



6-2017

Triplex Enim Eleemosyna Est, Cordis, Oris, Et Operis:
Pope Innocent III's Spiritual and Rhetorical
Approach to Almsgiving

Thomas J. Maurer

Western Michigan University, thomasmaurer15@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses

 Part of the [History of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maurer, Thomas J., "*Triplex Enim Eleemosyna Est, Cordis, Oris, Et Operis: Pope Innocent III's Spiritual and Rhetorical Approach to Almsgiving*" (2017). *Master's Theses*. 1126.

http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/1126

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



*TRIPLEX ENIM ELEEMOSYNA EST, CORDIS, ORIS, ET OPERIS: POPE INNOCENT III'S
SPIRITUAL AND RHETORICAL APPROACH TO ALMSGIVING*

by

Thomas J. Maurer

A thesis submitted to the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Masters of Arts
History
Western Michigan University
June 2017

Thesis Committee:

Larry J. Simon, Ph.D., Chair
Robert F. Berkhofer, Ph.D.
Kevin J. Wanner, Ph.D.

*TRIPLEX ENIM ELEEMOSYNA EST, CORDIS, ORIS, ET OPERIS: POPE INNOCENT III'S
SPIRITUAL AND RHETORICAL APPROACH TO ALMSGIVING*

Thomas J. Maurer, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 2017

The *Libellus de Eleemosyna* is a short work by Pope Innocent III on the topic of almsgiving. Historians have used this “little book” to understand better Innocent’s thoughts on the virtue. I have discovered, however, that the *Libellus* was not originally a “little book,” but rather a sermon. In this thesis I attempt to describe and understand the *Libellus* not as a “libellus” but as the preached sermon: *Date Eleemosynam*. No other historian has approached the *Libellus* this way. In the first chapter I examine the previous short studies done on the *Libellus*, how contemporaries viewed Innocent as a preacher, what he thought of the role, and how preaching as a social and religious phenomena evolved in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. In the second chapter I analyze and describe the sermon itself with the knowledge that the audience was lay. In the third chapter, I examine the manuscript diffusion of *Date Eleemosynam* and Innocent’s sermon manuscripts across Europe. I emend Johannes Schneyer’s *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters* on several points, and produce an updated number on the manuscript diffusion of Innocent’s sermons. By arguing that the *Libellus* should be viewed originally as a sermon, I offer insight into Innocent’s view of the laity, his propensity for the *vita apostolica* as later personified by the Franciscans, and make inroads into how clerical culture and education were translated into a lay setting.

Copyright by
Thomas J. Maurer
2017

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The roots of this journey began in my final semester of undergraduate at Christendom College in Front Royal Virginia. For my class paper on the history of the popes, I decided to write a historiographical essay on Pope Innocent III. I soon found myself fascinated by this figure and the myriad historical interpretations which surrounded him. Now after two years of studying this medieval pontiff, I find myself adding my own small interpretation on the proclaimed “Vicar of Christ.”

I must first thank Dr. Larry Simon. His request before I arrived at Western to list all the books on medieval history I had ever read struck me as a bit odd at the time, but his interest in my research interests have led me here. I still remember the message I received from him which enthusiastically stated that he had found a little studied document written by Innocent on almsgiving that would be perfect for an M.A. thesis. The hours he spent proof-reading, critiquing, and discussing the topic with me has played a large role in making this thesis what it is.

Secondly, I need to thank my family. I thank my mother and father for all the support they have shown me. From the first day I showed up at Christendom as a wide-eyed freshman, hoping even then to study history at the graduate level, to my graduation, to the two years of my M.A. work, they have always encouraged me to pursue my hope of one day attaining a Ph.D. My brothers, Charlie, Michael, John, Joseph, and Vincent, have all contributed their support in their own quintessential ways.

There are countless friends I should mention, and because I cannot list them all, I am blessed. Andrew Clark, who was always there to listen, Maria Bonvissuto, who was always

Acknowledgments—Continued

there to read, Tim Egan and Derek Benson, who were always there to drink, Peter Zinman, who was always there to plot, and Caroline Jansen, who was always there to help. I thank them, and all others who have discussed, encouraged, and prayed for this thesis.

Finally, I dedicate this thesis to Dr. Brendan McGuire. There are few individuals who have faced what he has faced, and yet remain optimistic and joyful. In his office in Front Royal, he had a blue flag with the white letters, “don’t give up the ship!” This mentality has sustained me through my M.A. and will continue through my Ph.D.

Thomas J. Maurer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
CHAPTERS	
I. Interpreting Almsgiving: the Context for <i>Date Eleemosynam</i>	1
II. Alms, Spiritual Reward, and Engaging the Laity: the Content and Structure of the <i>Libellus</i>	29
III. ‘Go, and Preach to all Nations:’ the Diffusion of <i>Date Eleemosynam</i>	74
CONCLUSION	
<i>Eleemosyna</i> : the Virtue of the Laity.....	95
APPENDICES	
Appendix One, Manuscript Descriptions.....	102
Appendix Two, Comparison of the Cologne Editions.....	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
I. Manuscripts Consulted.....	118
II. Manuscript Catalogues Consulted.....	118
III. Published Primary Sources.....	119
IV. Secondary Sources.....	122

CHAPTER I

Interpreting Almsgiving: the Context for *Date Eleemosynam*

Historians agree that Pope Innocent III's reign from 1198 to 1216 was the apogee of the political power of the medieval papacy. This opinion of Innocent's pontificate has remained consistent among scholars, yet views of Innocent himself have evolved from that of a lawyer-pope toward a figure focused on pastoral works. In the 1980s Kenneth Pennington gave voice to this evolving historiographical view by calling for further investigation of Innocent as theologian and pastor.¹ In line with this trend, my thesis will focus on the *Libellus de Eleemsoyna*, a little researched, and often misunderstood pastoral work by Innocent. Historians such as Brenda Bolton and James Brodman have used this "little book" to understand the important pontiff's views on almsgiving and charity. Both historians accept Jacques-Paul Migne's categorization of "libelli" without adequately consulting the manuscript from which the *Libellus* was drawn. The *Libellus de Eleemosyna* appears in a plethora of Innocentian model sermon collections, as the sermon *Date Eleemsoynam*. While Bolton's and Brodman's analysis of the document is enlightening, both miss the important function of the document as a sermon. My thesis will explore the *Libellus*, not as a theological work meant for the intellectuals and scholars of its time, but as a sermon promoting an active spirituality among the laity directly through the medium of preaching.

This first chapter will examine Innocent's pontificate, both his role as politician and pastor, the short historiography of the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*, Innocent's reputation as a preacher, and the overall context of late twelfth-century and early thirteenth-century preaching.

¹ Kenneth Pennington, "Further Thoughts on Pope Innocent III's Knowledge of Law," in *Popes, Canonists and Texts, 1150-1550*, ed. Kenneth Pennington (Aldershot: Variorum, 1993), II.1.

The second chapter will analyze the document with the understanding that it was originally preached. I will examine Innocent's rhetoric and focus, comparing it to Corinne Vause and John Moore's works on Innocent's sermons. In *Date Eleemosynam*, Innocent's Parisian education is brought to light as well as contemporary canonical debate about almsgiving. While the influence of Peter the Chanter's circle on Innocent is rather well documented, it is revealing to see that Innocent also brought his legal education into his sermons, and in one addressed to the laity no less. The third chapter will examine the manuscript tradition of Innocent's sermons. Johannes Schneyer and Katherine Jansen both document a wide manuscript diffusion which fits David D'Avray's criteria for "international diffusion." The number is expansive, but Schneyer's number is slightly off, mainly in regards to the manuscript list of the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, which I shall emend. I shall also examine the printed editions in the third chapter. Innocent's theological works were first printed in 1552 in Cologne Germany, which was later copied by a 1575 edition, and finally published in the *Patrologia Latina*. It was the 1552 edition which first categorized *Date Eleemosynam* as a "libellus" and I shall demonstrate that Migne's edition is an exact replica of the 1552 edition through the 1575. Overall, this thesis will strive to present a clearer understanding of the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*'s function, audience, and influence.

