira, dieta, dolor.

Castro Murelli¹¹⁰ Symon circumdatur, illic

Divinam suplex turmula poscit opem.

¹⁰⁶ This long digression, lines 199-404, finally ends, and John returns to the Albigensian Crusade. He passes over events of 1209-1213, confining his coverage to detailed accounts of the sieges of Béziers and Carcassonne (1209), Muret (1213), and the second siege of Toulouse (1218), undoubtedly the highlights of the long campaign.


¹⁰⁸ Rubric in right margin, ‘*De bello comitis Montis fortis apud Murellum.*’

¹⁰⁹ Raymond-Roger, his son-in-law.

¹¹⁰ At the battle of Muret, 12 September, 1213, in the outskirts of Toulouse, Simon de Montfort, heavily outnumbered, decisively defeated forces supporting Raymond VI. Peter II, king of Aragon was killed, and Raymond fled. For other accounts of the battle, see PVC, 446-66, and 469-83 (the widely-distributed letter sent from the Southern bishops immediately after the battle), Cansó, 135-41, WP, 20-21. These accounts suggest more of a pitched battle, though WP describes the same diversionary tactic by the crusaders as John. For analysis of the different accounts, see Roquebert (1970-89), 2, 421-39.
Quisquis in aurora suscepto corpore Christi,
   Post missam firmus induit arma sua.
Pars exit simulando fugam, pars se tenet intus;
   Exclusis vera creditur esse fuga.
Clamant exclusi, ‘Nunc, nunc properate, recedunt
   Hostes! Post tergum sentiat arma fugax!’
Dimisso campo, post hostem curritur, et rex
   Aragonum solus pene resistit ibi.
Symon cum paucis audax ad bella retentis
   Exit, et invadit regia castra suis.
Pugnat ibi virtus altissima; non tuba clangit,
   Non strepitat fastus, non vaga pompa volat,
Et tamen hic fastus regis descendit, et alta
   Pompa cadit, fastu rege cadente suo.
<81> Est necis incertus autor, sed clamor in astra
   Tollitur, ‘Occiso rege, parate fugam’.
Qui finxere fugam conversa fronte relidunt
   Hostes et mactant hos, aliosque fugant.

---

111 Because he defied custom by fighting in the second rather than the hindmost rank, wearing anonymous armour ( PVC, 463 and Sibly & Sibly trans. n. 46, p. 211), and by ignoring Raymond’s advice to stay put in his camp. WP, 21, however, says the king’s standard was clearly visible. In the previous chapter WP says Simon read out a letter in which Peter boasts of having come to Toulouse in pursuit of a local lady, partially confirmed by Llibre dels Fets, 9. John ignores this story. Matthew Paris’ account is based on the bishops’ letter, but as an example of Peter’s arrogance he reports that he was sitting down to eat as fighting began (CM, 2.568).
Conveniunt partes. Symon conformis Achilli

Quos agitat campis fluminis urget aquis. [94v]

Xancto Pelides, Ysmeno flumine pugnat

Hypomedon;\(^{112}\) valido vivit uterque viro.

Hic infinitos equites vicere trecenti,

Cede fluunt fosse, sanguine rura natant.

Stant campis vacua tentoria, cornipedesque

Discurrunt, prede purpura vasa patent.

Nunc ad aquas, nunc ad campos discursus habetur.

Est in aquis, campis nulla recepta salus.

Expuit hos aër, aqua devorat, ignis abhorret,

Detestatur humus qui meruere mala.

Polluerant elementa Dei; quos ipsa receptant

Et simul eiciunt, dantque negantque locum.

Quippe Creatoris in Virgine mira negantes,

Spreta lege,\(^{113}\) suum diminuere decus.

Sunt de Tholosa ter\(^{114}\) milia quinque necata

Corpora, sed reliqua non numerare licet.

Tholosam veniunt sine nave cadavera cursu

---

\(^{112}\) In classical mythology, Achilles, son of Peleus, fought the River Xanthos itself, and Hypomedon fought by the River Ismenus, outside Thebes.

\(^{113}\) Because Peter II contravened the pope’s instructions to break with Toulouse, PVC, 441.

\(^{114}\) Read ‘\textit{ter}’ for Wright’s ‘\textit{tihi}.’ For the number of 15,000 dead from Toulouse, see WP, 21. PVC, 466 suggests that around 20,000 died.
Fluminis, et tollunt corpora densa initus.  

Hec plangunt patres, hec natos, hecque maritos,

Hec fratres, sulcunt ungue rigente genas.

Crines avellunt; et planetibus ethera pulsant.

Cum pueris damnant bella cruenta senes.

Sed non hereticum virum pepulere dolore

Tanto. Sed quidam crebrius arma gerunt,

Quidam diffugiunt iusti, quidamque morantur

Inviti. Quosdam detinet urbis amor.

Rex iacet extorris, solus, disertus, inermis,

Nudus, vulneribus plenus, honore carens.

<82> Tholose positus, tandem transfertur ad oras

Aragonum, papa patre favente patrum.

Quem formidavit quondam Kartaginis alte

Rex victus, sacre dans sua terga Cruci,

Quando cruentatis Libicos Hispania campis

115 Read ‘initus’ for Wright’s ‘nutus,’ with sense. MS could be read either way. John paints a dramatic picture of corpses stuck around the piers of the bridge at Toulouse.

116 Read ‘hec’ with MS for Wright’s more grammatical ‘hae’ in all four instances.


118 The king’s body was repatriated in 1217, after an appeal to Pope Honorius III, Roquebert (1970-89), 2, 234.

119 Read ‘quem,’ with MS, rather than Wright’s ‘qui.’
Vicit, et afflictus Marte tirannus erat.  
Hic stabulum fedis pedibus promisit equorum
  Ecclesiam sacram, martia Roma, tuam.
Qui strator quondam fuerat modo stratus habetur,
  Aragonum ducunt sic quia fata ducem.
Strati successor Maiorica menia cepit,
  Et Sarracenos, eraque, marmor, ebur.
Aragones dominos ut fertilis insula sensit,
  Victor adoratus est crucifixus ibi.
Hoc est exemplum; victor sub nomine Christi
  Quisquis erit, contra victus, inermis erit.
Pauperis in specie Remundus ab aggere campi
  Effugit, et Symon alta trophea gerit.
Non tamen hiis damnis timuit Tholosa cruentas
  Victorii vires opposuisses suas,
Donec in adventu Ludovici menia fracta

120 Peter II took part in the Christian army on 18 July 1212 at the battle of Las Navas di Tolosa, at which the Almohad Caliph Muhammad al-Nasir was decisively defeated. John also praises his victories over the Muslims in CG, 4.1126-28.
121 James I of Aragon reconquered Majorca in 1229-30.
122 Ovid, Amores, 1.2.22 ‘Nec tibi laus armis victus inermis ero.’ Wright’s punctuation is changed. 123 Ussher (1613), 344-49, 361, 367, and 377-80, quotes extensively from Books 4 and 5. Tanner (1748), 309-10 is the only other direct reference to this poem before Wright’s work. See Introduction, 31, n. 105, DTE, 7, n. 91.
Descendunt, pacis conditione tamen.\textsuperscript{124} [95r]

Bis Ludovicus ibi fuerat; tamen ille secundo

Exclusus vastans proxima monte stetit.

Mauleo cui nomen fuerat Savaricus ab urbe\textsuperscript{125}

Exit et ut dominum te, Ludovice, petit.

Se nummis sumptis invadere dixerat hostes

Quos sibi vulpina pacificarat ope.

Consilium capiens redit inde Philippica proles

Ne frustra patrias attenuaret opes.\textsuperscript{126}

Astronomi dicunt mutari \textsuperscript{127} clima Tholose,

Magnanimosque viros esse calore loci.

Nix ibi rara iacet, largo sed ab aëre grando

Grandior est; nimbus grossior inde cadit.

\textsuperscript{124} Prince Louis (later Louis VIII) required Toulouse to demolish its walls in 1215, on his first expedition against the city. They were swiftly rebuilt. When he was next there, in 1219, he invested it for six weeks before abruptly leaving. The reference in line 485 is to Louis IX, who ensured in the Treaty of Paris (1229) that the walls be razed.

\textsuperscript{125} Savary de Mauléon (c. 1181-1233) was a Poitevin magnate. Captured by King John at Mirebeau (1202), Savary declared loyalty to him in 1203 on release. As John’s seneschal for Poitou (1205-12) he supported Raymond VI in the early stages of the Albigensian Crusade. See e.g. PVC, 254 for a vituperative critique. After flirting with Philip II in 1213-14, he renewed his oaths to John, and served him until the king’s death. Returning to Poitou in 1216, he set his estates in order and joined the Fifth Crusade at Genoa in June, 1219. Lines 489-94 are obscure. It seems possible, though not recorded elsewhere, that he could indeed have been in Toulouse in spring 1219, having switched sides yet again, on route overland with his crusade army. Unpublished research by Lucas Aristazabal suggests he had been at the siege of Caceres in León in 1218. Or maybe ‘pacificarat’ should be amended to ‘pacificaret.’ The passage would then describe an offer by Savary to attack the enemy at Louis’ expense. In any case he participated in Louis VIII’s final campaign of 1226, though Louis died before reaching Toulouse. See also Introduction, 20. For more on Savary, see Ledain (1892) and Chaytor (1939).

\textsuperscript{126} Read ‘frustra’ for Wright’s ‘frusta,’ with MS. ‘patrias …opes’ / ‘ancestral wealth’, Ovid, \textit{Met}, 8.843-44.

\textsuperscript{127} Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{Philosophica speculatio de situ Tholose.’}
<83> Ventorum rabie discurrens nubibus ignis

Horridius mugit, findit et urit ibi.

Altior hic tellus quam Parisius patet, ultra

Hoc magis assurgit subsequiturque calor.

Monte nives aliquo stringit subtilior aura,

Multiplicans radios sol tamen arva coquit.

Certat in ascensu fieri nox equa diei,

Hanc axis donec torridus equat ei.

Ortus ut elyacus vel cosmicus astra revelet

Hic nemo cernit, hic quia nemo manet. 128

Remundos igitur animosos alta Tholosa

Gignit, quos patrum bellica vita iuvat. 129

Postquam Remundo Remundus bellicus heres

Successit, 130 Symon cuncta negavit ei.

Pro domino iuvenem Balcaria firma receptat,

Sed toto Symon robore vallat eum. 131

Interea Tholosa potens fossata reformat,

---

128 Because it was too hot.
129 Rubric in right margin, ‘Quomodo Raimundus recuperavit terram.’
130 Raymond VI (1156-1222) and his son Raymond VII (1197-1249). Beaucaire welcomed the younger Raymond in 1216. Simon had appropriated the lands of the counts of Toulouse, and offered no concessions.
131 Beaucaire was a fortified town on the Rhône, opposite Tarascon. It surrendered to Raymond VII after a long siege, during which the garrison held out as Simon de Montfort in turn encircled the besieging army. This success proved the springboard for a counter-campaign by the two Raymonds. A further incentive was De Montfort’s harsh treatment of Toulouse in 1216, after the fall of Beaucaire, ending in exactions, arrests and razing of the walls, WP, 27, Cansó, 171-79.
Raymond VI mounted a surprise attack on Toulouse in 1217, with an army raised in Spain, and was welcomed inside. Simon de Montfort was campaigning near the Rhône, and the countess, Alice, was surrounded in the Château Narbonnais inside Toulouse with a small garrison.

The first time had been after the battle of Muret.

Rubric in right margin, ‘De obsidione Tholosae et morte Simonis comitis.’ I am grateful to Gregory Hays for this emendation.

Persius Flaccus 3.74, ‘in locuplete penu,’ This was late summer.

Read ‘tria’ with MS for Wright’s ‘tibi.’

See DTE, 4.451-52, ‘Sunt de Tholosa tria milia quinque necata / Corpora, sed reliqua non numerare licet.’ Different formulations of the same curiously identical estimates. John is probably making the point that there was a crossbowman for every Toulousain killed at Muret.

De Montfort had the Vilanova constructed over the winter of 1216-17 in the St. Cyprian quarter on the west bank of the Garonne (Cansó, 189-90). This could well have been the start of a long term plan to complete the destruction of Toulouse and build a wholly new city.
Nec turres tantas nec tot habere tholos.

Tollens Tholosa se laudibus intus abundat,

Plausu lascivos tollit in astra sonos.

Quid dicam crebros insultus totque recursus

Occursusque graves insidiasque geri? [95v]

Percussus totiens comes est anathemate\textsuperscript{140} sicut

Et pater illius, nec tamen arma sinit.\textsuperscript{141}

Conscius ipse boni sibi spem cum pondere iuris

Librat et eventum sperat adesse bonum.

Estus solstitium sol cancro provehit altum

Sollemnemque diem festa Iohannis agunt.

Post festum sacrum lux prima nascitur atra

Ecclesie turmis militibusque Crucis

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Comes} here is Raymond VII. His father, Raymond VI, was excommunicated in 1207, 1210 and 1213, and he himself in 1213 and 1225.

\textsuperscript{141} \textit{siti} is deleted in the MS and \textit{sinit} replaces it. \textit{finit} fits the sense better. Translate ‘refrain from.’
Book 5

Incipit Liber Quintus

<85> Hic mihi meroris causas Elegia prebet,

Pro qua Meonio non cano bella metro. ²

Plausus in hiis elegis esto mihi, virgula Iesse,

Virgo, favumque tuum funde favore tuo. ³

O felix miserum me cerne Maria Iohannem.

Exaudi, recrea, dilue, terge, fove.

Me Christus, me Virgo parens, me Crux sacra salvet,

Humani generis est quibus acta salus.

Salva per maria me dulcis Virgo Maria, ⁴

Oranti parens ⁵ sis mihi Virgo parens.

O mater veri mihi vera reclude. Tholosa

Mittit munitos urbis ad antra viros,

Sed vigiles vigilare Crucis didicere, videntes

---

¹ Rubric in left margin, ‘De strage mutua ante Tholosam ante mortem Symonis.’ The narrative, from ‘Tholosa’ at the end of line 9 follows line 544 at the end of Book 4. This invocation of the Virgin comes at the half-way point in terms of books. Its location seems to be more than coincidental. This would weigh against the theory that there is a missing book (see Introduction, 39–41).

² ‘Meonio metro,’ Homeric, or epic metre.

³ Is. 11, 1, ‘Et egredietur virga de radice Iesse.’ John uses this imagery repeatedly in the Epithalamium, e.g., 4.183. The rod of Jesse is Christ Himself. The honeycomb was a frequent attribute of Mary. Note the consonance of ‘virgula’ / ‘virgo’ and ‘favum’ / ‘favore.’

⁴ The Virgin Mary is frequently associated with the sea (‘maria’) e.g. as Stella Maris. This line suggests that John made sea voyages, or was about to make one.

⁵ A rare gloss indicates the meaning of ‘parens’ as ‘favens’.
Urbis propositum noctivagosque gradus.

Clamor in aurora vigilum profert, ‘Ad arma,
Arma venite viri! Fervidus hostis adest.’

Itur in adversos hostes, utrimque cruenta
Tela volant, telis corpora lesa cadunt.  

Effundunt funde lapides arcusque sagittas,
Expelluntque animas vulnera larga leves.

Inclusi plumbum calidum vitrumque solutum
Proiciunt, omni peste nocere student.

<86> Exclusos omnis tutatur machina, parma,
Vinea, trux aries, indomitusque catus.  

Ad fossata simul veniunt; hic statur acitis
Contis; et gladiis pugna cruenta madet.

Fit via vi Christi servis, incendia iactant,
Corripiuntque domos, itque Tholosa retro.

Urbis concurrent domine,  
flammisque resistunt;

Occurruntque viris, altera turba viri.  

Ad flammas peltis armantur, Amazones uncis
Diripiant ignes quos populantur aquis.

---

6 Ovid, *Met.* 5.158, ‘*Tela volant, hyberna grandine plura.*’
7 For the ‘cat’, see WP (Sibly and Sibly trans.), p. 61, n.59.
8 Cansó, 205, describes the supporting effort of the women of Toulouse, including the noblewomen.
9 Note the play on words, ‘vir’/ ‘man’ and ‘virus’ / ‘poison.’
Clave conquassant galeas, resecantque trilices
   Loricas gladii, viscera lapsa fluunt.\(^{10}\)

Inter se resonant ictus,\(^{11}\) sonus astra relidit
   Aurea, conclamor Martis in aure tonat.

Nunc hii nunc illi retrocedunt. Ira vigorque
   Exacuunt animos, instimulantque manus.

O miseris homines, discordia tanta fatigat!

Quam gravis est vita, quam brevis hora necis!

Dum sic densantur, furtivus corripit ignis [96r]
   Symonias crates et tabulam cati.

Clamor it ad Symonem, ‘Vos missam tempore tali
   Auditis, moritur dum Crucis ista phalanx?’”

Audivit missam cum, viso corpore Christi,
   Hic salvatori paucula verba dedit,
   ‘Aut hodie, mundi salvator, da mihi palmam,
   Aut me de curis eripe, Christe, meis.

Audita missa, velociter induit arma,
   Cuius multa manus ambit utrumque latus.

Huius in adventu consurgit turbo procelle,\(^{12}\)
   Que turres rutilo fulminis igne ferit.

---
\(^{10}\) Ovid, \textit{Met.}, 8.402, ‘viscera lapsa fluunt.’
\(^{11}\) \textit{IPGRR}, 33, p. 300, ‘resonant ictus.’
\(^{12}\) See \textit{DTE}, 4.333 and note.
Hinc Amalricus, illinc Laceyus Hugo.\textsuperscript{13}

Hic Boree similis provolat, ille Notho.

Symonis hic natus, miles Crucis ille, per hostes

Prorumpunt, quorum mors volat ante manus.

\textlangle87\textrangle{} Dum vacant equites campum, stratis tamen illum

Implent corporibus; pars inimica fugit.

Qui prius exierant, numquam rediere; vel ipsi

Fossis, vel mediis occubuere viis.

Notificare novem Muse non omnia possent

Vulnera; nec poterit hic stilus iste brevis.

Dicit ut historia Francorum, rivus inundans\textsuperscript{14}

Quondam sanguineus hic sine marte fuit.

Hoc variis bellis modo verificatur. Inundat

Intus et exterius, cede madente cruror.\textsuperscript{15}

Impegit postquam muris hostiliter hostes

Symon, crudescit altera pugna gravis.

---

\textsuperscript{13} Amalricus, Amaury, Simon de Montfort’s eldest son, who inherited his father’s lands on Simon’s death. He fought in the Barons’ Crusade, \textit{DTE}, 7.177-8. Hugh de Lacy, an exiled English knight, formerly with large Irish estates, by then lord of Laurac and Castelnaudary in Languedoc, features prominently in the Cansó, and is described by Matthew Paris, \textit{CM} 4. 232, as ‘\textit{bellator nominatissimus}.’ See Introduction, 24.

\textsuperscript{14} Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{De antiquo sanguinis rivo} Tholose.’ The soil of Languedoc is a rich red, and in turbulent weather after rain the Garonne can flow red. It did in fact flood at this time, e.g. PVC, 606B.

\textsuperscript{15} Read ‘\textit{cruror}’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘\textit{cruce}.’
Obvia tela volant, hiberna grandine plura,16

Et torquet lapides plurima funda graves.

Dimisso stat equo Symon, meditando patentis
Introitus vires ingeniique modos.

Forsan in urbe fuit peraria17 parvula, multas

Inter consimiles, otia nulla gerens,

Assidue quoniam mulieres saxa rotabant,

Ut pro parte sua sic nocumenta darent.

Quelibet Eva fuit sed prima nequior Eva,

Dum pro se studuit quelibet esse nocens.18

Crebros dum torquunt iuxta fossata lapillos

Et lapides, unum casus iniquus agit;

Symonis in galeam descendit, mons ibi fortis

Labitur Ecclesie, iustitieque pugil.

Non sequitur planctus, ne clausus gaudeat hostis,

Nocte sed abducto corpore miles abit.

Intitulant tempus claris annalibus illud19

Heretici, tempus flebile ludit eis.

---

16 Ovid, Met., 5.15; see line 18 above.
17 ‘peraria’ with MS, not ‘petraria’ with Wright.
18 Only the Cansó, 1205, and John report that it was a woman who fired the stone which killed de Montfort. John is probably following the Cansó.
19 Rubric in right margin, ‘De regulis kalendarii ex incidenti ad confusionem hereticorum et laudem sanctorum’ / ‘Regarding the rules of the calendar as the days fall, to the confusion of the heretics and in honour of the saints.’
Idus et nonas et tempora fixa kalendis,

Pretereunt bissex signa gradusque suos.

Signorum gradibus Phebo currente dierum

Ortus non numerant, sit nisi causa lucri,

<88> Hos non religio, sed nummus perdocet horas [96v]

Sumendi reditus, era, phalera, cados.²⁰

Nummis postponunt sanctorum festa, diemque

Servandum domini, iussaque sancta Dei.

Multiplicant et dimidiant, addunt sibi, nobis

Subtraxisse volunt, cum sibi posse datur.

Non ut ieiunent per tempora quatuor²¹ anni

Discunt declives enumerare dies,

Sed Pharios digitare dies didicere, putantes

Pravum temporibus omen inesse bonis.²²

Ediscunt annos Domini quadrare notando

Bissextum, sed habent vota sitimque lucri.

²⁰ Wright follows the MS, ‘phalerna,’ / ‘Falernian wines’; ‘phalera,’ / ‘ornaments’, better fits the sense. Heretics were commonly accused of usury, see Abulafia (1988), 213, Mundy (1954), 77-80, WP, 15. ‘Cados’ were pots used as money-boxes.

²¹ The ‘four times’ for fasting, or Ember Days, fell before Christmas and Easter, and after Whitsuntide and the Exaltation of the Cross.

²² Although dismissed as a superstitious practice by Augustine, twenty-four specific ‘Egyptian days’, not always the same ones, were often marked as unlucky in medieval calendars, inauspicious for e.g. starting a journey or enterprise, see Steele (1919). John seems to be saying that heretics perversely regard fine days as ill-omened.
Quis ciclus Domini, notulas comprehendit, et omnes

Scit concurrentes qui numerare studet,

Lucibus undenis lunaris quod minor annus

Anno sit solis. Lucra sequendo notat,

Annos ille decem notat ire novemque ferentes

Primam qua fenus dulce redire queat.

Cum solis ciclus vigenos claudat et octo

Annos quid lucru conferat arte notat.

Non causa Pasche curat cognoscere Pascha;

Propter se festum mobile scire negat.

Non Ianuario notat annum, sed sibi figit

Anni principium quolibet esse die.

Si quoris causam, sumit vadimonia, reddit;

Massat opes aliis, devorat Orcus eum.

Menses metiri duodenaque signa beati

Christicole propter festa beata student.

Dictio bissena dat in ordine grammata bissex

---

23 Read ‘Domini, notulas’ with MS, not ‘notulas Domini’ with Wright.
24 Nineteen years is the time taken by the moon to return to the same phase on the same calendar date. Twenty eight years marks the full solar cycle over which in the Julian calendar the days of the week and the date coincide. This section is more a display of John’s expertise in astronomy than a serious attack on moneylenders. His point is that moneylenders profit from the divergences between lunar and solar calendars by making sure interest, accrued daily, was charged for all the intercalary days needed to reconcile the calendars.
25 John uses both feminine and neuter declensions of Pascha.
26 Read ‘Ianuario’ for ‘hic Alano’ in MS and Wright.
27 MS has ‘orcbus’; read ‘orcus’ with Wright.
Illis, ut menses initiare queas,

Altitonans Dominus, Divina Gerens, Bonus. Extat

Granum Celeste;²⁸ Fert Ana Dona, Fide.²⁹

Mar. Ma. Iul. Oc. senas, reliquis quater, imprime nonas,

Octo sunt idus, subsequiturque kalon.


Lucibus at geminis Februus esto minor

Huic dabitur quarto lux bisextilis in anno

Quam faciunt hore sex superesse quater.

Post Martis nonas primam defige,³⁰ diesque

Bis sepecth numeras, Pascha sequetur eos.³¹

²⁸ ‘celeste granum susciptiens,’ Bernard of Clairvaux, De laude novae militie, 5.
²⁹ Wright punctuates ‘Altitonans Dominus, Divina Gerens, Bonus. Extat. / Granum Caeleste Fert Ana, Dona, Fide.’ This does not matter, since this was a list of twelve words (of which there were variations) enabling the user to work out on which day of the week any day of the month falls. The words in lines 121-22 represent the months, in order from January, and the initial letter is the ferial or Dominical letter on the kalends (first day) of each month. In a medieval calendar, these letters appeared in the sequence A-G beside each day of the year, beginning on 1 January and running through to 31 December. The Dominical letter for 1 January is A, for 1 February D, for 1 March D and so forth. If the Dominical letter for the current year is A, then 1 January will fall on a Sunday, 1 February (D) on a Wednesday, 1 March on a Wednesday and so forth. If it is a leap year, the Dominical letter for the year advances by one after 24 February. Since 15 January, 22 January and 29 January will also have the Dominical letter A, they will fall on Sunday in the year in question. Knowing this mnemonic—and the Dominical letter of the current year—allows one to calculate the weekday of any calendar date. I am grateful to Professor Faith Wallis for her guidance.

³⁰ John is explaining how to calculate the date of Easter. Using the Julian calendar, fourteen days following the Nones of March is 20 March (taking John’s definition as the eve of the Nones). The day following is 21 March, the vernal equinox. The Paschal Moon is the first full moon on or following that day, and Easter is the Sunday after that. His interest in this subject went back at least to when he wrote EBVM, 8.263-72.

³¹ According to Paetow, MS, 141-42, in many medieval manuscripts and ‘almost all the old bibliographies,’ John of Garland was credited with a work on computus, the art of calculating the incidence of Easter. Scholars before Paetow believed this was a mistaken attribution of works by Gerlandus, an twelfth century computist. However, given John’s prolific authorship, and his interest in the subject demonstrated in this poem, Paetow concludes that ‘we cannot fly in the face of so much manuscript evidence of the thirteenth and later centuries which
Per lucem Pasche tibi Septuagesima scitur,
   Ebdomadas retro conumerato novem.
Sustinet Ecclesia tamen illud mobile festum
   Nam prope iudicium cernit adesse Dei.

   Quinquaginta due sunt ebdomade, tamen anno
   In toto supra cernitur\textsuperscript{32} una dies.
Ista dies reddit Domini variabile grama\textsuperscript{33}
   Supra quod debet Pascha venire sacrum.
De saltu lune vel epactis defero tractum,
   Hoc alibi quia pagina certa docet\textsuperscript{34}
Prostrato fidei muro fecere patentes [97r]
   Portas cum plausu qui doluere prius.
Imperium Rome si vir modo talis haberet,\textsuperscript{35}
   Tutus papa foret, tutaque tota Syon.

\begin{flushleft}
ascribes this or that work on computus to John of Garland. Surprisingly he did not go on to say that lines 139-40 below provide \textit{prima facie} (though not overwhelming) evidence that John had already written such a work.
\textsuperscript{32}Read ‘cernitur’ for Wright’s ‘cerniter,’ with MS.
\textsuperscript{33}On dominical letters, see n. 29. The lunar year comprises 354 days, eleven days shorter than the solar year of 365 days (ignoring leap years). Therefore, starting both at the same time, at the beginning of the solar year 11 days of the the lunar year will already have passed, and \textit{pro rata}, 22 days will have passed by the end of two solar years. These measures of difference were ‘epacts’. When the difference became 30 days, an intercalary lunar month was inserted into the lunar calendar and 30 was subtracted from the epact. Because these figures are not precise, after every nineteen solar years, an extra day was added to the epact to rectify distortions. This process was ‘\textit{saltus lune}’ / ‘moon’s leap.’
\textsuperscript{34}This explanation is not in fact provided elsewhere in \textit{DTE}.
\textsuperscript{35}This line clearly follows on from the death of Simon de Montfort in line 84. It looks like an attempt to stitch together the section written in Toulouse and the sections written in the early 1240s. The reference in line 142 is to the people of Toulouse, following Simon’s death in 1218. John then makes a favourable and flattering comparison with the Emperor Frederick II. If this section was written in Toulouse, John is probably referring to Frederick II’s return from the Holy Land to deal with Pope Gregory IX’s ‘crusade’ against him in Italy in 1228-30.
\end{flushleft}
Ha! Nova damna queror, gemitus intersero iustos

Dum caput Ecclesie Cesaris ira ferit.

