



PROJECT MUSE®

Answerable Style

Grady, Frank, Galloway, Andrew

Published by The Ohio State University Press

Grady, Frank and Andrew Galloway.

Answerable Style: The Idea of the Literary in Medieval England.

The Ohio State University Press, 2013.

Project MUSE.muse.jhu.edu/book/23946.



➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/23946>

Langland Translating

TRAUGOTT LAWLER

You have shown to all who shall hereafter attempt the study of our ancient authors the way to success, by directing them to the perusal of the books which those authors had read. . . . The reason why the authors which are yet read of the sixteenth century are so little understood is, that they are read alone; and no help is borrowed from those who lived with them or before them.

—Samuel Johnson to Thomas Warton, July 16, 1754 (*The Letters of Samuel Johnson*, ed. R. W. Chapman)

I

This essay is meant to supplement my short discussion of Langland's translations in Roger Ellis's *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*.¹ There I raised the question why some Latin quoted in *Piers Plowman* is translated and some not, and put forward the theory that the answer lies in the relation of speaker to listener: speakers who talk down translate. Most translation is done by tutor-figures—Wit, Study, Clergy, Patience—tutoring Will, but much also is done by Langland in his author-voice, tutoring us; but any speaker who thinks he is smarter or better-educated than his listener translates for him: Hunger translates for Piers and so does the priest, and of course everyone translates for Will, but Will and Piers almost never translate. The talking down is also evident in pronouns: if you translate for some-

1. Traugott Lawler, "William Langland," in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, vol. 1: *To 1550*, ed. Roger Ellis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 149–59. I read an earlier version of the first part of this paper at the Langland Conference in Philadelphia in May 2007. Since Anne Middleton responded vigorously to it then, it pleases me to offer it to her now. I have not tried to suppress the marks of its original oral delivery.

one, you call him "thou," not "you." Only tutors translate, and tutors nearly always translate; studying this matter has made me conclude that Langland pays more attention to dramatic situation than has usually been thought. I also offered extended analyses of Langland's mode of translation, emphasizing his habit of making verbs, expanding, and specifying, and suggesting that improving his translations might have been one of his purposes in revising A into B and B into C.

I also made this remark: "Furthermore, more of [the] poetry than has been realized is not original composition but actual translation of particular sources. A single instance is B 15.332–41, lines that say that giving money to the rich is like adding trees to the forest or water to the Thames; this comes from a Latin proverb that goes back at least to Horace ("In silvam non ligna feras" [don't bring wood to the woods], *Satires* 1.X.34), which Langland probably drew from Peter Chanter's *Verbum abbreviatum*, ch. 48: "addere ligna silvis et aquas mari" [to add wood to the woods and water to the sea]" (151). That obiter dictum is the starting point for the present essay: I want in general to report on some new possibilities I have been pursuing about Langland's reading and translating, and in particular to uncover Latin sources for Langland's English that go beyond the Latin he actually quotes.

Like Anne Middleton, I am one of the authors of the Penn Commentary on *Piers Plowman*, though I am slower than Anne and much slower than Stephen Barney and Andrew Galloway.² My stint is C passus 15–19, which is B 13–17—from the dinner party at Conscience's through Will's meeting with the Samaritan. I spent some time several years ago reading Peter the Chanter's *Verbum abbreviatum*, because I thought it might be the source of even more of *Piers Plowman* than has been acknowledged; among other things, I hoped to see if could shed some light on the little knot of Latin quotations at B 15.342:

Who parfournep þis prophecie of þe peple þat now libbeþ,
Dispersit, dedit pauperibus?

.....

Fele of yow fareþ as if I a forest hadde
 That were ful of faire trees, and I fondede and caste
 How I my3te mo þerInne amonges hem sette.
 Right so ye riche, ye robeþ þat ben riche

2. Andrew Galloway, *The Penn Commentary on Piers Plowman, vol. 1: C Prologue-Passus 4; B Prologue-Passus 4; A Prologue-Passus 4* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Stephen A. Barney, *The Penn Commentary on Piers Plowman: vol. 5: C Passus 20–22; B Passus 18–20* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

And helpeþ hem þat helpeþ yow and zyueþ þer no nede is;
 As whoso filled a tonne ful of a fressh ryuer,
 And wente forþ wiþ þat water to woke [*moisten*] wiþ Temese.
 Right so ye riche, ye robeþ and fedep
 Hem þat han as ye han; hem ye make at ese.
 Ac Religiose þat riche ben sholde rapen feeste beggeris
 Than burgeises þat riche ben as þe book techeþ,

Quia sacrilegium est res pauperum non pauperibus dare. Item, peccatoribus dare est demonibus immolare. Item, monache, si indiges et accipis, potius das quam accipis; Si autem non eges & accipis rapis. Porro non indiget monachus si habeat quod nature sufficit. (B 15.326–43)³

For reasons that will become clear, I have given here the dozen or so lines before the knot of Latin, but it was that knot that I was originally after: “Sacrilegium est res pauperum non pauperibus dare”; “Peccatoribus dare est demonibus immolare”; “Monache, si indiges et accipis, potius das quam accipis, si autem non eges et accipis, rapis”; and finally, “Porro non indiget monachus si habeat quod naturae sufficit.” The first three of these four statements had been identified in Peter Chanter (though not together), but the fourth had not. I thought I had an advantage that John Alford didn’t have when he compiled his *Guide to the Quotations*:⁴ online search engines, notably the *Patrologia latina* online and the CETEDOC Library of Latin Texts. And indeed I did find that fourth quotation in the *PL* online, not in Peter the Chanter but in Peter of Blois’s Letter 102—and when I went to read that, I found all the others also, and “Dispersit, dedit pauperibus” at the start of Langland’s passage as well, which suggested pretty strongly that Langland’s source was not Peter Chanter at all, but Peter’s older contemporary Peter of Blois.⁵ But what was really interesting was what else I found—that not only was all the Latin there, but in between the “Dispersit” line and the knot of four remarks on wasting the patrimony of the poor, Peter of Blois says, “We are neither to give to the rich, nor to bring wood to the forest, nor to pour

3. I cite the B and C versions of *Piers Plowman* from the Athlone editions (I do not cite A): George Kane and E. Talbot Donaldson, eds., *Piers Plowman: The B Version; Will’s Visions of Piers Plowman, Do-Well, Do-Better, and Do-Best* (London: Athlone Press, 1975); George Russell and George Kane, eds., *Piers Plowman: The C Version; Will’s Visions of Piers Plowman, Do-Well, Do-Better, and Do-Best* (London: Athlone Press, 1997).