It should be noted how I reference the subject of this thesis. In the *PL* the title is *Libellus de Eleemosyna*. The 1552 and 1575 Cologne editions label it likewise. Innocentian sermons, however, are generally referred to by their *incipit*, or first scriptural quote. From this perspective, the source can be referred to as *Date Eleemosynam*. Which title is correct? The second, *Date Eleemoysnam*, is certainly more original. The source was a sermon which Innocent included in his sermon manuscripts and preached to his flock. I shall generally refer to it as *Date*

Eleemosynam as this title better reflects Innocent's original intent. However, I will not regard the name *Libellus* as illegitimate. While the editor of the 1552 edition may have made a mistake in categorizing the document, all who read this edition and the subsequent editions saw *Date Eleemosynam* as its own standalone treatise. This would unfairly disregard more than half the document's lifetime and readership as misled. Innocent's pastoral message, while originally contained in a sermon, should also be viewed as finding fruition in the early modern world as this "little book." Therefore, I shall use *Date Eleemosynam* and *Libellus de Eleemosyna* interchangeably, except when circumstances dictate a precise reference.

Innocent's reign not only had a large impact on the society and politics of his time, but had continued influence throughout a large portion of the thirteenth century. A firm advocate of papal independence and political supremacy, Innocent would back the imperial candidate Otto of Brunswick, receive the young Frederick II as a papal ward, and clash with both King John of England over the appointment of Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury, and Philip Augustus of France regarding the divorce of his Danish wife. Innocent viewed himself and the office of the papacy as "higher than man, but lower than God," which in turn provided him with the ideological basis to argue for the power to arbitrate between states in *ratione peccati*.² Robert Brentano presents Innocent as possessing youthful energy, a man "bursting with self-confidence and a sort of optimism."³ Innocent would attempt to reform the papal curia, call the Fourth and Albigensian Crusades, strengthen the Papal States, found the hospital *Sancto Spirito*

² Jane Sayers, *Innocent III: Leader of Europe, 1198-1216* (London: Longman Group, 1994), 91-92.

³ Robert Brentano, *Rome Before Avignon: A Social History of Thirteenth-Century Rome* (New York: Basic Books Inc, 1974), 148-49.

on the banks of the Tiber, and approve the Humiliati and Mendicant movements. The last major event of his pontificate would be the Fourth Lateran Council, which defined the doctrine of Transubstantiation and implemented new regulations regarding the Sacraments of Confession and Communion for the laity. Jane Sayers argues that Innocent was “undeniably one of the most important popes of the medieval period” and that Innocent’s rule in particular brings forth the stark paradox of the medieval papacy: “the pope’s rule was supposedly above the world, yet in practice it was inextricably entangled in it.”⁴ Innocent’s time as the proclaimed “Vicar of Christ” influenced religious practice, social life, and secular politics across Europe.

Innocent, or Lothario dei Conti, would spend his formative years at the Universities of Paris and Bologna before his time as pope. He first began his education in the Benedictine monastery of St. Andrea al Celio in Rome under Peter Ismaele.⁵ Lothario would later travel to Paris at age fifteen for theological training, a common course for young Italian nobles pursuing a career in the Church.⁶ He spent six to ten years studying theology and the liberal arts.⁷ Paris at this time had moved away from the speculative theology of Peter Abelard and had begun to focus on the practical application of doctrine to the ethics of social life.⁸ The writings of the masters Peter the Chanter, Peter of Poitiers, and Peter of Corbeil had gained intellectual primacy. The members of this circle considered themselves active social reformers and not distant

⁴ Sayers, *Innocent III*, vii.

⁵ John Moore, *Pope Innocent III (1160/1-1216): To Root Up and to Plant* (Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2003), 4.

⁶ Moore, *Pope Innocent III*, 6-7.

⁷ Moore, *Pope Innocent III*, 8.

⁸ Sayers, *Innocent III*, 18.

academics.⁹ Peter held the view that a theologian's ability and writings should consist of *lectio*, *disputatio*, and *praedicatio* to promote their active ideal. The final aspect, preaching, was considered the “crowning” feature of a theologian.¹⁰ Peter of Corbeil in particular was remembered fondly by Innocent. Corbeil was famous for his lectures on theology and his ability to preach; as pope, Innocent would endow him first with the bishopric of Cambrai and later the archbishopric of Sens. Innocent remembered not only teachers, but also fellow students such as Robert of Courson and Stephen Langton, who would both be placed in key clerical roles. Sayers holds that “traces of Parisian teaching are to be found in some of Innocent's letters, with their biblical quotations and scholastic distinctions.”¹¹ Later, Innocent would study canon law at Bologna between 1187 and 1189.¹² The intellectual formation Innocent received at Bologna, and more importantly at Paris, would play a key role in his papal policies, theological writings, and sermons.

What specific social events and movements might have influenced *Date Eleemosynam*? Brenda Bolton, in her invaluable article on Innocent's social programs, dates the writing of the treatise to 1202 or 1203.¹³ These early years saw positive developments for Innocent's political agenda, as in late 1201 Innocent's Imperial candidate Otto of Brunswick steadily gained

⁹ Baldwin, *Masters Princes and Merchants*, xiv-xv.

¹⁰ Baldwin, *Masters Princes and Merchants*, 12, 14.

¹¹ Sayers, *Innocent III*, 18.

¹² Sayers, *Innocent III*, 21.

¹³ Brenda Bolton, “Hearts Not Purses? Pope Innocent III's Attitude to Social Welfare” in *Innocent III: Studies on Papal Authority and Pastoral Care*, ed. Brenda Bolton (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995), 129.

influence, and the papal ally Walter of Brienne launched a successful military campaign in Southern Italy against imperial foes. Closer to home, Innocent had secured political control in Rome over republican ambitions, and was able to usurp local control over the nearby territories of Sabina and Marittima.¹⁴ The next year, Innocent dealt with local food shortages, as his anonymous biographer claimed that he fed more than eight thousand people and implored the wealthy to do likewise.¹⁵ Contention between the papacy and its urban antagonists continued, culminating in violence during Holy Week of 1203, interrupting Innocent's Easter Monday liturgy.¹⁶ The need to focus on his Roman flock through almsgiving and urban unrest must have been at the forefront of Innocent's priorities at that time. However, Innocent's most pressing international concern in 1203 was most likely the still excommunicated crusading army encamped at Zara, as he continued to encourage them to receive absolution and fulfill their vows.¹⁷ Innocent saw both early success and several setbacks internationally and locally in the opening years of his pontificate.

Innocent was also responsible for two other developments at the same time as his political and social maneuvering: the approval of several caritative orders and the founding of the hospital *Sancto Spirito*. There is debate as to whether Innocent was a passive figure in the creation of these new orders, or whether, as James Powell argues, Innocent should be given direct credit for the increase.¹⁸ Regardless, Innocent approved the Order of the Holy Spirit with

¹⁴ Moore, *Pope Innocent III*, 85.

¹⁵ Moore, *Pope Innocent III*, 85-86.

¹⁶ Moore, *Pope Innocent III*, 95.

¹⁷ Moore, *Pope Innocent III*, 95.

¹⁸ James Brodman, *Charity and Religion in Medieval Europe* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 137.

two bulls in 1198 and 1204.¹⁹ The order had been originally founded in 1175 by Guy of Montpellier, and soon the order's hospitals spread across France and Italy. Furthermore, the order was given care of a defunct English hospice in 1204 which Innocent had remodeled into the hospital Santa Maria in Sassia, also known as *Sancto Spirito*.²⁰ In addition, Innocent approved the Trinitarians in 1198. This order was primarily concerned with ransoming captives from Muslims, and gained prominence in the Mediterranean world.²¹ Finally, Innocent approved the request of another hospital order, the Antonines, to separate from the Benedictines of Montmajour in 1205.²² James Brodman argues that the thirteenth century was a "golden age" for hospital and caritative orders, as their formal approval at the beginning of the century led to a remarkable expansion across Europe.²³ Innocent's patronage of these religious orders at the beginning of his pontificate illustrates an acute interest in charitable orders.

Hospitals also expanded in tandem with the religious orders which ran them. John Henderson's work on hospitals in Florence observes that of the sixty-eight hospitals built between 1000 and 1500, thirty percent were begun in the thirteenth century.²⁴ Florence appears to be a microcosm for this development, as Daniel Le Blévec estimates that between 1100 and 1460, roughly twenty-seven percent of all hospitals were founded in the thirteenth century.²⁵

¹⁹ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 137.