Musica dum metricam sibi copulat artis amicam,\textsuperscript{36}

Ut Lapithes\textsuperscript{37} satyram temperat arte liram,

Ditonice canerem bellum, nisi bella timerem.\textsuperscript{38}

Privatim doleo, iura perire fleo.\textsuperscript{39}

Cantus cromaticus lascivis aptus, iniquus

Est mihi. Dum refero gesta, modestus ero.

Papa fatigatur, terraque marique gravatur.\textsuperscript{40}

Nil curant nati patris amore pati.

Hec probo; mutescunt residentque, metuque tepescunt;

Torporem fidei puniet ira Dei.

More patrum solito, Francos, pie pastor, adito.

---

\textsuperscript{36} Rubric in right margin, ‘Interseritur de gestis nobilibus Karoli regis.’ This looks out of place. Charlemagne appears in line 159. Note however the stylistic feature of rhyming half-lines in lines 147-228, with a few exceptions. This suggests insertion of a separate piece of work, essentially about Charlemagne, introduced to contrast Frederick’s treatment of the pope with Louis IX’s offer of refuge in Lyon. John struggles on occasion to combine rhyme with sense and strays from the rules for leonines.

\textsuperscript{37} For ‘sapiat’ in MS and Wright read ‘Lapithes’/ ‘Lapith’ to make sense of this line. This looks like another error by the scribe because of his unfamiliarity with classical mythology.

\textsuperscript{38} In lines 149-52, John uses the language of music, linking rhythm and harmony with metre. He refers to Boethius’ division of song into three genera, diatonic, chromatic and enharmonic, \emph{De institutione musica}, 1.15. In 1.21 Boethius writes ‘diatonum quidem aliquanto durius et naturalius, chroma vero iam quasi ab illa naturali intentione discedens et in mollius decidens’ / ‘the diatonic is somewhat more austere and more natural, but the chromatic seems to depart from that natural inclination and to slip into softer mode.’ John is saying here that he will stick to words rather than music. On music, see also \emph{DTE}, 6.49-54 and Introduction, 26.

\textsuperscript{39} John is referring to the Toulousains’ rejection of Simon’s claims on their city.

\textsuperscript{40} The pope is Innocent IV, elected in 1243 after a two year interregnum.
Rex occurret ibi,\textsuperscript{41} gensque modesta tibi.

<90> Est ibi Pipinus, est Karolus, ad mare pinus

Si sit opus renovans, pro patre victor ovans.\textsuperscript{42}

Rome bis terque succurrens fortis uterque

Gothos acephalos reddidit ense malos.\textsuperscript{43}

Karolus ut dictis Turpini promo relictis

Terris sanctorum gaudet habere chorum.\textsuperscript{44}

Insula multa maris\textsuperscript{45} titulis est addita claris,

Et Sarraceni mixta iuventa seni.\textsuperscript{46}

Reges gentiles exarmat ad arma viriles

Inclita palma Crucis, corde fideque ducis

Imperium rexit Rome. Papalia texit,

\textsuperscript{41} Read ‘occurret’ with MS, not Wright’s ‘otfret.’ I am grateful to Gregory Hays for this.

\textsuperscript{42} Read ‘sit’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘sic.’ ‘Si opus sit,’ was a medical formula, shortened to ‘SOS’, requiring a prescribed dose to be administered ‘when required.’ Lines 159-60 were clearly written around 1245, when the pope fled to Lyon. Only Louis IX of the Western monarchs responded to the new Pope Innocent IV’s call to recover the Holy Land by starting to prepare a fleet. Vergil Aen. 5. 331, ‘hic iuvenis iam victor ovans.’ In fact this passage describes Nisus’ joy immediately before he slips and loses the race, so could have been written before or after Louis’ defeat in 1250.

\textsuperscript{43} Lines 162-95 are based on Pseudo-Turpin. Both Pippin (c.714-68) and Charlemagne (c.745-814) were kings of the Franks engaged in fighting the Muslims in Europe. John’s narrative is in line with the Capetian propaganda demonstrating direct continuity with the Carolingians. See Introduction, 79 & n. 348.

\textsuperscript{44} Ps-T, 32 describes Charlemagne’s death, Turpin’s premonition of it, and his confidence that Charlemagne had won a martyr’s crown.

\textsuperscript{45} Charlemagne added Corsica, Sardinia and the Balearics to his empire. He was named ‘patricius’ by Pope Adrian I (772-95) in 774, and crowned emperor by Leo in 800.

\textsuperscript{46} This line seems corrupt. The reading is unambiguous. Amending to ‘Sarraceno’ would establish a reference to the vernacular tale of the combat between Renaud of Montauban and the Old Man of the Mountains, but would destroy the leonine form.
Servans Ecclesiam cumque Rachele Lyam.\textsuperscript{47}

Sevas esse manus tunc Papa videns Adrianus,\textsuperscript{48}

Regem per Karolum terruit omne solum.

In Longobardos rex non ad prelia tardos

Inclitus optinuit, inclita palma fuit.

Magni frater erat Karoli; bene si modo queras,\textsuperscript{49}

Cronica qui retegit et sua gesta legit.\textsuperscript{50}

Magnum papa\textsuperscript{51} Leo magno comitante tropheo

Accivit Karolum, suppeditando dolum.

Nam Leo cecatur sed celicus ut reparatur

Tutus Romuleo rege triumphat eo.

Magnus Agolandum\textsuperscript{52} confundit sepe nephandum,

Tandem quod querit, impius ense perit.

\textsuperscript{47} Rachel and Leah, Gen. 31, the wives of Jacob, typically here symbolising the monastic and lay elements of the Church respectively. Constable (1995) 3-141, passim, reviews their treatment by medieval writers and that of Mary and Martha, Lazarus’ sisters (see DTE, 2, n. 151 & 3, n. 177).

\textsuperscript{48} Pope Adrian I asked Charlemagne to repel the Lombards, who were threatening Rome. He did this in 773-74.

\textsuperscript{49} Read ‘queras,’ with sense, for MS and Wright ‘querat.’

\textsuperscript{50} There is no record of any such account by Carloman, Charlemagne’s younger brother. Einhard’s Vita Caroli and the Frankish archives on which it is based are the obvious source for this reference, based as they are on sources close to Charlemagne.

\textsuperscript{51} In 799, attackers of Pope Leo III (795-816) tried to tear out his tongue and eyes. He was rescued by Charlemagne, and crowned him emperor the following year. The ‘Paderborn epic,’ or De Karolo Magno et Papa Leone, describes this encounter, also mentioned by Einhard, Book 3.

\textsuperscript{52} Agolandus, see also DTE, 3,328-36. For his death in Pamplona, see Ps-T, 14.
In Ferracutum Rolandum\textsuperscript{53} mittit acutum,

Hicque giganteum morte perurget eum.

\textbf{185}\quad Marsirii\textsuperscript{54} munus cum vino femina funus

Multis triste facit, agmen ad ima iacit.

Marsirium sternit Rolandus. Cur? Quia spernit

Baptismi lavacrum persequiturque sacrum.

Non hodie callis amfractu Rocidavallis\textsuperscript{55}

\textbf{190}\quad Rolandi resonat ense tubisque sonat,

Rore Pireneo vallis madet, aut Karoleo [97v]

Marte cruenta fluit insidiasque luit.\textsuperscript{56}

<91> In fraudem proni multi modo sunt Ganaloni.

Qui fallax fuerit hic Ganalonus erit,

\textbf{195}\quad Hic bellatores dat fraude neci meliores.

Tempore quam timeo posse nocere meo!

\textsuperscript{53} Ferracutus was a giant, descended from Goliath, killed by Roland on Charlemagne’s orders, Ps-T, 17

\textsuperscript{54} Marsirius, a fictional Persian king sent by the emir of Babylon to fight Charlemagne. He is killed by Roland at Roncesvalles in Pseudo-Turpin, but in the Song of Roland loses his hand, dying later. It was he who bribed Ganelon with women and wine for the army, to betray the rearguard of Charlemagne’s army which Roland commanded. He had falsely promised to convert. Marsirius’ bribe is described at Ps-T, 21, and his death in ch. 22. Roland and his forces were slaughtered at Roncesvalles.

\textsuperscript{55} The battle of Roncesvalles, a Pyrenean pass, took place in 778. Earlier accounts say that Charlemagne’s army was attacked by Basques, later versions (like Pseudo-Turpin) say the enemy was Muslim. ‘\textit{Tubis}’ in line 190 refers to Roland’s blast on his ivory horn, too late for Charlemagne and reinforcements to be of any use. See Ps-T, 23-24 for the rest of the battle and its aftermath.

\textsuperscript{56} If this section was written in the early 1240s, the latter-day Ganelon may be Raymond VII, who briefly supported Henry III’s invasion of 1242, and was blamed for the murder in 1242 of Dominican inquisitors, \textit{DTE}, 7.279-80. Or it could be the Count of Foix, who supported a rebellion by Raymond II Trencavel in 1240. Another strong candidate is Frederick II.
Quis modo tutatur papam? Quis ad arma paratur?

Quis fugat excubias? Evacuatque vias\(^{57}\)?

Venti succurrerit Dives, bona quando ligurrit,\(^{58}\)

Fortis sincerum dulce bibendo merum.

Causatur clerus, Sciolus reputatur Homerus,

Nummos dum querit, pro quibus arma gerit.

Tales dum comedunt avide, stomacum sibi ledunt.

Plurima qui\(^{59}\) sitiunt noscere vina sciunt.

De propriis matri succurrrite, propria patri

Solvite. Cur Dominus languet habendo minus?

Contra scismaticos fidei Crux armet amicos

Verbis altisonis, Ecclesieque bonis.

Ad patris femora male Cham\(^{60}\) sua solverat ora;

Cur tu derides qui bene gesta vides?

Rex non degenerat Ludovicus,\(^{61}\) si bene querat,

‘Quis gladios acuit, robur in arma struit?’

\(^{57}\) This appears to refer to the events of 1244, when the pope fled to Lyon to escape the forces of Frederick II. Lines 199-206 are an attack on the clergy of the day, who spent the substance of the Church, undermined the classics and engaged in armed warfare, instead of supporting the pope. John seems to be saying that while the very rich and powerful thrive on their depredations, the clergy cannot digest them.

\(^{58}\) Dives, medieval name for the rich man in the parable of Lazarus, Luc. 16, 19-31.

\(^{59}\) Read ‘qui,’ with sense, not ‘quae’ with Wright.

\(^{60}\) Ham, son of Noah, saw his father naked, Gen. 9, 20-22.

\(^{61}\) Louis IX emerges as the hero who gave refuge to the pope, and took up arms against his enemies the Saracens. John contrasts the duty of kings to take military action, and that of popes to use intellectual and ecclesiastical weapons.
Est pape cura Christi defendere iura,

Que lex sancta movet, curia iusta fovet.

215 Patres Ecclesie tendunt in calle sophie.

Non errare queunt dum sapienter eunt.

‘Cesar magne, pape! Quid agis? Dentur sua pape. 62

Tu cohibe vires, qui probitate vires.

Parce potens celo, dispar tua gloria Belo

220 Stat pro Christicolis, idola nulla colis. 63

Sit Constantini tibi vita preambula fini,

Cuius 64 sancta fides fulsit ut ipse vides’.

Fulminis igne perit dum celum scandere querit

Atrox Centimanus 65 bellipotensque manus.

225 Da stabilem pacem, Deus, ensem tolle minacem,

Regnet ut ingenua Crux tua lexque tua.

<92> Surgat vir fortis aliquis princepsque cohortis 66

Extinguens heresum virus amando Ihesum.

---

62 This is a difficult passage. The punctuation differs from Wright’s, turning this into a direct appeal to Frederick II to join forces with the pope, probably in the early 1240s, but possibly surviving from material John wrote in the 1220s. John uses the colloquial ‘Quid agis?’ reminiscent of Latin comedy, in a pun alongside ‘pape’ / ‘pope’. In CG, 4.1629, John explains the use of ‘Pape’ as ‘Quid hoc est?’ / ‘What’s all this?’ In the next line John uses ‘vires’ as both noun and verb. Lines 219-20 are retained as in MS and Wright, leaving words which attribute probitas to Frederick.

63 John alludes to contemporarary accusations of heresy against Frederick.

64 Read ‘cuius’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘eius.’

65 ‘Centimanus’, a giant of classical mythology, e.g. Aen. 10.566-68.

66 John juxtaposes Louis’ Carolingian provenance with his criticism of Frederick, who claimed direct imperial succession.
Annos ecce quater centum trigintaque lapsos

Et sex a Karoli tempore\textsuperscript{67} scripta ferunt.

Post Karolum reges cuncti fulsere fideles.

Ista probat proles, magne Philippe, tua.

O dolor, O luctus, risus Elegia furtim

Surripit, et subito gaudia vana rapit,

Cincta\textsuperscript{68} triumphali Ludovitica tempora lauro

Febris oppressit, deposuitque solo.

Rex studet opprobium Christi Symonisque perempti

Ulcisci; regem mors animosa rapit.

Avinone tamen prius in sua iura redacta

Cives fregerunt menia pace data.\textsuperscript{69}

Succedit regi Ludovico rex Ludovicus, [98r]

Cuius consiliis\textsuperscript{70} pax diuturna placet.

Cognatus regis paci revocatur ab armis.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{67} 436 years from Charlemagne’s death would be 1250. This is therefore one of the later passages of \textit{DTE}.

\textsuperscript{68} Read ‘\textit{cincta},’ for ‘\textit{cuncta}’ in MS and Wright.

\textsuperscript{69} Louis VIII (1223-26), Philip’s son, died during the siege of in 1226, having all but captured Avignon from Raymond VII of Toulouse, WP, 33-34; \textit{CM}, 3.114-17. See also \textit{DTE}, 3.293-94. Officially the king died of dysentery, but Matthew Paris suggests he was poisoned. He was succeeded by his son, Louis IX, then aged twelve. Until he became of age, Louis IX effectively shared the throne with his mother, Blanche of Castile.

\textsuperscript{70} ‘\textit{consiliis}’ could refer either to the advice Louis was receiving or to his ‘plans or policies.’ The former interpretation gives Blanche the credit for rapid neutralisation of Raymond VII.

\textsuperscript{71} Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{De plantatione studii Tholose}’/ ‘regarding the establishment of the Toulouse \textit{studium}’. ‘\textit{Cognatus},’ Raymond VII of Toulouse was the son of Raymond VI and Joan, sister of Richard I of England. Richard’s mother was Eleanor of Aquitaine, who was
Remundus, tali condicione tamen:

Quod comitis natam Robertus frater haberet

Regis, at Alphonso postea nupta fuit:

Quod proprio sumptu studium sollemne Tholose

Fundaret; caperet quod simul ille Crucem. 72

Qualiter impleta fuerint promissa, patescit 73

Omnibus; ad pugnam pax simulata redit,

Sed comes allegat inustitiam sibi factam

Dum rex conatur castra 74 tenere sibi.

Inquiri Bugaros 75 permittit, eosque peruri.

Qualia sunt novit interiora Deus.

Hunc probitas et nobilitas de stemate regum

Gazaque magnificent, castraque plena viris.

Pravos extirpat et doctor et ignis et ensis,

married first to Louis VII of France and then to Henry II of England. Philip II’s mother was Louis VII’s third wife, Adela of Champagne.

72 The Treaty of Paris was concluded between Raymond VII and Louis IX in 1229, C. Devic, & J. Vaissète eds., Histoire générale de Languedoc (Toulouse, 1879), vol. 8, 883-93. John lists here some of the Treaty’s provisions. Raymond’s daughter Jeanne was to marry one of Louis IX’s brothers, and on Raymond’s death his remaining territories were to pass through her to the French crown. The Capetian monarchs, having already confiscated the Trencavel lands, consolidated their control over Languedoc. Raymond was required to take the Cross, and to establish the studium at Toulouse. ‘Sollenne’ is most safely translated as ‘on a regular basis’ rather than given a religious implication.

73 John implies bad faith on Raymond’s part.

74 In 1240, Raymond recovered some fortresses which he felt had been unreasonably held by the king.

75 ‘Bugaros’ reflects the putative Bulgarian origins of the Cathar heresy. ‘Bugerus’ was also used mid-twelfth century for ‘usurer’. On nomenclature, see Wakefield (1974), 30.
Falcat eos Fulco presul in urbe sacer.  

Hic dudum fuerat ioculator, civis et inde

Marsilie clarus coniuge, prole, domo.

<93> Intrans cenobium Turoneti veste sub alba

Certat ut interius albior esse queat.

Factus de monacho fuit abbas, presul et inde

Tholose, pass pro grege multa mala,

Probra, minas, iter, exilium, suspiria, luctus,

Raptus, contemptus, insidiasque graves.

Abbates facti Fulconis sunt duo nati,

Consecrat et matrem religionis apex.

Multa novo studio dedit hic solacia postquam

Romanus studium sanxit in urbe novum.

Sed Grandis Silve pius abbas dictus Helyas

Sub duce legato proxima frena capit.

Parisius doctos abbas elegit, at illos

---

76 Read ‘sacer’ for Wright’s ‘sacra.’ John describes Fulk as ‘beatus’ at DTE 6.15. Fulk, a Cistercian, bishop of Toulouse (1205-31). On Fulk, see WP (Sibly & Sibly, xxi-xxii, xxviii, & 83-84, n. 12. There are frequent references to him in WP and the Chronicle of William Pelhisson. Some of his poetry survives and it is tempting to surmise that John acquired his knowledge of the vernacular from him, see Introduction, 22 & 86.

77 The Cistercian abbey of Le Toronet, in Provence.

78 Fulk’s mother and sons.

79 Romanus, or Romano Bonaventura, papal legate 1225-31, who, with Fulk, introduced the inquisition process in Toulouse.

80 Helyas, or Élie Garin, abbot of Grand Selve, an influential Cistercian abbey North of Toulouse. He was sent by Romano to broker the Treaty of Paris with Raymond VII.
Duxit legatus munera larga pluens. 81

Rupis Amatoris clivosa sede manebat 82

Legatus triduo, sedis amore sacre.

Rupis in abrupto locus hic dependet, ibidem

Virginis et matris maxima mira micant.

Hec est cui cedit supplex Elegia, per quam

Risus succedit, mors dominata perit.

Illius hic meritis omnes devotio morbos

Diluit; hic, Ὑποκρας, hic, Galiene, tace; 83

Devote mentes artem, pronostica, curam,

Antidotum, spondent efficiuntque sibi. 84

Firma fides sociata spei, dилectio fervens,

Ad dosim veniunt pondere pensa pari.

Est velut urine signum confessio, mentis

Est colamentum, notificatque malum.

---

81 John suggests generous incentives were paid. On the salaries, see Introduction, 61 & n.

244. The detailed stipends at the outset, and the implied pecking order of the subjects taught, are set out in the Treaty of Paris.

82 Rubric in right margin, 'De miraculis gloriose Virginis Marie'. Rocamadour, Lot, a site of pilgrimage to the cliff-top sanctuary of the Virgin, containing an image traditionally carved by St. Amator (Amador). Bull (1999), gives a full account of reported miracles. St. Amador was identified in French folklore with Zacchaeus, the biblical tax-collector, believed to have reached Aquitaine by sea from the Holy Land.

83 Hippocrates, ‘the most famous physician of antiquity and one of the least known,’ Oxford Classical Dictionary (2017). Galen of Pergamum (129 - c. 200 or c. 217 CE) was a practising surgeon, who wrote prolifically about both medicine and philosophy. His works were increasingly available from the eleventh century, through translations into Latin from Arabic and the original Greek.

84 See Stella, 64-75, for another vindication of divine, specifically Marian, healing over human medicine. Urine was the ‘colamentum’/‘filter’ of the blood.
Propositum sanctum sequitur miseratio summa,

Sanans exterius interiusque lavans.

Est afforismus Christi: si tu bene credis, [98v]\(^{85}\)

Factaque si fuerint inelita, salvus eris.\(^{86}\)

Est brevis hic sermo, describens integra queque

Clarificans sensum sub brevitate rei.

<94> Quid facit\(^{87}\) herbarum gradus hic, opiata, syrupus?

Compositum, simplex hic medicamen\(^{88}\) hebet.

Christi Virgo parens est, omnia prole potenti

Hic\(^{89}\) operans, morti suscitat illa datos.

Integer apparet ibi sanctus Amator, amicus

Virginis, et nomen remque beatus habet.

Illic inspectis miris, precibusque peractis,

Tholosam clerus tutius explet iter.

Omnis in ecclesia Iuliani contio sancti\(^{90}\)

Nostra fuit primo, parva sed apta tamen.

Hic abbas Grandis Silve dubio mihi sanctum

Edidit hunc, dicens Cenomanense decus.

\(^{85}\) Read ‘si’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘sed.’ Wright’s punctuation is changed.

\(^{86}\) Rom. 10, 9.

\(^{87}\) ‘hic’ is deleted after ‘facit’ in MS.

\(^{88}\) ‘habet’ is deleted from MS.

\(^{89}\) Read ‘Hic’ for Wright’s ‘Haec.’

\(^{90}\) Rubric in left margin, ‘De quatuor sanctis Julianis exemplariter.’ ‘The church of St. Julian’ was on the river to the north, just outside the walls of the Bourg,’ J. Mundy (2006), 40, with map, 10.
‘Sanctus Brivate Iulianus, sanctus et alter

Cenomanis, sanctum fertur habere locum.\textsuperscript{91}

Est primus martir, confessor episcopus alter.

Amborum sanctus spiritus hospes erat.\textsuperscript{92}

Tertius ut fama est Dominum transvexit ad amnem,

Fovit et in tepido membra beata thoro.

Temptatus meruit cenum, cum coniuge martir,

Et Domini munus hospitis hospes habet.

Cenomanensis erat comes huic pater, et comitissa

Mater; ut est scriptis consona fama piis,

Corniger ut cervus predixit utrumque parentem

Occisurus erat, commiserante Deo.

Effugit ergo nephas peregrinans, sed peregrinus

Tempore post longo est factus uterque parens.

Hos pia sponsa viri pascit, lectoque reclinat

Itque foras. Absens vir Iulianus adest.

Mechari sponsam credens, occidit utrumque.

Sed sponsa redit clamans, ‘Est parricida miser!’

\textsuperscript{91} St. Julian of Brioude was a third century martyr and soldier, whose headdress was buried in Vienne with the body of his associate Ferreolus. Jean de Mailly refers to him as St Julian of Arvernia. Julian of Le Mans (\textit{Cenomanensis}) was a third century holy man, a leper who became first bishop of Le Mans. He is confused in Jean de Mailly’s and John’s accounts with Julian \textit{Hospitator} or \textit{Paenitens}, also from Le Mans, a fourth century martyr said to have carried Christ across a river as a penance (lines 311-28). John’s fourth St Julian was Julian of Antioch, husband of St. Basilissa (lines 329-38). See also JdeM, 349-52 & 77-81.

\textsuperscript{92} In MS ‘erit’ is deleted and ‘erat’ substituted.
Hos iterum profugos purgavit pena piatrix,\textsuperscript{93}

Martirio meruit\textsuperscript{94} donec uterque Deum.’

Nauta Dei causa Dominum suscepit, egeni

In specie, celum quo Iulianus habet.

\textless 95\textgreater  Antiochenus erat Iulianus quartus; et idem

Civis cum sponsa virgine virgo virens.

Hiis Deus apparens votis respondit eorum

Et consignavit corda parata Deo.

Multos convertit virgo Basilissa, maritus

Quampluros; moritur sponsa polita polo.

Preside cum pravo fecit Iulianus agonem,

Cuius vix poterit nomen habere metrum.\textsuperscript{95}

Dic ergo ‘Martí’, dic, ‘Anus’; martius egit

In sancto martem, nomine teste suo.\textsuperscript{96}

Templa deosque suos Iulianus vicit, et ipsum

Et tormenta, quibus gaudia victor habet.

Servi restituit oculum qui leserat ipsum [99r]

Quod tenebris positi non potuere dei.

In nihilum prorsus sunt templa redacta. Resurgit

\textsuperscript{93} Wright’s punctuation is changed to reflect direct speech.

\textsuperscript{94} Wright has no space between these words.

\textsuperscript{95} For unscannable words see \textit{DTE}, 1.97 & n. 35.

\textsuperscript{96} According to Jean de Mailly, the local governor in Antioch was called Martianus. Punctuation is changed from Wright’s to reflect the play on words.
Mortuus, et narrat Tartara visa sibi.

In vitam reidiens credit. Confunditur istis

Preses, presidium non videt esse sibi.

In Christum credit proles uxorque tyranni,

Cuius degladiat corda cruenta dolor.

Sanctos esse feris laniandos precipit ille;

Elambunt sacros circueuntque pedes.

Ergo iubet gladio Iulianum subdere colla,

Consortesque suos quoslibet ire pares.

Deportat secum Iulianus ad horrea celi

Messem celestem se sociosque sacros.

Urbem tempestas ferit, et populus perit;\(^97\) ortis

Vermibus emoritur preses aditque deos.

Demonis hereticus hospes tenebrosa subintrat\(^98\)

Tartara, quem\(^99\) semper torrida strata cremant.

Quippe Deum spernit, in demone spem sibi figit,

Qui nummos tanquam numina sacra colit.\(^100\)

Incepto studio legatur epistola talis,

---

\(^{97}\) N.b. the internal rhyme.

\(^{98}\) The purpose of the *studium* was to fight heresy. Lines 357-60 are an abrupt bridge to the section of the poem covering John’s time in Toulouse, probably written in the 1230s. John is credited with drafting the prose ‘recruitment advertisement’. For other reference to heretics as covetous usurers, see n. 20 above.

\(^{99}\) Read ‘*quem*’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘*quae*.’

\(^{100}\) N.b. John’s pun on ‘*nummos*’ and ‘*numina*’. 
Sic aliis studiis verba soluta ferens.\textsuperscript{101} 

\textlt<96>\textltdi> Se lector recreare potest quem metra fatigant

Edita cum vario sit mea Musa sono.

\textbf{Epistola transmissa a magistris Tholosanis ad universalia studia alibi florentia}\textsuperscript{102}

Universis Christi fidelibus et precipe magistris et scolaribus ubicumque terrarum studentibus, presentes litteras inspecturis, universitas\textsuperscript{103} magistrorum et scolariorum Tholose studium in nova radice statuentium, vite bone perseverantiam exitu cum beato. Stabile fundamentum non invenit operatio, que non est in Christo, sancte matris Ecclesie fundamento, firmiter collocata. Nos igitur, hec attendentes, summo conamine nostro conati sumus in Christo Tholose studii philosophici fundamentum durabile collocare super quod edificent nobiscum\textsuperscript{104} ceteri quorum bona voluntas sit ad hec Spiritus Sancti luminosis radiis illustrata. Dicit enim beatus Augustinus, ‘Deus voluntatem bonam preparat adiuvandam et adiuvat preparatam,’\textsuperscript{105} ipse quidem nolentem prevenit ut velit, volentem vero subsequitur ne frustra velit. Unde, dilectissimi, velitis et vos nobiscum bonam voluntatem Domino preparare, quam cum ipse preparatam inveniat ad opera sancta perducat, ut ubi pridem gladii viam feceris, pugnetis acumine lingue; ubi bellica strages inhorruit, pacifica militetis doctrina; ubi pravitatis heretice silvestris spinetum excrevit, cedrus fidei catholice per vos ad sidera sublimetur. Et ne vos absterreat tanti laboris aggressio, viam vobis preparavimus. Prima tedia sustinuimus, vexillum securitatis vobis pretendimus, ut

\textsuperscript{101} ‘Verba soluta’, Ovid, Tr., 4.10.23-26. ‘totoque Helicone relicto / ...scribere conahar verba soluta modis. / Sponte sua carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos, / et quod temptabam dicere versus erat.’