4. John Alford, *Piers Plowman: A Guide to the Quotations* (Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992).

5. I therefore retract the statement in my translation essay (“William Langland,” cited in n. 1 above), p. 151, that the source is Peter the Chanter.

water into the sea"—that is, what Langland has between his Latin quotations, lines that seem to be so English, so perfectly Langlandian, that no one has ever supposed that they are translations, are in fact translations of Peter's Latin. Here is Peter: "Ubi est ergo, quaeso, verbum illud Prophetæ, 'Dispersit, dedit pauperibus'? Porro nec divitibus dare, nec nos ligna ferre in silvam, nec aquas in mare effundere oportebat. Verbum Beati Hieronymi est, sacrilegium esse res pauperum non pauperibus dare . . ." (*PL* 207.319).⁶ And so on.⁷ And here again is Langland:

Who parfournep þis prophecie of þe peple þat now libbeþ,
Dispersit, dedit pauperibus?

.

Fele of yow fareþ as if I a forest hadde
 That were ful of faire trees, and I fondede and caste
 How I myȝte mo þerInne amonges hem sette.
 Right so ye riche, ye robeþ þat ben riche
 And helpeþ hem þat helpeþ yow, and ȝyueþ þer no nede is;
 As whoso filled a tonne ful of a fressh ryuer,
 And wente forþ wiþ þat water to woke wiþ Temese.
 Right so ye riche, ye robeþ and fedep
 Hem þat han as ye han; hem ye make at ese. (326–40)

This is Langland translating. It expands—Peter of Blois's twelve words become nine lines; it specifies—the sea becomes the Thames; and it makes verbs: Peter's two verbs (*ferre*, *effundere*) become seven. Indeed with hindsight one might have seen that the very inflation of it should suggest that it is translation.

I can't begin to say how much time this little discovery has caused me to waste. Now every time I see a line or passage that has a little fat in it,

6. All citations of the *Patrologia latina* are made by volume and column from the Chadwyck-Healey electronic version of the first edition: *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina*, ed. Jean-Paul Migne et al., 221 vols. (Paris, 1844–55 and 1862–65).

7. The speaker is actually Hugh, Abbot of Reading. Peter of Blois cites a recent conversation with him, in which Hugh expressed his distaste for the high living associated with his office and his desire to return to the life of a simple monk. He laments especially the requirement of elaborate hospitality, in which it seems to him he is spending the patrimony of the poor on delicacies for the rich. Finally: "Where, I ask, is that phrase of the Prophet: 'He distributed and gave to the poor?' We are neither to give to the rich, nor to bring wood to the forest, nor to pour water into the sea. St Jerome said, 'It is a sacrilege to give what belongs to the poor to those who aren't poor.' And again, 'Giving to sinners and making sacrifice to devils are the same thing; and it is no less sinful to give to the wicked than to give for wickedness.'" And twelve sentences later: "Listen to Jerome: 'Monk, if you are in need and take, you should still rather give than take; if you aren't needy and take, you commit rapine. A monk isn't needy if he has what nature requies.'"

or seems by any chance, however remote, to contain hidden translation, I try to figure out what it might be in Latin and then go hunting in the online databases. I might as well be looking in the woods for a particular tree, or in the Thames for a particular drop of water. Well, actually it isn't that bad. I have made a few more little discoveries. "Alle myzte god haue maad riche men if he wolde" (B 11.197; cf. 14.166–67, C 16.18–20) is St. Augustine, "Potuit enim Deus omnes homines divites facere."⁸ "Double scape" (B 15.59) is "duplex malum."⁹ Chaucer's "Diverse folk diversely they seyde" (*CT* A.3857; cf. E.1469, F.202) is "Diversi diverse dicunt."¹⁰ "Riȝt softe walkeȝ" (B 14.211) is Paul's "caute ambuletis" (Ephesians 5.15) applied ironically by Langland to the rich man's burden of worry. "Cristes court" (B 15.17) is "aula Christi."¹¹ Will's question to *Liberum arbitrium*, "Is þat body bettere þen þou?" (C 16.179) plays on the topos "anima corpore melior."¹² The branches of the seven sins are "rami vitiorum" (part of the same metaphor as *radix vitiorum*).¹³ "Grammer, þe ground of al" (B 15.372) is from Cassiodorus, repeated by Isidore and Bede: "Grammatica . . . origo et fundamentum liberalium litterarum," quoted in a commentary on Donatus as "fundamentum et origo omnium liberalium artium."¹⁴ "Grace sholde growe and be grene þoruȝ hir goode lyvyng" (B 15.424): you'd suppose that one would surely be English, with the happy alliterating of grace, grow and green—and yet the idea of the greenness of grace, *viriditas gratiae*, is all over the place—I saw dozens of instances.¹⁵ So I intend to keep on wasting my time—always hoping that I'm not wasting it—and perhaps I have reminded you that brilliant though Langland's poetry always is, more of it than we think may have its *fundamentum et origo* in somebody else's Latin. (I pass over the possibility that some of the Latin lines we can't identify, not even with our data bases, are by Langland, translating his English, making it more portentous by rendering it in Latin. I'm pretty sure that's true of B 13.45, *Vos*

8. Actually from a sermon, *De misericordia divina et humana*, attributed to Augustine, *PL* 39.2930. But cf. Augustine on Psalm 72, *PL* 37.1649–50, for an implicit reference to the same idea.

9. E.g., Bernard, *PL* 182.881.

10. In various phrases with various verbs. E.g., Augustine on Psalm 119: "in diversis codicibus diverse scriptum est" (*PL* 37.1600).

11. E.g., Alcuin (who particularly liked the phrase) in the poem "De sancto Amando episcopo Trajectensi": "Coetibus angelicis Christi subvectus in aulum" (*PL* 101.741a).

12. E.g., Augustine, *De immortalitate animae*, *PL* 32.1034.

13. E.g., Gregory, *Moralia*, *PL* 76.744.

14. Cassiodorus, *De artibus et disciplina liberalium artium*, *PL* 70.1151. Isidore, *Etymologiae*, *PL* 82.81. Bede, *De ratione temporum*, *PL* 90.305. The commentary on Donatus is *Expositio in Donatum majorem*, ed. B. Löfstedt, CCCM 40A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977), 4. I found this by searching the Brepols Library of Latin Texts website.

15. E.g., Ambrose, *Hexaemeron*, *PL* 14.186.

qui peccata hominum comeditis, nisi pro eis lacrimas & oraciones effuderitis, ea que in deliciis comeditis in tormentis euometis, which translates lines 42–44.¹⁶

As for Peter of Blois: his letters were if anything more popular than the *Verbum Abbreviatum*; about 250 manuscripts survive. And he is a brilliant, readable writer, with a taste for satire. I don't see why Langland could not have been reading him, and found in Letter 102 not only some telling satire on lush monastic banquets, and the idea that monks should feast the poor instead, but his whole set of quotations, including "Dispersit, dedit pauperibus" as prophecy, and the woods and sea metaphors—and all much closer together than they are in Peter the Chanter. I'm actually inclined to think that Langland knew this material from both writers, since both say so much pertinent to his theme, but the compactness of the passage in Peter of Blois makes me feel sure he knew Letter 102. In any case, it seems clear that both of these Peters had a major place in Langland's reading, and deserve to have a place in our reading as well.