²⁰ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 138-39.

²¹ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 150, 154.

²² Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 134.

²³ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 176-77.

²⁴ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 59.

²⁵ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 55.

Innocent was not to be excluded from this trend and built his own hospital of *Sancto Spirito* in 1202.²⁶ This hospital was one of several that Jacques de Vitry praised for its zealous charity.²⁷ Bolton argues that this hospital encompassed Innocent's social and religious aspirations for the simultaneous care of body and soul.²⁸ Innocent himself would extol his own work in a sermon delivered in 1208, praising the hospital as a place where "vices transformed into virtues, [and] where the corporal works of mercy are performed in all their fullness," as paraphrased by Bolton.²⁹ Not to be outdone by other metropolitans of Christendom, Innocent sponsored the new hospital *Sancto Spirito* around the same time he may have preached *Date Eleemosynam*.

Overall, the *opus caritatis* in medieval Europe was a multi-faceted endeavor whose role and control in the medieval Church was in a state of constant flux. One of Innocent's Parisian classmates, Robert Courson, wanted the French Church to assume control over the charitable houses, but this idea never caught on and Innocent left the matter alone at the Fourth Lateran council.³⁰ This movement, with the increase in hospitals, was primarily urban and primarily lay. The orders which sprung up almost all started as lay confraternities focused on the local community, with the regularized orders gaining popularity and reach across Europe.³¹ The other important source of charity was the local parish which Brodman asserts was controlled by both the local priest and the lay parishioners. Brodman summarizes these two institutions thus:

²⁶ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 138.

²⁷ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 136.

²⁸ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 137.

²⁹ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 141.

³⁰ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 79-80.

³¹ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 221.

Medieval confraternal and parochial charity was essentially lay in character, so its study provides us with a mirror into the religious attitudes of the non-clerical classes. Some confraternal charity—but almost none emanating from the parish—was directed at the anonymous poor...Consequently, in some confraternal charity there was a degree of overlapping with the clientele of ecclesiastical charities. Yet in these charities of the neighborhood and town there was a special emphasis upon the local community. Few of these initiatives were tied to larger institutions. Their focus was local, upon the needy of the town, the neighborhood, and the parish.³²

For Brodman, the eleemosynary movement of the twelfth- and thirteenth-centuries calls Herbert Grundmann's thesis that all religious movements were either brought within the fold of the Church, or discarded as heresy into question.³³ For my purposes, however, this short exposition of the caritative movement shows that the audience of this sermon might very well have already seen and experienced the expanding *opus caritatis*.

It is within this political, social, and religious context that Innocent may have written and preached *Date Eleemosynam* in 1202 or 1203. The *Libellus* consists of six chapters of varying lengths in the 1552 and 1575 editions as well as in the *PL*. We shall see more clearly in chapter two that the sixth chapter of the *Libellus* is not original to the sermon *Date Eleemosynam* and was added later. The first chapter begins with Innocent's bold proclamation that almsgiving possesses the ability to cleanse the world.³⁴ Innocent proceeds to explain how almsgiving frees, liberates, protects, prays for, obtains, accomplishes, blesses, justifies, reawakens, and saves the giver, with appropriate biblical passages added as evidence for these effects.³⁵ The second chapter is in a similar vein as the first, but much is longer and includes a plethora of biblical

³² Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 220.

³³ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 144-45.

³⁴ *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 217: column number 746, "Quam ipsa Veritas commendavit, quae per eleemosynam asserit universa mundari."

³⁵ *PL*, 217: 747-748.

references about the many effects of alms.³⁶ This chapter introduces the important image and primary motivation for almsgiving of the poor standing as agents of conversion, through whom temporal goods are converted into spiritual returns.³⁷ Later in chapter two of this thesis, we will see that this fits with Vause's belief that Innocent had a "mystical" view of the world which informed his sermons. These two chapters promote the spiritual benefits of almsgiving.

Innocent turns almost immediately to a potential problem with his initial thesis. What does one make of a world filled with sins and filth? Is the power of alms insufficient for the task of purifying the world?³⁸ This problem, and Innocent's solution, will be a main theme for the rest of the document: almsgiving must proceed from charity, and must be performed with the correct motivation.³⁹ Without this, alms achieve nothing. He sidesteps this discussion only briefly in chapter four by placing the spiritual efficacy of almsgiving above that of fasting and prayer.⁴⁰ In the fifth and longest chapter of the treatise, Innocent presents what could be understood as a manual for eleemosynary deeds, by explaining the order, manner, reason, and

³⁶ *PL*, 217: 748, "Sunt quoque et alii plures eleemosynarum effectus quos ex subjectis testimoniis poteris cognoscere."

³⁷ *PL*, 217: 749, "Dives enim dat pauperi eleemosynam temporalem, pauper autem retribuit diviti mercedem aeternam."

³⁸ *PL*, 217: 750, "Nunquid ergo facientibus eleemosynas omnia munda sunt, ebrosis, adulteris, homicidis, caeterisque vitiorum sordibus involutes? Licenter ergo suas exercent turpitudines, et peragant voluptates, si eleemosyna sufficient ad redimenda peccata, si suffiecit ad emundanda delicta?"

³⁹ *PL* 217: 751, "Vera igitur Eleemosyna de vera charitate procedit."

⁴⁰ *PL* 217: 752, "Caput IV. Eleemosynam jejunio et oratio esse meliorem, nec quemquam ab ea excusari."

end of almsgiving.⁴¹ This chapter continues as Innocent examines each aspect of almsgiving at length. Finally, Innocent, or whoever wrote this chapter, ends his treatise with an exhortation for perseverance, as without this essential virtue God will not be pleased.⁴² Overall, Innocent's sermon is an appeal for all, rich and poor alike, to give alms in order to help their spiritual cause through assisting their brethren.

Scholarship on the document itself has remained limited. Brenda Bolton conducted an important examination of the work in her article, "Hearts Not Purses? Pope Innocent III's Attitude to Social Welfare."⁴³ This article discusses the natural calamities of the time, the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*, and Innocent's problems with the intransigent clergy. Bolton believes that this document, along with another small work of Innocent's regarding charity, the *Encomium Charitatis*, applies the Church's tradition of almsgiving to the time and is a "deeply serious and thoughtful work."⁴⁴ She highlights the main points of the document and proceeds to describe Innocent's quarrel with the archbishop of Narbonne, Berengar II, his anger with the monks of Monte Cassino for their lack of charity, and the establishment of the hospital *Sancto Sprito* in Rome.⁴⁵ For Bolton, the principle of loving one's neighbor reflects Innocent's view of the *vita apostolica* and the solution to satisfying both spiritual and material needs.⁴⁶ Bolton's

⁴¹ *PL* 217: 753, "Restat modo ut circa eleemosynam quatuor diligenter attendas, videlicet causam et finem, modum et ordinem."

⁴² *PL* 217: 759, "Quoniam autem nec Eleemosyna . . . de placere vel homini esse meritoria ad vitam beatam possunt sine perserverantia."

⁴³ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 131-145.

⁴⁴ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 127, 129.

⁴⁵ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 129-132, 134, 138

⁴⁶ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 141, 144-45.

article provides a context for both the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* and Innocent's charitable programs throughout the Church.

My main critique of Bolton's article is that she fails to examine *Libellus de Eleemosyna* in-depth and ignores the manuscript tradition. She gives only a brief outline of the document and does not speculate on the treatise's function within the Church or even within Innocent's social programs. Oddly enough, Bolton references Vat Lat 700, a manuscript of Innocent's sermons, but does not seem to notice that there is no title *Libellus de Eleemosyna* in the manuscript.⁴⁷ Bolton seems to posit the importance and influence of the document solely on the fame of its author. She does not provide information as to what extent the treatise was spread across Italy or Europe or how others made use of it. While Bolton's use of the document as a backdrop for the social concerns of Innocent during his pontificate is logical, she does not speculate on a potential use or influence of the document.