\textsuperscript{102} The title is inserted by the rubricator, in line with a draft by the scribe. A text of this letter, based on Wright’s, appears in \textit{CUP}, 1, 129-31. For a recent edition see Schmidt (1998); this was helpful in identifying some of John’s classical quotations. I am grateful to Susan Edgington for drawing my attention to a similar appeal to the Masters and Scholars of Paris by Pope Honorius III in 1217, also offering full remission of sins, \textit{CUP}, 1, 83-84. None of the earlier papal language is borrowed here.

\textsuperscript{103} ‘Universitas’ refers to the community of scholars; it should not be translated ‘university’, see Verger (1992), 37-40.

\textsuperscript{104} Read ‘nobiscum’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘nobiscunt’.

nobis vestris armigeris precedentibus valeatis vos philosophie [99r] milites, arpe\textsuperscript{106} Mercurii, telis Phebi, lancea Minerve,\textsuperscript{107} tutius militare. Ut iterum spem habeatis de incepti studii stabilitate, nobis onus inuinctum\textsuperscript{108} auctoritate suscepimus Ecclesi. Erat enim Moyses, noster dominus cardinalis, et legatus in regno Francie, \textsuperscript{109} dux et protecteur et autor post Deum et dominum Papam tam ardua incoationis, qui statuit quod omnes Tholose studentes et magistri et discipuli omnium peccaminum suorum plenariam indulgentiam consequantur. Ob hanc igitur causam, et propter continuitatem legendi disputandique quam magistri diligentius et crebrius exercent quam exercuerunt Parisius, multi scolares confluunt Tholosam, videntes quod flores iam apparuerunt in terra nostra, et tempus putationis advenit.\textsuperscript{110}

Sicut idcirco nostrum Achillem novum\textsuperscript{97} philosophie militandem nulla detineat Deidamia\textsuperscript{111} quin alteram adeat Troiam, de qua sic iterum posset dicere Statius Tholosanus\textsuperscript{112}:

‘Omnis honos illic, illic ingentia certant

Nomina; vix timide matres, aut agmina cessant

Virginea. Hic multum steriles damnatus in annos

Invisusque deo, si quem hec nova gloria segnem\textsuperscript{113} preterit.’

\textsuperscript{106} Read ‘arpe’, ‘sword or scimitar’, with MS, not ‘arte’ with Wright. This fits in a list of weapons but has no known link to Mercury. ‘Harpa’ or ‘lyre’ would fit Mercury, but is not a weapon and is in the genitive, not ablative. On balance read with MS.

\textsuperscript{107} The patron deities of poetry, music, and wisdom.

\textsuperscript{108} CUP has ‘iniunctum’, marginally preferable to Wright’s ‘invinctum.’ The text permits either.

\textsuperscript{109} Romano Bonaventura.

\textsuperscript{110} Cant. 2, 12, ‘flores apparuerunt in terra, tempus putationis advenit.’ The biblical context makes this a metaphor of spring, intellectual in this case. ‘Putatio’ can also mean ‘thinking’, as well as the commoner translation, ‘pruning.’

\textsuperscript{111} Read ‘Sicut’ with MS, not ‘Et’ with Wright. In Greek mythology, Deidamia was a daughter of king Lycomedes, at whose court Thetis had hidden her son Achilles, disguised as another of his daughters to avoid recruitment to the Greek expedition to Troy.

\textsuperscript{112} Statius was widely believed to have come from Toulouse. See O.A.W. Dilke, ed., Statius’ Achilleid (Cambridge, 1954), 3. This was due to a confusion with the first century rhetorician, Statius Ursulus Tolosanus.

\textsuperscript{113} Statius, Achilleid, 1. 798-802. In l. 801, the MS has the singular ‘deo’ for Statius’ ‘deis,’ a Christian tweak to John’s text.
Induat igitur quilibet probus animosum Achillem, ne meticulosus Thersites occupet laurum promissam Aiaci magnanimo, ut saltem bello finito stadium militantium et studium philosophantium admiretur. Et ut libentius Tholose gloriam simul cum studio studiosi dinoscat, sciint hanc alteram esse terram promissionis fluentem lac et mel, ubi fetose pasce virent, ubi arbores pomifere frondent, ubi Bacchus regnat in vineis, ubi Ceres imperat in arvis, ubi temperatus aër antiquis philosophis fuerat consideratis terre stadiis preelectus. O, quam incomprehensibilia sunt omnipotentis Dei magnalia!

‘Hic est pax; alibi toto Mars sevit in orbe.’

Sed Martem prius et mortem locus iste recepit.’

Praeterea ne ligones ad steriles et incultos deferatis agros, vobis magistri Tholose legentes tribulos plebee ruditatis et ceteraque removerunt obstacula. Hic enim theologi discipulos in pulpitis et populos in compitis informant; logici liberalibus in artibus tirones Aristotilis erudiant; grammatici balbutientium linguas in analogiam effigiant. Organiste populares aures melliti gutturis organo demulcent;

---

114 In Homer’s Iliad, 2.212-77, Thersites was a loud-mouthed Greek soldier, beaten by Odysseus for berating Agamemnon and urging abandonment of the expedition to Troy. John appears to mean that the most qualified volunteers should come to Toulouse to make sure that they bestow (academic) prizes, as Achilles did at Patroclus’ funeral games in the Iliad, on worthy people rather than rabble-rousers. It is difficult to pin down the analogy.

115 Read ‘stadium’ with MS for Wright’s first ‘studium.’

116 Bar. 1, 20.

117 Bacchus and Ceres, Roman deities respectively responsible for wine and corn.

118 Omit ‘O’, with Wright, marked as deleted in MS, before ‘magnalia.’

119 Vergil, Georg. 1. 511, ‘saevit toto Mars impius orbe.’ These two lines, otherwise John’s own, are in the epic hexameter metre.

120 ‘Analogia,’ like ‘ratio’ summarises the regularities of grammar, Copeland & Sluiter (2009), 280-81, n. 53.

121 ‘organum’ was a form of plainchant, where an accompanying part was sung above or below the main melody. This is an unusually early reference to polyphony. See Aubrey (1997), who translates ‘the organistae of the people charm the ears with organum of a honey-sweet throat.’ I am grateful to Professor Rob Wegman for drawing this to my attention, and for his advice on other musical references. Consistently with the rest of John’s catalogue of specialists, I would venture to translate ‘organiste soothe the ears of the [local] people with organum of a honey-sweet throat.’ The experiment was short-lived. According to Aubrey,
decretiste Iustinianum extollunt et a latere medici predicant Galienum.\textsuperscript{122} Libros naturales qui fuerant Parisius prohibiti poterunt illic audire qui volunt nature sinum medullitus perscrutari.\textsuperscript{123} Quid deert vobis igitur? Libertas scolastica?\textsuperscript{124} Nequaquam, quia nullius habenis dediti, propria gaudebitis libertate. An timetis malitiam populi sevientis? Vel tirannidem principis injuriosi? Ne timeatis, quia comitis Tholosani liberalitas nobis sufficientem fecit securitatem, et de salario nostro et de servientibus nostris Tholosam venientibus et redeuntibus, quod si detrimentum rerum suarum [100r] patiantur per manus predonum in dominio comitis, malefactores nostros ad satisfactionem tanquam pro Tholosanis civibus per vires Tholosani capitolii persequetur.

Predictis adhuc adicimus, quod, sicut speramus veraciter, dominus legatus theologos et decretistas alios adhuc advocabit ad augmentationem studii, tempusque determinabit per quod oporteat scolares\textsuperscript{125} Tholose propter indulgentiam commorari, si moram illorum non impediat, quod Deus advertat, ille prevaricator <98> invidus humani generis, ut consequenter locum et gentem tollant Romani, per Crucis salutifere triumphale misterium dimicantes. De foro rerum venalium fugata caristia, per praedictam percipere poteritis certitudinem, et super hec tam fama\textsuperscript{126} quam nuntio credatis, et hiis versibus:

\begin{quote}
‘Pro parvo vinum,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{122} ‘The southern composers…. maintained their own traditions until the end of the [thirteenth] century, and from all evidence the southern ethos was barely touched by indigenous northern products or practices….’
\textsuperscript{123} Read ‘Galenum’ for ‘Galienum’ in MS and Wright.
\textsuperscript{125} This is not a general reference to ‘academic freedom,’ but a relaxation of the Paris rule that a student had to be tied to a specific master (see Introduction, 59), who monitored his conduct as well as his studies.
\textsuperscript{126} Presumably remission of sins was a weaker incentive to the young students than to the Doctors. This reference to Scholars suggests difficulty in ensuring that they stayed long enough to complete their course.
\textsuperscript{126} Read ‘fama’ with sense for ‘fame’ in MS and Wright.
De curialitate populi non est pretermittendum, videtur enim hic facies curialis cum militia simul et cum clero sedera pepigesse. Si volueritis igitur bona plura quam prediximus admirari, paterna postponatis hospitia, collis manticas maritando, illud morale dictum\textsuperscript{127} Senece complectendo, ‘Terras omnes tamquam meas videbo, meas tamquam omnium, sicque\textsuperscript{128} vivam quasi sciam aliis me natum\textsuperscript{129} esse.’ Est enim ‘alta temptare et mente maiora concipere’ res homini generousa.\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{127} CUP omits ‘dictum.’
\textsuperscript{128} Read ‘sicque’ with MS, not ‘sic quod’ with Wright. CUP also has ‘sic quod.’
\textsuperscript{129} Seneca \textit{De vita beata} 20.3. Read ‘natum’ with Wright for ‘notum’ in MS.
\textsuperscript{130} \textit{De vita beata} 20.2.
Book 6

Incipit liber sextus, de mirabilibus quae contigerunt per diversas terras

Annum millenum Domini, centum bis et annos
Vigintique novem semita solis agit.

Sanguine Parisius studium dissolvitur. 1 Orbe
In toto sentit prelia sacra Syon. 2

Andegavis studium quod particulare coheret, 3
Illud dissolvunt proxima bella novum.

Gentibus, heu! Miseris elementa minantur. Inundat
Unda nimis, turbat aëra tristis hiems.

Trecensis ruit ecclesie sublime cacumen,
Et turres multas ventus ad ima iacit. 4

Parisius lapsa est fratrum domus alta minorum

---

1 CM, 3.166-68 describes the vigorous reaction of Blanche of Castile, acting as regent, to drunken riots by the clerks of the Paris schools in 1229, and the dispersal of the Masters and Scholars, many of them to Angers. See Grant (2016), 96-99 for a detailed account of the dispute.

2 John makes Jerusalem the symbol of Christendom. In 1229, The Emperor Frederick II secured Christian control of Jerusalem without a battle, but his own territories were attacked by John de Brienne and pro-papal forces in Italy.

3 Rashdell (1895), 2, 150-51, observes that Angers was becoming a studium generale, while John describes it as 'particulare,' usually interpreted as a centre which specialized, in this case in civil law. See also Verger (1992) 35-37. Weijers (1987), 34-40, conveniently summarises the arguments, concluding however that a precise meaning for 'studium generale' did not crystallise until the end of the thirteenth century. John may just mean 'separate.' He seems to say that this new studium was prematurely disrupted, due perhaps to the result of Blanche’s occupation of Angers in 1230 in her campaign against Peter of Brittany, who was supported by Henry III’s abortive invasion.

4 The cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul at Troyes was severely damaged by ‘ventus validissimus’ on 10 November, 1228, Alberic des Trois Fontaines, MGH SS, 23.922. CM, 3.158 notes serious autumn storms in 1228, causing much destruction, but not in 1229.
Valle quidem viridi quam statuere sibi.\textsuperscript{5}

Italiam terre motus perterret et ether

Intonat horribilis subsequiturque fames.\textsuperscript{6}

Tholosam ferit ista fames, sed Fulco beatus

Pauperibus vitam prorogat ere, cibo.\textsuperscript{7}

Tunc ibi de Pascha fuit ignorantia multis

Illis; quam dederam regula talis erat:\textsuperscript{8}

‘Tres primas scriptas post stelle festa requiras.

Inde dies Domini tertia Pascha colet.

Tertia prima Domini si forte tenebit,

Esse trium primus postulat ille dies.

<100> Non est curandum si currat mobile Pascha;

Instat qui moveat omnia summa dies.\textsuperscript{9}

Illic exegi spatio studiosa trienni

Tempora, Romano sub duce lector ibi.

Virgine de sacra sponsalia carmina legi\textsuperscript{10} [100v]

\textsuperscript{5} The Franciscan church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine was authorised in 1223 and constructed in Vauvert, on the site of the present-day Jardin de Luxembourg. It collapsed in 1228 or 1229. Thomas of Eccleston, \textit{Tractatus de Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam}, ed. A.G. Little, p. 47, notes that many Franciscans thought the church too elaborate and prayed to St. Francis for its destruction. See also Davis (2011).

\textsuperscript{6} The punctuation differs from Wright’s.

\textsuperscript{7} For Fulk’s generosity, see WP, 34.

\textsuperscript{8} See \textit{DTE}, 5. 129-34 for further reflections on the \textit{computus}, and a close echo of line 24.

\textsuperscript{9} ‘Read ‘moveat’ for Wright’s ‘moneat’. Vergil, \textit{Aen}. 2.324, ‘Venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus.’

\textsuperscript{10} A reference to \textit{Epithalamium}. Its prologue states that the legate Romano ‘mihi praecipit in Concilio Bituricensi quo librum Tholose legerem.’ This poses dating problems since the Council of Bourges,
Legato Bituris, que recitata dedi.

Illum cum clero toto plebs prava necare

Clam studuit; sed non pertulit ista comes.

Cardetum falc aggreditur; doctrina recidit

Ramnos et tribulos, vivificatque rosas.

over which Romano presided, took place in 1225, four years before John took up his post in Toulouse. Paetow (MS 108-09, and n. 4) therefore suggested amending to ‘Biterris / Béziers.’ This can however be explained if John had been to Toulouse before; see also Introduction, 21. Saiani accepts this possibility in his excellent analysis of the dating problem in EBVM, pp. 25-27, and nn. 54-56, referring also to pre-existing schools in Toulouse following Honorius’ earlier initiative, DTE, 5, n. 102.

11 A critical reference to the attack on Romano and his entourage by a group of 140 Scholars and eighty Masters of Paris in 1225 immediately prior to the Council, following a legal dispute. Romano banned the Scholars from teaching but the Masters were pardoned at the Council. John contrasts the orderly governance of Toulouse under Count Raymond VII. See Dunstable Annals, p. 98, Kay (2002), 250-53, 290-304.

12 A highly abbreviated and cramped rubric is in the left margin of the MS, ‘De ratione scientiarum quae Tolose legebantur.’ Elsewhere in the MS such entries are drafts for the fair copies of rubrics, but there is no fair copy. This is because the illustration leaves no space for the rubric. Both this and the rubric at n. 20 below are cramped because of the size of the ‘tree of knowledge,’ Plate 7, p. 314, the most ambitious illustration in the MS. The bird represents the Holy Spirit, from which knowledge flows. John’s description of the curriculum, and the accompanying diagram, owe much to Hugh of St. Victor’s Didascalion, e.g. Book 2, chapters 1, 12, 18, 19.
Plate 7. MS London Cotton Claudius A x, f. 100 v., ‘Tree of knowledge’,  DTE, 6.33-56
Frondet in eloquium divisa scientia; ramus

Qui sapit egreditur eloquiumque regit.  

Tres habet eloquium ramos quos ordine tendit,

Gramaticam, logicam, rethoriceque thimum.

Hinc speculativam gignit sapientia; gignit

Hunc ramum cuius practica nomen erit.  

Practica dat ramum qui dicitur ethica, cuius

Corpus divisum triplce fronde viret.

Providet hec urbi, domuique sibique vicissim;

Debet enim prudens providus esse sibi.

Dat celeste logos speculatio; dans ea fisim

Et mathesim, ducta triplce fronde viret.

Dinumerat mathesis, mensurat, consonat; astris

Instudet et vere singula scire facit.

Eulogium tendo divinis, tendoque fisim

Hiis qui secretis insenuere suis.

13 Note the continuation of botanical imagery. This description refers to the ‘tree of knowledge’ diagram, and sets out the traditional hierarchy of subjects. The ‘trivium’ of grammar, logic and rhetoric underpin the ‘quadrivium’, comprising arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, see EBVM, 3.105-06.

14 Punctuation varies from Wright, who has ‘speculativam gignit sapientia’.

15 Lines 47-48 seem to say that John has high praise for students of theology and leaves them to deal with natural science. But the language is difficult.
Musica cuncta ligat, mundana, humana,\textsuperscript{16} sed inde

\begin{quote}
Instrumentalis triplex calle meat.
\end{quote}

Se melice metrica, metrice se rithmica iungit,
\begin{quote}
Sed melice\textsuperscript{17} dulcis est via secta\textsuperscript{18} triplex.
\end{quote}

Dat studiis enarmonicam, variisque coreis

\begin{quote}
Aptam cromaticam, ditonicamque tubis.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

Ultima Tholose viguit dum venimus illuc,
\begin{quote}
Et stupuit melice bellica turba modis.
\end{quote}

Silvas commovit Orpheus\textsuperscript{20} modulamine plectri,
\begin{quote}
Fecit et Amphion\textsuperscript{21} saxa salire lira.
\end{quote}

Non cantatorum modulos intelligo tantum,
\begin{quote}
Quilibet est Orpheus promptus in arte sua.
\end{quote}

Surgit ab hiis livor et ab hoc elegia belli,
\begin{quote}
Qua cessat studium fructificusque labor.
\end{quote}

Italus huc veniens ad robora nostra magister

\begin{flushright}
<101>
\end{flushright}

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item Boethius \textit{De Institutione Musica}, 1.2 subdivides music into three categories, ‘\textit{mundana}’, ‘\textit{humana}’, and ‘\textit{instrumentalis}.’
\item A play on ‘\textit{mel}’ / ‘honey’. Jeserich points out that John’s use of ‘\textit{melica},’ rather than the more usual ‘\textit{harmonica}’ suggests that William of Conches’ commentary on the \textit{Timaeus} is among his sources. On the possibility that John was also the author of works on music, see Introduction, 26.
\item ‘\textit{secta}’ replaces ‘\textit{facta},’ which is deleted in the MS.
\item Read ‘\textit{tubis},’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘\textit{cubis},’ and repunctuate lines 52-4, with the sense. See Waite (1960), 185, n. 30.
\item Orpheus (two syllables), son of Apollo and a Muse, famed for his musical skills.
\item Amphion, son of Zeus and Antiope, who charmed the stones of the city walls with his lyre.
\end{enumerate}
Rolandus verbi claruit ense sacri.\textsuperscript{22}

Forti Rolando maior quia corpora stravit

Ille, sed hereticum contudit ille nephas.

Gaudia qui vana Galvani tradidit igni

Dispar Galvano nam fuit iste probo.

Iste probus fuerat Arthuri tiro facetus;

Inprobus iste, dolis plenus, inopsque boni.

Non solum sanctos spreverunt, sed sacra scripta,\textsuperscript{23}

Heretici quorum serpit ab ore dolus.

De spe deque fide suevi retinere libellum,

Huic et apostolica gesta ligata tuli.\textsuperscript{24}

Illis exposui quadam brevitate tenorem;

De sancto fuerat pagina prima Petro.

Petri martirium vidit tricesimus annus

Et sextus postquam venit ad astra Ihesus. [101r]

Octavum numerant quidam quia cronica distant

\textsuperscript{22} Roland of Cremona (1178-1259), see Introduction, n. 250. John compares his battle against heresy with Roland’s campaigns against the Moors in the \textit{Chanson de Roland}. John also compares Galvanus, an alleged heretic, with Gawain (Galvanus), nephew of King Arthur. Roland of Cremona burnt Galvanus’ house, disinterred his body and carried it through the streets of Toulouse, and burnt it. (William of Pelhisson, 88).

\textsuperscript{23} Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{Hic ponuntur exempla et miracula apostolorum contra hereticos.’}

\textsuperscript{24} ‘\textit{libellum},’ John seems to be referring to a physical book, which was probably the four gospels bound together with the Acts of the Apostles. See Introduction, 27.
Inter se, Petrus in cruce quando fuit.  

Hic cruce, sed gladio venit ad celestia Paulus,  

Exauctusque Deo reddere gaudet oves.  

Pomposum vicere magum qui lapsus ab alto  
Sanctorum precibus venit ad ima Stigis.  

Sic venit hereticis planctus, sic gloria iustis,  
Sic lamenta malis, gaudia vera bonis.  

Offendens Romam Nero tortor ab urbe timore  
Exit; distractus non habet inde locum.  

Andreas urbis Patere pater in cruce pendens  
Circa se meruit lumen habere Dei;  

<S102> Spiritus assiluit celo, sed demone multo  

Mortuus Egeas mortis in antra ruit.  

Audax invidie Iacobus populator Hebree  

Hermogenem prius ipse magum multos et Hebreos  

---

25 John dates Peter’s martyrdom sixty-six years after Christ’s death. Eusebius has sixty-seven years, and Jerome sixty-eight.  
26 Read ‘exauctus’ with MS, not Wright’s ‘exauctas.’  
27 Simon Magus, Act. 8, 9-24. Subsequent apocryphal literature, echoed in various Saints’ Lives, credited the prayers of Peter and Paul with causing his death while flying, e.g Golden Legend, 89.2.  
29 St. Andrew’s martyrdom was traditionally in Patras, at the hands of the Roman governor Aegeas. The saints’ lives tell of a bright radiance at the time of his death, JdeM, 11.  
30 St. James the Apostle (son of Zebedee, and brother of John, commonly called ‘the Greater’, to distinguish him from St. James ‘the Less’). His remains were believed to be housed in Santiago di Compostella, JdeM, 246-55.
Gentilesque sacram fecit habere fidem.

Illius frater\textsuperscript{31} Epheso dormivit, at alter

Ierusalem Iacobus\textsuperscript{32} presul habebat oves.

A summo templo fuit hic deiectus Hebreis.

Statem fullonis pertica stravit eum.

In Sicia\textsuperscript{33} Martem vicit fregitque Philippus\textsuperscript{34}

Hicque triumphantis fixerat arma crucis.

Pars Asiae Frigia qua semina sparserat ante

Vite Christicola gente recept eum.

Illic decessit senior, dignae sepulto

Corpore pro iustis mens agit ante Deum.\textsuperscript{35}

Indorum gladio Thomas transfertur Olimpo

Architectus enim celica tecta tenet.\textsuperscript{36}

India, quam tangit lenis\textsuperscript{37} Oceanus, sacra verba

Vomere multiplicat, Bartholomee, tuo.\textsuperscript{38}

---

\textsuperscript{31} St. John the Apostle and evangelist.

\textsuperscript{32} St. James the Apostle, son of Alpheus, ‘the Less’, JdeM, 169-74.

\textsuperscript{33} A variant of Scythia.

\textsuperscript{34} John says that St. Philip the Apostle died peacefully in old age in Hierapolis in Phrygia. JdeM, 167-69, has this version, but there was a strong patristic tradition that he was martyred. Jean de Mailly also has the story of Philip persuading the Scythians to destroy a statue of Mars before he could successfully expel a dragon.

\textsuperscript{35} Read ‘digneque sepulto,’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘digno sepulcro.’

\textsuperscript{36} St. Thomas the apostle traditionally was an architect, who went to Kerala, India and was ultimately martyred there, JdeM, 23-30.

\textsuperscript{37} Read ‘lenis’ for Wright’s ‘levis.’

\textsuperscript{38} Bartholomew also was traditionally martyred by beheading in India, on the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome. According to JdeM, 341-46, he caused ‘ingentem maurum nigriorem fuligine’ to disappear.
Astiagis regis subvertens numina nigra,
    Celi regna capit cesus ab ense caput.
Iudeis Grecisque Matheus semina spargens
    Ethiopum gladio victima sancta fuit.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{115} Consortes Symon et Iudas\textsuperscript{40} docmate, morte,
    Spe, mercede, dabant se sacra\textsuperscript{41} digna Deo.
Persas et Parthos docuerunt, et Babilonis
    Cives et regem suppositosque duces.
Hiis iustis Zaroes magus Arfaxatque nephandus
\textsuperscript{120} Obstrepitant; angues carminis arte novant.
Anguibus hiis implent sua sancti pallia, mittunt
    Hos in eos, torment morsibus ergo magos.
Dum miseri clamant ululando more lupino,
    Sanctorum pietas inclita sanat eos.
\textsuperscript{<103>} Diffamant tamen hos, celesti fulmine donec
    Percussi cessant, supplicioque gemunt.
Urbis prelati Samuyr\textsuperscript{42} stravere beatos,

\textsuperscript{39} Both Christian and some Islamic traditions associate St. Matthew’s ministry and death with Ethiopia, e.g. JdeM, 392-395.
\textsuperscript{40} The apostles Simon Ze\textlites (Luc. 6, 14-16), and Judas, son of James (St. Jude), JdeM, 444-47. Compare John’s ‘anguibus his implent sancti pallia’ with JdeM, 445 ‘apostoli pallia sua serpentibus impleverunt.’
\textsuperscript{41} ‘digno’ is deleted here in the MS.
\textsuperscript{42} Suanir, in Iran. There are many versions of the saints’ martyrdom, one of which suggests they were sawn in half there. John’s account follows closely Bartholomew of Trent, 323-27, who does not specify how they died.
Sed mortis speciem non reperire queo. [101v]

Xerses rex sanctis construxit nobile templum,

In quo sanctorum plurima mira micant.

Pro Iuda sumptum voluit Deus esse Mathiam,

Ex decies septem sorte iubente viris.

Hic verbi virtute sacri confundit Ebreos

Dum cecos propria lege probavit eos.\(^43\)

Barnabas in metro veniat, metro licet hostis\(^44\)

Sit nomen; ratio vox sit Ebre tamen.

Filius est dictus Salaminis,\(^45\) almus eundem

Spiritus elegit, supposuitque sibi.

Ex septem decies\(^46\) fuit hic pariterque duobus

Discipulis socius, Paule beate, tuus.\(^47\)

Iam conversus eras anno, pie Paule, secundo

Ut subiecta sibi venit ad astra Iesus.

Ante Joseph dictus fuerat, qui vendidit agrum,

Misit apostolicis gressibus omne suum.\(^48\)

---

\(^43\) Act. 1, 23 records the selection by lot of St. Matthias to replace Judas.

\(^44\) Clearly ‘Barnabas’ was pronounced with the last syllable long. John makes a similar joke about ‘Innocentius’, DTE 1, n. 35. Here he deliberately breaks the rules of scansion.

\(^45\) Read ‘Salaminis’ for ‘solaminis’ in MS and Wright, JdeM, 199-201. All versions of Barnabas’ martyrdom attribute his death to a group of Jews in Cyprus. John sticks closely to Jean de Mailly’s version. If John had been the scribe, this error would have been unlikely.

\(^46\) Luc. 10, 1.

\(^47\) Act. 13, 2.

\(^48\) Act. 4, 36, ‘posuit ante pedes apostolorum.’
Hinc et apostolus est dictus, quia factus eorum

Nuntius et Christi, nuntia vera tulit.