Let me end this portion of my essay with an anecdote that has a small surprise ending. In Peter of Blois's letter 102, down past the part that Langland clearly drew on, comes this statement: "Video in claustris coelestes homines, aut potius angelos terrestres, quorum conversatio est in coelis [Phillipians 3.20]" (*PL* 207.315), "In cloisters I see heavenly men, or rather angels on earth, whose conversation is in heaven." I read that and thought, "Oh my, this could lie behind that remark we all love in passus B 10, "If heaven be on this earth, and ease to any soul,/ It is in cloister or in school" (it's 10.305–6), which I had always thought of as a charming original opinion by Langland. So I tried the data bases, pairing "caelum" with "claustrum," but found nothing. But I remembered that Morton Bloomfield's book had a lot about Langland and monasticism, so I looked there—and duly discovered that the monastery as paradise is an old motif, and that Bloomfield in 1958 and Robert Kaske in 1957 had given ample evidence that Langland's couplet was a translation of Latin.¹⁷ Kaske cited Benvenuto da Imola, the commentator on Dante, quoting someone he calls Petrus Ravennas (who is probably Peter Damian): "Si paradus in hoc mundo est, in claustro vel in scolis est." What could be closer? And yet, how far from Langland. And Bloomfield cited Bishop Thomas Brinton, Langland's contemporary, who says "Si vita

16. See my "Harlots' Holiness: The System of Absolution for Miswinning in the C Version of *Piers Plowman*," *Yearbook of Langland Studies* 20 (2006): 188–89, and Katherine Kerby-Fulton, *Reformist Apocalypticism and "Piers Plowman"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 157.

17. Morton W. Bloomfield, "*Piers Plowman*" as a Fourteenth-Century Apocalypse (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, n.d. [1962]), 72, 197; Bloomfield, "*Piers Plowman* and the Three Grades of Chastity," *Anglia* 76 (1958): 229 n. 1); Robert E. Kaske, "Langland and the *Paradisus claustralis*," *Modern Language Notes* 72 (1957): 481–83.

angelica sit in terris, aut est in studio aut in claustro,” and repeats it twice more (with “paradisus” once for “vita angelica”).¹⁸ There is also an article by Elizabeth M. Orsten in the *American Benedictine Review* for 1970.¹⁹ Writing in ignorance of Bloomfield, Orsten cites Brinton’s three places, then goes on to speculate whether Langland knew the Benedictine priory in Worcester. But she mentions something that Bloomfield does not, namely, that in Sermon 98 Brinton prefaces the remark with the phrase “juxta vulgare,” that is, maybe, “as they say in English.” So it’s an English proverb? That seemed a little unlikely—and it isn’t in Whiting—so I thought, better try the databases again, now that I know that the word is *paradisus*, not *caelum*—and I found it: “Juxta sententiam cordis mei, si paradisus in hac vita presenti est, vel in claustro est vel in scholis.” It’s by—guess who?—Peter of Blois, in his letter 13, writing to a novice monk urging him to stay where he is (*PL* 207.39).²⁰ So what do I make of all this? I doubt the sentence is original with Peter of Blois, because so much of what he writes is taken from others, but the immense popularity of his letters, added to the clear evidence that Langland knew Letter 102, leave me thinking: first, that Langland in Passus 10 was translating Peter of Blois; second, that Benvenuto’s Peter of Ravenna, or Benvenuto himself, was remembering Peter of Blois; and third, that when Brinton referred to the phrase in English, he was thinking of Langland. How pleasant to imagine a bishop reading *Piers Plowman*.²¹

II

Thus far my Philadelphia talk (with a few changes and a lot of footnotes). I had intended to extend it for this essay by offering a few more examples

18. Sister Mary Aquinas Devlin, ed., *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester (1373–1389)*, Camden Society, 3rd Ser. 55–56 (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1954), 101 (Sermon 25); 118 (Sermon 29, with “paradisus”); 453 (Sermon 98).

19. Elizabeth M. Orsten, “‘Heaven on Earth’—Langland’s Vision of Life within the Cloister,” *American Benedictine Review* 21 (1970): 526–34.

20. Bloomfield appears to have known this place, though he contents himself with mentioning Peter of Blois’s name in a little list of “various manifestations of the image” of “the cloister as the earthly counterpart of heaven.”

21. Galloway, *Penn Commentary*, 1:133–34, 139, has also suggested that Brinton read Langland—specifically that the traditional idea that Langland read the fable of the mice and rats in Brinton has the matter backwards. As for “paradise on earth,” since Devlin places Sermon 24 definitely in 1373, seems to put Sermon 29 in that year also, and dates Sermon 98 as probably in 1378, and since the B-version was probably completed around 1376, it is entirely possible that the influence goes both ways: that Langland knew the phrase first from Brinton, and that Brinton then saw Langland’s English before he used it again in 1378. In any case, if Devlin’s dates are right, and the dating of B is right, the notion that Brinton read *Piers Plowman* provides a neat explanation of why he only says “juxta vulgare” the third time.

of hidden translation from Passus B 15. What I discovered when I tried to do that, however, was that between finding an exact hit and finding nothing there is a vast middle ground, so most of what follows—discussion of six passages—is examples of partial hits or semi-finds. (It's of course a little base of me to speak of "hits" and "semi-finds," as if my making discoveries were the only issue. The obvious explanation for a so-called "semi-hit" is that Langland is not simply translating but making English poetry. But he is also making English poetry even when he translates exactly. Nothing I have found has undermined in the least my sense of Langland's originality. I certainly want to show that he found more of his poetry in Latin books than we have been supposing, but it's also clear to me that, as I have spelled out in the Peter of Blois example, he always makes it his own, just as Chaucer makes his own what he borrows from Boethius or Jerome or the Bible. When Eliot translates Dante, as in "I had not thought death had undone so many," or Brunetto's "What! are *you* here?" (in *Little Gidding*), we thrill at the enrichment that comes from allusion. Langland's sources are more pedestrian than Eliot's, but his "translations" in fact bring a similar enlargement to the world of the poem. And it is precisely the fact that he makes what he borrows his own that has kept us from sniffing out these Latin sources.) Readers may well want to skim my six passages for what interests them, but I urge everyone to take a good look at the last one, which I thought particularly repaid my effort.

l. B 15.111–16 Dunghill hypocrisy

The first is a passage where Langland actually tells us his source is Latin:

For ypocrisie in latyn is likned to a lōply dongehill
 That were bisnewed wiþ snow and snakes wiþInne,
 Or to a wal þat were whitlymed and were foul wiþInne;
 Right so, preestes, prechours and prelates manye,
 Ye aren enblaunched wiþ *bele paroles* and wiþ *bele clopes*
 Ac youre werkes and wordes þervnder aren ful wolueliche.