Another important work that mentions the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* is James Brodman's book *Charity and Religion in Medieval Europe*. He holds that Innocent was a "pivotal figure in promoting assistance to the poor."⁴⁸ Unlike Bolton who starts with the natural calamities of Innocent's time, Brodman begins by examining the *De Miseria Conditionis Humane*, written by Innocent before he became pope. Sections of this work detail the plight of the poor vividly and show Innocent's awareness of their suffering.⁴⁹ Brodman quotes John Moore, who argues that this work does not promote a monastic or contemplative response to the plight of the world, but is an appeal to the active life. Brodman also examines the document more thoroughly than

⁴⁷ Bolton, "Hearts Not Purses," 127.

⁴⁸ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 19.

⁴⁹ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 20.

Bolton. He believes that Innocent is in line with the tradition of the canon lawyer Gratian who relied upon the social theology of St. Ambrose. Thus, Innocent's originality lies with his ability in "bringing this teaching from a juridical into a pastoral environment."⁵⁰ This argument is correct and will be analyzed further in chapter two. Brodman views the document as promoting an active spirituality over a contemplative one. He says:

While prominent thirteenth-century ascetics such as Francis of Assisi did not keep fully to the path charted out by Pope Innocent, his statement was an important milestone in the development of an activist spirituality and its promotion among Europe's developing urban populations.⁵¹

Brodman presents this work as first showing Innocent's mindset, and second as evidence of a wide scale transition toward the promotion of the active spiritual life over the contemplative. Even, however, with this development both historians have two main problems. The first is taking the *PL* at face value without noticing that in the manuscript, the *Libellus* appears as a sermon. Thus when analyzing the content of the document, they mainly view it as illustrating. When Innocent wrote *Date Eleemosynam*, he was not attempting to write his own personal manifesto on almsgiving, or attempting to weigh in on a canonical debate. Rather, Innocent wrote and preached *Date Eleemosynam* as an exhortatory sermon to instill a sense of charity in others. One can still use Innocent's sermon to understand the man, but knowing the document's functionality would change the interpretive lens and thus the conclusions they draw. The second problem stems from the first: what was the influence of the manuscript tradition of Innocent's sermons and *Date Eleemosynam*? Both historians rest the influence of the document on Innocent's name recognition. Their assumption regarding the document's influence is correct,

⁵⁰ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 20.

⁵¹ Brodman, *Charity and Religion*, 24-25.

and I shall show definitively in chapter three that Innocent's sermons and *Date Eleemosynam* had a wide ranging influence throughout Europe.

One other historian who makes brief mention of the document is Robert Brentano in *Rome Before Avignon: A Social History of Thirteenth-Century Rome*. He quickly states that this document shows Innocent to be "a really serious and thoughtful and religious man," one focused not only on the virtues of the biblical Martha, but also on maintaining the virtue of Mary.⁵² Again, with Brentano, the focus is solely Innocent's mindset, and not on examining its utility or influence of the work.

There are two historians, however, who were not taken in by Migne's edition and see the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* as a sermon. Katherine Jansen and Keith Kendall, who will both play an important role in the third chapter, mention the document's true nature in passing. Jansen attempts to enumerate all of Innocent's sermons, and mentions that the number would "be eighty when we include the tract, *Date Elymosina*."⁵³ In a footnote, she mentions that "unlike the printed editions, the manuscripts usually regard this tract as a sermon."⁵⁴ Kendall, in his dissertation, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III: The Moral Theology of a Pastor and Pope," mentions that:

PL prints *Date eleemosynam* as a separate treatise; however the manuscripts include it as a *de tempore* sermon in the original version of the collection. Most of the manuscripts label it as for the beginning of Lent, and both its positions in the collection (immediately

⁵² Brentano, *Rome Before Avignon*, 150-151.

⁵³ Katherine Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," in *Innocenzo III: urbs et orbis: atti del Congresso Internazionale* ed. Andrea Sommerlechner (Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1998), 373.

⁵⁴ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 373.

following two Ash Wednesday sermons) and its contents suggest its use primarily as a sermon for Ash Wednesday or early in Lent.⁵⁵

It is not surprising, then, that both of the sermon historians correctly highlight the *PL*'s incorrect categorization of *Date Eleemosynam*. They are, however, focused on different areas of Innocent's sermon collection and do not provide the context or analysis that Bolton and Brodman provide. Overall, both Bolton and Brodman give the sermon its due, but not for the right reasons. They see this sermon as its own standalone, informational document, and not as a performative pastoral work focused on catechizing Innocent's flock.

In which part of the liturgical year would this sermon be used? Any knowledge of the Church's acute focus on prayers, fasting, and almsgiving during Lent would lead to the assumption of a Lenten sermon. We must turn to Stephen Van Dijk's *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and Related Documents* which prescribes the liturgy and readings in the time of Innocent which he himself had updated. The *Ordinal* lists in "Dominica Prima [in quadragesima]" the refrain, "Date eleemosynam" as part of that Sunday's liturgy.⁵⁶ It would seem appropriate to identify the *Libellus* as a possible sermon for the first Sunday of Lent. Kendall also attempts to order Innocent's *de tempore* sermons and lists *Date eleemosynam* as a sermon for the beginning of Lent after *Tu cum jejunaveris* and *Hoc est majus*, both of which he believes were used for Ash Wednesday.⁵⁷ This follows the order of the Vatican

⁵⁵ Keith Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III: The Moral Theology of a Pastor and Pope" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Maxwell School of Syracuse University, 2003), 92.

⁵⁶ Stephen Van Dijk, O.F.M. and John Walker, trans., and ed., *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and Related Documents* (Fribourg: The University Press), 191.

⁵⁷ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 269.

manuscripts as both Vat Lat 700 and 10902 lists the sermons *Tu cum jejunaveris*, then *Hoc est majus*, and finally *Date Eleemosynam*.⁵⁸ However, the *Ordinal* does not match with this division quite as well. For the *Dominica Secunda in Quadragesima*, the *Ordinal* indicates Innocent's sermon *Hoc est magnum ieiunium*, a variant name for *Hoc est majus*, is listed as one of the possible sermons for that Sunday.⁵⁹ The liturgical place for *Date Eleemosynam* appears set for the beginning of the Lenten season, yet the exact place for a specific Sunday is still unclear. Perhaps the specific nature of the sermon, almsgiving, allowed it to be used at any part of Lent, as it functioned not as an encompassing work on Lent, but as an exhortation for a specific virtue. While the exact place for *Date Eleemosynam* is not completely clear, the beginning of Lent appears the most probable place.

Innocent himself appears to have been remembered as a preacher of ability in the years after his death. Humbert of Romans, the Master General of the Dominicans, in his *De eruditione praedicatorum* references Innocent's homiletic ability an entire forty years after Innocent's death:

I heard that Pope Innocent, a man of great learning, under whom the Lateran Council was celebrated, when once he was preaching on the feast-day of the Magdalene, kept close by a certain homily of Gregory's about the very same feast, and he was translating word for word into the vernacular what had been written in the Latin, searching the book he held for the proper order when he did not remember it. After the sermon, when asked why he had done so, he replied that he had done it to reprove and instruct those who refuse to speak the words of others.⁶⁰

This custom appears to be well known, as Salimbene de Adam in his *Chronicle* also mentions that "Innocent was also accustomed to have a book open before him when he preached to the

⁵⁸ Vat Lat 700 21v, 24r, 25r. Vat Lat 10902 48v, 55r, 58r.

⁵⁹ Van Dijk, *The Ordinal of the Papal Court*, 195.

⁶⁰ Katherine Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 369.

people.”⁶¹ When Innocent’s chaplains inquired, “why he, a man so learned and wise, did so” Innocent responded with “I do it for your benefit, as an example to you, because you are ignorant and yet you are ashamed to learn.”⁶² Jansen believes that Humbert uses this quote to exhort arrogant priests to use model sermons instead of relying upon their own ability; if Innocent, a pope, used these collections, so should they.⁶³ Corinne Vause believes that Innocent’s “charismatic personality” and “sonorous voice” aided his preaching ability.⁶⁴ Furthermore, she speculates that Innocent may very well have used his sermon collections to actually preach:

There is, of course, no certainty that all of these sermons were actually preached by Innocent III. Yet, the rhythm of the Latin phrasing, the vocal flow of the wording, the interjections which appear to be extemporaneous, the adaptations of the sermons to specific circumstances, and the tone of immediacy that can be felt in most of them, led us to believe that they may very well have been spoken by Innocent himself on the occasions for which they were composed.⁶⁵

We shall see in chapter two that several parts of *Date Eleemosynam* have a certain cadence and rhetorical flourish that leads one to believe that the *Libellus* in its sermonic format may have been actually preached as written. The evidence from Humbert and Salimbene both open this possibility. Suffice it to say, Innocent during his time, and within memory after his death, enjoyed a positive perception as an efficient and engaging preacher.