Passus in urbe cadit Salamina; torquet eundem

Livor Ebreus, equo distrabat, igne cremat.

In mare ne sanctus mittatur, surripit illum

Turba fidelis, cum clam sepelire studens.

Lucas testatur quod post tormenta Iohannes

Marcus qui fuerat, intumulavit eum.\(^{49}\)

Istis expositis, mihi gesta Georgius offert,\(^{50}\)

Que legi verso margine scripta libri.\(^{51}\)

Exemplis volui duros mollire, rudesque

Informare, graves flectere voce mea.\(^{52}\)

Qui cano militiam faveas mihi, sancte Georgi,

Cum sis mirificus miles ad arma Dei.

\(^{49}\) Luke was considered by the Church fathers to be the author of the *Acts of the Apostles*. But the secret burial of Barnabas by John Mark is not recorded in either Luke’s Gospel or the *Acts*, but in the apocryphal *Acta Barnabae*, purportedly written by John Mark.

\(^{50}\) Rubric in right margin, ‘Miracula quae fecit Deus pro sancto Georgio.’ The cult of St. George, an Eastern saint martyred variously by the emperor, Diocletian, the ‘king of Persia’ or the Roman governor, Dacianus (as here). He became a tribune in Diocletian’s army but was executed for refusing to renounce Christianity. The *Passio Georgii*, recounting George’s lengthy torture and death was a popular text in the medieval period. John does not refer to his encounter with the dragon, popularized in *Golden Legend*. On the cult of St. George and its introduction to Europe, especially England, see J. Good (2009), 21-51. *Gesta francorum*, 29 reports St. George’s presence at Antioch in 1098, with the Eastern Christian warrior Saints Mercurius and Demetrius.

\(^{51}\) Line 154 makes it clear that John took a close interest in his manuscript, even if he was not the scribe, in that he refers specifically to the intended rubric. See Introduction, 30 & 27. This reference cannot be taken as supporting the case for John of Garland’s authorship of a lost *Georgica Spiritualia*.

\(^{52}\) John makes explicit his use of ‘exempla’ to influence, educate and persuade his audience.
<104> Pauperibus tribuit large possessa tribunus53 

Qui de Capadocum gente beatus erat.

In partes rota dira decem distorserat illum,

Sed qui fecit Adam dextra refecit eum.

Fecerat hoc54 Christus cum multis milibus urbis

Angelice, pugilis ductus amore sui.

Tiro tronos veteres Daciani fronde virere

Et fructu fecit surgere ligna novo.55

Te fissam56 mendax in abissum mersit Apollo

Idola comminuit que nituere tua.57

Qui putres cineres annis iacuere ducentis

Ad se delato pulvere stare iubet.

Surgunt bis centum triginta duoque reducti

In vitam; Iobel58 prefuit unus eis.

Poscunt baptismum signo Crucis; est ibi natus

Fons, quo tincta madet turba renata Deo.

53 Read ‘large’, with MS, not ‘larga’ with Wright. Note play on ‘tribuit’/‘tribunus.’
54 Read ‘hoc’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘hic.’ Wright’s punctuation is changed.
55 One of George’s alleged miracles was to restore Dacianus’ chairs to living trees.
56 ‘abyssum’ is a feminine noun.
57 Dacianus and his false images were reportedly struck by lightning and cast into a chasm after George’s death as God’s punishment for his continuing paganism. Dacianus’ wife, Alexandra, was converted, and despite being beheaded by Dacianus she was granted eternal life by George. John does not derive all his account from the short lives, e.g. JdeM, 158-61, Bartholomew of Trent 106-07.
58 Read ‘Iobel,’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘Lobel.’ Lev. 25, 8-13 defines the annum iobelus, occurring every 50 (or 49) years as a time for remission of debts, restitution of assets and forgiveness of sins. John is saying that through George, God was able to restore to life, redeem sins and grant access to heaven. This might also have read ‘Iubal,’ Gen. 4, 21, credited with inventing music.
'Ite', sacer miles clamaverat, 'In Paradisum!'\(^{59}\)

Nullus ad hanc vocem visus adesse fuit.

Ad lavacrum veniunt iam milia multa virorum

Turbaque feminea sponsaque clara ducis.\(^{60}\) [102r]

Dum suspensa fuit per crines, cesa, cruenta,

Mundari lavacro blanda sitivit ovis.

Nubes de celo descendit, qua sibi palmas

Humectans miles mundificavit eam.

Decollata petit celum, milesque triumphans

Sub gladio sumit premia pulcra poli.

Hinc preconcessit Dominus: qui premia poscit,

Suppliciter sancti sumet amore viri.

Illius meritis mihi, Christe, remitte reatum,

Et tecum facias post mea fata locum.

Hereticis postquam sunt talia dicta Tholose,

Clam rident, calcant sub pede sacra sues.

Hic Iacobitani\(^{61}\) primo crevere capellam

---

\(^{59}\) Read, ‘Ite’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘Ire’. Repunctuate to reflect direct speech.

\(^{60}\) Read ‘ducis’ with MS, not, with Wright, ‘dua’s.’

\(^{61}\) Rubric in right margin, ‘De origine fratrum praedicatorum Tholosae, et dissipatione studii eiusdem.’

The Dominicans were named ‘Iacobitani’ after their church in Paris, Saint-Jacques-le-Majeur, granted to them in 1218. First established in Toulouse by St. Dominic in 1214, they began building the church of St. Romanus in 1216. William Pelhisson, ch. 85, describes their move to the Garden of the Garrigues in 1230 because they needed more spacious premises.
Sancti Romani\textsuperscript{62} qui tenuere diu.

\textless 105\textgreater{} Urticas inter mordaces floridus hortus

Spirat, et Ecclesie spargit odoris opes.

Frater Remundus populo qui predicat arte

Fulconis baculum sumit, onusque patris.\textsuperscript{63}

Doctorum primo sunt certa salaria,\textsuperscript{64} donec

Cuncta negans livor cepit habere locum.

Florentis studii paulatim turba recedit;

Hec ego qui scribo cuncta recedo prius,

Insidias metuens. Celeri me trado carine,\textsuperscript{65}

Intus sed predis insidiator hiat.

Ad Sarracenum castrum\textsuperscript{66} me ducere temptat,

Suffocet ut tacitis impia turba dolis.

Sed quem vult servare Deus servabitur; O res

Mira! Patet clipeus aëre nube cava.\textsuperscript{67}

\begin{flushleft}
Ostendo clipeum quem format in aëre nubes,
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{62} St. Romanus of Rouen, a Sixth Century French saint.
\textsuperscript{63} The Dominican Raymond de Falgar, bishop of Toulouse 1232-70.
\textsuperscript{64} The salaries of the masters recruited to Toulouse were specified in the Treaty of Paris (1229), see Introduction, 61 & n. 244.
\textsuperscript{65} Read ‘celeri’ with Wright, not ‘sceleri’ with MS. He escapes down the Garonne. John’s escape from Toulouse, lines 200-52, has a distinctively picaresque flavour, clearly influenced by the vernacular fabliaux. See Introduction, 50. John’s imagery is bold and designed to shock.
\textsuperscript{66} Castelsarrasin, Tarn et Garonne, a town near Moissac, on the opposite bank of the Garonne. It was a hotbed of resistance, still in Raymond VII’s hands in 1228, WP (Sibly & Sibly), 76-77.
\textsuperscript{67} Vergil, \textit{Aen.} 1.516-17, ‘…nube cava speculantur amicti / Quae fortuna viris, classem quo litore linquant…’.
De forma clipei nautica corda stupent.\textsuperscript{68}

Exclamo ‘Bellum, bellum denuntiat aër!

Nec procul Ecclesie celicus ultor abest!\textsuperscript{69}

Dum clipeum solidam cerno durare per horam,

Ad facinus tardat impia corda stupor.

Ecce superveniunt peregrini,\textsuperscript{70} dum prope portum

Moysiacci navis concita sulcat aquas.\textsuperscript{71}

Crastina lux oritur; sitiens manus impia predam\textsuperscript{72}

Incendit factis raptibus igne casas.

Est furis gressum Veneris comitata chimera,\textsuperscript{73}

Qua leo regnat, olet hircus, hiatque draco.\textsuperscript{74}

Ex monstro Veneris elegia venerat ista,\textsuperscript{75}

Et veniet quotiens vir parat esse Paris.

Hic Veneris nodum strictum denodo, genasque

\textsuperscript{68}John reminds readers of superstition among sailors—see DTE, 2.436-37.

\textsuperscript{69}MS contains deleted ‘adest.’ Read ‘abest’ with corrected MS and Wright.

\textsuperscript{70}The abbey of St. Pierre in Moissac was an important stage on the pilgrimage route from Le Puy-en-Velay to Santiago de Compostella, and the crossing point for the Garonne.

\textsuperscript{71}Ovid, \textit{Met.} 4. 706-07, ‘Ecce, velut navis praefixo concita rostro / Sulcat aquas.’

\textsuperscript{72}‘Crastina lux,’ Vergil, \textit{Aen.} 10.244. See also DTE, 8.293.

\textsuperscript{73}Rubric, ‘De latronibus qui insidiabantur magistris ibidem.’

\textsuperscript{74}Ovid, \textit{Met.} 9.647-48 includes only the lion and dragon in describing the \textit{chimaera}. Marbodus, \textit{Liber decem capitulorum}, 3.45-49, gives this monster representing female lust, ‘\textit{forma triformis}’; the middle portion between lion and dragon ‘\textit{nil sunt nisi fervidus ignis}.’ See also \textit{PP}, 7.62 ‘hiccus olens, meretrix, rabiesque canina.’

\textsuperscript{75}‘\textit{Elegia ista}’ is best read as a reference to Alan of Lille’s \textit{De Planctu Nature} (see also DTE, Preface.1), particularly its opening section, described there as ‘\textit{flebile carmen}’. Compare Alan’s line 4, ‘\textit{Cum Veneris monstro naufraga turba perit},’ particularly apt in John’s circumstances, and line 49, ‘\textit{Sed Paris in Paridem monstra nefanda parit.}’ The homophobic drift of this passage in \textit{De Planctu Nature}, would be instantly recognisable to a sophisticated audience familiar with Alan’s works, but see also \textit{PP}, 4.272, which suggests that John’s target is Paris’ adultery.
Tectas denudo, monstraque monstro sua.

Mentes venatur Venus, irretitque per omnes
Blanditas, magica devirat arte viros.\textsuperscript{76}

225 Mechie facinus mulier facit, eruit era
A mechi loculo, Marte vel arte trahens.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{<106>} Mentula surripitur mechi quandoque resexta,
Dum decollatus frater uterque cadit.\textsuperscript{78} [102v]
Sincopat interdum vitam mala mecha marit,

230 Dum Veneris clibanum stultus inignit amor.
Bacchus bacchatur per eum, Mars vincit ustus,
Est urens Titan et furit igne Tethis;
Nec tantum Titani, sed Triton per mare ludens
Cum Borea gelido sudat amore novo.

235 Fabula Nasonis verum subpalliat.\textsuperscript{79}

\textit{Urit}

Neptunum Veneris fax, gelidosque cremat.
Noctua pavoni turpis prefertur amore,
Ostro panniculus, feda cicuta rose.

\textit{Fur meretrixque viri mitis vestigia nacti,}


\textsuperscript{77} ‘\textit{Marte vel arte,}’ a proverbial expression.

\textsuperscript{78} Dictionnarius, 3, ‘\textit{Natura tria dedit homini genitalia, quae sunt virga virilis et duo fratres pendiculi, qui sunt testiculi.}’

\textsuperscript{79} Ovid, \textit{Met.}, 6.702-10.
Instant dum detur preda petita dolis.

Arte malignandi, preludit copia fandi.\textsuperscript{80}

Hec prudens timeat ut sibi cautos eat;

Occurrunt cause peccandi, si gerit extra

Limen homo gressus; hostis ubique latet.\textsuperscript{81}

Aut videt aut audit aut cogitat id quod obesse\textsuperscript{82}

Possit, et icirco non sit inermis homo.

Semper premisso signo Crucis exeat, et sit

Eius in ore Dei nomen et intus amor

Tutus ab hoste. Sui fidibus persaepe canoris

Casibus in dubiis ars variata iuvat.

Cetera pretereo, fueram quae tedia passus,

Que via, que latro, que malus hospes agit.

Partibus Austrinis scripsi discrimina facta;\textsuperscript{84}

Nunc mala sub Boree flatibus acta canam.

Dudum venerunt Huni de partibus illis\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{80} Lines 241-42 are leonines. ‘Copia fandi,’ Vergil, \textit{Aen}, 1.520.

\textsuperscript{81}‘Hostis ubique latet,’ Hugh of Mâcon, \textit{Gesta Miltum}, 3.514. Hugh, a Cistercian, was first abbot of Pontigny.

\textsuperscript{82} Read ‘id quod’ with MS, not ‘idque’ with Wright.

\textsuperscript{83} John travelled home with a group of returning pilgrims.

\textsuperscript{84} Rubric in left margin, ‘De hereticis Hunis et Wandalis, qui per Galliam strages fecerunt.’

\textsuperscript{85} The Huns under Attila invaded western Europe in the 451, and the Vandals in 407.
Per quos martirium Gallia passa fuit.

Sanctus Nichasius\(^8^6\) per eos pluresque cruore

Fuso purpureas promeruere stolas.

<107> Heretici dum Vandalici\(^8^7\) fecere ruinam,

Compluit Ecclesiam sanguinis unda sacri.\(^8^8\)

Iustorum meritis, quosdam percussio stravit

Celestis digne, perdomuitque nephas.

Pauci Burgundi noviter baptismate loti

Hunos innumerous ense dedere neci.\(^8^9\)

Virus adhuc quidam sapiunt, occultaque secta

Serpit qua multi promeruere rogos.\(^9^0\)

Circuit Ecclesiam bellum; sine preside Roma\(^9^1\)

---

\(^8^6\) St. Nicasius, traditionally bishop of Reims, was a martyr. Some sources attribute his death to the Vandals in 407, and some to the Huns in 451, Flodoard, *Historia Remensis Ecclesie*, MGHS,13, 417-420.

\(^8^7\) ‘Vandalici’ for ‘Uvandalici’ in MS and Wright.

\(^8^8\) ‘Sanguinis unda sacri,’ from a liturgical chant for St. Maurice, ‘Sanctorum corpora sacri sanguinis unda’, Cantus Database 004762.


\(^9^0\) Lines 285-6 appear to be displaced, and would follow naturally here. They refer to Louis IX’s campaign against the Cathars and the conspiracies with which he had to deal in the early years of his reign.

\(^9^1\) Original draft rubric in left margin, ‘*De bello imperatoris Romani contra papam.*’ In the actual rubric, ‘*contra papam*’ is overwritten in a black hand, perhaps with ‘*cum Christo*’. This is a reference to the period 1241-3, between the death of Gregory IX on 22 August, 1241 and the election of Innocent IV on 25 June 1243. Celestine IV was pope for only 17 days, from 25 October to 10 November 1241, in chaotic circumstances. Frederick II had captured and imprisoned two cardinals and several bishops at sea in 1241. Rome lacked a bishop (pope), but Cardinal Colonna in the city of Rome was an ally of Frederick, who had been excommunicated in 1239. He continued during this period to attack and win territory from the Papal States. Prior to Innocent IV’s election Frederick released the two cardinals, but there was no respite in hostilities, Abulafia (1988), 346-54.
Ad, Frederice, tua prelia, damna gemit.

Legatos et prelatos in carcere claudit

Princeps quos terra, quos capit ipse mari.

Presule Roma carens,\(^92\) spatio viduata bienni,

Asscrisit cause Cesaris arma sue.

Captos prelatos tamen hic e carcere misit,

Ut iustum caperent ad diadema patrem.

Eligitur quartus In papa Nocentius,\(^93\) aptus,

Ecclesie fortis ferre laboris onus. [103r]

Ut pastorales cambuce principis hastas

Frangant, Lugdunum papa venire parat.\(^94\)

Belli causa fuit quia Cesar predia pape

Cepit et Ecclesie subdita multa sacre.

Quod tenuere diu patres, ad quid retinere

Vult Caesar? Teneat quod tenuisse decet.

Si rex hereticos perimit civesque rebelles\(^95\)

Punit, sic legem iustitiamque tenet.

---

\(^92\) A phrase ending ‘...papa’ has been illegibly deleted, and ‘Praesule Roma carens’ substituted in the margin in a different hand.

\(^93\) ‘In-nocentius’ see DTE 1.97, and n. 35.

\(^94\) Innocent fled from Italy and made his way to Lyon, effectively under the protection of Louis IX. Frederick was again excommunicated at the Council of Lyon in 1245.

\(^95\) John does not usually refer to the Emperor as ‘rex,’ and lines 285-86 appear to be displaced. They relate to Louis IX, and fit well after line 268 above.
Panditur ex Aquilone malum, quia Tartara mittunt

Tartaream gentem cum feritate nova.

Fortunam natura levem facit, ut probat eius

Orbita; propterias labitur orba bonis.

Qui risit meret, qui mestus erat modo ridet,

Qui viguit languet, qui fuit altus eget.

Ergo Fortune vicibus confidere numquam

Presumas, sed eam sub pede fortis habe.

Hoc per tartaream gentem fortuna probare

Nititur, ut possit posse probare suum.

Tharsenses Tharsis transmiserat, hoc alieno

Nomine Tartareos dicimus esse viros.

Iudicis ira, Dei permissio, culpa reorum,

Inferni livor, hec nova bella parant.

Proditio prodit, fraus imperat, estuat ira,

---

96 Rubric in right margin, ‘De ceteris hereticis quos Gallia Tartaros dicit sub rethorica descriptio.’
97 ‘Ab Aquilone pandetur malum,’ Ier. 1, 14.’ John uses the pun, ‘Tartara’/ ‘hell’ and ‘Tartari’/
98 ‘Mongols’ elsewhere in the poem. It was a contemporary commonplace.
99 In this tortured pun, John contrasts the reversal of fortune from the commercially successful
99 Thomas May’s Supplementum Lucani (1640), 4.394, has ‘monstro nova bella parari.’
100 Read ‘imperat’ with Wright, not ‘imparat’ with MS.
Regnat avaritia,\textsuperscript{102} fastus ad astra volat.

Ensis Tartareus nostrum scelus expiat. Ensi

Offert materiam culpa secanda suam.

Polluit Ecclesiam luxus, respergit\textsuperscript{103} candel

Turpi fece gula, decipit umbra doli.

Hereticus latitat, incautos fallit, amicos

Corruptit fidei, perfidiamque foveit.

Est ‘Thare’ formido.\textsuperscript{104} Sonat ex hoc Tartarus; huius

Penam formidat quisquis iniqua gerit.

Mittitur ergo reos qui punit Tartarus; omnes

Percutit, et nescit impius esse pius.

Ultor ab Aurora veniens sibi proxima queque

Dum metit occasum subjugat ense sibi.

Armenie proceres pereunt, Syrieque tyranni\textsuperscript{105}

Succumbunt; Pontus colla subacta gemit.

Caucasus inclinat sese, sua porrigit Hister\textsuperscript{106}


\textsuperscript{103} Read ‘respergit’ with Wright, for ‘respargit’ in MS.

\textsuperscript{104} Read ‘Thare’ = ‘Terah,’ for Wright’s ‘thare.’ Thare was Abraham’s father, who took him to Canaan, Gen. 11, 24-32. ‘Formido’ was a device for scaring birds, e.g. Vergil, Aen., 12.750, as well as the noun and verb ‘dread.’ John is saying that his very (Jewish) name occasions dread; and that the dreaded word ‘Tartarus’ sounds like it and represents God’s instrument for punishing wrong-doing.

\textsuperscript{105} Rubric in right margin, ‘De terris quas Tartari destruxerunt, et eorum militia.’ CM, 3.488-89 describes a Muslim delegation mainly from Syria to Louis IX in 1238 reporting Mongol depredations and seeking help. The queen of Georgia asked the pope for assistance in 1239, Jackson (2005), 60.

\textsuperscript{106} The lower Danube.
Arma, suum luget Thracia victa ducem.

Mars, deus armorum, qui terra regnat in illa

Subdit Tartareis martia tela viris.

Rucia destruitur, destructa Boemia plangit. ¹⁰⁷

Planctu pulsatur Austria, pulsa tremit. ¹⁰⁸

Sevus Agarenos ¹⁰⁹ agit in cunctos furor; omnes

Hii feriunt, et eos percutit omnis homo.

Omnibus occurrunt, omnes grassantur in illos;

Et sic more suo qui patiuntur agunt.

In Sarram conspirat Agar; consurgit alumna ¹¹⁰

In dominam, turbat serva superba domum. [103v]

<109> Dic, ‘Que causa fuit?’ -- Serve conceptio, lectus

Illicitus, fracta lex, Abraheque venus?

Hanc venerem luit hoc tempus, periere tot anni.

Est tamen in pena pristina culpa recens;

Ex veteri culpa novus est pudor ortus, et illi

Est nova pena comes, immeritos que gravat. ¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ The Mongols subdued Rus over the years 1238-1240, Jackson (2005), 40. Regarding Bohemia, Matthew Paris paints an alarming picture, CM, 4.110-11, 115, but the impact there was less severe than on neighbouring countries, Berend (2013), 447-48.

¹⁰⁸ For a strategic view of the Mongol attacks of 1241, see Jackson (2005), 61-65.

¹⁰⁹ ‘Agarenos,’ derived from ‘Hagar,’ were the Muslims. Just as in Gen. 16, 12, God says to Hagar about her son by Abraham, Ishmael, ‘manus eius contra omnes, et manus omnium contra eum,’ so his descendants the Muslims have been at loggerheads with the world. They are receiving a dose of their own medicine from the Mongols.

¹¹⁰ Gen. 16.

¹¹¹ Horace, Odes, 4.5. 24, ‘culpam poena premit comes.’
Non ea affirmo, sed gens scelerata resurgit

Que cupido voto cuncta tenere sitit.\footnote{Read, with MS, ‘\textit{Que}’ rather than Wright’s ‘\textit{Et}’.
\footnotetext{112}}

Dices, ‘Quod iustus Deus est, non vult pius ergo

Immeritos homines impietate premi.

Presens turba nihil meruit.’ Ne talia dicas,

Est rea quam semper polluit egra caro.

Non omnes dico presentis carnis amore

Infectos; multos inficit egra caro.

Ismaëlita\footnote{\textit{Ismaëlita}, a non-classical form, means ‘Muslim.’ John is referring to the Muslim occupation of Jerusalem and compares the Christians in the Holy Land with the ancient Israelites.
\footnotetext{113}} Syon gremium defedat, at illud

Exornare studet Israëlita pius.

Hinc est iniustus, hinc iustus; purus abhorret

Impurum; sanctos turba maligna fugat,

In nostro luctu ridet, casuque cruento

Surgit, et esurie corda refecta cibat.

O quam felices veteres vixere, sepulti

Ante dies nostros et populare chaos.

O quotiens fausti sunt hii, feralia facta

Qui non viderunt que videt ista dies.

Brutis Tartarei conformes sanguine gaudent

Impuro, comedunt cruda, venena bibunt.

\footnotetext{112} Read, with MS, ‘\textit{Que}’ rather than Wright’s ‘\textit{Et}’.
\footnotetext{113} \textit{Ismaëlita}, a non-classical form, means ‘Muslim.’ John is referring to the Muslim occupation of Jerusalem and compares the Christians in the Holy Land with the ancient Israelites.
Monstrifere fame non credo per omnia, sed me

De monstris dicta monstra referre iuvat.

Tartareos gladios baratralis fabricat hostis,

Tartaream predam Crux quia sancta tulit.¹

Impia demessit² celi gens ista triumphos,

Dum iustos perimit, Ecclesiiamque premit;

Sic nisi plebs mendax, superare tragedica cuncta

Ista videt quisquis carmina prisca legit.

Natum sevus Ytim Thereus non sponte comedit,³

Fecit et infamem Colchida lesus amor.⁴

Infandas epulas sumit non sponte Tyestes,

Ignorans natum dum vorat ipse suum.⁵

Sed sic detestor vano mendacia risu

Horret que genius, credere nemo velit.⁶

¹ I.e. the Mongols are the Devil’s revenge for the triumph of the Church.
² Read ‘demessit’ for ‘demeruit’ in MS and Wright.
³ See Ovid Met. 6.650-52 for Tereus unwittingly eating his son, Itys.
⁴ Medea famously murdered her children to avenge herself on Jason.
⁵ In Greek mythology, Thyestes unwittingly ate his own sons, served up by his brother Atreus in revenge for his treachery and adultery.
⁶ Wright’s punctuation is amended.
Gens est seva nimis, Sathaneque domestica pestis\textsuperscript{7}

Ecclesie fidei dissona, cedis amans.

Limpha, merum, panis, caro, piscis, friget, abundat,

Iucundat, nutrit, vivit in ede proba.\textsuperscript{8}

Excedit\textsuperscript{9} gens ista feras, quas mundus abhorret.

Cur? Quia naturam calcat iniqua suam.

Queris forte modum calcandi? Sanguinis haustu

Emadet humani,\textsuperscript{10} se furor iste bibit.

<111> Esuriens hominem corrodit homo? leo nullus [104r]

Carne leonina viscera laxa replet.

Non lupus ungue lupum lacerat. Gens ista columnis

In veribus vertit membra veruta foco.\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[7] Latin extracts from Book 7, were quoted ‘tels qu’ils nous sont transmis par l’obligeant secrétaire de la Camden Society,’ by M. D’Avezac in 1838, well before Wright’s edition. He identifies John’s priestly source, line 32, as Ivo of Narbonne, \textit{CM}, 4.272-77, or Roger of Torre Maggiore, author of \textit{Miserabile Carmen}.
\item[8] This figure whereby lists of nouns and verbs are paired, occurs also at e.g. 8.244.
\item[9] The MS deletes a ‘c’ from ‘exceedit.’ Read ‘quas’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘quae.’
\item[10] See Matthew Paris’ image of Mongols roasting human flesh on spits, \textbf{Plate 8, p. 337}.
\item[11] Vergil, \textit{Georg.} 2.396, ‘\textit{in veribus ....columnis}.’
\end{footnotes}
Famam Virgilius monstrum depingit habere\textsuperscript{12}

Sub plumis oculos instabilesque gradus.

Illi mille dedit linguas figmenta loquentes;

Falsis fermentat sic modo vera loquax.

Fingit fama tamen quedam conformia vero,

Nam mihi pro certo presbiter ista tulit.\textsuperscript{13}

Presbiteros terrae prosterunt, sic crucifigunt

Illos prostratos, excruciantque diu.

Matres occidunt, parvosque per ubera matrum

\textsuperscript{12} Rubric in right margin, ‘\textit{Qualis est Fama secundum Virgilium.}’ Vergil’s description is at \textit{Aen.}, 4.173-88.

\textsuperscript{13} See Introduction, n. 218 on possible clerical sources. Mongol atrocities were widely reported, and John provides his own gruesome selection.
Flentes, clamantes, ire, perire sinunt.

Hac feritate refert hos fama bibisse medullas

Humanas. Feritas quod scelus ista timet?

Sic ex concesso fit fama sophistica, dicit

Nil contra positum de feritate loquens.

Pingues et teneros et molles et generosos

Et pulchros, horum rex coquit igne sibi;

Plebs vorat annosos, duros, nigros, scabiosos,

Hirsutos, tremulos, hoc nec abhorret opus.

Quod sequitur, vere faciunt. Muliebria\textsuperscript{14} truncant

Guttura post veneris corpora iuncta sue.

Turmas Tartarei varie statuunt aciei;\textsuperscript{15}

Hii sunt funerei quos movet ira Dei.