The lines contain five elements; hypocrisy, dunghill, snow, snakes, and wall.

A dunghill (Latin *sterquilinum*) is a refuse pile: it has trash and garbage as well as actual dung. The inevitable association for Langland is the book of Job, since in the Vulgate Job sits not "in the ashes" (2.8), as in modern Bibles based directly on Hebrew, but, following the Septuagint, "on the dunghill," in *sterquilinio*. The potsherd he uses to scrape the pus

from his sores he presumably found in the dunghill. His comforter Zophar associates the dunghill with hypocrisy: “gaudium hypocritae ad instar puncti . . . quasi sterquilinum in fine perdetur” (“The joy of the hypocrite [is] but for a moment . . . in the end he shall be destroyed like a dunghill,” Job 20.5–7). This verse is cited often, e.g. by John of Salisbury, “Ecce quam miser est finis hypocritarum, qui, sacro testante eloquio, perduntur ut sterquilinum quo nichil immundius est” (“See how miserably hypocrites end up: as the sacred text says here, they will be destroyed like a dunghill, than which nothing is filthier,” *Policraticus* 7.24, *PL* 199.701). It is also common to picture Job’s dunghill as crawling with worms, though the Bible text does not say that, e.g. Aelred of Rievaulx, “Ecce sterquilinum in quo sedebat, sanies quam radebat, foetor quem exhalabat, vermes quibus scatebat . . .” (“The dunghill he sat in, the sores he scraped, the stench of his breath, the worms he was crawling with . . .,” *Dialogus de anima* 2.273–75);²² Dhuoda, “(Job) solus in sterquilinio putredinum sedens, vermes ei ad cibum undique fluebant” (“As Job sat alone on the dunghill of filth, worms sprang up from everywhere to feed on him,” *Liber manualis* 5.1.86–87);²³ Peter Chanter: “Recole penitentiam Job qui sedens in sterquilinio testa radebat saniem, et vermes scaturiebant de carne propria, uxoris et amicorum paciebatur obprobria” (“Remember Job’s penance: he sat on a dunghill and scraped the sores from his head, and worms swarmed out of his flesh, and he endured insults from his wife and his friends,” *Verbum abbreviatum, textus conflatus* 2.53.143).²⁴ To these can be added the fact that many species of snakes lay their eggs in a warm, moist place such as a dunghill; the association of snakes with dunghills is a commonplace: see the passages from Swift, Walton, South in the Appendix. Finally, see Matthew 23:33, where, in the passage in which Jesus accuses the Scribes and Pharisees of hypocrisy again and again, he calls them “You serpents, you brood of vipers.” There is then a diverse background, much of it in Latin, for associating hypocrisy with dunghill and snakes.

The image of a hypocrite as a whitelined wall comes from Acts, where Paul addresses the high priest Ananias, who should uphold Jewish law but has violated it by striking him, as “paries dealbate.” Augustine: “Paries quippe dealbatus hypocrisis est, id est simulatio sacerdotalem praeferens dignitatem,

22. In *Aelredi Rievallensis Opera Omnia*, ed. A. Hoste and C. H. Talbot, CCCM 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971), 713.

23. *Manuel pour mon fils*, ed. Pierre Riché and trans. Bernard de Vregille and Claude Mondésert, Sources Chrétiennes 225 bis (Paris: Éditions de Cerf, 1991), 266.

24. Peter the Chanter, *Verbum abbreviatum*, ed. Monique Boutry, CCCM 196 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 812.

et sub hoc nomine tamquam candido tegmine interiorem quasi luteam turpitudinem occultans" ("A whited wall is hypocrisy, that is, a show of priestly dignity, and under the name of priest, as under a white surface, hiding a dirty inside," *De sermone Domini in monte* 1.1463).²⁵ But surely the much more famous image of the Scribes and Pharisees as whited sepulchers (Matthew 23:27), outwardly beautiful but within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness, is in both Augustine's mind and Langland's, since though a wall might be weak within, or rough-looking until whitewashed, it is not likely to be "foul within." Paul's image does not imply a foul inside, only the superficiality of the whitewash (and perhaps Ananias's inflexibility). Hypocrite and wall are connected to the dunghill by Peter Chanter: "De quibus etiam Job ait: 'Hoc scio, quod laus impiorum brevis est, et gaudium hypocritae ad instar puncti. Si ascenderit usque ad coelum superbia ejus, et caput ejus nubes tetigerit, quasi sterquilinum in fine perdetur (Job 20:[4–5]). Hic hypocrita sterquilinio comparatur, qui est paries dealbatus'" ("Job says about them, 'This I know, that the praise of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment.' . . . Here a hypocrite, who is a whited wall, is compared to a dunghill," *Verbum abbreviatum*, ed. Boutry 1.11.293–96, pp. 96–97).

As for the fifth element, snow, though it occurs several times in the Bible as an image of purity (e.g. Isaiah), it is not associated with hypocrisy either in the Bible or, as far as I have been able to find, in the patristic tradition. At 4 Kings 5:27, however, Giezi is "leprosus quasi nix" ("a leper as white as snow") and Peter Damian comments, "Nix enim alba, sed frigida; ypocrita nempe, qui se per sanctitatis adumbratae figmentum transfigurat in angelum lucis, nullis infervet aestibus charitatis; atque ad instar nivis simul est albus et frigidus, quia piis quidem se deservire operibus simulat, sed viscera solidae pietatis ignorat" ("Snow is white but cold; the hypocrite by pretending a holiness he doesn't have transfigures himself into an angel of light, but he certainly does not glow with any heat of charity, but like snow is white and cold, because he pretends that he devotes himself to good works but does not know genuine goodness from the inside," *Epistolae* 6.32, *PL* 144.426). Dan Michel of Northgate used the image of a snow-covered dunghill not for hypocrisy but for beauty: "Non uayr body ne is bote a huyt zech uol of donge stynkinde and ase a donghel besnewed" (A fair body is nothing but a white sack full of stinking dung, and like a dunghill with snow on it" (*Ayen-*

25. Augustine, *De sermone Domini in monte*, ed. Almut Mutzenbecher, CCSL 35 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967), 68.