⁶¹ Salimbene de Adam, *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, ed. and trans. Joseph Baird, Giuseppe Baglivi, John Kane (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986), 5.

⁶² Salimbene de Adam, *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, 5.

⁶³ Jansen, “Innocent III and the Literature of Confession,” 369.

⁶⁴ Corinne Vause, Introduction to *Between God and Man: Six Sermons on the Priestly Office*, Pope Innocent III, ed. Corinne Vause and Frank Gardiner (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press), xx.

⁶⁵ Vause, “Introduction” to *Between God and Man*, xxi.

What was the point of Innocent's preaching and his promotion of the role of preacher throughout the Church? Jansen argues that Innocent was concerned with preaching on three levels: against heresy, to support the crusade, and also the "ordinary, everyday preaching of the faith in the local parish."⁶⁶ Vause believes that Innocent avidly attempted to share his Parisian learning with his fellow, less educated clerics.⁶⁷ Innocent would exhort his listeners to sanctity with the rhetorical taxonomy long a favorite of his teacher in Paris: "corde" "ore" and "opere."⁶⁸ For Jansen, this Parisian influence is further solidified with canon ten of the Fourth Lateran Council which orders bishops to "recruit persons mighty in word and work, capable of fulfilling the duty of holy preaching."⁶⁹ Innocent's preaching thus had a two-pronged approach: his own immediate exhortation to the crowds for holiness, and a wider view of the exhortation of the Catholic clergy to do likewise. In the *Gesta Innocentii*, this two-fold pastoral role is present. On the clerical side, the anonymous author attributes Christ-like zeal to Innocent as he overturned money changers' tables found within the Lateran palace and creating restrictions on the payments members of the Curia could extract.⁷⁰ Furthermore the legal proceedings he heard were dealt with in such a "subtle and prudent manner" that "many quite learned men and legal experts frequented the Roman Church simply to hear him."⁷¹ The author then falls into typical hyperbole as these learned men thus "learned more in his [Innocent's] consistories than they had

⁶⁶ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 369.

⁶⁷ Vause, "Introduction to *Between God and Man*," x.

⁶⁸ Keith Kendal, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 7.

⁶⁹ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 370.

⁷⁰ *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III by an Anonymous Author*, trans. James Powell (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 55-56.

⁷¹ *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, 56.

learned in the schools.”⁷² Overall, in the first years of Innocent’s reign, Innocent “pondered how he could extirpate it [venality] from the Roman Church.”⁷³ This focus on clerical reform is supplemented in the later parts of the *Gesta* as a reader sees Innocent preaching to the laity:

Moreover, he established at the same hospital [Holy Spirit at St. Mary in Sassia] the solemn station for the first Sunday after the Epiphany, on which the Christian people flocked there to see and venerate the *suadarium* [The towel of St. Veronica] of the Savior . . . to hear and understand the exhortatory sermon, which the Roman Pontiff delivers there about the works of piety and meriting and obtaining forgiveness of sins which is promised to those exercising the works of mercy, to which as others he summons them not only with words but by example.⁷⁴

Furthermore, the *Gesta* also recounts Innocent “exhorting the rich and powerful equally by word and example to give alms.”⁷⁵ Innocent perceived the business of caring for neighbor’s bodily needs as a job fit for the laity. The boundless youthful energy which Robert Brentano believes Innocent possessed is exhibited in Innocent’s twofold spiritual reforms: rooting out corruption in the Curia and clergy, and promoting an active charitable spirituality among the laity through exhortatory sermons.

This double focus is further explained by Kendall. He describes Innocent thusly:

A “moral theologian” who was interested in applying Christian theology to the task of informing and reforming society, Innocent’s originality and importance lay in his ability to take accepted theological ideas, apply them creatively and persuasively to specific situations, and implement societal change by means of his papal authority, which included judicial and legal means.⁷⁶

⁷² *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, 56.

⁷³ *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, 55

⁷⁴ *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, 259.

⁷⁵ *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, 258.

⁷⁶ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 44.

Kendall also argues that Innocent's sentiments regarding preaching were very similar to those of Alan of Lille, who saw preaching as "the manifest and public instruction for mores and faith."⁷⁷ Kendall compares Alan's ideas to Innocent's sentiments in the prologue of his sermon collection to Arnold, abbot of Cîteaux saying, "a preacher ought principally to attend to the instruction of faith and to the formation of life."⁷⁸ This "instruction of faith and formation of life" would take several forms. *Ecce Veniet propheta magnus*, was a sermon primarily for clerics, while *Ego sum pastor bonus* was Innocent setting himself up as the "pastor of last resort" for his flock.⁷⁹ Furthermore, Kendall quotes Brenda Bolton who believed that Innocent possessed a legitimate care for the religiosity of common people.⁸⁰ The motivation of Innocent's sermons appears twofold: on one hand, Kendall sees Innocent as transitional, preaching in both Latin and the vernacular to the lay.⁸¹ On the other, Innocent is supremely concerned with clerics performing their pastoral duty and preaching to their flock lest they become "mute dogs unable to bark."⁸²

Contemporaries thus saw Innocent as a preacher of merit. His role as pope would also have lent importance to his sermons, even if they did not match the theology of other preachers and schoolmen at the time. How then did Innocent as preacher fit into the wider world of late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century preaching? Beverly Mayne Kienzle calls preaching "the central literary genre in the lives of European Christians and Jews during the Middle Ages. . . [it

⁷⁷ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 56.

⁷⁸ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 56.

⁷⁹ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 152, 190.

⁸⁰ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 37.

⁸¹ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 121.

⁸² Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 221.

was] the primary medium for Christian clergy to convey religious education to lay audiences.”⁸³ James Powell mentions that “the study of the role of preaching is central to an understanding of the nature of the Church.”⁸⁴ Preachers attracted large crowds as the medium tapped into medieval Europe’s oral culture.⁸⁵ Sermons are the bridge between God and man, the between one who “perceives the will or mind (*sensum*) of God,” to those who do not: the literate to the illiterate.⁸⁶

The preaching of the thirteenth century has roots in the monastic preaching of the twelfth-century as well as the early school masters. The monastic preaching of the twelfth-century was obviously focused on monks and would revolve around the exegesis of one or two words.⁸⁷ These sermons were mainly inward looking and were part of the communal liturgy, sometimes given two times a day, focusing on the life of monks.⁸⁸ The schoolmen of the twelfth-century had a wider focus. Mark Zier uses Alan of Lille’s definition of preaching from Alan’s *Ars Praedicandi* as “the manifest and public instruction for mores and faith.” This definition is applicable to most preaching but more specifically applies to that of the schoolmen of the late

⁸³ Beverly Mayne Kienzle, introduction to *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 143.

⁸⁴ James Powell, Forward to *Between God and Man: Six Sermons on the Priestly Office*, Pope Innocent III, ed. Corinne Vause, and Frank Gardiner (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press), vii.

⁸⁵ Kienzle, “Introduction to *The Sermon*,” 143.

⁸⁶ Kienzle, “Introduction to *The Sermon*,” 153, 154.

⁸⁷ Beverly Mayne Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 271.

⁸⁸ Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 271, 272, 278, 306.

twelfth-century.⁸⁹ It was at this point that preaching to lay audiences was becoming popular and the schoolmen had to be able to preach to a variety of audiences.⁹⁰ Preaching to the laity grew to such an extent that the Third Lateran Council in 1179 had to draw up regulations.⁹¹ Many masters would eventually become abbots, and thus a good deal of their preaching would also be in a monastic context.⁹² Peter the Chanter would enshrine preaching, “praedicare,” as one of the essential aspects of a theologian.⁹³ Thus, the early thirteenth century would be a turning point in the medium of preaching, as slowly the “evil silence” which Peter the Chanter had fulminated against was lifted as clerics slowly became better educated in this role.⁹⁴ Innocent himself, probably due to his Parisian training, was well aware of the lack of qualified preachers and devoted canon ten of the Fourth Lateran Council to instructing preachers.⁹⁵ The schoolmen of the late twelfth-century provide an important moment in the evolution of preaching between the inward looking monastic preaching to the outward manifestation of faith which would come with the Mendicants.