Tartara miserunt hos; hiis iusti perierunt.

Omnia dum querunt, bella necemque gerunt.

Hii quia sunt diri, nequeunt pietate poliri.

Hiis periere Tiri, Pergameique viri.\textsuperscript{16}

Cor gustando ferum, fetus truncant mulierum.

Sanctum, me miserum, non venerantur herum.

\textsuperscript{14}‘tractant’ is deleted here in the MS.
\textsuperscript{15} Lines 47-54 are leonines. End-rhymes continue to line 60, and from 65-70.
\textsuperscript{16} Mongol armies briefly occupied Anatolia and Syria in 1243-44, Jackson (2005), 74.
Hec est experta plaga succumbens Borealis.  

De tantis certa quanta renarro malis.

Hec patiente Deo pridem patrata fuere.

Hos nequeunt, timeo, pellere castra, sere.

Quis dux est autor scelerum, factorque malorum,

Et gentis fautor quam timet omne forum?

Sic sacra lex loquitur. Regem silvestria ligna

Rhamnum flammivomum constituere sibi.

Hic Antichristum signat preludia cuius

Gens agitat credens cuncta licere sibi.

Istis Cumani servire mali didicerunt,

Qui vacui, vani, falsa dolosque ferunt.

Hii sunt Christicole falsi, sine lege severi.

---

17 Read ‘hec’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘hac.’

18 ‘castra, sere’ are the fortifications and locks on the gate in the Caucasus said to have been erected by Alexander the Great to enclose Gog and Magog and other hostile tribes, later extended to include the ten lost tribes of Israel.

19 Despite interrupting a rhyming passage, lines 61-64 have been transposed in this edition from 363-66 in MS and Wright, where they made no sense. Here, they identify the leader of the Mongols with the Antichrist. ‘Silvestria ligna’/‘brushwood’ symbolizes sinful mankind. After the vine and the olive had rejected the idea, the ‘rhamnus’/‘Christ’s-thorn’ accepted their crown, and, like the Antichrist, consumed the brushwood, e.g. Sancti Melitonis Clavis, Pitra (1876-91), vol.2, vii, 20. On the Antichrist in this context see Thomas of Spalato, MGHS, 29.591.

20 John reverts to the Mongols after a long digression,

21 Rubric in right margin, ‘Cumani falsi Christiani erant proditores regis Hungarie.’ The nomadic Cumani, or Qipchaq Turks, lived on the steppes north and east of the Black Sea. Their armies were defeated by the Mongols in 1223. A few were converted to Christianity in 1228. In 1239 they resisted the Mongol invasion, but many sought refuge in Hungary, and were welcomed by King Béla IV, on condition that their leader, Köten, became a Christian. Köten was murdered by Hungarian nobles distrustful of the Cumans and their own king and the Cumans abandoned Hungary. Béla’s army was crushed at the battle of Mohi on 11 April 1241, and he was driven into exile pursued by the Mongols. Some contemporary chroniclers blamed the Cumans for betraying Béla. He eventually returned to Hungary. See Jackson (2005), 17-18 & 61-65, Morgan (2007), 122-23.
Hac de fraude schole propostrere queri.

Exit feralis pollutus anelitus oris,

Est intus talis spiritus atque foris.

Aër polluitur; stupet hinc tellus; aqua fetet.

Hic\textsuperscript{22} cuī sentitur tristia fata meret.

Sanguine punicio rubet Ister Tartareorum.\textsuperscript{23}

Dum furus illorum sevit ut hidra, leo,

Obstat eis Renus et eorum bella repellit.

Hoc hominum vellit vis tua, Christe, genus;

Crux adversatur illis Christique potestas, [104v]

Cuius maiestas imperiosa datur.

Tartarei fera gens committunt impiæ celo

Prelia, perdentes que bona percipiunt.

Percipiunt bona que perdentes proelia celo

Impia committunt gens fera Tartarei.\textsuperscript{24}

Consimiles sacra dant ludeis,\textsuperscript{25} sordida divo

Viscera ponendo. Mundificant male se.

Se male mundificant, ponendo viscera divo

\textsuperscript{22} Read ‘hic’ for Wright’s ‘hoc.’ MS could have either reading.

\textsuperscript{23} The Mongols crossed the frozen Danube on 25 December 1241. A German army reportedly defeated them in 1241 at the river Delphes, near the Danube, \textit{CM}, 4.131. Jackson (2005), 67, dismisses this and other reports of a German victory as wishful thinking.

\textsuperscript{24} Lines 79-82, and 83-86 are \textit{versus retrogradi} (palindromes).

\textsuperscript{25} Matthew Paris, \textit{CM}, 4.78-81 specifically says the Mongols did not speak Hebrew and had no knowledge of Mosaic law. He does not corroborate John’s assertion that they were circumcised.
Sordida, ludeis dant sacra consimiles.\textsuperscript{26}

Dum circumcisa pro pelle merentur Apelle

Nomen; cognomen hoc valet esse suum.\textsuperscript{27}

He gentes misere mortem misere per orbem

Destructas leges per mala cuncta leges.\textsuperscript{28}

Quid referam plausus quos perfida dat Sinagoga?\textsuperscript{29}

Nuncia quid promam perfidiamque suam?

Munera pretereo quae mittit clam vel aperte,\textsuperscript{30}

Dum sibi Messiam credit habere suum.\textsuperscript{31}

\begin{quote}
\textless 113\textgreater  Spes sua messe\textsuperscript{32} caret, expectans tempore tanto

Messiam sterilem spem miseranda fovet.
\end{quote}

Hos ut cognoscas, illos denominat error

Ipsum qui sunt Tartarus ipse niger.

Non sunt Tartarei tantum, sed Tartarus ipse.

Gens scelerata nimis dicitur, immo scelus.

Pagina sacra viros verpos denominat istos

\textsuperscript{26} See Introduction, 93 & n. 431.

\textsuperscript{27} ‘Apella’ is the name of a Jew in Horace, \textit{Serm.}, 1.5.100. John quotes this in \textit{CG}, 4.881-82, “\textit{Flaccus proponit, ‘credat Iudeus Apella.’ Circumcisus Apella manet, vates sit Apelles.” For John the Jewish name offers a coarse pun.

\textsuperscript{28} Another pun, ‘\textit{leges}’ / ‘\textit{laws}’ and ‘you will read’. John is accusing Mongols and Jews indiscriminately.

\textsuperscript{29} John seems to be referring to the Jews alone in lines 87-100. Synagoga was the effigy of a young woman representing the Jewish religion often seen on churches in the company of Ecclesia.

\textsuperscript{30} ‘\textit{apertes}’ is corrected in the MS.

\textsuperscript{31} For the only other account of a Jewish plot to assist the Mongols, see \textit{CM}, 4.131-33. Matthew Paris specifically refers to ‘gifts’ / ‘\textit{munera}’.

\textsuperscript{32} Note the further pun, ‘\textit{messe}’/ ‘\textit{Messyam sterilem}.’
De quibus in toto personat orbe fragor.

Urbs est orbis honor qua proles Virginis orbis
Abstersit facinus sanguinis imbre sui.

Lignum damnavit, sed lignum nos reparavit.

Fructus opem dederat, mors quia fructus erat.

Mortem Virgo dedit, sed Virgine mors retrocedit
Per quam procedit vita, salusque redit.

Astutum vermem pendens Cruce reddit inermem,

Dum concludit ei patris imago Dei.

Est homo qui nomen a crismate sumpsit, et intus
Ex alto Sanctus Spiritus unxit eum.

Imperiosa Dei proles et Virginis alme
Partus mirificus puniet ista mala.

Sublimes fastus humilis patientia Christi
Prosternet, per quam gens violenta cadit.

Gloria vanescit mundi, mundana potestas
Dum surgit, recidit, et perit orbis honor.

Crux humilis gladios elatos destruet, arma

Seva per assiduas conteret ara preces.

Bellî clangores resonans campana refringet,

---

33 Jerusalem.
34 John is referring to the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.
35 Lines 105-109 are leonines. *vermem* ‘the serpent’ signifies the devil.
36 *orbis honor*, i.e. Jerusalem (see line 103).
Cum feriet gentis canonis ense nephas.  

Si fas est dicam, papam denuntio segnem  

Si gentem tales non abolere studet.  

Dum sua iura tepent in iure paterculus esse

Promeruit; tales nec decet esse patrem.  

Si nolunt reges vindictam sumere, papa [105r]  

Sumet; sed pape pectora somnus habet.  

<114> Non didicit dormire Deus; si surgere non vult  

Ultio digna Dei, gens sua stare nequit.  

Occidet Ecclesia, surget sinagoga, bonique  

Occumbent, dabitur lux diurna malis.  

Cur, O terra, viros cum sis tam iusta nephandos  

Sponte creas? Tellus, hoc tolerare potes?  

Tu, pia nostra pares, paris omnia que pariendo  

Donas et recipis accumulasque tibi.  

Si pia sis mater, humanos exere mores,  

Infaustumque pares inclita perde genus.

---

37 John is carried away by his rhetoric. The language suggests his attack has shifted to the Emperor Frederick. It is hard to see what the sword of canon law could do against the Mongols.  

38 ‘Paterculus,’ a derogatory diminutive of ‘Pater.’ In a discussion of diminutives, John refers to ‘Pauperculus’ in CG, 2.429.  

39 Read ‘sed’ for Wright’s ‘si.’ The MS reading could be either.  

40 Wright’s punctuation is amended with the sense. In PP, 7.159 John uses the same imagery of a sleeping pope, in a specimen letter from Honorius III to Frederick II regarding the emperor’s reluctance to engage in the Fifth Crusade (1218-21), ‘Imputabitur neglectientie sopnolenti pastoris si lupina lacerantur ovicule feritate.’  

41 Likewise, read ‘si’ for Wright’s ‘sed.’
Puram tellurem gens polluit ista, suosque
140 Sordes vix poterunt hec elementa pati.
Absorbere velis gentem, gremiumque profundum
Pande tuum, capiat hanc Stigiale chaos.
Ablue pollute gentis vestigia, limphas
Emittas per quas hec\textsuperscript{42} abolere queas.
145 Quos horret tellus, deglutiat unda,\textsuperscript{43} relidat
Aër, turbo terat, concremet ignis edax.\textsuperscript{44}
Prostratis monachis aras et templa cruentant,
Hiisque boves statuunt cornipedesque ligant.
Impedit Ecclesiam fera dum discordia regum,
150 Tartareos acuit liber ad arma furor.
In claustris sacrisque locis concumbere feda
Gens audet, vellit sancta sepulcra solo.
Sanctorum capsas constringit et eruit ossa.
Et gemmis, auro femina mecha nitet.
155 Mundis Ecclesie pannis immunda perornat
Membra, sacros calices tractat\textsuperscript{45} et inde bibit.

\textsuperscript{42} Read ‘hec’ for Wright’s ‘hoc’.
\textsuperscript{43} Num. 16, 34 & 36. Here ‘deglutire’ is used of the earth rather than the sea.
\textsuperscript{44} ‘ignis edax’, \textit{DTE}, 4.144.
\textsuperscript{45} Read ‘tractat’ for ‘trectat’ in MS and Wright.
Catholici falsi comitantur eos, vacuusque

Vispilio, cupidus fur, homicida rapax.

Sed Deus opposuit illis iuga, flumina, silvas,

Illricas fauces, Theutonicasque manus.  

Sed rex Illiricus exclusos\(^ {47} \) circuit illos

Insidiis, nec eos hinc sinit ire procul.

\(<115>\) Hec Sarracenis gens peior, plus venerandam\(^ {48} \)

Sevit in Ecclesiam, quod ratione probo.

Memphis que fertur Damiata vigore coacta\(^ {49} \)

Summo, Christicolis clausa recepta fuit.

Illic per Pharias excrevit Nilus harenas,

Et Christi pugiles clausit et hausit aquis.

Quando Iherosalem rex inclitus ille Iohannes\(^ {50} \)

Impulerat gentem strage, cruore feram,

Nostra famem gens passa fuit vallata caterva

\(^{46}\) CM, 4.107, for the imperial army under Frederick’s son, Conrad.

\(^{47}\) Read ‘exclusos,’ for ‘exclusus’ in MS and Wright.

\(^{48}\) Rubric in right margin, ‘De captione Damiate civitatis in Aegypio a Christianis, et de perditione eiusmod.’

\(^{49}\) Wright’s note suggests that this is an abrupt leap ahead to Louis IX’s conquest of Damietta. It is however an example from the Fifth Crusade, intended to illustrate the Saracens’ moral superiority to the Mongols. This is John’s only substantive reference in De triumphis to the Fifth Crusade. In the Epithalamium 4. 103-4, John avoids giving a detailed account of this Crusade, ‘Hec alias alio dixi pede plenius aptans / Historiam, causas in nova bella canens.’ John has however left no such account in De triumphis or elsewhere. If a book is missing (see Introduction, 39-41), maybe this was its subject.

\(^{50}\) John of Brienne, King of Jerusalem. For his role in the Fifth Crusade, see Perry (2013), 90-119). For John see also DTE, 2, n. 21.
Hostili, Nili flumine clausa vagi.

Soldanus tamen Ecclesie transmisit alendis

Panes militibus, hostis in hoste pius.

175 Ad proprios dominos Memphis redit, hic\textsuperscript{51} sed abire

Sancte permittit agmina densa Crucis.

Tempore post longo fuit Amalricus\textsuperscript{52} ab illa [105v]

Captus gente, tamen redditus inde suis.

Hic Montis fortis comes, hic et Symonis heres

180 In reditu moritur, miles ad arma probus,

Quando Navarrensis rex et Campanicus heros\textsuperscript{53}

It, redit, et sequitur inde Ricardus eum.

Hic frater regis Henrici struxerat unam

Turrim, qua gaudet Aschalonita regi.\textsuperscript{54}

185 Risus adest elegis, lacrimas elegia nostra\textsuperscript{55}

Tergit Luciferi lumine leta novi.

\textsuperscript{51} Read ‘hic’ with MS, not ‘haec’ with Wright.

\textsuperscript{52} Rubric in left margin, ‘De aliis crucisignatis captis quibusdam comitibus nostris.’ This is a reference to the so-called Barons’ Crusade (1239-41). Amaury de Montfort, son of Simon de Montfort, was captured by the Egyptians in 1239, and released in 1241, but died on the way home. For Amaury’s role in the Albigensian Crusade see \textit{DTE}, 5.53.

\textsuperscript{53} Thibault IV was count of Champagne and King of Navarre. ‘Ricardus’ is not the Lionheart but Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III. For the Barons’ Crusade, see Lower (2005).

\textsuperscript{54} Richard refortified the strategically important castle fortifications in Ascalon in 1241, of which ruins remain, \textit{CM}, 4.107.

\textsuperscript{55} Rubric in left margin, ‘De sancto Edmundo confessore, qui eo tempore decessit juxta Provinum, translatus Pontiniacam, qui fuit archiepiscopus Cantuariensis.’
Tempore mestitie Romana sede vacante,\textsuperscript{56}

Solamen summa mitit ab arce Deus.

Surgit leta Syon, Edmundi presulis alta

Gloria dum veri pascua veris\textsuperscript{57} habet.\textsuperscript{58}

Quo Pontiniaci crescit domus inclita, cuius

Anglia thesaurum deflet abesse sibi.

Gallis confessor datus est Edmundus, et Anglis

Martir,\textsuperscript{59} utrique tamen Anglia mater erat.

Hic rex, hic primas; hic miles et ille sacerdos.

Dispare morte, pares sunt in honore stole.

<116> Primati pro martirio fuit aspera vita,

Pungentes ut apes qui reprobavit opes.

Vite velamen sanete nova mira revelant,\textsuperscript{60}

Et reserat latebras mors radiosa sacras.

Sobrius in vivis fuit, esurie satur, inter

Delicias humilis, in dominante cliens.

\textsuperscript{56} See also \textit{DTE}, 1.361-62, 5.153. This reference to the papal interregnum suggests John is writing between November 1241 and July 1243. This could be a celebration only of Edmund’s posthumous miracles, but more likely John is referring to the election of Innocent IV as pope, and therefore writing in summer, 1243.

\textsuperscript{57} Walter of Châtillon, \textit{Alexandreis}, 1, 208, ‘\textit{Paulus ad aeterni convertit pascua veris.’}

\textsuperscript{58} Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury (1234-40), later St. Edmund of Abingdon. He was buried at the Cistercian abbey of Pontigny, after dying en route to Rome in 1240. The monks of Canterbury refused to accept his remains. He taught in Oxford and Paris and may have been known to his contemporary, John of Garland. His final illness, death and miracles are extensively reported by Matthew Paris, see especially \textit{CM}, 4.324-28. He was canonised in 1246. John is celebrating the discovery of evidence of miracles, which established the road to sainthood.

\textsuperscript{59} King Edmund the Martyr (855-869), \textit{DTE}, 4.299-300, \textit{CM}, 1.400.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{CM}, 4.324-25. Miracles are reported at Catesby where Edmund’s pallium was kept.
In Doctore fuit quasi discipulus, rigidusque
Cervici rigide, flexibilique pius,

Enitet Edmundus mundo, re, nomine mundus.  
Nubit dote Dei vox ita iuncta rei.

Irriguum fontem cleri, meroris aquosus
Finis desiccat, et lacrimosa dies.

Philosophia iacet plorans, Elegia clamat
In studio, studii Musa sonora tacet.

Barbarolexis adest, quoniam trufator honorem
Invenit, et rethor desipit arte sua.

Praeterea quidam Greci de more resistunt
Romanis, cause disparitate sue.

Panes conficiunt altari; Roma repugnat
De simula cuius hostia pura placet.

Plus feritatis habet ferus Ismaëlita, relegat

---

61 This is an untranslatable play on words. ‘Mundus’ means both ‘the world’ and ‘civilised, morally pure’. ‘Edmundus’ reflects the pun.
62 ‘inriguamque bibant violaria fontem,’ Vergil, Georg., 4.32.
63 ‘Lacrimosa dies,’ from the liturgy of the Requiem mass
64 i.e. the Paris studium.
65 ‘Inter barbarismum autem et barbarolexim hoc interest, quod barbarismus in verbo latino fit, dum corrumpitur; quando autem bara verba latinis eloquii inferuntur, barbarolexis dicitur’, Isid. Orig., I.31. Here the word is used more loosely to describe deteriorating standards of Latin, though its use paves the way for an attack on Orthodox differences with the Roman Church.
66 Rubric in left margin, ‘Elegia de Grecis rebellibus Ecclesie.’
67 John refers to Greek objections revived in 1054 to the use by the Roman Church of unleavened bread at the Eucharist. See Whalen (2007) for an account of this, which became a major element in the ‘great schism’ between the churches.
Humanos ritus, non homo, tigris atrox.  

Imperii dominos expugnat Grecia, regna

Omnia nature gens inimica sitit.

Flandrensis comitis virtus Bisancia regna

Rexerat, electos duxit in arma viros.

Dum caput imperii comes est animosus in armis,

Vincit. Hunc carcer et locus ater habet.

Carcere sed fracto, divino munere clausus

Exit, et ad patrium pervenit usque solum.

Est primo princeps magno susceptus honore, [106r]

Quamvis et pauper et peregrinus adest.

Hunc si Tartareus populus cepisset, ad ignem

Vertisset nudi membra veruta viri.

<117> Illius finem modo non reor esse canendum,

Si comes hic fuerat ut vaga fama sonat.

Grecorum pugnas et Sarracenica bella

---

68 John now places the Muslims beyond the pale of humanity.
69 John refers to increasing Greek pressure on the Latin Empire of Constantinople. The emperor Baldwin II attended the Council of Lyon in 1245, and unsuccessfully tried to attract western reinforcements. ‘Regna / omnia nature gens inimica sitit’ clearly refers to the Muslims here.
70 Rubric in left margin. ‘Elegia gravis de comite Flandrie electo in imperatorem, qui victus, captus et incarceratus tandem evasit et a suis in Flandria damnabatur.’ Baldwin IX of Flanders was crowned Latin emperor in Constantinople in 1204. He was captured by the Greeks’ allies, the Bulgarians, in 1205 and probably murdered. A man claiming to be him appeared in Flanders in 1225. Initially believed, he was later accused of imposture and executed in 1226. See Wolff (1952), 281-322, esp. 294-300.
71 i.e. if his captors had been the Mongols.
Sufficiat nostris inseruisse malis.\textsuperscript{72}

Filius, heu! quantum primo nunc distat ab Adam\textsuperscript{73}

Nec scit nec tantum vivit inermis homo.

Nongentos annos simul et triginta peregit

Adam;\textsuperscript{74} post mortem danda tributa dedit.

Annos Matusalem\textsuperscript{75} nongentos decies sex

Et ter tres mortem viderat ante suam.

Quis tantum vivit? Nullus. Corruptio causa est

Nature nostre culpaque nostra gravis.

Non hodie primo surgit gens impia mundo.\textsuperscript{76}

Pridem de Chanaan\textsuperscript{77} venit iniqua manus,

Huic genti similis. Venumdare non dubitavit

Hungarie regem gens scelerata sua.

Cumanis et Tartareis\textsuperscript{78} datus effugit, et vim

\textsuperscript{72} John may be skipping swiftly over the Fourth Crusade and sack of Constantinople of 1204, and the Fifth (1213-21) and Sixth (1227-29) Crusades. Or he may simply be referring to Greek and Muslim pressures on the Latin Empire and the Holy Land respectively.

\textsuperscript{73} Rubric in right margin, ‘De brevi vita hominis.’

\textsuperscript{74} Gen. 5, 3. John seems to be saying that Adam left the legacy of original sin, for which man is still paying.

\textsuperscript{75} Gen. 5, 25.

\textsuperscript{76} Rubric in right margin, ‘De prodigione Cumanorum et Tartarorum saevitia.’

\textsuperscript{77} See DTE, 6.309, & n. 104.

\textsuperscript{78} CM, 4. 131. Matthew Paris links Tartars and Cumans in his account of the ‘Jewish plot.’
Colliget et cogit hos retroferre gradus.  
Muniti redeunt; sed nos altissima virtus

Protegat et faciat menia tuta Syon.

Sed reges nostri firmato federe\textsuperscript{80} gentem

Crudelem vincent, predominante fide.

Sunt magni generis reges probitate quod augent,

Qui stimulant animos prelia quando parant.

Preterea magnas reparant ad prelia vires

Gallicus hinc et illinc\textsuperscript{81} Anglicus, arma gerens.

Troianus quondam fuerat dux Francus,\textsuperscript{82} Alanos

Qui fregit fortes excidioque dedit.

Patri Francigene similes densantur in unum,

Sublimant animos exacuantque suos.

Enee de stirpe fuit rex Brutus, et orbis

Partes occiduas subdidit ense sibi.

\textsuperscript{79} Here, John at first appears to be writing at the time of the ‘Jewish plot’ of 1241, blaming the Jews for betraying King Béla to the Cumans and the Mongols. But he then moves on to the idea that the kings of England and France, united after their war in 1242, will join forces to defeat the returning Mongols and make Jerusalem safe, both suggesting 1243 as a likely date, after the Barons’ Crusade but before Jerusalem had been sacked by the Khwarazmians.

\textsuperscript{80} Louis IX and Henry III entered into a five-year truce in 1243, renewed in 1246, \textit{CM}, 4.242, 506, and uneasily maintained. See also Jordan (1979), 25-26.

\textsuperscript{81} ‘et’ inserted by editor for metrical purposes.

\textsuperscript{82} Francio, proverbially son of Hector, William le Breton, \textit{Gesta Philippi}, 2-4. This is a good example of the prevalence of Trojan myths in literature of the time, juxtaposing the founding myths of France and England.
Eius ad exemplum pugnando Britannia maior

Assumit vires exstimulatque viros.

<118> Compositis igitur amborum viribus, omnes

Cedent Tharsenses Assiriiique. Duces

Qui nisi perpetuo coniungunt federe dextras,

Pugnas perpetuas dissona regna gerent.

Non annus presens\textsuperscript{83} hec prelia finiet; immo

Sentiet hec etas postera; cede nova

Mars duo regna ferus depauperat, exuit urbes

Ere, viros vita, iugera messe sua.

Si propriam gentem rex diligit Anglica ergo,

Dilecte gentis robore tutus erit.

Gallicus in comitem Tholose fortia mittit\textsuperscript{84}

Agmina. Conflictus densat utrimque necem.

Quid mirum? Iustos quosdam stravere nephandi [106v]

Pro quibus excelsi dextera mira facit.

Inquisitores scelerum scelerata peremit\textsuperscript{85}

Dextera, qui vivunt finis honore deo.

Sed regi comitem iam pax confederat ut sic

\textsuperscript{83} Almost certainly 1242. John is piecing together pieces of work written at different times.

\textsuperscript{84} Louis IX sent an army to suppress Raymond VII’s revolt in 1242, which led to his surrender, see line 281 and CM, 4.216.

\textsuperscript{85} The inquisitors and their retinue were murdered 28 May, 1242 in Avignonet (Garonne), CM, 226-27.
Altera rex levius subiuget arma sibi.
Federe treugarum suspendunt prelia reges.
O, utinam\(^{86}\) pacem perpetuare velint.

Cognati reges geminas duxere sorores\(^{87}\)
In natis geminis se geminabit amor.
Per bellum facinus geminabitur; absit, et assit
Ut geminetur amor, ut geminetur honor.

Est dum depositus fortis Fredericus,\(^{88}\) et alter
Electus, surgit martius inde furor.\(^{89}\)

Si Sarracenos Fredericus convocat, illi
Succumbent, Christi Crux superabit eos.\(^{90}\)

Fracta pace Deus irascitur. Edocet illud
Perlustri sancto Scotia clara viro.

Brandanus\(^{91}\) Eusebio maledixit teste Britannos;
Icirco flebant multa pericula pati.

---

\(^{86}\) Read ‘O, utinam’ MS, not ‘continuam’ with Wright.

\(^{87}\) Louis IX and Henry III married respectively Margaret and Eleanor, daughters of Ramon Berenguer IV, count of Provence.

\(^{88}\) Frederick II was formally deposed by Pope Innocent IV at the Council of Lyons in 1245. An anti-king, Heinrich Raspe was elected in 1246, but Frederick continued in practice to rule until his death in 1250.

\(^{89}\) Abulafia (1988), 375-80 covers the immediate aftermath of Frederick’s deposition.

\(^{90}\) John is not suggesting that the Muslim world would rise in support of Frederick. There were significant numbers of Muslims in Southern Italy and Sicily, some of whom served in Frederick’s armies.

\(^{91}\) St. Brendan was an Irish abbot and missionary in the fifth or sixth centuries CE. His voyage is described in *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis*, ed. C. Selmer (Notre Dame, 1959). Here John is citing not Eusebius, who predated Brendan, but Sigebert, an eleventh century continuator, *MGHSS*, 6.318. See also Ussher (1639), who quotes lines 293-300. (On Ussher, see Introduction, n.105 & *DTE*, 4, n.123).
Trans mare se misit et eos prece solvit eorum

Et peregre licuit ire venire viro.

<119> Frangentes igitur pacem maledictio franget.

Gratia nec fractos que reparabit erit.

Nonnulli densant acies telluris amore,

Non celi; linquunt firma, caduca petunt.

Est Hodie venalis amor simulataque virtus.

Et sic spe luceri falsus amicus erit.

Est aliquis iuste pugnans sed cum rigor ultra

Ius trahit, et poscens plus, capit inde minus.

Dum sulcat cupidus terram, verrit mare, predam

Hic et ibi querit, ulteriusque sitit.

Aëra temptaret, celumque invadere vellet,

Si cupidus celo posset habere viam.

Noxia nox baratri scandentes taliter omnes

Sorbet in exemplo Lucifer esse potest;

Sic aliquis metas temptans excedere retro

Labitur, et perdit qui sibi cuncta petit.