bite of Inwyt, 23b).²⁶ Samuel Singer's *Thesaurus proverbiorum medii aevi*,²⁷ s.v. Schnee 47–51, gives four French proverbs comparing pride or physical beauty to snow on a dunghill, and also gives Lydgate's *Pride* asserting that her mantle hides her foulness, "As snowh (who that loke wel) Maketh whyht a ffoul dongel" (*Pilgrimage of the Life of Man* 14541–42 [Whiting S441; cf. Deguileville 7999]),²⁸ but no Latin proverb; yet something like "hypocrisis est quasi sterquilinium tectum nive" may well have existed (indeed, I cite something close to that just below, though it is not a proverb). Under Frau 839–40 Singer cites Matheolus, *Lamentationes* 1973–75 on women: "Vestibus ornata mulier nive stercus opertum / Est; cum, sublata nive, vile sit id quod apertum/Est" ("A woman decked out in her clothes is like a dunghill covered with snow, since if the snow is removed what is revealed is vile"). The one text I know of that applies the image of a snow-covered dunghill to hypocrisy is already known to Langland scholars: the thirteenth-century *Summa virtutum de remediis anime*, edited by Siegfried Wenzel for the Chaucer Library and referred to by A. V. C. Schmidt in his note to B 15.11–13; it says that a hypocrite "est sterquilinium niue tectum in quo sal inutile est" ("is the dungheap covered with snow in which salt is useless, Luke 14").²⁹ Surely, however, no proverb nor learned authority would claim that snow on a dunghill hides snakes, since snakes hibernate in underground cavities, not in dunghills. Thus the idea of a dunghill with snow on the outside and snakes on the inside is actually quite improbable, though surely within the reach of the imagination.³⁰

26. Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, ed. Richard Morris and newly collated by Pamela Gradon, EETS o.s. 23 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 81.

27. Samuel Singer, ed. *Thesaurus proverbiorum medii aevi*, 13 vols. (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995–2002).

28. Guillaume de Deguileville, *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man, Englished by John Lydgate, A.D. 1426, from the French of Guillaume de Deguileville, A.D. 1330, 1355*, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall and Katherine B. Locock, EETS e.s. 77, 83, 92 (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1899–1904); *Le pèlerinage de la vie humaine*, ed. J. J. Stürzinger (London: Printed for the Roxburghe Club by Nichols & Sons, 1893); Bartlett Jere Whiting with the collaboration of Helen Wescott Whiting, *Proverbs, Sentences, and Proverbial Phrases from English Writings Mainly before 1500* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).

29. Siegfried Wenzel, ed., *Summa virtutum de remediis anime* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984). The salt reference is misleading. Luke quotes Jesus saying that salt that has lost its savor "is neither profitable for the land nor the dunghill" (14.35), but Jesus makes no connection to hypocrites or snow. The author of the *Summa* is able to apply the text to hypocrites by adding the snow. Schmidt's edition is William Langland, *The Vision of Piers Plowman: A Critical Edition of the B-Text Based on Trinity College Cambridge Ms. B.15.17*, 2nd ed. (London: J. M. Dent; Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle, 1995).

30. Derek Pearsall in his *Piers Plowman: A New Annotated Edition of the C Text* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2008), 16.266–68n, has noted the resemblance to Chaucer's *Squire's Tale* V.512–20,

This was an instructive place, tempering my confidence. I started out feeling sure that I would find a single source for the whole set of lines. What I found instead is that yes, every element in the lines is traditional, and we can even grant that individual words or phrases such as "dongehill" for "sterquilinium" or "wal that is whitlymed" for "paries dealbata" are translations—but finally what we have here is Langland composing, not Langland translating.

2. B 15.13 *Oon wipouten tonge and teef*

I did not find the simple phrase "sine lingua et sine dentibus." But I did find that such oxymorons as "speaking without a tongue" and "eating without teeth" occur regularly in attempts to describe spirits. The passages quoted in the Appendix from Tertullian and Jerome are sarcastic rejoinders to those who deny the reality of Christ's flesh—as if he ate without teeth, spoke without a tongue, etc. Alcuin says to Pippin, "Quidam ignotus mecum sine lingua et voce locutus est, qui nunquam ante fuit, nec postea erit; et quem non audiebam, nec novi" ("Somebody without a voice or a tongue spoke to me: he never was and never will be, and I didn't hear him and don't know him," *De dialectica*, PL 101.978). Pippin guesses right: a dream. St. Bernard says of the Holy Spirit, "Docet vel monet sine lingua; praebet vel tenet sine manibus; sine pedibus currit et succurrit pereuntibus" ("He teaches and warns without a tongue, he offers or holds back without hands, without feet he runs to the aid of those who are perishing," *Sermo* 6, PL 183.803). And Richard of St. Victor, "O dulcis confabulatio Dei in anima, quae sine lingua et labiorum formatur strepitu, quae sine aure percipitur, sed sub silentio solus qui loquitur et cui loquitur audit illam, a qua omnis alienus excluditur!" ("O, the sweet talking of God in the soul, which takes form without a tongue or sound of lips, which is heard without ears: alone in silence the speaker speaks, and alone in silence the one spoken to hears the talking, and everyone outside him is excluded from it," *De gradibus charitatis*, PL 196.1206–7). In short, "speaking without a tongue or teeth" is a standard

in which the hypocritical tercelet is compared first to a snake hiding under flowers, then to a fair tomb covering a corpse. But the snake hidden in flowers is a much more common image, with clear overtones of the temptation of Eve in Eden—and what really makes Langland's image different from Chaucer's is the double hiding: the snow hides the putrid dunghill, and the dunghill hides snakes, not merely putrid but deadly. And at line 116 the snakes metamorphose into wolves. The image of snow on a dunghill is alive today in the myth that Luther called man redeemed a snow-covered dunghill, which is what you get if you Google the phrase.

way of describing a spirit: Langland here draws on a tradition so broad that he hardly needs to translate any particular text.