The preaching of the schoolmen changed rhetorically as well, away from the exegesis of a solitary word which was so popular in monastic preaching, toward focusing on an entire text.

⁸⁹ Mark Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 325.

⁹⁰ Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” 326.

⁹¹ Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” 326.

⁹² Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” 334.

⁹³ Baldwin, *Masters Princes and Merchants*, 12,14.

⁹⁴ D.L. D’Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 15.

⁹⁵ D’Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 15, 25.

Mark Zier argues that Old Testament texts lent themselves to monastic/scholastic audiences, while New Testament passages were generally preached to the lay and the less educated. After the initial comment on the text, the preacher might then segue into a larger discussion.⁹⁶ By far the most common and ubiquitous device these preachers used were rhythmic triplets, called tricolons.⁹⁷ Zier uses an example from a sermon of Peter Comestor, a late twelfth-century theologian, to illustrate:

Prima ergo humilitas est domestica,
 Secunda erratica,
 Tertio sophistica,
 Quarta Dominica.
 Prima enim est naturalis,
 Secunda volatilis,
 Tertia verspellis,
 Quarta admirabilis

Per primam incedunt pusillanimes,
 Per secundam murmurantes,
 Per tertiam hypocritae trites
 Per quartam columbae
 simplices⁹⁸

Each division would then be provided with scriptural proofs and ultimately this rhetorical device would lend itself to the creation of the *distinctiones*. Another rhetorical device these schoolmen would popularize is the *exemplum*, the use of short stories from “the Bible, saints’ lives, the *Dialogues* of Gregory, the writings of Bede, bestiaries, and lapidaries.”⁹⁹ This late twelfth-century rhetorical and theological focus would have influenced Innocent while he was at Paris.

⁹⁶ Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” 336.

⁹⁷ Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” 336-337.

⁹⁸ Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” 337.

⁹⁹ Zier, “Sermons of the Twelfth-Century Schoolmasters and Canons,” 337.

The next major movement in preaching that would come after Innocent's lifetime would be the Mendicants. Starting with St. Francis and St. Dominic, the Mendicants would dominate Europe at all levels of society through the *vita apostolica* and preaching charism. An important work on the preaching of the mendicants is David D'Avray's book *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300*. This technical book focuses more on the medium of preaching aids and shows the apparatus with which Innocent's sermon collections would have been gathered and disseminated through the course of the thirteenth century.

Model sermon collections were the medium for this expansion of the role of the preacher. These manuscripts are scattered throughout European libraries and are an area where historians have an *embarrass de richesses*.¹⁰⁰ The most important manuscripts by far were ordered around the liturgical year. This genre has four sub categories: *de tempore*, *de sanctis*, *de communi sanctorum* and *de quadragesima* sermons. *De tempore* were for general Sunday sermons, *de sanctis* for feast days, *de communi sanctorum* specifically for saints' feast days, and *de quadragesima* functioned as Lenten sermons.¹⁰¹ While these appear in nice tidy categories, D'Avray believes that many sermons fit a combination of these four categories and that a single sermon can exhibit many different functions.¹⁰² *Date Eleemosynam* is one such sermon, as it is placed as a *de tempore* sermon in the manuscript but content wise could be categorized as a *de quadragesima* sermon.

These model sermon collections were then dispersed throughout Europe. For example, St. Bonaventure's Sunday sermons were copied at Paris by the "peciae" system. D'Avray says

¹⁰⁰ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 13.

¹⁰¹ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 78-79.

¹⁰² D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 79.

we can view this process as similar to modern notions of publishing.¹⁰³ This system created standardized copies quickly and efficiently:

A Parisian university stationer produced an exemplar of a work in demand. The exemplar in theory, but evidently not often in practice, was an authoritative text, representing a carefully written and scrupulously corrected copy of the author's autograph or his fair copy. This exemplar was written in quires of four or eight folios, called *peciae*, which were numbered in sequence and were left separated, instead of being bound as a codex. Any scholar who wanted a copy of the work, rented, or had a scribe rent, the exemplar from the stationer, one or more *peciae* at a time—a practice which permitted several copies at varying stages of completion to be made concurrently.¹⁰⁴

To view model sermon collections as intransigent monolithic blocks, however, would be a mistake. Many times these collections would be broken up, and individual sermons would be mixed and matched according to an editor's preference.¹⁰⁵ It was not uncommon to see the texts of these sermons “evolve.”¹⁰⁶ D'Avray speculates that many of them would be used for private reading and believes that, on the whole, sermon collections were a “multi-purpose genre” which could be read for devotional or educational purposes as well.¹⁰⁷ D'Avray muddies the waters even further by stating that “any short simple treatise dealing with faith or morals could be regarded as a potential aid for catechetical preaching.”¹⁰⁸ Model sermon collections were thus as diverse as the audience they were preached to and the contexts in which they were created.

To supplement D'Avray's sentiments about the model sermon genre, Carlo Delcorno presents an interesting phenomenon which is directly applicable to the *Libellus*:

¹⁰³ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 96-97.

¹⁰⁴ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 98-99.

¹⁰⁵ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 99.

¹⁰⁶ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 101.

¹⁰⁷ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 126.

¹⁰⁸ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 88.

Often the Lenten cycles came to be rewritten in the form of treatises on the vices and virtues. The *Collationes de peccatis* of Aldobrandino da Toscanella exist in two redactions, in homiletic form and in the form of a treatise. The famous *Libellus de moribus hominum et de officiis nobilium super ludo scaccorum*, composed around 1300 by Iacopo da Cessole “was born as the re-edited version of series of sermons recited to the people and to the nobility, that is sermons dedicated to the laity and eventually combined in a sermon cycle in which the various social states were also examined.”¹⁰⁹

Most of the examples which Delcorno gives are from the fifteenth and sixteenth century.

Delcorno believes that the fifteenth century was a time when the “form of treatise was emphasized in the sermons collections.”¹¹⁰ While this reinforces D’Avray’s point about the mutability of the model sermon medium, it also directly influences the present thesis. If Lenten sermons were on occasion turned into *Libelli*, this may explain why *Date Eleemosynam* was converted into the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*. This topic and explanation will be brought up in chapter three.

Who were the recipients of these sermons? The answer to this question is not as straightforward as one would think. While most of these sermons were for the laity, it would be wrong to see this as the sole reason for the model sermon’s existence. D’Avray takes a middle course, and thinks sermons should be viewed as “a cultural phenomenon in which both clergy and laity participated in different ways and degrees.”¹¹¹ Sermons should be seen as containing two levels: elementary and supplementary.¹¹² This distinction is needed because D’Avray brings up several examples of sermons which, at face value, may have been appropriate for the laity,

¹⁰⁹ Carlo Delcorno, “Medieval Preaching in Italy (1200-1500),” in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 506, 507.

¹¹⁰ Delcorno, “Medieval Preaching in Italy,” 507.

¹¹¹ D’Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 64.

¹¹² D’Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 82.

but on closer examination, exhibit areas which are beyond an average layman's knowledge.¹¹³ Sermon collections were fluid sources, and would have to be modified for lay or clerical audience, although D'Avray does admit that using a model sermon for, perhaps, a university sermon to faculty, would have been bad form on the part of the preacher.¹¹⁴ In all, the question of audience seems to border on a moot point for D'Avray:

Drawing these threads together, one is led towards the conclusion that the line between clerical and popular preaching was a faint one, easy to cross when a model sermon collection was being put together....sermons 'to both clergy and laity,' *tam clero quam populo*...could be represented in the collection. Guibert does not seem to find this lack of homogeneity surprising. Were his sermons to the people very different from his sermons to the clergy, except for the language?¹¹⁵

D'Avray's sentiments regarding the medium follow a certain pattern: sermon collection, focus, audience: all are mutable.

D'Avray is "very loath" to deny that the laity were the main recipients of sermons, yet believes this obscures a wider use.¹¹⁶ He believes by the thirteenth century that the distance between clerical "culture" and lay "culture" was rapidly shrinking and was one area in which the mendicants would ultimately try to bridge.¹¹⁷ Rather, the difference D'Avray presents is educated versus uneducated. The "evil silence" of clerics which Peter the Chanter inveighed against appears to be a problem which a continental wide diffusion of sermon aids could fix for both clerics and laity. At this point, the upper levels of lay society would have received some sort

¹¹³ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 112.