Sunt proceres quidam privantes iure vetusto

92 Rubric in left margin, ‘De cupiditate et de eius damnatione.’ Vergil, Aen 1.171, ‘magni telluris amore.’
93 Augustine, Sermones, 68.1. ‘Falsus amicus peior aperto amico.’
Ecclesiam, matris nec male dicta timent.

Nudus qui venit, nudus discedet, honestam

Huic nisi texuerint inclita facta togam.

Inter bella fames dominatur, planctus, egestas,

Formido, luxus, fraus, scelus, ira, fuga.

Nescio quo vertar;\textsuperscript{94} aqua, flamma, rapina, ruina

Occurrunt, et habet mors vaga mille vias.

Materiale modo bellum, modo dico vicissim\textsuperscript{95}

Spirituale; gemit undique pulsus homo.

Nusquam tuta quies, nusquam pax; hinc premit ensis,

Hinc vitium natos deicit, Eva, tuos.

Inter bella mali nolunt peccata fateri, [107r]

Penam iungendam qui timuere sibi.

Purgat pena levis culpas, confessio si sit

Previa, confessor si modo doctus erit.

Doctus terrebit caute, blandque monebit.\textsuperscript{96}

Presbiter ad\textsuperscript{97} fletum temperat ipse metum.

\textless 120> Lesi per verba, fecerunt peius acerba.

Ne noceas plaga, tu sapienter age!\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{94} Cicero, \textit{Pro Ligario}, 1, ‘Quo me vertam nescio.’
\textsuperscript{95} Rubric in left margin, ‘De spiritualibus bellis’ / ‘Regarding wars of the spirit.’
\textsuperscript{96} Lines 331-33 are leonines.
\textsuperscript{97} ‘m’ is deleted in MS.
\textsuperscript{98} Amend ‘plage’ in MS and Wright to ‘plaga,’ with sense.
Plate 9. MS London British Library
Cotton Claudius A x, f. 107 r.,
the sword, the lion, the sea and the hyena,
DTE, 7.139-40.
Frange cupidineos arcus, carnisque sagittas,

Et Veneris munda destrue mente faces.

Impugnant hominem caro, serpens, et leo, demon,

Et pelagus, mundus, et tonat ense polus.

Imminet huic pena gladius, leo, pontus, hyena.

Hec prece si superet vir diadema feret. 99

Prelia sunt aliis peiora domestica carnis, 100

Demonis et mundi, 101 tres tria bella movent.

Spiritus est unus, tres hostes, machina multa

Que pulsat mentis menia 102 fraude trium.

Spiritus est promptus, infirma caro, prope demon

Occultus, mundum lucida larva tegit.

Expilat mundus oculos, caro lubrica mentem

Glutinat hanc, Sathane retia multa trahunt.

Invadit cum morte senes hebetatio sensus,

Tabida tussis, hebes visio, scabra cutis

---

99 In an illustration, Plate 9, p. 356 in the right margin of f. 107 r. is a framed rectangular polychrome drawing of a naked man, kneeling in the sea and threatened by an angel wielding a sword, and a fanciful hyena and lion, both on their hind legs. The angel is placing a crown on his head. The man may represent Louis IX, courageously crossing the sea and confronting his enemies.

100 Rubric unusually in left margin of recto page, ‘Elegia de rebellione carnis.’ (not ‘crucis’, as in Wright). Drafts of both this and the following rubric are in the right margin, but this rubric is squeezed out by the illustration (see preceding note), and the next, in the right margin, is awkwardly placed, so as to look like the title for the illustration.

101 Bernard of Clairvaux, Liber Sententiarum, 2, ‘Quattuor sunt, quorum in hac vita obsequuis deservimus: caro, mundus, diabolus, Deus.’

102 Alan of Lille, Liber de Planctu Naturae, PL, 210, col. 0465D, ‘Hospitium cordis, et moenia mentis avaraec / Invadunt hostes multi.’
Frontis ruga, caro macilenta,\(^{103}\) gravisque tumultus

Ventrūs, calvitium, rixa, querela, tremor.

Quid muliebre scelus posset, docet et probat uxor\(^{104}\)

Arthurī, cuīs crimine victus obit.

Modredum regis dum regi mecha nepotem

Pretulit innumerōs perdidit illa viros.\(^{105}\)

In Rutupi\(^{106}\) portu frateriis decidit armis

Galvanus\(^{107}\); populi vivit in ore tamen.

Invictos vicere viros mala sponsa neposque

Regis; finitimos ergo cavete dolos.

Mistica Nasonis mutatio fit;\(^{108}\) modo dama

Debitor est\(^{109}\) fugiens, credita cuncta negans.

Arbor fructificat qui reddit debita. Fallax\(^{110}\)

Fit vulpes, cupidus bupho, rapaxque lupus.

\(^{103}\) ‘caro predicat hec macilenta,’ from a song ‘Clauso Cronos et serato’ from Carmina burana 13.73, Walsh (1993), 47.

\(^{104}\) Rubric in right margin, ‘De malitia uxoris Arthurī.’

\(^{105}\) Geoffrey of Monmouth, De Gestis Britonum, 177, 20-23.

\(^{106}\) Richborough.

\(^{107}\) For Gawain, see also DTE, 1.385-89, 6.67-69.

\(^{108}\) John compares disappearing debtors with one of Ovid’s Metamorphoses in the language of John’s Integumenta Ovidii.

\(^{109}\) Read ‘debitor est’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘debitorem.’

\(^{110}\) See important n.19 above. Lines 61-64 are at 363-66 in the MS. The scribe was understandably misled by the reference in the new line 363 to trees and fruit.
Serpenti, milvo latro, petulcus equo.

<121>Portat avaritia rude saccum, spicula lingua

Livoris, gladios ira, libido faces.

Implicat accidia laqueos, se fastus inaurat

Casside, scrutatur vina cibosque gula.

Cauponam celebrant in summo mane gulosi,

Nec satiare queunt ventris inane chaos.

Prestat apostolicis festis ieunia cunctis [107v]

Mens pia; sex cohibet regula fixa dies,

Petrus et Andreas, Jacobus cum Symone, Iudas

Matheusque, cibos attenuare moment.

Ieiunare iubet Laurentius, at pia Virgo

Inspirat dapibus nos reparare semel.

Non quadragenas, non tempora quatuor anni

Respiciunt, certant qui vacuare ciphos.

Vortigerne, Britonum rex, tibi femina potus

Dans prius equales auxit in orbe gulam.

Sancte tibi, Michael, siquis ieunia prestat

---

111 Read ‘saccum,’ Avarice’s usual attribute, for Wright’s ‘scutum.’
112 Rubric in right margin, ‘De vii criminalibus, et de dominatione gule.’
113 John enunciates the seven deadly sins. He uses ‘fastus’ for the more usual ‘superbia,’ and ‘libido’ for ‘luxuria’.
114 ‘tempora quatuor,’ see DTE, 5.97 & n. 21.
115 Vortigern, King of the Britons, made over Kent to Hengist in exchange for his daughter Rowena, who had plied him with drink, GM, 100. ‘Vortigern’ upsets the metre.
Angelicisque choris, celica dona feret.

385 Hii nos tutantur, pellunt fantasmata, pestes
   Aërias removent, insidiasque fugant.

In somnis hominem perturbant somnia; tractat
   Frivola, sed vigilat sit nisi serva caro.

Vix venit ad celum miles, vix clericus; illud

390 Simpliciter credens rustica turba rapit.

Ex alphabeto sequitur meditatio longa,116

Pena gravis, facilis rixa, remota via,

Mors anime. Pro divitiis vel carnis amore
   Aut heresi, sic, sic, quid didicisse iuvat?

395 Brutis voce pares populus stupet; ecce scolares,
   Dum fatue clamant, verbaque litis amant.

<122> Vlocem caprinam nunc fingunt, nunc asininam.117

Formant voce sues, effigiantque grues.

‘Ha!’118 dabitur pueris post ‘a’, nisi tempora vitae119

400 Disponant, studii sit nisi meta Deus.

Si genitor peccat, in eodem filius errat,
   Et terrena sequi patre docente studet.

---

116 Rubric in left margin, ‘De elegia vite scolastica.’ Wright’s punctuation is changed significantly here.
117 Read ‘nunc’ for Wright’s ‘nec’, with the sense and MS, in both cases.
118 CG, 2.1633, “dolet ‘heu’, dolet ‘ha’, dolet ‘heheu.’”
119 Read ‘dabitur’ with MS, and not ‘habitur’ with Wright. Repunctuate, as against Wright’s ‘Ha! Habitum pueris post a nisi tempora vitae/ Disponaut, studii sit nisi meta Deus.’
Dulce dedisse Deo\textsuperscript{120} vitam que tam cito labens

Tempora continuat parva labore gravi.

Felix\textsuperscript{121} febris erat regis, qua Gallia tota

Est cum rege suo baiula facta Crucis.

Cesareas aquilas et regis lilia nostri\textsuperscript{122}

Formidat solo Parthia victa metu.

Est fundata super Francorum gesta libelli\textsuperscript{123}

Pagina, contentis continuata suis.

Occidue partes equites transmittere forties

Festinant, Babilon ut retro signa ferat.

Athletas fidei prostratos templaque ruentes

Sancta Dei doleo, damnaque plango nova.\textsuperscript{124}

Sanguine sed fuso Parthorum milia multa

Ante suam mortem strata dedere solo.

Flet flebitque magis princeps Babilonis; in illum

\textsuperscript{120}Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, 3.696, ‘et iuvat hanc magno verba dedisse deo.’ This line probably refers to John’s own life slipping away.

\textsuperscript{121}Louis IX’s fever was ‘\textit{felix}’ because he took the Cross on his recovery in 1244, and began planning the Seventh Crusade. This marks the start of John’s narrative of that campaign. He hyperbolically says the whole of France is taking the Cross.

\textsuperscript{122}John here assumes the emperor will join the crusade.

\textsuperscript{123}The oldest manuscripts of the anonymous account produced very soon after the First Crusade give it the name ‘\textit{Gesta Francorum.’} John may conceivably be referring to it directly. More likely, however, he is echoing the \textit{incipit} of William le Breton’s \textit{Gesta Philippi Augusti}.

\textsuperscript{124}At the battle of La Forbie in 1244, the Khwarazmians, supported by Egyptian forces, won a crushing victory over the Latins, allied to Muslims from Homs and Aleppo. The military orders suffered particularly badly. The Latins never recovered Jerusalem, \textit{CM}, 4.299-311.
Pergere proponit martia turba Crucis.

A papa missus referens a cardine nomen,

Otto Crucis miles de Cruce verba serit.  125

Rex utinam vivat Francorum, baiulus ipse

Est Crucis; efficitur istud agente Deo.

Regia Crux pacis est causa preambula; pulsis [108r]

Florebit reprobis clerus in urbe Salem.

Anni sunt quinque decies octoque peracti,  126

Ut Crucis accepte tiro Philippus erat.  127

Quatuor armantur fratres Cruce: rex Ludovicus,

Robertusque comes, Attrebatense decus,

Pictavie dominus Alphonsus, Karolus audax,

Cui Provincia dat robur habere suum.  128

<123> Remundum comitem mors surripit ausa Tholose.  129

Hugonis 130 sequitur Marchia mota Crucem,

Dux Burgundorum regi favet Hugo secundus.  131

125 Eudes (Odo) of Châteauroux was made cardinal-bishop of Frascati in 1244 and sent by Innocent IV to France to preach the Cross. He accompanied Louis IX on crusade. John makes the etymological point that ‘cardinal’ is derived from ‘cardo’/‘hinge, pivot [in the affairs of Christendom].’

126 Here the word ‘parati’ is deleted in the MS, as an error for ‘peracti.’

127 Philip II took the Cross in January, 1189, Rigord, 55.

128 Louis’ brothers Robert of Artois and Charles of Anjou embarked with Louis from Aigues Mortes on 25 August, 1249. Alphonse of Poitiers joined them from Marseille in spring 1249. Except for the countess of Artois, who was pregnant, their wives accompanied them.

129 Raymond VII of Toulouse died in Marseille on 27 September, 1248, before he could embark on crusade.

130 Hugh X de Lusignan, see DTE, 1, n. 105.

131 Hugh IV, Duke of Burgundy (1213-72).
Guillermi comitis Flandria scuta gerit.  

Qui se subtraxit inglorius occidit ille,

Cui preclara Crucis gloria vilis erat.

Hastam pauper homo portat, veteremque galerum,

Herbum sponsa, duplex pondus asella brevis.

Hinc puer, hinc saccus pendet, lac prebet asella

Pullo, lac puero ducta capella macra.

Dum dant cuncta Cruci sua quamvis parvula donant,

Divitibus multis uberiora Deo.

Impediunt Terre per bella negotia Sancte

Qui papam bello sollicitare student.

Ve cunctis illis qui marte negotia tardant,

Impediuntque sacre signa parata Crucis.

Sit collata Dei pax et benedictio cunctis

Est promota quibus martia turma Syon.

Vincere si vultis humili prece, vincite; sancti

Abbatis precibus mira videre licet.

---

133 The context suggests that John is referring to the prayers of St. Basil, Bishop of Caesarea (329/30 - 379). It was through his prayers that the Virgin Mary was believed to have miraculously effected the death of Julian the Apostate by bringing Mercurius back to life to kill him, JdE, 326. But Basil was certainly not an abbot. John’s more likely message is that those who are not part of the crusading army
Imperium liquit Iulianus Apostota,\textsuperscript{134} fossus

Hasta defuncti. Matre iubente Dei,

Cenobii sancti domus est ita libera.\textsuperscript{135} Victor

Quiriacus miles ad sua busta redit

Sumpta reponebat in templo Virginis arma,

Intrans in foveam Patre vidente loci.

Almipare matris inter miracula lecta

Nomina sunt alia, codice teste sacro.

Urbis Cesaree presul Basilius\textsuperscript{136} ista

Vidit. Mercurius nomine miles erat.

Dicitur hasta ‘quiris’; hinc ‘Quiriacum’ puto dictum

Impulsu cuius hasta cruenta fuit.

Incantator erat Iulianus apostota; turbas

Demonicas sancta\textsuperscript{137} vidit abire Cruce.

\textsuperscript{<124>} Vidit, et invidit,\textsuperscript{138} et diruit inclita templa,

Sed prius, ut dixi, dirutus hostis erat.

Vis est mira Crucis inter miracula sancte

\textsuperscript{134} ‘Julian the Apostate’, Flavius Claudius Julianus, Roman Emperor 331-363. For another account of this version of Julian’s death, see \textit{Stella}, 430-41, & 181-82. For Julian, see also \textit{DTE}, 1.411-14 & n. 113, and 2.583-86 & n. 147.

\textsuperscript{135} St. Basil was credited with establishing the first ‘coenobium,’ / ‘monastery’ near Caesarea in 360.

\textsuperscript{136} St. Basil, bishop of Caesarea

\textsuperscript{137} Read ‘sancta’ for Wright’s ‘facta.’

\textsuperscript{138} ‘vidit, et invidit,’ Augustine, \textit{Sermones}, 229.2.
Virginis, est Ierico que speciosa rosa.\textsuperscript{139}

Ad civile forum Rome quasi clericus actor

Demon visus erat calliditate sua.

Mater de nato natum concepit ab illo;

Hoc de peccato causa movenda fuit.

Pape confessa Luciano\textsuperscript{140} fletibus ora [108v]

Merserat et Christi matris habebat opem.

Coram iudicibus invisibilis stat amena

Virgo; sublimat laudibus hostis eam.

Accusata prius, ab eo laudatur et omnes

Se Cruce consignant frontibus; ille fugit.

Suppeditant bellum sibi materiale potestas,\textsuperscript{141}

Canonis et gladium\textsuperscript{142} spiritualis apex.\textsuperscript{143}

Fert de concilio generali\textsuperscript{144} sic mihi Clio;

Ad nutum pape cuncta peracta cape.

\textsuperscript{139} Anastatica, the plant ‘rose of Jericho’ or ‘rosa Sanctae Mariae’ has a capability, regarded as miraculous, for springing into life after long periods of drought.

\textsuperscript{140} See Stella, 382-99, for another version from John of this traditional Marian story, and Stella, 176 for full background. Like Vincent of Beauvais, Speculum Historiale, 8. 95, John refers to Pope Lucius as ‘Lucianus.’

\textsuperscript{141} This follows on from line 448. Lines 449-478 have been interposed to illustrate the power of the Cross and the limits of sorcery, prior to a denunciation of Frederick II.

\textsuperscript{142} Read ‘gladium’ for ‘gladitii’ in MS and Wright, with sense and grammar. John is contrasting secular with spiritual power. John scans the first syllable of ‘canonis’ long.

\textsuperscript{143} A verbal allusion to Innocent IV’s apostolic letter deposing Frederick II, ‘Ad Apostolicae Dignitatis Apicem.’ This was promulgated on 17 July 1245, under the sign of Cancer.

\textsuperscript{144} The first Council of Lyon, 1245.
Signum retrogradi Frederico flebile cancri
Depositum tristes signat inire dies.

Hic licet astronomus esset, non vidit in astris
Se deponendum, seque referre gradum.

Sed leo subsequitur de cancro; si leo fiat,
Efficiet fortes febricitare metu.

Papa dabit gladium, sed siquis abutitur illo
Hunc privare dator munere debet eo.

Divine menti que sunt ventura relinquo,
Dum portum properat cimba tenere mea.

Quod tamen in primis promisi, dicere nitar,
Hostes victrici succubuisse Cruci.

Multiplicat planctum primus liber, arma secundus
Preparat; ordo sequens prelia seva movet.

Sanctorum monstratur hiis victoria, mundi
Corruptela, scelus, pompa, ruina, dolus.

Historiis satiras et gesta tragedica iunxi,

Hec ut venturi singula vera legant.

---

145 ‘tibi’ is deleted in MS here.
146 See Abulafia (1988), 375-80 for events after Frederick’s deposition. John appears to be criticizing Innocent IV’s support for the failed plot to kill Frederick.
147 This could indicate that John thinks his death is imminent; but could also mean that DTE is nearing completion.
148 John defines satire, ‘in qua recitantur malefacta causa correctionis,’ and tragedy as ‘carmen quod incipit a gaudio et terminatur in luctum,’ both subdivisions of ‘historicum,’ PP, 5.360-66, with Lawler’s notes.
Incipit liber octavus

<125> Qui legis historias gentiles, perlege mira

Christi; vanescant numina vana Iovis.¹

Est liber hic nonus² qui cum preaeuntibus³ octo

Ecclesie laudes, bella, trophea canit.

₅ Tempora cum causis,⁴ adversaque mixta secundis,⁵

Nasonisque sacris obvia sacra leges.

Crede dies fastos omnes nullosque nefastos

Et quecumque Deus fecerit esse bona.

Virgo concipitur, oritur, verbum capit, ortum

₄ Tempora cum causis,' 'Events and their causes.' Ovid’s opening words, Fasti, 1.1.

₁⁵ Lucan, 5.3, 'miscens adversa secundis.' Walter of Châtillon, Alex., 2.154, 'mixta adversa secundis.'

John refers to the Feasts of the Immaculate Conception (8 December), the Nativity of Mary (8 September), the Annunciation (25 March), and the Assumption (15 August), and to the Presentation of Jesus at the Temple (2 February).
Virgilii mirandi viret sententia, Naso

Tanquam de nihilo carmina longa trahit.

Statius in serie vernat, Lucanus adaugens

Mores historiis phisica multa canit.

Hos sequor in metro tanquam vestigia nanus

Herculis, et forsan ut therebintus ebur.

Nil mihi dant nostri proceres pro carmine dulci.

Hii quondam fuerant qui didicere dare. [109r]

Hic est laus Christi, laus Virginis et Crucis, et laus

Regum, certamen qui subiere Crucis.

<126> Nesci  iperbolicas heroum fingere laudes

Clio, solamen sed mihi quero meum.

Sepe Crucis repeto sacre preconia; merces

Hec erit, et studii laurea leta mei.

Copia nummorum regnat, non gratia morum.

Si pauper fuerit, vilis Homerus erit.

Hos elegos lector noli contemnere, rerum

Hic quia naturas et nova gesta leges.

---

7 Lines 15-18 each have their own rubrics in the left margin, ‘Vergilius’, ‘Ovidius’, ‘Statius’, and ‘Lucanus’ respectively.

8 John of Salisbury, Metalogicon, 3.4, ‘Dicebat Bernardus Carnotensis nos esse quasi nanos gigantum humeris insidentes...’.

9 Ovid, Ex Ponto, 3.3.98, ‘nec, quod erat candens, fit terebinthus ebur.’

10 Walter of Châtillon, Carmina 10, ‘Nummus vincit, nummus regnat, nummus cunctis imperat.’

11 Homer was believed to have been poor, Claudian, Epigrams, 24.16. See also CG, 4. 1089-90 on the current obsession with wealth.
Est homini melius habitacula poscere luctus

Quam risus; dictis ut Salomonis habes,

Occupat extremo plausum dolor, ergo dolere

Sic discas, plausus possit ut inde sequi.

Ad nova bella Crucis post spirituale flagellum

Apto stilum, mediis continuata ligans.

Inter mesta canit letos stilus iste triumphos,

Qui planctum plausu, prelia pace fugant.

Sacre castra Crucis dum ducit fortia Christus,

Victrix letatur per Crucis arma fides.

Quem peperit Virgo, fructus tulit in Cruce, vitam

In Cruce nos sacram fructificare docens.

Pro Cruce sumenda que predicat unus et alter

Pretereo, series est quia longa stili.

Urbs Acronensis collectis viribus hostes

Compulit illata strage referre gradus.

Accedent vexilla Crucis penitusque repellent

---

13 Wright’s punctuation is varied.
14 Alan of Lille, De planctu naturae, 1-2, ‘In lacrimas risus, in luctus gaudia verto / In planctum plausus, in lacrimosa iocos,’ See also DTE, Preface.1.
15 Here John’s language reverts to that of the ‘Exhortatio ad crucem suscipiendum’ of Book 2.
16 A discreet reference to the capture of Acre from the Muslims under Saladin in the Third Crusade, and to King Richard’s execution of hostages (1191), IPGRR, 3.17-4.4. John is using the Third Crusade as a successful model for the Seventh.
Hostes et fient libera signa\textsuperscript{17} Syon.

Per vexilla crucis elegia maesta recedit;

Sepe sed incautis culpa suborta nocet.

Sobrius et castus,\textsuperscript{18} orans, humilisque fidelis

Et patiens debet baiulus esse Crucis.

Hanc infra legem, felix Elegia, virtus

Est electa, favum fundit, aroma sapit.

Si quandoque pluit, succedit gratia solis.

Fortuneque fugat nubila leta dies.

\textless 127\textgreater Qui sibi vult luctus avertere,\textsuperscript{19} corda serenent

Huic divinus amor obsequiumque Crucis.\textsuperscript{20}

Succumbunt anime victrici prelia cuncta,

Summa triumphantis gloria cuius erit.

Suffusos lacrimis mihi dextera tergit ocellos\textsuperscript{21}

Risibus et lacrimis debet inesse modus.

Sed modus in scelerum factis quia\textsuperscript{22} nescit haberi,

Vix poterit finem planctus habere suum.

Sponsa triumphabit in celis que domat hostes

\textsuperscript{17}‘signa’ often meant ‘miracles’; hence ‘wonders’.
\textsuperscript{18}‘Sobrius et castus,’ Orderic Vitalis, 4, p. 354, ‘humilis, fidelis,’ Peter of Blois, Sermones 10, Gerald of Wales, Expugnatio Hibernica, 1.43, ‘Vir sobrius, modestus, et castus; stabilis, firmus, atque fidelis.’
\textsuperscript{19}Statius, Thebaid, 5.276, ‘lacrimisque avertere luctus.’
\textsuperscript{20}Gerald of Wales, De Instructione Principis 8.10.
\textsuperscript{21}Valerius Maximus, 2.6.8, ‘suffusis tamen lacrimis,’ Vergil Aen, 1.228, ‘tristior et lacrimis oculos suffusa nitentis’.
\textsuperscript{22}Read ‘quia’ with MS for Wright’s ‘quod.’
In terris, risus excitat ergo michi.

Lugdunum venit quo sanctus tempore papa

Hoc mea Parisius Musa trahebat opus.

Mille ducentenis coniungo decem quater annos

Virginis a partu, tresque duosque ligo. [110r]

Cronographi iungunt annorum milia quinque

Annis bis centum, demitur unus eis,

Virginis ad partum tot ponunt orbis ab ortu

Annos. Ulterius tempora certa patent.

Papa citat contra discordes federa patrum;

Assunt et redeunt ecclesiasque regunt

Presul Guillelmus et cancellarius urbis

Petrus Parisius; docmata sacra ferunt.

Doctores reprimunt mundi mala, que nisi crebro

Corriperent recti nemo teneret iter.

Annis predictis Domini ternarius assit

Ad pelagus properant undique signa Crucis.

Civibus urbs Parme Frederici sternere palmam

---

23 The first Council of Lyon, 1245. John makes it clear that he was working in Paris on De triumphis.
24 i. e. Eusebius, Jerome and Bede, See McKitterick (2004), 7-13.
25 William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris (1228-49), and Petrus Parvus, Chancellor of the University of Paris, probably 1244-46. See Hauréau (1877), 6, Paetow, MS Intro., 123, n.17.
26 The Council of Lyon promulgated reforms aimed at curbing corruption in the Church, and strengthening its finances, CM, 4, 456-72.
27 1248.
Gaudet, et innumera strage fugare ducem.

Prefertur bello victricis imago Marie,

Datque suas vires previa Virgo viris.29

Regis prelustris sacra capella30 ferebat

Parisius nenie munera31 larga nove,

Omni luce per octo dies, septemque decemque

Annos et decies quatuor adde dies.

<128> Mortua portus Aqua32 dictus Ludovitica signa

Suscipit, et classes a statione movet.

Tartaree gentis rex sacro fonte renasci33

Poscit, sed caveat Gallica turma dolos!

Franci, Teutonici, Daci densantur et Angli34

Et leti tanto sub duce bella petunt.

28 Frederick II besieged Parma 1247-8. He was defeated by papal forces at Victoria, outside Parma, on February 12, 1248. On this battle see Stella, Intro., 78-7 & lines 904-915. CM, 5.14-15 makes no mention of the Virgin’s miraculous help. See also Abulafia (1988), 396-400.

29 Another instance of alliteration and the pun vires / viris.

30 Louis IX built Sainte Chapelle in 1242-8 to house the Crown of Thorns and other relics, purchased in 1239 from Baldwin II, Latin Emperor of Byzantium. It was consecrated on 26 April 1248. See also DTE 2.65-72 & n.14, 2.549 and n. 133. Lines 90-92 are obscure. The consecration of Sainte Chapelle coincided closely (though the figures do not add up perfectly) with the time interval, seventeen years and fifty-seven days since the disappearance of the Holy Nail (sacre clou) from the Abbey of Saint Denis on 28 February 1231. The nail was rediscovered on 1 April 1232. See Le Goff (2009), 80-82.

31 Horace, Odes, 2.1.37, ‘Sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis / Ceae retractes munera neniae.’

32 Louis IX rebuilt the port of Aigues Mortes in Languedoc as the point of departure for his crusading fleet, and set sail on 28 August, 1248. On Louis’ choice of Aigues Mortes, see Jordan (1979), 71-76.

33 A reference to Louis’ hope of converting the Mongols, and despatch from Cyprus on 25 January, 1249 of André of Longjumeau to the general, Eljigidei, with a lavish portable altar as a gift. (André returned to Louis in 1251 in Caesarea, with only a provocative message to show for his mission). There had been strong indications from Mongol envoys in Cyprus that the Mongols, including Eljigidei and the Khan, Gûyûk, were sympathetic to Christianity. For a fuller treatment see Jackson (2005), 97-103.