3. *B 15.42–43 Presul and Pontifex and Metropolitanus /
 . . . Episcopus and Pastor*

Will's riot of terms reads almost like a parody of the following passage: "Ceset ergo Eboracensis Ecclesia primatum Scotiae sibi vindicando appetere; quem si haberet, cum praesul Sancti Andreae summus pontifex Scotorum appelletur, summus vero non est nisi qui super alios est; qui autem super alios episcopus est, quid nisi archiepiscopus est, licet barbaries gentis pallii honorem ignoret? Si, inquam, super hunc, qui summus vocatur pontifex suae gentis, praelationem haberet praesul Eboracae, jam non tantum metropolitanus, imo primas esset alterius etiam regni. Quod nusquam legitur" ("Therefore let the church at York stop trying to claim pre-eminence in Scotland. If it had it, even though the bishop of St Andrew's is called the highest priest of the Scots—nobody is the highest who isn't above others. What is a bishop above other bishops but an archbishop, even if the barbarity of the nation ignores the honor of the pallium? If, I say, the bishop of York had pre-eminence over him who is called the highest priest of his nation, he would be not just the metropolitan but the primate of the other kingdom—which is unheard of," Nicholas of Worcester, *Letter to Eadmer*; *PL* 159.810).³¹

4. *B 15.69 Cristes counseil*

"Consilium Christi" is a fairly common phrase, used by Paulinus of Nola, but especially in Franciscan writers. Of 15 examples that come up in CET-EDOC, two-thirds are by Franciscans: two by Bonaventure, one by John Pecham, one from the *Legend of the Three Companions*, and six by Peter John Olivi. Thus Langland's use of the phrase may support Lawrence M. Clopper's hypothesis that he had been a Franciscan novice.³²

31. Printed also in A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1869–78; repr., 1974), vol. 2, part 1, 202–4. For the controversy Nicholas is writing about, whether the archbishop of York or Canterbury was the metropolitan of Scotland, and for his letter, see Antonia Gransden, *Legends, Traditions, and History in Medieval England* (London; Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1992), 14–15.

32. Lawrence Clopper, "Songs of Rechelesnesse": *Langland and the Franciscans* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 325–33.

5. B 15.125 *Ac a Porthors þat sholde be his Plow, Placebo to sigge.*
 (Cf. B 7.124 "Of preieres and of penaunce my plou3 shal ben herafter"
 and C 5.45–46, "The lomes þat y labore with and lyflode deserue/
 Is paternoster and my primer, placebo and dirige.")

Behind this cluster of lines, as behind the entire poem, is the rich agricultural imagery of the Bible and of Christian tradition.³³ Plowing appears as a metaphor in at least three biblical places: Job 4:8 and Osee 10:13, both on plowing wickedness, and in Jesus's remark at Luke 9:62, "No man putting his hand to the plow and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God." One large Christian tradition associates plowing and preaching; this was explored by Stephen A. Barney in his essay "The Plowshare of the Tongue."³⁴ But another is about plowing the field of one's own heart, discarding the rocks of sin and sowing the seeds of righteousness, and it is in that tradition that Langland's metaphor belongs. This plowing is penitential: the ground, it is assumed, has been infertile; the cutting action of the plowshare represents the painful work of cutting away sinful habits. Bede says of Luke 9:62, "Manum cuiuslibet in aratrum mittere est, quasi quodam compunctionis instrumento, ligno et ferro dominicae passionis, duritiem sui cordis atterere, atque ad proferendos operum bonorum fructus aperire" ("For anyone, to put the hand to the plow is as it were with a kind of tool of compunction, with the wood and steel of our Lord's passion, to wear down the hardness of one's heart, and to open it to bringing forth the fruit of good works," *PL* 92.461.) This definition is repeated by Rabanus (*PL* 110.513), by Gratian (*PL* 187.1567), and many others. Rabanus builds on it: "Arator crux, sive praedicationis officium, vel inchoatio bonorum operum, ut in Evangelio: Nemo mittens manum suam in aratrum, et respiciens retro, aptus est regno coelorum (Luc. IX[:62])" ("The plowman is the cross, or the office of preaching, or the beginning of good works, as in the Gospel: 'No man putting his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God,'" *De universo* 19.1, *PL* 111.505).³⁵ If Bede's statement is not the exact basis of Piers's image in B 7.124, it is at least behind it—and Piers's image in turn lies behind both Will's in C 5.45–46, of his penitential psalms as his

33. I grant, of course, that it does not take a Latin tradition to call the key instrument of any trade a plow, as when the merchant in Chaucer's *Shipman's Tale* says that merchants' money is their plow (VII.288).

34. Stephen A. Barney, "The Plowshare of the Tongue: The Progress of a Symbol from the Bible to *Piers Plowman*," *Mediaeval Studies* 35 (1973): 261–93.

35. A rich sentence for the poem in general: the plowman is the cross, or the office of preaching, or the beginning of good works. Piers really takes up the plow when he abjures plowing for good works: he becomes most fully himself in his moment of conversion in passus 7.

tools, and the present one of the breviary as plow—with the implication that reading one's breviary is a penitential act.³⁶

There is also an old play on “arare/orare.” Cicero puns “ex oratore arator factus sit” (“from an orator he was made a plowman,” *Orationes Philippicae* 3.22), and Quintilian quotes him in a passage praising witty plays on words (*Institutio oratoria* 9.3.71); Ordericus Vitalis asks, “Unde vivent oratores si defecerint aratores?” (“How would orators live if there were no more plowmen?,” *PL* 188.250). Likewise many Christian writers link “orare” and “laborare,” as in the traditional Benedictine motto “ora et labora”; however, the common belief that St Benedict’s rule includes the dictum “laborare est orare” is erroneous,³⁷ and I cannot find anywhere an assertion from the Middle Ages that work is itself prayer. I remembered Barney’s essay and wondered why I didn’t get more, till I recalled that it is preaching he discusses, and I didn’t want to go that route: I wanted collocations of plowing and praying, not plowing and preaching. I then remembered that “bubulcus” means one who plows with oxen, and I put aside “arator/aratrum” and “vomer” to search it, and found this: “De arantis allegorico officio: Bubulcus qui in bobus arat, debet habere duo, vocis suavitatem, qua mulceat laborem bonum operantium; et aculeum pungentem, quo torporem excutiat pigritantium” (“On the allegorical office of plowman: A plowman who plows with oxen needs two things: sweetness in his voice, to soothe the labor of good workers, and a stinging goad to stir the torpor of lazy ones,” *Miscellanea* attributed to Hugh of St Victor, *PL* 177.745). The writer doesn’t apply the allegory, but at least makes clear that plowing can be allegorized, and stresses voice. I also found Honorius’s identification of the precentor with a plowman goading oxen; see Appendix. Now I had a definite connection of plowing and singing the office. Of course Langland’s verb is “sigge,” not “singe,” and of course one would not sing from a portehors, which is a portable breviary. Nevertheless all this material suggests that Langland’s thrice-used metaphor of praying and plowing has a tradition behind it.

36. See also Paulinus of Nola, Letter 39, to his farmer-friends Aper and Amanda, developing at length the image of cultivating the heart. At one point he says that the soul “cultivates itself with regular prayer” (*orationibus crebris semet excolat*) (*PL* 61.365; P. G. Walsh, *Letters of St. Paulinus of Nola* [Westminster, MD: Newman Press; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1968], 2.198).