¹¹⁴ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 111, 123-24.

¹¹⁵ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 123.

¹¹⁶ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 124.

¹¹⁷ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 43.

of education, and Flanders by the thirteenth century had a basic education system for the laity.¹¹⁸ Italy had the largest proportion of educated lay men and one should assume that preaching was done to a fairly educated audience.¹¹⁹ This revival of orthodox preaching in the late twelfth- and early thirteenth-centuries was inherently wrapped up in a larger current of lay revival and spirituality. Innocent was directly involved in this movement, through both his own preaching to the laity and clergy, as well as his involvement with the *opus caritatis*.

Date Eleemosynam, or the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*, stands at a two-level intersection. The first is preaching. Peter the Chanter and Innocent both saw the lack of qualified preachers as a grave problem for the Church and worked to fix it. In tandem with the expansion of preaching, the works of charity and hospitals were also growing, mainly due to the increase of urban life and lay spirituality. *Date Eleemosynam* overlaps both movements as it intersects with two epicenters of lay spirituality. Innocent appeared to be aware of these movements and he attempted to assist both with his decrees in the Fourth Lateran Council, the foundation of *Sancto Spirito*, and the approval of several caritative orders. His sermon *Date Eleemosynam* is a small feature of Innocent's wider concerns for his flock. With this context in mind, the next chapter will systematically examine the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*. The examination will focus on how its message is applicable to the laity, as well as its rhetoric which also indicates a lay audience. Innocent's reign was placed at a time of transition between the twelfth- and thirteenth-centuries. We see several elements of that transformation in *Date Eleemosynam*.

¹¹⁸ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 37-38.

¹¹⁹ D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, 31-35.

CHAPTER II

Alms, Spiritual Reward, and Engaging the Laity: The Content and Structure of the *Libellus*.

This chapter will focus on an in-depth reading of the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*'s content, rhetoric, and structure. Corinne Vause in her dissertation, "The Sermons of Innocent III: A Rhetorical Analysis" argues that Innocent's mindset was formed by a "mystical" viewpoint. She says:

Innocent's attitude toward his work and toward all of human life was that of a mystic, that is, his mind was always focused on the final cause of human existence as he understood it. Like Augustine before him, his question was always, "quare...quare...quare?" The answer to the question was the ultimate cause of all things: God's desire that everyone and everything be united with Him in His glory. With this objective always before him, Innocent III viewed every worldly concern in the light of eternity.¹²⁰

This "mystical" view of the world is an ever present part of *Date Eleemosynam*. Innocent almost unilaterally sees alms as a means toward achieving eternal beatitude. However, this mystical view also gives way to a legal one, as Innocent will insert canonical debate regarding who should give and who should be given to in the sermon. The brilliant Brian Tierney expertly lays forth the parameters of these debates in his work, *Medieval Poor Law: A Sketch of Canonical Theory and its Application in England*. I will use this work to contextualize Innocent's seemingly unnecessary digressions. John Moore believes that Innocent brought his Parisian training to his sermons, but not his legal education.¹²¹ We shall see this was not the case

¹²⁰ Corinne Vause, "The Sermons of Innocent III: a Rhetorical Analysis" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbra, 1994), 229.

¹²¹ John Moore, "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," *Romische Historische Mitteilungen* 36, (1994): 88.

in *Date Eleemosynam*. These two seemingly opposed mindsets, mystical and legal, both find a place in *Date Eleemosynam*.

I have alluded to the lay audience of *Date Eleemosynam* in chapter one, and I wish to expand upon my suppositions a bit here. John Moore believes that one way to determine Innocent's audience was by his manner of address. He says that when referring to a clerical audience, Innocent would use terms such as "fratres" or "filii."¹²² This, however, is not a perfect barometer, as sometimes Innocent would address non-clerical audiences with the term "fratres."¹²³ Lay audiences, on the other hand, would be referred to as "Christiane." In *Date Eleemosynam* Innocent addresses his audience only once and says: "Rogo te, frater, et hortor, et precor, et moneo, quisquis es, Christiane."¹²⁴ The first part, "frater" could indicate a potential clerical audience, but the final word "Christiane" shows that it was meant more likely for a lay audience. Moore also believes that Innocent had a rather flippant way of address when speaking to his flock.¹²⁵ We see this especially in his offhand remark about the "scholastici" and the disputes they carry on regarding how much one should give.¹²⁶ His seeming disregard for describing nuanced scholastic disputes leads me to believe that while Innocent wanted to educate his audience, he knew what material would be lost upon them. This offhand reference to scholastics, along with D'Avray's mention that it would have been bad form to give a model sermon to a university audience, confirm to me, that this was not meant for well-trained clerics,

¹²² Moore, "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 94.

¹²³ Moore, "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 94.

¹²⁴ Moore, "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 97.

¹²⁵ Moore, "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 96, 97.

¹²⁶ *PL* 217: 759 A, "licet de mercede prostibuli soleant scholastici disputare."

if it was meant for clerics at all. At best, if this sermon was given to the clergy, it was most likely poorly educated priests who would have used the sermon to educate themselves for their own sermons to their own flocks. Thus, even if given to clerics, it was still written with the assumption that this would eventually be disseminated to an urban or parochial audience.

We also know that Innocent did preach some of his Lenten sermons to the laity and that he saw almsgiving as primarily a lay endeavor. Innocent himself referred to preaching to both the clergy and the lay in Latin and the vernacular in his preface to Arnold, so we know that Innocent did at certain points preach to the lay.¹²⁷ Moore says that Innocent, in a Lenten sermon “complained that necessity often stood in the way of . . . the season of Lent, when he should be preaching to the people even more than usual the press of duties kept him from doing so.”¹²⁸ In addition, his sermon regarding Mary Magdalene, has “a fairly direct appeal to the laity to practice the corporal works of mercy.”¹²⁹ Vause agrees with this, as she believes Innocent’s Christocentric world view led him to push the laity to prayers, fasting, and almsgiving.¹³⁰ When one considers medieval society, the laity emerges as the most likely target audience for such exhortations to almsgiving. Innocent may have thought his fellow priests needed to give alms as well, but his typical clerical exhortation was for sexual purity and leadership of their flock and not almsgiving.¹³¹ I say with some degree of certainty then, that *Date Eleemosynam* was a sermon primarily meant for the laity.

¹²⁷ Moore, “The Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 94.

¹²⁸ Moore, “The Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 109.

¹²⁹ Moore, “The Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 99, 135.

¹³⁰ Vause, “The Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 80.

I will use Jacques-Paul Migne's edition in the *Patrologia Latina* for this chapter. A full investigation and discussion of the manuscript tradition of the *Date Eleemosynam* will be provided in chapter three; however, a few statements regarding it should be made here. The *Libellus* can be found in manuscripts Vat Lat 700 and 10902, as well as others, both of which are Innocentian model sermon collections. I have compared both Vat Lat 700 and 10902 to the Migne edition and both show a well transcribed edition. There is one instance in *Caput I* where a phrase is missing, but by far this is the most egregious transcription error and will be noted later in this chapter. At places one also finds word order changed. Generally speaking however, when one views the *PL* one views an excellent transcription. Migne himself should not receive credit for this, as most likely through luck as much as anything, he chose the 1575 Cologne edition for the *PL* which came from the expertly transcribed 1552 edition. A comparison of these two Cologne editions is demonstrated in appendix two. One of the main differences that I can find between the two manuscripts and the *PL* is the absence of *Caput VI*. Both manuscripts end the sermon with Innocent's final exhortation to give alms and do not include a chapter dedicated solely to the role of perseverance. In addition, the chapter headings are also not original to these Vatican manuscripts, or any of the French manuscripts I have viewed. With the assumption that these chapter headings were added by the 1552 editor (which may be wrong there could be a Late Medieval manuscript that denotes *Date Eleemosynam* as a *Libellus*), the chapter headings expose an editor who knew his business. The chapter markings are well placed to indicate a transition in Innocent's thought patterns. This might explain why the 1552 transcription is so precise: the editor had read his transcription carefully and understood where

¹³¹ Moore, "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 94, 95.

chapter markings were appropriate. My decision to use the *PL* edition imitates Vause, who also used the *PL* for her dissertation.¹³² She says:

[William] Imkamp has researched the Lateran IV sermon extensively and has concluded that the version in Migne is substantially correct. Helene Tillman's meticulously documented biography of Innocent also treats the Migne edition as authentic.¹³³

By comparing the two manuscripts to the *PL* I am forced to agree.