34 Whilst there was a small English contingent, the vast majority of crusaders were French.
Rex in divitiis viridique modestus in evo

100 Posse suum totum promit amore Crucis.

Hostes Ecclesie nutant formidine cuncti,

Quorum confringit cornua fama ducis.

Historias ego maiores ab origine mundi

Perstrinxi; superest laus sine fine Crucis.

105 Bellis finitis surgunt nova bella; nec illa

Infinita queo tradere certa stilo.

Pauci Christicole temptant devincere gentes

Innumeratas, urbes, castra, venena, dolos.

Ferrea nunc etas in secula terrea transit,

110 Assirique ducis monstrat imago pedes.

Transit unda Noe, venient incendia mundo,

Ignis purgabit hec elementa\(^{40}\) vorax.

Vos Crucis armigeri, fraudes virusque timete;

Serpentum virus occulit herba virens.

115 Proditio vigilat fusca sub nube latendo,

---

35 Ovid, *Tristia*, 4.10.17, ‘viridi tendebat in aevo.’
36 Ps. 74, 11, ‘et omnia cornua impiorum confringam.’
37 An extravagant claim.
38 Dan. 2, 31-45. Daniel’s account of the successive eras, gold, silver, bronze, iron is paralleled by Ovid’s description of the ages of man in *Met*. 1.89-150. Nebuchadnezzar’s image had feet of clay. John sees the arrival of a new age, worse even than the iron age.
39 Lucan, 1.656, ‘toto fluerent incendia mundo.’
40 ‘Hec elementa’, earth and water.
Et reticere mihi tutius esse puto.\textsuperscript{41}

Dat mihi gaudia Crux mea gloria, Crux mea virtus.\textsuperscript{42}

Crux mihi lux, mihi dux, vita, corona, salus.

Heu Crucis armigeros spoliat piratica\textsuperscript{43} turba,

Sternit et occidit, precipitatque mari.

Murmura dum\textsuperscript{44} vulgi\textsuperscript{45} de proditione voluant,

Incertas scelerum ferre timesco manus.\textsuperscript{46}

Vatibus insultat elegia! Musa recede,

Musa sile, quoniam sepe nocere soles.

Eusebii sicut testatur pagina, bustum

Continet Ovidis frigida terra Thomi.\textsuperscript{47}

Octavo decimo quem Salvatoris ab ortu

Mortis iter tritum fecit inire dolor.

Annos virginee quingentos prolis ab ortu

Vigintique duos littera certa tenet

\textsuperscript{41} John is probably referring here to the instigators of attacks on the crusading army as it made its way through Avignon, labeled ‘proditores,’ ‘potionatores’ and ‘Albigenses’ by Louis’ army, and at Marseilles, \textit{CM}, 5.23-24. Louis left behind significant numbers of troops and knights, who according to Matthew Paris were close to rebelling against him in alliance with the English. John’s coyness may be a reluctance to name names associated with this alleged conspiracy.

\textsuperscript{42} Lines 117-18 have no spondee feet, and are clearly part of rhythmic hymn or chant. ‘\textit{Crux sancta est mihi lux / Non draco sit mihi dux}’ comes from ‘\textit{Vade retro Satane},’ a Benedictine exorcism prayer.

\textsuperscript{43} ‘Pirate’ can mean ‘brigands’ as well as ‘pirates.’

\textsuperscript{44} ‘dum’ is inserted in the MS as a correction for ‘\textit{de}.’

\textsuperscript{45} Ovid, \textit{Heroides} 17. 149 ‘\textit{sensi mala murmura vulgi}.’

\textsuperscript{46} Ovid, \textit{Ex Ponto}, 1.5.46 ‘\textit{nec tenet incertas alea blanda manus}.’

Rege Theodorico Gothorum, magne Boethi,

Exul et afflicctus, iura sequendo peris. 48

Si nocuit tantis personis inclita Musa

Hec mihi ne noceat nenia mesta tremo.

Heretici Crucis armigeros invadere temptant,

Quos princeps terris, nautaque vendit 49 aquis.

Hospes truncatur dum dormit ab hospite, quosdam

Exscaturit fervens hospitis unda feri.

Quosdam vispilio vita denudat et ere,

Duxque suus perimit vestis amore sue.

In levo dexter non fidel ocellus ocello,

Parte nec in leva fidere dextra potest.

Frivola sed franget veniens de monte lapillus,

Christus compensans premia cuique sua.

Flebilis electis elegia nulla nocebit;

Pro noxis reprobos noxius ignis edet. 50

Crux erit in celo signum, cum venerit equus

Iudex, cum celum pro Cruce munus erit.

48 Boethius (Anicius Manlius Severinus) was executed on the orders of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, c. 524 CE. His influence on the Schools, especially Adelard, was extensive.

49 Read ‘vendit’ with MS, not ‘vendis’ with Wright, meaning ‘betrays.’ It is tempting to translate ‘princeps’ as ‘the emperor,’ as the crusaders’ journey was through imperial lands, but it seems here to mean ‘immediate superior’ rather than ‘overall leader’. ‘Dux’ in line 140 is translated as ‘guide.’ John describes graphically the perils soldiers faced from untrustworthy superiors and unreliable boatmen (remembering his own experiences, DTE, 6. 201-54).

50 Statius, Thebaid, 1.508, ‘lacte novo perfusus edet Volcanius ignis.’
Est celi sine nocte dies,\textsuperscript{51} plausus sine planctu,

Absque fame saties, absque labore quies.

Est ibi verus amor sine luxu, pax sine pugna,

Et sine sorde decor, et sine lite favor.

In Cruce gens hodie vincet prece supplice, palmis

Protensis prono vertice, corde pio.

Crux salvatoris est clava triangula summo

Vertice, qua demon ictus ad ima ruit.\textsuperscript{52}

Qui duxit Moysen sine nave per equora tutum

Ducet tranquillum per mare signa Crucis.

Papa quasi Moyses orando vincet, et alter

Arma ferues Iosue rex Ludovicus erit.\textsuperscript{53}

<130> Sed Crucis armigeris absit fraus tecta, libido

Devia, livor edax,\textsuperscript{54} mens vaga, fastus hebes.

Post aderit Christi victoria leta, potestas

Ampla, Dei regnum, pax rata, tuta via.

Crux veneranda viam peregrinis iam dedit, undas

Tutius equorias plebs peregrina secat.


\textsuperscript{52}Eadmer, \textit{Vita Sancti Dunstoni}, 208 ‘primus ad ima ruit.’

\textsuperscript{53}On the comparison between Louis IX and Joshua, see Gaposchkin (2008). He was also often compared with the biblical king Josiah, see Prologue, n. 21 above.

\textsuperscript{54}Ovid, \textit{Amores}, 1.15.1.
Gaude sancta Syon! congaude Francia felix!

Vos gaudere Crucis inclita palma iubet.

Nomine, re, Blanca prolis letatur honore,

Gemma pudicitie, regis amena parens.

Ride! Flevisti, Ierolsolina. Sta! Iacuisti

Lude, laborasti! Vive, soluta iugo! [111r]

Letitiam moderare tamen, quia non ita semper

Gratia surridet, sorsque benigna favet.

Anticipare mihi verum licet; aut modo Parthus

Aut post Ecclesie robore victus erit.

Inter leta gemit iustus, lapsumque veretur.

Ridet in adversis, spe comitante fidem.

Niliace gentis lacrimas fideique triumphos

Letos exiguo tradere tempto stilo.

De regione Phari prostrata tot agmina fari

Quis vatum poterit? Vix Maro tantus erit.

Milia Parthorum decies plagunt sua fata;

---

55 Rubric ‘De Damiata capta.’ This is the last rubric in the manuscript. But see n. 123 below. These lines seem to have been written in anticipation of victory. ‘Gaude sancta Syon,’ a strand running through the liturgy commemorating the capture of Jerusalem, see Gaposchkin (2017), esp. 263, App. 1. Blanche of Castile. This is an obvious play on her name.

56 ‘gemma pudicitie,’ ‘De Misteriis, 643, referring to Alexander of Hales. Whilst there is no doubt of Blanche’s piety, Wendover, Flores, 3.4 and Matthew Paris, CM, 3.119 suggest that Blanche had affairs with the legate Romano and Thibault of Champagne. John has no criticism of her.

58 ‘robore’ is inserted as an addition to the text.

59 The infinitive of ‘fateor’; note the rhyme with ‘Phari’. Lines 183-84 are also leonines.

60 Lines 183-84 and 187-8 are rhyming couplets.
Pars est illorum strata, fugeque data.

Milia ter decies hiis addita sunt aliorum,

Est urbi quorum flebilis illa dies.

Unus ibi tantum peregrinus fata peregit,\textsuperscript{61}

Sic Crucis athletas gratia summa regit.

Verum falsa fugat; ius fraudes amputat, hostes

Legis lex reprobat, fabricat arma fides.

Tristia letitie miscentur,\textsuperscript{62} nubila luci,

Damna ioco, paci bella, venena favo.

Te, Machomete, metus invadit, repetit ultrix

Crux, te condemnat, te, scelerate, fugat.\textsuperscript{63}

<131> Isis lanifica dea, Lini numen, Osiris,\textsuperscript{64}

Diique rudes alii terga dedere Cruci.

Huius signarei ‘X’\textsuperscript{65} ceciderunt idola quondam,

Dum tulit huc Christum stella serena maris.\textsuperscript{66}

Cui disponit opem Deus, illi nulla nocebunt.

\textsuperscript{61}Reportedly only one of Louis’ soldiers was killed in battle, \textit{CM}, 6 (Add). 159. This was Hugh X, Comte de la Marche, see \textit{DTE}, 1, n. 114. If he or a family member was a patron, John would have good reason for the reference. ‘Fata peregit,’ Lucan, 4.361, and especially 6.820, where, like Hugh, a corpse is finally allowed to die.

\textsuperscript{62}Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, 6, 463. ‘Miscentur tristia laetis’ / ‘Sorrow is mingled with joy.’

\textsuperscript{63}Read ‘scelerate’ for Wright’s ‘sclerate,’ with MS.

\textsuperscript{64}‘Lanifica’ is unusual, and not elsewhere associated with Isis, though she embodied the domestic virtues. Ovid, \textit{Met}, 6.6, applies it to Arachne. See Lucan, 9.159, ‘Eolvam busto iam numen gentibus Isim / Et tectum lino spargam per volgus Osirim.’

\textsuperscript{65}The MS contains a Greek ‘chi’ / ‘X’, and is followed here. Wright omits. This was the symbol for ‘Christ.’

\textsuperscript{66}This refers to the flight of the Holy Family to Egypt, Matth. 2, 13-20, and the introduction of Christianity there.
Quo victrix palmam fert peregrina phalanx?

Tedia ne faciam sumens exordia longe,

Ordia a portu fluctivagoque mari.

In mortem Pharie gentis Francos Aqua misit

Mortua, que mortis nomen et omen habet.

Que gens morte perit? Incredula. Quo duce? Rege

Armigero Christi. Quomodo? Marte fero.

Si queratur, ‘Ubi?’ ‘Damiate.’ ‘Quid Damiata?’

‘Succubuit? Periit?’ ‘Non, sed aperta fuit.’

Gentis amoriferam\(^{67}\) Venerem Ciprus insula dudum

Excoluit, Christique modo signa gerit.\(^{68}\)

Applicat armipotens ibi rex regemque secute

Sunt turme. Turmas aptat ad arma quies.

Rex leo\(^{69}\) perdomuit Ricardus milite Ciprum,

Remige, quam querit pacifice modo Crux.\(^{70}\)

Crux modo pacifice querit quam remige Ciprum

Milite Ricardus perdomuit leo rex.\(^{71}\)

Hic Franci classisque tenax recreantur; habere

---

\(^{67}\) Read ‘*amoriferam*’ for ‘*amorifer*’ in MS and Wright.

\(^{68}\) Aphrodite was believed to have been born in Cyprus, where Paphos was an important site for her worship. Cyprus had been continuously Christian, as part of the Byzantine empire, then under Lusignan rule from 1192. See *DTE*, Prologue, 91-2 & n. 33.

\(^{69}\) ‘*Rex Leo*’, Richard the Lionheart conquered Cyprus en route to the Holy Land in 1191. See *DTE*, 3.119-128 above for John’s account.

\(^{70}\) Curtius 4.3.18, ‘*milite ac remige.*’

\(^{71}\) 213-16 are *versus retrogradi*, a palindrome.
Franci ver optant, findere classis aquas.

Strato rex classem pelago committit, ad urbem

Tendit Alexandri;\(^{72}\) sed negat unda viam.

Non tenet aura fidem; mentitur, murmurat, obstat,

Intumet,\(^{73}\) iratam percutit ergo Tethim.\(^{74}\)

Alternant alapas\(^{75}\) Tethis et ventus; ictu

Vento respondet ebria, ventus ei.

Aër ventosus, pontus furibundus et ignis

Terribilis sevas exeruere\(^{76}\) minas.

Arthous Boreas Austro plus obstat, at Auster

In Boream surgit huncque sedere iubet.

<132> ‘Urbem postergat\(^{77}\) Pelleam.\(^{78}\) ‘Cur?’ ‘Quia Memphim Tendit.’ ‘Quid querens?’ ‘Huc agitare rates.’

In tumulos arat Auster aquas, rabiesque procelle\(^{79}\)

Sevit. Vela ferit Auster, et unda rates.

Nox tegit atra diem, micat ether fulgure,\(^{80}\) nimbus

\(^{72}\) ‘urbem..Alexandri;’ Only John and Matthew Paris maintain that Louis’ fleet was heading for Alexandria, rather than Damietta. This derives from the ‘letter from Gui in CM. 6 (Add).155-62, & 5.139. See Jackson (2007), 87, n. 118, who notes this.

\(^{73}\) A non-classical form. ‘Intumescere’ is the usual verb.

\(^{74}\) ‘Tethim;’ Tethys was a sea-goddess, wife of Oceanus. Her name was used allegorically to mean ‘the sea’.

\(^{75}\) ‘alapa’/‘box on the ear’ was unusual in classical poetry, but well-known from Ioh. 19, 3.

\(^{76}\) ‘manus’ is deleted here in the MS.

\(^{77}\) A non-classical word, used here for the first time as far as I can ascertain.

\(^{78}\) ‘urbem Pelleam,’ Alexandria.

\(^{79}\) Seneca, In Phoenissas, 1.43, ‘Perfurit motae rabies procellae.’

\(^{80}\) Vergil, Aen. 1.89-90, ‘ponto nox incubat atra, / intonuere poli et crebris micat ignibus aether.’
Book 8

Densatur; nimbo vela virique madent.\textsuperscript{81}

Mors mare non metuit, quia morte natatile quidque

Deficit, et morti subiacet omnis homo.

Formidare viros facit aër turbine, rupes

Occursu, pontus fluctibus, igne polus.

Dum proponit homo, disponens gratia celi

Prospera post lacrimas prosperiora facit.

Cum turres altas Damiate navita cernit,

Divino nutu ventus et aura\textsuperscript{82} silent.

Inconcussa fides, spes ardua, Crux veneranda

Salvat, fert, sedat, corpora, vota, mare.\textsuperscript{83}

Consiliis initis properant quicumque balistas

Portant ut faciant previa tela viam.

Francia si fallit regem, nec Secana\textsuperscript{84} pisces,

Nec lucus frondes, nec polus astra gerit.

Sed si sic quidam fidei virtute stetissent,

Sub Parthis iterum non Damiata foret.\textsuperscript{85}

Pila volant plura vernali grandine, mortem

\textsuperscript{81} Ovid, \textit{Met.}, 11.519, ‘\textit{vela madent nimbis.’}

\textsuperscript{82} ‘\textit{unda}’ appears in MS as palimpsest in a different hand above ‘\textit{aura},’ and is the reading favoured by Wright. See however Ovid, \textit{Amores}, 1.106, ‘\textit{nec tulerint voces ventus et aura meas}’. ‘\textit{Aura}’ is not deleted in the MS, and is retained here.

\textsuperscript{83} A contrived grammatical structure, with three consecutive subjects, verbs and objects.

\textsuperscript{84} ‘\textit{Secana},’ more commonly ‘\textit{Sequana},’

\textsuperscript{85} John appears indirectly to be blaming Robert of Artois for the defeat at Mansourah and the subsequent loss of Damietta.
Incutiens crebro missa sagitta rubet.

In ponto pugnant primo, ducuntque galeas;

Induti galeas stant, animantque suos.  

Cedunt innumerous pauci, membrisque gigantes

Parvi, terribiles voce, caterva decens.

Hic pedes, hic et eques; pedites equitesque relidunt.

Sternunt quadrupedes precipitantque viros.

Obruit hos sonipes, illos ferrum premit, istos

Unda vorat. Moriens hic gemit, ille tacet.

Regis ad exemplum, pelago se cetera turba

Committit; pugnat hic in aquis et equis.

<133> Dum pretemptat aquas princeps, phalerantur equorum

Terga, resistit eques qui stetit ante pedes.

Montes et valles resonant clangore tubarum

Neptuni surda terror in aure strepit.

Viscera rimantur gladii, cerebella secures,

Guttura cultelli, pectoris hasta viam.

Sanguinis unda globos et densa cadavera ponto

Infert, et mixtas pugna rubricat aquas.

---

86 ‘galeas’ ... ‘galeas’. A play on the medieval meaning ‘galleys’ and the classical ‘helmets’.
87 ‘Regis ad exemplum’, Claudian, Panegyricus de Quarto Consulatu Honorii Augusti, 300.
88 Lucan, 4.750, ‘Quippe ubi non sonipes motus clangore tubarum.’
89 Juvenal, Sat, 10.186, ‘ac tarda per densa cadavera prora.’
In Casios

conversa duces est maxima strages

Et Lagea metit agmina Franca manus. [111v]

Rex dictus Rocus cadit, ‘eschec’ dicitur urbi

‘Math’que, simul peditum vis equitumque perit.

Tres admirali

linquent in litore vitam,

Clamantes frustra, ‘Nos Machomete iuva!’

Ut Juvenalis

ait, porros cepasque per agros

Quos habuere cibos, hos habuere deos.

Submerso Pharaone mari, quod tempore tristi

Fecerat Egyptus numen, habebat opus.

Innumerum vulgus fugiens occumbit in undis

Et campis; quosdam Memphis aperta capit.

Ad terram vexilla Crucis properare videres

Castraque defigi, letitiamque sequi.

Palma venit velox. Diversos litore tacto

Exponit populos plurima classis ibi.

Memphios est tota dolor ergo tans in urbe,

90 ‘Casios’. Mount Casius was a mountain between Lower Egypt and Arabia, close to the scene of Pompey’s death (Lucan, 10. 434 & 8. 539). Wright, in his note on p. 165, sees this as ‘a not very intelligible metaphor from the game of chess’. More likely it is a poetic use meaning no more than ‘Egyptian’, like ‘Lagea’. Lines 273-74, however, do present a metaphor from chess, elegantly translated by Rigg, ‘The king (called rook) is felled, the city’s first in check and mated too—the knights and pawns are lost’, Rigg (1992), 175.
91 ‘Emirs’.
92 Juvenal, Sat. 15, 8-9, ‘oppida tota canem venerantur, nemo Dianam, / porrum et caepe nefas violare et frangere morsu.’
93 John endows the Egyptian commander with the divinity of pharaohs in the pre-Roman period.
94 ‘Innumerum’ for Wright’s ‘Innumeri,’ with the grammar. Both readings are possible.
Urbem quod metuit gens retinere suam.

Cives terrentur populari funere, portu

Amisso, captis finibus hoste fero.

Consuluerē95 fuge, linquunt caligine noctis96

Divitias, carnes, faria, phalerna, thoros.

Crastina lux97 regi Francorum liberat urbem

Dum deserta patet, dum vacuata viris.98

Victores caveant ne per sua crimina perdant

Ditia dona Dei tempore parta brevi.

<134> In Pentecostes octava luce subintrat99

Crux urbem, resedit victor in urbe sua.

Expectat refluos autumni tempore fluxus

Nili, qui septem brachia solus habet.

Temperat hic calidam terram, fecundat100 et illam

Ex fluviis vivis, O Paradise, tuis.101

Philosophi perhibent, Cillenius102 exorit illum

---

95 Read ‘Consuluerē’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘consuluetē.’
96 Prov. 7, 9, ‘in obscuro advesperascente die in noctis tenebris et caligine’.
97 Vergil, Aen. 10.244, ‘Crastina lux ……..ingentis Rutulae spectabit caedis acervos.’ See also DTE, 6.215.
98 See n. 72 above. The ‘letter from Gui’ also uses the word ‘vacuata’ to describe the desertion of Damietta.
99 6 June, 1249.
100 Read ‘fecundat’ for ‘fecundet’ in text and Wright.
101 in the medieval world view, the Nile, under the name of ‘Gihon’, was one of the four rivers with their source in Paradise, Gen. 2, 13. The others were the Tigris, Euphrates and Pishon. See EBVM, 7.157-70.
102 ‘Cillenius,’ Mercury.
Dum sol in Cancro dumque Leone meat.

Se retrahit cum Libra pares equaverit\textsuperscript{103} horas,

Cum minor est fervor quem moderatur hiems.

Rex est incolumnis, et tota domestica turba.

Et fratres regis prosperitate vigent,

Robertus comes Attrebati, Provincia paret

Cui domino Karolus tecta cedrina tenent.\textsuperscript{104}

In regum vasis ibi fulget iaspis, achates,

Unio, saphirus, crisolitique decor.

Fratribus Alphonsus properat succurrere; linquit

Pictaviam, ducit per mare robur, opes.\textsuperscript{105}

Gulielmus Longus Ensis qui dicitur exit

Anglorum fines et petit ense Pharon.\textsuperscript{106}

O fratres, generosa manus, caveatis in armis

Vobis et vestris.\textsuperscript{107} Fraus latet ante pedes,

Fraus ancilla necis quam abhorreo dicere vobis

Occultat laqueos,\textsuperscript{108} insidiasque suas.

Stet nisi vester honor, letabitur impius; alget

\textsuperscript{103} Read ‘\textit{aequaverit}’ with MS for Wright’s ‘\textit{aequaliter horas}.’

\textsuperscript{104} Wright’s punctuation is revised, to follow the grammar and sense.

\textsuperscript{105} The king’s brother Alphonse of Poitou followed later with substantial reinforcements, including Hugh X de Lusignan, sailing on 24 June and joining the king in Damietta on 24 October 1249, Layettes, 5, 177-78.

\textsuperscript{106} For his departure from England with other knights, see \textit{CM}, 5.130-31. John refers to William Longespée II’s valour at \textit{DTE} 3.459-60 & 8.351-54.

\textsuperscript{107} ‘\textit{vobis et vestris},’ RH, 62.

\textsuperscript{108} Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{Sermones in Quadragesima Habiti}, 3.
In multis\textsuperscript{109} hodie mortificata fides. [112r]

Mille ducentenis coniungo decem quater annos

Virginis a partu, connumeroque novem.

In quinquageno sors flebilis accidit anno,

Tristia sed redimet tempora leta dies.

Tempore meroris monstro solacia mesta;

Observare decet pectora mesta modum.\textsuperscript{110}

Quid dicat vel agat hominis mens ceca futuri?\textsuperscript{111}

Nescit, que modico sole vel imbre stupet.

\begin{quote}
Sirenes cantant, ludunt, gaudentque procellis,

Languent in claro, flentque gremuntque freto.
\end{quote}

Sunt epiteta\textsuperscript{112} Crucis cruciatus, pugna, triumphus

Mens robusta, fides firma, perenne decus.\textsuperscript{113}

Dum sumit mens munda Crucem, Crux promovet actum,

Actus dat palmam, palmaque dona capit.

Que nos impugnant species sunt mille reatus,\textsuperscript{114}

Mille tamen vincit mistica pugna Crucis.

Assunt Fortune ludibia,\textsuperscript{115} que levat illos,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{109} ‘Wright’s ‘multis’ is preferred, though ‘inultis’ would also be a possible reading.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{110} John writes in the present tense as the shock and grief of Louis’ defeat in Egypt was still raw. See
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{111} \textit{DTE.} 64-65 on the impossibility of curbing grief.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{112} Lucan, 2.14-15, ‘sit caeca futuri/ mens hominum fati.’
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{113} C.G., 3.145, ‘Est epiteton, ubi dicenda notatio restat.’
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{114} Venantius Fortunatus, \textit{Poemata}, 7, 6, ‘et sit mercis odor flore perenne decus.’
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{115} Ovid, \textit{Rem.}, 526, ‘Mille mali species, mille salutis erunt.’
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{116} Cicero, \textit{Parad.}, 9, ‘ludibia fortunae.’
\end{flushright}
Hos premit, illecebras donat, easque rapit.

Donatam revocat Damiatam, reddit inermes
Soldanos, rursus munit et armat eos.

Cur, Deus, pateris succumbere iustos?
Iustus es, et iustis das tua regna viris.

Sub dubio verum non queres, lex quia certa
Est tua; tu rectum cernis, et equa facis.
Si vincunt, vel si vincuntur, premia sumunt
Augmento fidei, martirioque sacro.

Martirio proceres transmisit Francia felix
Ad celum; celi rex locupletat eos.

Robertus comes Attrebati, Guillelmus ab ense
Longo nomen habens enituere probi.\textsuperscript{116}

Ensiferum circa Guillermum sanguis inundat.
Purpurat et caput copia densa solum.

Truncat Oliverus de Termis,\textsuperscript{117} mittit et orcho
Parthorum cuneos quos ferit, urget, agit.

Dedecus Ecclesie regisque silere decebit,
Qui mala pro Domino sub pede cuncta premit.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{116} See n. 106 above.
\textsuperscript{117} Olivier de Termes was a southern lord who had resisted French rule in the Languedoc, and was reconciled to Louis and the Church only in 1247. He stayed on in the Holy Land with Louis after his defeat and imprisonment. Matthew Paris wrongly reported his death at Damietta, \textit{CM}, 5.165.
\textsuperscript{118} Ovid, \textit{Rem}., 530, ‘\textit{et tua saevus Amor sub pede colla premit.}’
Si gentes gladiis, si gazas igne pelasgo

Perdidit, in donum gaudet habere Deum.

Ordo duplex alba cruce pugnax et cruce rubra\textsuperscript{119}

Assyrios mittit ad stigiale chaos.

Pugnaces alii celi meruere coronam

Crux quibus electis celica clavis\textsuperscript{120} erat.

<136> Spes erecta, fides stabilis, dilectio vera.\textsuperscript{121}

Hec tria sunt validis palma vigorque viris.

Bello sunt strati quidam super astra levati,

Infortunati nil meruere pati.

Tempore iudicii de pulvere corpora surgent,

Quando bonis dabitur gloria, pena malis.

Dum sol irradiat Pisces, hiememque relegat,

Et florum pingit tegmine prata novo, [112v]

Conflictus fuerant ad carniprivia sevi

Ut se privaret carne beata cohors.\textsuperscript{122}

Desertum Babilon fuga fortes deicit, estu,\textsuperscript{123}

Desertum Babilon agmina fraude, fuga.

\textsuperscript{119} A reference to the white and red crosses of the Hospitallers and Templars respectively, a piquant reminder of the massive casualties they suffered at La Forbie (1244).

\textsuperscript{120} Read ‘\textit{clavis}’ with MS, not ‘\textit{clarus}’ with Wright. Augustine, \textit{Enarratio in psalmum XLV}, 20, ‘Crux Domini nostri clavis fuit.’

\textsuperscript{121} Hope, faith and charity. ‘\textit{spes},’ ‘\textit{fides}’ and ‘\textit{dilectio}’ were frequently linked, e.g. Tertullian, \textit{De Patientia}, 12.8.