37. Marie-Benoit Meeuws, “‘Ora et labora’: Devise bénédictine?” *Collectanea cisterciensia* 54 (1992): 193–219. Meeuws claims it’s not the motto of the Benedictines, but a nineteenth-century invention. But see some corrections in Marjorie O’Rourke Boyle, “William Harvey’s Anatomy Book and Literary Culture,” *Medical History* 52 (2008): 73–91, which establish that it is older, but offer no evidence that it goes back to Benedict, or even the Middle Ages.

6. B 15.148–50 *A Pauline mélange*

“What is charite?” quod I þo; “a childish þyng,” he seide:

“*Nisi efficiamini sicut parvuli non intrabitis in regnum celorum.*

Wiþouten fauntelte or folie a fre liberal wille.”

My procedure really paid dividends in deepening my understanding of this definition of charity by Patience, and the development in lines 156–75 of “charite þat Poul preiseþ best” (156). It was clear from the start, of course, that Langland was asserting a paradox: charity is childish but not infantile. Its biblical basis is also clear enough in the passage, since Langland quotes both Jesus’s “*Nisi . . . efficiamini sicut parvuli*” (“Unless you . . . become as little children,” Matt. 18.3) and Paul’s “*hic in enigmate, tunc facie ad faciem*” (“here darkly, then face to face,” cf. 1 Cor 13:12, at line 162b) which evokes his (Paul’s) contrast in the preceding verse between childhood and adulthood: “*quando autem factus sum vir, evacuavi quae erant parvuli*” (“but when I became a man, I put away the things of a child,” 1 Cor 13:11). Searching “*parvulus*,” however, made me see Paul’s own expression of the paradox in the next chapter of 1 Corinthians: “*Fratres, nolite pueri effici sensibus, sed malitia parvuli estote; sensibus autem perfecti estote*” (“Brethren, do not become children in sense; but in malice be children, and in sense be perfect,” 1 Cor 14:20); and searching “*pueritia*” (fauntelte) led me to the hardheaded view of boyish folly characteristic of Proverbs: “O children, how long will you love childishness, and fools covet those things which are hurtful to themselves, and the unwise hate knowledge?” (1:22); “Folly is bound up in the heart of the child, and the rod of correction shall drive it away” (22:15). Furthermore, various Latin writers (e.g. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 12.35 [PL 42.272], Isidore, *Allegoriae sacrae scripturae* 98 [PL 83.113]) compare the Jews who mock Jesus on Calvary to the “*puerilis stultitia*” of the boys who mock Elisha’s baldness and are eaten by two bears (4 Kings 2:23–24). That phrase, “*puerilis stultitia*,” seems to lie behind Langland’s “fauntelte or folie.” And a still deeper sense of the biblical basis of the passage came to me when—again, thinking Latin—I read “He is glad wiþ alle glade” (169) and thought, that’s Paul: “*gaudere cum gaudentibus, flere cum flentibus*” (“rejoice with them that rejoice, weep with them that weep,” Romans 12:15)—a line Langland has already quoted at A 11.193. In the C version it is clearer that Langland is translating Paul: “He is glad with alle glade as gurlis þat lawhen alle/And sory when he seth men sory” (C 16.302–3). So I turned to Romans 12—and realized that Langland’s whole passage defining charity, B 15.148–74 (C 16.298–315, a little less clearly; see below) trans-

lates (not in order of verses, and with Langland's usual freedom) Paul's two meditations on charity, Romans 12:9–21 and 1 Corinthians 13. The use of 1 Corinthians 13 is maybe obvious enough, since Langland quotes it several times in the passage, but there is no Latin hint given of the reliance on Romans 12, even though more of the passage actually comes from there:

165 ne chaffareþ noȝt, ne chalangeþ, ne craueþ: “non quaerit quae sua sunt”
 1 Cor 13:5; 166–68 As proud of a peny as of a pound of golde . . . scarlet:
 “non alta sapientes, sed humilibus consentientes” Rom 12.16; 169 glad wiþ
 alle glade: Rom 12:15 (as above); good til alle wikkede: “nulli malum pro
 malo reddentes” Rom 12:17; 170 lenep and louep alle þat oure lord made:
 “si esurierit inimicus tuus, ciba illum, si sitit, potum da illi” Rom 12:20
 (also “necessitatibus sanctorum communicantes” 12:13, “providentes bona”
 12:17); 171 Corsep he no creature ne he kan bere no wraþe: “benedicite
 persequentibus vos: benedicite et nolite maledicere” 12:14, “date locum
 irae” 12:19, “non irritatur” 1 Cor 13:5; 172 Ne no likynge haþ to lye ne
 laughe men to scorne: “non gaudet super iniquitate, congaudet autem ver-
 itate” 1 Cor 13:6; 173–74 Al þat men seyn, he leet it soop and in solace
 takeþ/And alle manere meschiefs in mylde nesse he suffreþ: “omnia credit,
 omnia sperit, omnia sustinet” 1 Cor 13:7, “nulli malum pro malo reddentes”
 Rom 12.7, “non vosmetipsos defendentes” Rom 12:19; 175 Coueiteþ
 he noon erþely good, but heueneriche blisse: “non est ambitiosa, non quaerit
 quae sua sunt” 1 Cor 13:5 plus 8–14, all looking to “cum autem venerit
 quod perfectum est” (10).

The personification of charity, the re-ordering of the statements, and all the little vignettes and specifications disguise the translation; nor is every verse of Paul in either passage translated. Still the *fundamentum* of Langland's passage, the *fons et origo*, the ground of all, is Paul. Of course, someone else who knows the Bible better might have recognized the reliance on Paul without trying to smell out translated lines, but my method worked for me. I should also say that the revision of this passage in C, despite the one line I have already quoted that is closer to Paul, seems designed to make it a little less derivative. And yet even in the C version, Paul is still the ground.

What can I conclude from these six examples? First, that extended, point-for-point reliance on an unacknowledged source, such as shows up in the Peter of Blois passage, and that I had hoped (as if hunting for Easter eggs) to find more and more of, is probably very rare: even the extended reliance on Romans 12 in the definition of charity, though I can tick off the correspondences, is much more mediated by Langland's shaping and his inventive

phrasing than the Blois passage. The other five have illuminated Langland's methods of composition precisely by refusing to yield a perfect match to me: each in its way shows how deeply intertwined his imagery and diction can be with Latin materials, but each also finally shows him composing freely, not working with any one identifiable text. They vindicate his independence, which the Blois passage might conceivably call into question (though I have argued that it does not). They give us a glimpse beyond a Langland learned in Latin to a Langland inventive in English. But the definition of charity lets us see deepest of all, lets us see how fruitful engagement with two of Paul's most eloquent passages brings Langland also to a new pitch of eloquence, makes him not less inventive but more. I have always thought that the definition of charity is a highlight of the poem, always felt a new surge in the verse; now it is hard for me not to see that surge as arising out of the thrill Langland must have felt at outdoing Paul with new diction, new imagery, even as he stays close to Paul's text. This is translation and transcendence at once.