\textsuperscript{122} Deprivation of meat ahead of the Lenten fast undermined morale.

\textsuperscript{123} John seems to be using this clumsy construction to emphasise that the French were twice misled by Egyptian withdrawal, first from Damietta, then Mansourah.
Quid gaudes, soldane miser? Letabere parvo

Tempore, subsequitur ultio larga Dei.

Assyrios, Medos, Arabes necat, exsecat, arcet,

Plebs, miles, princeps, arcubus, ense, metu.

Parthos connumera, stragem discerne, iacentes

Plange, tuos sepeli si sepelire potes.

Si verbo Domini sua laxat retia Petrus,

Et magnos pisces pisciculosque trahit,

Naufragus ad portum defertur, pervenerit exul

Ad patriam, mundum linquit initque polum.

Claudunt septa gregem, granum granaria, messem

Horrea, cella favum, mistica vina penus.

Victrix Ecclesia regnat super astra triumphans,

Militis Ecclesie dum nova dona capit.

Parthos irretit mendica cupido, rapine

Affectus, belli causa, cruoris amor.

Affectant igitur nostras invadere terras,

Dextera sed tantam destruat ampla sitim.

Cuncta Deus donans compensat munere laudes,

125 What looks like the cryptic phrase ‘fuista singlier’ appears in the left margin opposite line 379.
126 In this elaborate construction, the objects and verbs apply to all three subjects. ‘Princeps’ is translated as ‘emperor.’
127 ‘Laxat retia Petrus,’ Augustine, *Sermo* 59.2. Here John appears to be saying that once the Muslims have been converted, the crusaders can go home and eventually to heaven.
128 The Church benefits from the victories of the crusaders.
Sed pro laude nihil donat avara manus; Fedat avaritia multos, exclusit amicum
Cognatumque fugat, evacuatque fidem.

<137> Hostes pacificat largus, capit oppida, reges

Suppeditat, vulgus allicit, auget opes.

Convenit ut dicam casus expressius istos
Qui circa primi tempora veris erant.

Nondum Massoram pervenit turmula Christi,

Et nondum Thaneos illa bibebat aquas.

In fluvio Thaneos Christus mirabile fecit

Et campo, victor dum Ludovicus erat.

Rex soldanus obit; succedit filius eius,

Et crucisignatis obvia signa gerit.

Per terram Parthi pereunt, per flumina Nili.

Dum Robertus ibi robore pandit iter,

129 ‘caseus est sanus quem dat avara manus,’ ‘Cheese is healthy if given by a sparing hand,’
Montanaro (2010), 16, ‘an aphorism attributed to the Salerno school of medicine became almost a
platitude in medieval medical literature, and soon after attained the status of a proverb.’ Here, John
seems to be taking another shot at the parsimony of a noble patron, whom he has praised.

130 Rom. 3, 3. ‘fidem Dei evacuabit.’ John is taking aim at those who did not support the crusade.

131 Mansourah.

132 Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi, 23.4, ‘Hinc turmula Christicolarum.’ ‘Turmula’ emphasises the
Christians’ alleged numerical inferiority.

133 ‘Thaneos’ / ‘Tanais.’

134 The Sultan al-Malik al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub ibn al-Malik al-Kamil (Ayyub) died on 22
November 1249. He was succeeded by his son al-Malik al-Muazzam Ghiyath al-Din Shah (Turan
Shah), who arrived in Mansourah from Aleppo on 25 February 1250. Ayyub’s death was concealed
until Turan Shah arrived some time after the battle, though it seems that the French had this
intelligence before the battle of Mansourah. Egyptian tactics were engineered by the emir Fakhr-al-
Din, who died before the Egyptians secured victory.
Ad fluvium Thaneos divina potentia fecit

Quod rex adversas exsuperavit aquas,

Quod stratam fecit, quod Sarracenica castra

Dirruit, et multo sanguine tinxit aquam;

Sepe quod insultans victor stetit et retrocedens,

Et quod spem valido corpore, corde tulit.

Massore perit nimis audax turba, relict

Templi consilio, velle secuta suum.

Tempore transfluxo dum sol illustrat Aprilem,

Providet ad pacem turma venire Crucis.\(^{135}\)

Tot bellis habitis Sarracenisque peremptis

Fessa sedet sacro fonte renata phalanx.

Soldanus tamen ante petit sibi menia reddi

Memphios et damnis consona dona suis.

Pacis condicio est signata, sed inter agendum

Soldanus propria gente peremptus obit.\(^{137}\)

Hunc admirati magnates nomine dicti

---

\(^{135}\) For Robert of Artois' dispute with the Master of the Temple, see Rothelin, 64 and CM, 5.149-51. Joinville, 218-19 confirms this dispute. John, in line with the king's letter to the French people of August, 1250, Du Chesne, 5, 428-32, trans. Jackson (2006), 108-14, contrives not to blame Robert explicitly for the disaster.

\(^{136}\) Read 'turma' with MS, not 'turba' with Wright. Louis IX's armies were blockaded and heavily defeated as they tried to retreat to Damietta. Louis and his two brothers were captured. A truce was concluded on 1 May, entailing the mutual release of prisoners, payment of reparations by the French, surrender of Damietta and retention of its territory in the Holy Land by the kingdom of Jerusalem.

\(^{137}\) Before the truce could be signed, Turan Shah was murdered by Mameluk soldiers, see Humphreys (1977), 302-03. It was renewed on 6 May by the emirs who collectively assumed power. Louis was released, along with other prominent prisoners, and withdrew to Acre.
Post cenam perimunt, Christicolasque premunt.

Condicio pacis tamen est iterata, relinquat

Ut terram captam martia turma Crucis.

Milia centena nummos bis quater auro

Ex puro pretium condicionis erat,\textsuperscript{138}

<138> Sic ut Christicole salventur, resque, piique

Captivi, quorum copia multa fuit.

Pugna, fames, pestis, multos rapuere fideles

Sed Deus hiis finem fecit adesse malis.

Nam sicut dixi, gemini periere tiranni;\textsuperscript{139}

Et rex sub certo federe salvus abit.

Fraus inimica tamen Parthorum federa fregit,

Firmam Francorum rege tenente fidem.

Rex medium pretii soluit, sed fraude reperta

Consilio turme nil dedit inde sue.\textsuperscript{140}

Larga manus regis\textsuperscript{141} vitam preponderat auro,

Non aurum vite sicut avara manus.

Quas admirati treugas statuere tenendas

Cum sacramentis non tenuere suis.

\textsuperscript{138} This figure of 800,000 ‘Saracen bezants’ is confirmed by the king’s letter. 400,000 were paid to Turan Shah, but the emirs reneged on the agreement to release all prisoners. Some were ill-treated and killed and many not released until mid-1251. The outstanding half of the ransom was never paid. Other sources refer to 1mn. silver marks as the ransom amount.

\textsuperscript{139} i.e. Ayyub and Turan Shah.

\textsuperscript{140} John is careful not to blame Louis for reneging on payment.

\textsuperscript{141} See 395-96 and n. 129 above.
Reddendos ad martirium deducere certant,

Non metuunt validi quod tolerare viri.

Sed miseri mortis formidine munera vite

Mortifere capiunt servitiique iugum.

Sunt Saraceni fallaces, fraudque pleni,

Expertes veri, demonioque feri.\(^{142}\)

Probra serunt, spernuntque Crucem, calcantque verenda

Signa Dei, cuius in sacra scuta spuunt.

Hec facit invidie stimulus,\(^{143}\) quia parvula Christi

Turmula tot reprobos ensis agone domat.\(^{144}\)

Christicole pereunt Damiate, resque negate\(^{145}\)

Sunt regi contra iura statuta palam.

Surgit Halcupensis soldanus, iamque Damascum

Et plures urbes subiugat ense sibi.

Hic interfecti soldani regna cruore

Purpurat et nobis posse nocere studet\(^{146}\)

\(^{142}\) Note the internal rhyme.

\(^{143}\) 'invidie stimulus,' John of Salisbury, *De Dogmate Philosophorum*, 1719.

\(^{144}\) On the size of the crusading force, see Introduction, n. 446.

\(^{145}\) See the king’s letter (n. 135 above).

\(^{146}\) John refers again to Louis’ letter, on the seizure of Damascus in July 1250 by the Ayubbid sultan of Aleppo, al-Nasir Salah al-Din Yusuf. Al-Nasir invaded Egypt unsuccessfully in January 1251. Louis was eventually forced to offer support to Egypt against him to secure the release of the remaining prisoners. War continued inconclusively between Syrian and Egyptian forces until 1253, Humphreys (1977), 321-23. See also lines 517-28 & n. 165 below.
Hoc poterit forsan prodesse, quod ipse potentes

Destruct Egypti, perfidieque duces.

Cum quibus hic tandem Machometi tendet\textsuperscript{147} ad umbras,

Infernique ducis carcere clausus erit.

<139> Sacram tellurem quam pollut ipse relinquet

Et dabitur tellus libera tota Crucis.

Constantis fidei Ludovicum salvat honestas,

Et vivit meritis maxima turba suis.

In celo terraque probi vixere per illum.

Sors mundi quamvis aspera pressit eos.

In celos messem Christi messoria\textsuperscript{148} misit.

Massoram sed eam fama sonora refert.

Massa mali format Massoram, villula vilis

Sit licet hec, facinus omne maligna facit.\textsuperscript{149} [113v]

Quod nos deficimus faciunt contagia culpe;

Victorem virtus ad fera bella facit.

Nemo negare Deum sic aut sic cogit et unquam;\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{147} The MS makes this correction to the future tense by amending 'tendit.'

\textsuperscript{148} 'messoria', reap-reeve, responsible for the harvest.

\textsuperscript{149} This is an etymological double entendre. 'Massora' looks like a derivation from 'massa'/‘lump, mass.’ ‘Malum’ means ‘evil’ and ‘apple wood’. ‘Maligna’ means both ‘ill-intentioned’, but can also be construed as ‘bad wood’.

\textsuperscript{150} Abelard’s recommended method for arriving at the truth was known as ‘Sic et non’ / ‘is it so or not?’ ‘sic aut sic’ means that only the answer ‘yes’ is possible.
Corporis ac anime mors erit iste furor.\footnote{Apostasism was a serious risk, as Christians asked how God could allow Louis’ army to be defeated. See lines 342-43 above, \textit{CM}, 5.169-70, 254, 332, and other sources listed in Jackson (2007), 176-77.}

O dolor, O plus quam dolor, O mors, anxiam\footnote{Read ‘\textit{anxiam}’ with MS, not ‘\textit{anxia}’ with Wright.} per quam

Cum lacrimis elegos iusta querela movet.

Conveniens metro titulus bene consonat altis

\textit{Planctibus}.\footnote{John is justifying his up-beat title of ‘\textit{De triumphis Ecclesiae},’ despite having chosen the elegiac form which would invite a gloomy title. In line 485 he is explicitly critical of the king.} Extimui non tamen ista mala,

\footnote{I Sam. 4, 11, the ark of the covenant was captured by the Philistines, and, in I Samuel, 6, returned.} Quod rex deficeret, quod ius descenderet et quod

\textit{Opprimeret Babilon inclita signa Crucis.}

Non sic celestis ratio determinat, archam

\footnote{Henry III took the Cross in March, 1250, perhaps in response to Louis’ capture of Damietta. The truce between England and France was extended. Henry did not go to the Holy Land, either to relieve Louis or to mount a further challenge, though he appeared to make genuine preparations for a future campaign. Henry’s true intentions remain unclear. See Carpenter (1996), 115-18, Jackson (2007), 196-97, Weiler (2006), 140-46. For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).} A reprobis modico tempore passa capi.\footnote{Ferdinand III of Castile and León also took the Cross in 1250, but died on 30 May 1252, when about to depart for the East. He was succeeded by Alfonso X. (\textit{CM}, 5.170 & 311). See line 557 below.}

\footnote{John hints here at his own failing health or intimations of mortality.} Goliam pastor vicit puer; a Babilonis

\footnote{For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).} Israel exercuit libera colla iugo.

\footnote{For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).} Ecclesie vires auget rex Anglicus\footnote{For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).} et rex

\footnote{For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).} Hispanus;\footnote{For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).} robur undique turma novat.

Deposcent alios illorum gesta poetas,\footnote{For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).}

\footnote{For a survey of Henry’s crusading pledges, see Forey (1973).} Qui quando tempus venerit illa canant.
Dante Deo vivit rex per miracula sanus.

Bello que cepit menia pace dedit.

Est talis iactura levis; fortuna movebit

Iustitie causas, rex quibus ultor erit.

Muris muniit pulso procul hoste refertam\(^{158}\)

Urbem Cesaream milite, farre, mero.

<140> Mos est in bellis post lapsum surgere, vires

Sumere, victorem strage domare nova.

Hiis compensavit adversis gratia celi

Plurima Parthorum colla subacta ducum.\(^{159}\)

Hos invadentes peregrinum martia castrum

Turma Crucis cepit, supposuitque iugo.\(^{160}\)

Tutius esse mori reor in Cruce, quam diuturne

Vivere peccandi sic quia causa perit.

Vivat turma tamen Crucis, ut conversa sit exlex\(^{161}\)

Natío; converti si neget, ense cadit.

\(^{158}\) ‘refertam’ is semi-erased in the MS. There is a gloss in the left hand margin of f. 113 v in what is probably a fourteenth century hand, omitted by Wright. It reads, ‘Scilicet: Palestiam non Cesarem Philippi quam fecit Philippus frater Herodis quando ultra Jerusalem quandam metienda erat Palestina.’ The Tetrarch Philip II, brother of Herod Antipas, built Banyas (Philippi) in 3 BCE, when Herod the Great’s kingdom was divided at his death. Louis IX built fortifications at Caesarea Maritima, the modern Caesarea, from 1 April 1251, and other defences in Acre, Haifa, Jaffa and Sidon.

\(^{159}\) Probably a retrospective reference to the murder of Turan Shah by the Mamelukes in 1250.

\(^{160}\) It is not clear to which encounter John is referring.

\(^{161}\) Menache (1997), 143; \textit{CM}, 4.115. ‘Haec enim gens est feralis et exlex.....’ an extract from a letter about the Mongols of 3 July, 1241 from Frederick II to Henry III. Earlier, \textit{CM}, 4.77-78, Matthew Paris says the Mongols are ‘the ten tribes, who abandoned the law of Moses.’
Tartarei perimunt se, rege iubente; sed idem
Spernere sunt ausi mitia iussa Dei.
Iuste Deus, remove tot seva flagella tueque
Sponse succurras, Ecclesiamque iuves!

Persolvit morti Fredericus federa, pacem
Federat ergo sibi post fera bella fides.
Cum duce Francorum si iam Babilonicus heres
Federa constituit condicione bona,
Sacra Cruci terra reddetur tota, ducique
Conferet Assirio Gallicus ensis opem.
Iustus Heleupenses rex vastat, quicquid et armis
Adquirit victis hostibus eius erit.
Rex Babilonis eos alia de parte potenter
Expugnat flamma, strage, cruore, fame.

Firmum durabit fedus ter quinque per annos

162 In 1251-52, the new Khan, Möngke purged supporters of his rivals. See Jackson (2005), 113-5, who cites this passage, and CM, 5.340, ‘strage inter eos pestifera.’
163 The MS duplicates ‘s’ in error at the beginning of the line. This reference to the Mongols probably refers to Andrew of Longjumeau’s report back to Louis IX in Caesarea in 1251 of the Mongols’ defiant response to his embassy, DTE 8.94-95 above. See also Joinville, 470-86.
164 Frederick II died on 13 December, 1250. There was no significant let-up in hostilities between the papacy and Frederick’s heirs. By 1251, the former ‘anti-king’ William of Orange asserted control in Germany, but Frederick’s son Conrad IV successfully resisted papal forces in Italy. He was excommunicated in 1254, and died the same year.
165 The murder of Turan Shah (line 426, n. 137 above) had marked the permanent shift of power in Egypt to the Mameluks, though at first they retained the widow of Sultan Ayub as a figurehead, and then a six-year old Ayubbid, al-Ashraf Musa, ‘Babilonicus heres.’ Louis IX concluded a fifteen year agreement with the Mameluks in March 1252, securing the release of remaining prisoners and committing to military support against al-Nasir the sultan of Aleppo. On his final departure for France Louis concluded a peace of two years, six months and forty days with al-Nasir, more or less maintaining the territorial status quo.
Spem convertendi rege tenente Phari.

Hic idem dominus Babilonis tempore solvit

Captivos multo quos tamen ipse tenet. [114r]

O rex, tiro crucis, caveas tibi! Ne tibi fraudes

Occultant laqueos precipitentque gradus.\(^{166}\)

Dum Ludovicus adhuc rex Parthos impetit, ite,

Doctores legis\(^{167}\), spargite verba Crucis.

Arma crucis capiat Romanus, Dacus, Hiberus

Anglia, Teutonicus, Illiricusque vigor.

<141> Corbanan exponant prelati; non licet illis

Caudere thesaurum, sed reserare Deo.

Sanguinis Assirias ubi tinxit purpura Carras,\(^{168}\)

Quadratum castrum suscitat omne scelus.

Aurum bullitum bibit illic Crassus, et illic

Magnus Pompeius\(^{169}\) decapitatus erat.

Romanos vetuit Pharon impugnare Sibilla\(^{170}\)

\(^{166}\) Read ‘occultent’ for MS, Wright, ‘occultant.’ See line 320, n. 108 above for a similar sentiment.

\(^{167}\) I Tim. 1, 7. See also MS, 51, ‘O vos doctores legis, fratresque minores.’ By ‘Doctores legis’ John probably means no more than ‘preachers’. He is making the point that the clergy, as preachers, and governments as a source of wealth should support Louis’ military efforts. Of the nations listed, the Spanish were fully engaged against the Muslims in Iberia, the Romans and Germans against the Staufen in the Empire, and the English committed to Henry III’s future crusade. The Seventh Crusade had been preached amongst the Danes (Innocent IV’s letter to Eudes). ‘Illyrians’ were Latin Christians resisting Greek encirclement of the Latin Empire of Constantinople.

\(^{168}\) Crassus, the Roman triumvir, was defeated and killed by the Parthians at the battle of Carrhae, in 53 BCE.

\(^{169}\) Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus was defeated by Caesar at the battle of Pharsalus and murdered on landing in Egypt in 48 BCE.

\(^{170}\) Lucan, 8.824-26.
Docto concipiens pectore fata suo.

Non hec fata tamen nos tangunt, nos quia noster

Salvabit Moyses,\textsuperscript{171} Christus ubique potens.

Papa regit Petri navem, rumpensque procellas

Litora difficili tuta labore petit.

Sortiti nomen qui sunt a cardine,\textsuperscript{172} cursum

Navis rectificant Ecclesieque statum.

Aura sacri flatus tranquillat tempora, portum

Indicat occasus nescia stella maris.\textsuperscript{173}

Ecclesie sancte pollet victoria; portum

Cum nautis retinet leta carina Petri.

Parthia suspirat, gravibus percussa flagellis,

Per que crux domuit terga superba sua.

Insidias nuper Libicas percepit Hiberus\textsuperscript{174}

Rector, et innumerous messuit ense viros.

Heres Alphonsus Fernandi corde leonem\textsuperscript{175}

---

\textsuperscript{171} See line 157 above. John again compares Innocent IV with Moses.

\textsuperscript{172} i.e. cardinals. See Walter of Châtillon \textit{Alexandres}, 1.325, ‘Sortiti qui sunt a cardine nomen’.

\textsuperscript{173} ‘\textit{Stella maris occasus nescia}’ is from the liturgy for the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, Bannister & Blume (1906), vol. 1, 335.

\textsuperscript{174} A reference to Ferdinand III’s successful campaigns against the Muslims in Iberia, 1228-48, in which his son Alfonso played a leading part from 1240-50.

\textsuperscript{175} ‘\textit{leonem / Gessit},’ an implicit comparison with Richard the Lionheart. Alfonso X of Castile succeeded Ferdinand on 30 May 1252. ‘\textit{Heres}’ is just as likely to mean ‘heir’ as ‘successor’, and to refer to Alfonso’s contribution to his father’s campaigns. This reference alone does not therefore fix the date of composition after Ferdinand’s death. Alfonso invaded Portugal after accession, and formed an alliance with Henry III of England against Louis IX in 1254.
Gessit, et Ecclesie clara trophea dedit.

Christus quem signat Habraam Loth tollet ab hoste\textsuperscript{176}

Et Cisaram Barach coget inire fugam.\textsuperscript{177}

Sceptra David novus accipiet, pereunte Saule,

Et fugient palee sub Gedeone leves.\textsuperscript{178}

Portas avellet quasi Sampson gratia Christi,

Per quam deflebit diruta phana Dagon.\textsuperscript{179}

Stella maris, quam pulera Judith designat et Hester,\textsuperscript{180}

Deiciet precibus hostica colla suis.

Natis prima suis elegia fluxit ab Eva,\textsuperscript{181}

Sed mundo fudit gaudia stella maris.

<142> Que mortis virus victrix exterminat,

Carminis et vite terminus illa mihi.

i. Carmine sic gemitus crebri, diversaque vota,

Et varii mores, et vaga corda patent.\textsuperscript{182}

ii. Sanctas reliquias quas regis gratia fecit

\textsuperscript{176} Gen. 14, 12-16. Abraham rescues his nephew, Lot, from the King of Sodom.
\textsuperscript{177} Iud. 4, 6-22 & 5. 20-21. Barak and Deborah rout the Canaanite king, Sisera, at Mount Tabor, helped by divine intervention. See also \textit{EBVM}, 1.499-510, for a fuller version of the story.
\textsuperscript{178} Iud. 6, 11, Gideon delivers the Israelites from the Midianites, scattering them like chaff in the winepress.
\textsuperscript{179} Iud. 16, 23-30. Samson brings down the temple of Dagon, and saves the Israelites from the Philistines.
\textsuperscript{180} Judith (in the Book of Judith) saved the Israelites by murdering Holophernes, Esther (in the Book of Esther) persuaded the Persian king to allow the Jews to defend themselves. These female champions complete John’s biblical precedents for recovery from adversity.
\textsuperscript{181} John contrasts the Virgin with womanhood generally. Holtz (2012), 292 notes John’s play on the contrasting anagrams ‘\textit{Eva}’ and ‘\textit{Ave},’ linked so closely with the Virgin.
\textsuperscript{182} These numerals appear in the left margin of MS beside the lines indicated. See Introduction, 41-42.
iii. Hic natura maris monstratur; motus ad arma
Subsequitur; miserum vulgus inerme gemit.

iv. Urbs Acconensis\textsuperscript{184} capitur probitate potentum
Regum; dissensum sed nova palma parit.

v. Ortus adhuc durat dissensus; bella sequuntur\textsuperscript{185}

Ecclusie paci que nocuere diu. [114v]

vi. Hereticis domitis respirat terra Tholose
Et colit Ecclesiae sacra statuta sacre.\textsuperscript{186}

vii. Strages hereticos ad Tartara mittit, Olimpo
Sublimant animas inclita bella Crucis.

viii. Plurima mira parent, et in his miracula fulgent
Sanctorum ; salvat quos Deus ipse legit.\textsuperscript{187}

ix. Gentes Tartaree dominantur; sed dominantes
Omnipotens domitat, catholicosque iuvat.\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{183} See \textit{DTE}, 2.71-76 & 8.89. A reference to Louis’ housing of the Crown of Thorns and other relics in the Sainte Chapelle.

\textsuperscript{184} Acre.

\textsuperscript{185} i.e. the rift between Richard I and Philip II, and its consequences, traced in \textit{DTE}, 2, 651-54.

\textsuperscript{186} A dubious claim given John’s own experiences in Toulouse and the long campaign of the Dominicans there, despite royal victories in the Albigensian Crusade and against Raymond VII of Toulouse.

\textsuperscript{187} Strangely reminiscent of the comment attributed by Caesarius of Heisterbach to Arnaud Aimery regarding the siege of Béziers, ‘\textit{Caedite eos. Novit enim Dominus qui sunt eius.}’ (\textit{Dialogus} 5.21, from II Tim. 2,19).

\textsuperscript{188} Rumours of the Mongols converting to Christianity were persistent at the time of the Seventh Crusade. See for example \textit{CM}, 5.80, 87, from 1249. At \textit{CM}, 6 (Add). 163-65 is a letter translated into French from the Khan to Louis IX, protesting at the mistreatment of Christians by the Muslims. In 1252, word reached Louis in the Holy Land that Sartaq, son of the Great Khan Batu, had become a Christian, William of Rubruck, 1.7. See also \textit{DTE} 8.95 & n. 33.
x. Exsurgit gravibus tandem victoria bellis

Plebsque triumphantrix regnat in arce poli.

Terminat in Domino qui vitam corporis umbram

Exuit et fracto carcere liber abit.

Tota triumphantem circumdat curia celi,

Que miris modulis leta resultat ei.

Cives celestes sua muleet musica, mentes

Pascit concordi disparitate modi.

Urbis panduntur porte, sociosque receptant

Urbani proceres, ethereique duces.

Nobilis urbs celi tenet ampla suburbia partes

Mundi; sed carcer est baratrale chaos.

Rex illic de iure suos incarcerat hostes,

Divite qui iustos ditat in urbe sua.

<143> Est alius carcer istoc qui crimina purgat,

Que non perfecte diluit exul homo.

Spretis terrenis rebus, spretisque caducis,

Hec data sunt pugili dona beata probo,

Eterni trabea regni viteque corona

---

189 Lucan, 6.720, ‘Aspicit astantem proiecti corporis umbram.’
190 Panduntur portae,’ Vergil, Aen. 2.27.
191 Read ‘istoc’ with MS, for Wright’s ‘liber.’ This is a reference to the spiritual prison, or purgatory, where even men without sin need to purge original sin.
Et pacis palma, letitieque stola.

Principis astriferi sceptrum crux florida fructum

Solvit eis quorum floruit ante fides.

Est ubi iustitie sol Christus, gaudia vera

Estas continuat spiritualis ibi.

Tandem fulgebunt sanctorum corpora, sana,

Fortia, formosa, libera, leta, cita.

Dos anime dabitur concordia, plena potestas,

Intellectus, amor, pax, et honoris apex,

Visio leta Dei,\textsuperscript{192} que pascit. Nectar amoris

Imbuit, hic somnum nescit\textsuperscript{193} amena quies;\textsuperscript{194}

Insopita micat celi lux, atria semper

Vernant, in thalamis omnis abundat honor.

Sponsa Deo nubit, sed ad hec connubia nullus

Lascivit saltu, tegmine, voce, manu.

Hic sunt matrone caste, nupteqque fideles,

Prudentes vidue, virgineique chori.

Emeritos tenet ordo senes, gratantur ephebi

Carnis victores glorificantque Deum.

Pro celo certans celum pro munere sumit

\textsuperscript{192} \textit{visio laeta Dei}, Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{Sermones in Cantica Canticorum}, 36.6.
\textsuperscript{193} Read ‘nescit’ with MS, not ‘nascit’, with Wright.
\textsuperscript{194} These two lines are amended, with the MS, from Wright’s ‘\textit{Visio laeta Dei quem nascit nectar amoris}/Imbuit, hic somnum nascit amena quies.’
Celestesque liras, angelicumque melos.

Convivas reficit redolens rosa celica, florem

Flos pariens solem, stella, Maria Deum.

ΗΞΠΛΙΚΙΤ . Λίβερ . ΔΗ . Τριυμφίς . Ηκκλεσία.¹⁹⁵

Plate 10. MS London British Library Cotton Claudius A x, f. 114 v., Colophon transcribed into Greek letters.

¹⁹⁵ The colophon is a transcription in a different hand in mixed upper and lower case Greek letters of 'Explicit liber De triumphis Ecclesie'. Plate 10, above.
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