Appendix of Illustrative Passages to #1, 2, and 5 Above

1. *Dunghill/hypocrite*

Swift's "Description of a Salamander," 29–31:

I've seen a snake in human Form,
All stain'd with Infamy and Vice,
Leap from the Dunghill in a trice.

Walton's *Compleat Angler*, ch. 8: "The land-snake breeds and hatches her eggs, which become young snakes, in some old dunghill, or a like hot place."

From a sermon of 1845 by Robert South: "For as snakes breed in dunghills, not singly but in knots . . ." (*Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions* (Philadelphia: Sorin & Ball, 1845).

2. *One without tongue and teeth*

Tertullian, *De carne Christi* 5: Quid dimidias mendacio Christum? Totus veritas fuit. Maluit, credo, nasci quam ex aliqua parte mentiri, et quidem in semetipsum, ut

carnem gestaret sine ossibus duram, sine musculis solidam, sine sanguine cruentam, sine tunica vestitam, sine fame esurientem, sine dentibus edentem, sine lingua loquentem, ut phantasma auribus fuerit sermo ejus per imaginem vocis. (Why make out that Christ was half a lie? He was wholly the truth. He thought it better, I am sure, to be born than to be partially a liar, a liar too against himself, by wearing flesh without bones yet hard, without muscles yet firm, without blood yet gory, without a cloak yet clothed, flesh that hungered without appetite, ate without teeth, and spoke without a tongue, so that his discourse should be a phantasm conveyed to the ears by the ghost of a voice. [*Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani De Carne Christi Liber: Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation*. Ed. and transl. Ernest Evans (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1956)].)

Jerome, *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum, ad Pammachium* [Against John of Jerusalem, To Pammachius] (like the preceding, contradicting Marcion) (*PL* 23.387): Noli potentiam Domini Magorum praestigiis adaequare, ut videatur fuisse quod non fuit, et putetur comedisse sine dentibus, ambulasse sine pedibus, fregisse panem sine manibus, locutus esse sine lingua, et latus monstrasse sine costis. (Don't equate the power of the Lord with the tricks of magicians, so that he may appear to have been what he was not, and may be thought to have eaten without teeth, walked without feet, broken bread without hands, spoken without a tongue, and showed his side without ribs.)

3. *Plowing*

Honoratus of Marseilles, *Vita Hilarii* (*PL* 50.1223): Corpore infirmus, mente validus et robustus, sobolem novam spiritali adhortatione concipiens, instructione formans, orationibus procreans, in corde praeclari cespitis sanctum semen aratro fidei percolendum jaciebat peritus agricola, quod orationum perennibus donis et lacrymarum fluentibus rivis irrigabat. (Weak in body but strong and robust in mind, the expert farmer conceived a new shoot by spiritual exhortation, formed it by instruction, and brought it forth by prayer. He sowed in his bright heart of turf a holy seed to be cultivated by the plow of faith, and he irrigated it by constant gifts of prayers and flowing rivers of tears.)

Gregory, *Homilies on Ezechiel*, 3 (*PL* 76.813): Manum quippe in aratrum mittere est quasi per quemdam compunctionis vomerem ad proferendos fructus terram sui cordis aperire. (To put your hand to the plow is as it were by the plowshare of compunction to open the land of your heart to bear fruit.)

Galandus Regniacensis, *Libellus proverbiorum*, Proverb 99: Qui terrenam mentem suam penitentie uomere scindens eius occulta confitendo aperit, spiritalis arator est (A man who cuts the earth of his mind with the plowshare of penance and thus opens up his secrets by confessing them is a spiritual plowman.) Galand de Reigny, *Petit livre de proverbes*. Ed. Jean Chatillon, Maurice Dumontier, and Alexis Gréolois. Source Chrétienne 436 (Paris, Editions de Cerf, 1998), p. 142.

Honorius of Autun, *Gemma animae*, 1.17, *PL* 172.549–50 (describing a high mass with the bishop presiding): Legitur in Evangelio de servo arante, quod, peracto acto opere de agro, domum redeat, et post servitium Domino suo impensum ad convivium recumbat (Luc. 17). Ager Dei sunt corda fidelium, servus arans est ordo praedicantium; per lectorem Epistolae doctores exprimentur, qui agrum Dei praedicando coluerunt; per responsionem, fideles qui per bonam operationem respondentes fructum justitiae protulerunt. Aratrum, est nostrum servitium. Boves hinc inde trahentes sunt utrinque totis viribus Domino canentes. Praecentor qui cantantes manu et voce incitat, est servus qui boves stimulo minans dulci voce bobus jubilat. . . . Cantores qui respondent primo canenti, vox est auditorum quasi evigilantium et Dominum laudantium. Versus, est arans servus per dulcedinem modulationis corda carnalium, quae se aperiunt more sulci in confessione vocis et lacrymarum. Arant qui aratro compunctionis corda scindunt, in lectione pascitur auditor quasi quodammodo bos. Bos ad hoc pascitur, ut in eo opus agriculturae exercentur. Bos est praedicator, cantor, quodammodo bubulcus, qui jubilat bobus, ut hilarius aratrum trahant, scilicet instigat canentes ut laetius canant. Terra scinditur, quando corda auditorum compunguntur. Tales operarii cum de agro hujus mundi redeunt, aeternum convivium cum Domino suo ineunt.

(We read in the gospels of a servant plowing that when his work in the field is done he comes home and after further service to his Lord sits down to supper [Luke 17:7–8, bent to Honorius’s needs]. God’s field is the hearts of the faithful, the plowing servant is the order of preachers. The reader of the epistle stands for teachers who have cultivated the field of God by preaching; the response stands for the faithful who respond by doing well and thus have brought forth the fruit of justice. The plow is our service of worship. The oxen pulling back and forth are those singing on both sides of the choir with all their strength to the Lord. The precentor who leads the singers with hand and voice is the servant who even as he threatens the oxen with the goad calls joyfully to them in a sweet voice. . . . The singers who respond to the first singer—this is the voice of listeners as it were watching and praising the lord. The verse is the servant plowing hearts of the carnal with the sweetness of his modulation; the hearts open up just like a furrow, confessing with voice and tears. They plow who

cut those hearts with the plow of compunction; in the reading the listener grazes in a way like the ox. The ox grazes so that he can do the work of cultivating the field. The ox is the preacher; the cantor, in a way like the plowman who calls joyfully to the oxen so that they will pull the plow more gaily, goads the singers to sing more joyfully. The earth is cut when the hearts of listeners are pierced with compunction. And all these workers, when they come home from the field of this world, go into endless supper with their Lord.)