My analysis shall be structured around the added chapters for two reasons. The first is that these chapters are well placed: they accurately draw attention to the pauses and development of Innocent's thought as he wrote *Date Eleemosynam*. The second was touched on in the first chapter and will be mentioned again in the third. The *Libellus de Eleemosyna* is the legitimate title for a work, credited to Innocent, which was read as a little book from 1552 onwards.

Innocent's works and arguments about almsgiving do not suddenly become bastardized because the form of his message changed. Untold people from 1552 onwards read this booklet, with this chapter structure, with the understanding that it was Innocent's words and ideas. They were not wrong on this count, and it would be wrong also to shun a particular structure simply because it was not medieval or original. On the whole, the *PL* appears to be a relatively reliable edition of *Date Eleemoysnam* turned *Libellus*.

The *Libellus de Eleemosyna* runs a little over 6,000 words in the *Patrologia Latina*. The first chapter deals with the eleven spiritual effects that alms produce and gives the corresponding Scripture passages which attempt to prove these effects. Chapter two avoids the constrained style of the first chapter and focuses on the good that alms accomplish for the giver himself: mainly the attainment of everlasting beatitude. At this point, Innocent turns the *Libellus* away

¹³² Vause "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 21.

¹³³ Vause, "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 21.

from simply stating the effects alms produce toward instructing an audience on how one should give. The third chapter acts as a foil to the first, as Innocent rhetorically asks whether alms are sufficient for cleansing a world filled with sin and vice. Innocent is able to overcome his “opponent” by showing that charity must be the primary motivation for one’s alms. In the fourth and shortest chapter, Innocent places the efficacy of alms above fasting and prayer. The fifth is the longest chapter and Innocent moves beyond a simple exhortation for charity into a complex web of distinctions as he provides the cause and end, mode and order of almsgiving. As cause and end—charity and beatitude—were already examined in preceding chapters, Innocent focuses most heavily on order and provides a complex understanding of who to give to and which material goods are acceptable to give. Finally, he, or whoever added this chapter, ends the *Libellus* with a chapter dedicated to perseverance, thus promoting a life-long commitment to almsgiving.

Caput I: Date Eleemosynam, et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis.

This chapter begins with Innocent proclaiming that the world can be cleansed by the power of giving alms.¹³⁴ Innocent invokes God as witness for the efficacy of alms, stating that nobody is worthier to commend the giving of alms than “ipsa Veritas.”¹³⁵ Innocent then investigates the very nature of the word “eleemoysna.” He proposes that it is a combination of the words, “eli” and “moys:”

Nam Eleemosyna dicitur ab elimino, vel ab eli, quod est Deus, et moys, quod est aqua; quia Deus per eleemosynam maculas peccatorum eliminat, et sordes abluit vitiorum.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ *PL*, col. 745d: “Date eleemosynam, et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis.”

¹³⁵ *PL*, col. 746d: “Nemo dignius posset eleemosynam commendare, quam ipsa Veritas commendavit.”

¹³⁶ *PL*, col. 747a.

For “Eleemosyna” comes from to eliminate, or from “Eli,” which is God, and “moys” which is water, because God, through alms, eliminates the stains of sins, and washes out the filth of vice.

The word “eli” is most famously used by Christ during the passion, “eli eli, lema sabachthani?”¹³⁷ Remigius Autissiodorensis, a Benedictine monk who focused on Latin grammar and philology during the Carolingian period, writes in his *Commentum Einsidlense in Donati Artem maiorem* that “moys” is what the Greeks called water, originating from the name of Moses or “Moyses,” who produced water by striking the rock in Exodus 17.¹³⁸ Thus “alms” by its etymological origins means “God washes.” This main point will be a consistent aspect in Innocent’s thinking throughout the *Libellus*: alms are primarily used by God to cleanse sin, usually in the giver. Innocent adds to this by mentioning that alms assist the “indigenti pietatis.”¹³⁹ Innocent toys with a double meaning of “indigent;” Niermeyer’s Medieval Latin dictionary defines the word “indigentia” as “lack, want, indigence, privation, shortage, need, hardship, famine.”¹⁴⁰ This double meaning of “indigentia” is masterfully used to evoke a correlation between the plight of the pauper, and the privation of the impious. This short introduction puts forth the origins of the word “eleemosyna” and presents the main function of almsgiving.

¹³⁷ RSV, Matthew 27:46.

¹³⁸ *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Remigius of Auxerre” accessed October 25, 2016, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12764a.htm>. Remigius Autissiodorensis, “Commentum Einsidlense in Donati Artem maiorem” libri I-II. Page 234, line 28. Accessed on Brepols Cross Database search tool, October 20, 2016, “moys.”

¹³⁹ *PL*, col. 747a: “Eleemosyna quidem est, indigenti pietatis intuitu subvenire.”

¹⁴⁰ J.F. Niermeyer and C. Van de Kieft, eds., “Indigentia,” *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Boston: Brill, 2002).

Innocent then proceeds to explain the effects of alms:

Nam eleemosyna mundat, eleemosyna liberat, eleemosyna redimit, eleemosyna protegit, eleemosyna postulat, eleemosyna impetrat, eleemosyna perficit, eleemosyna benedicit, eleemosyna justificat, eleemosyna resuscitat, eleemosyna salvat.¹⁴¹

For almsgiving cleanses, almsgiving frees, almsgiving liberates, almsgiving redeems, almsgiving protects, almsgiving prays for, almsgiving obtains, almsgiving completes, almsgiving blesses, almsgiving justifies, almsgiving reawakens, almsgiving saves.

Innocent sticks to a redundant and methodical explanation of each effect of almsgiving. He first begins with an effect, such as “mundat,” provides a Bible verse which contains the effect and is dealing with almsgiving, and then finishes with “Ecce qualiter eleemosyna mundat.”¹⁴² This is the same for each effect except “redimit.” Innocent followed the first part of the formula by using the Prophet Daniel’s exhortation to Nebuchadnezzar to give alms and mentions “redime” in the quotation, yet no concluding formula is found in the *PL*.¹⁴³ This can be corrected by referencing Vat Lat 700 and Vat Lat 10902 which both have, “Ecce Qualiter eleemosyna redimit.”¹⁴⁴ While it seems that alms have eleven effects, in reality all of Innocent’s exegesis points to the fact that alms either save the giver from eternal damnation or admit them to Heaven. Innocent’s distinctions are essentially a rhetorical feature, as Vause mentions that Innocent enjoyed word and phrase repetition for added emphasis.¹⁴⁵ Tobit, Nebuchadnezzar, Cornelius,

¹⁴¹ *PL*, col. 747a.

¹⁴² *PL*, col. 747a.

¹⁴³ *PL*, col. 747b: “Daniel autem dixit ad Nabuchodonosor: ‘Placeat tibi consilium meum, rex, et peccata tua eleemosynis redime, et iniquitates tuas misericordiis pauperum, forsitan ignoscet Deus delictis tuis (Dan. IV).’”

¹⁴⁴ Vat Lat 700, fol. 21 r; Vat Lat 10902, fol. 58 r.

¹⁴⁵ Vause, “The Sermons of Innocent III,” 104, 111.

Tabitha, and Zachaeus all follow this rule, as each is exhorted to give alms to save his soul.¹⁴⁶

There is one exception to this. Tobit is used as an example a second time; he is saved from mortal death when he is assisted in hiding from the king on account of his good works.¹⁴⁷ This long list of effects certainly sets the stage for an audience and shows Innocent's scriptural aptitude. In addition, the use of proper names from the Bible could have been an attempt to present a closer parallel between these legendary figures of Scripture and the audience at hand. Innocent's first chapter sets the stage with an important Bible quote, "Date Eleemosynam, et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis," and shows Innocent's ability with Scriptures.

Caput II: Effectus eleemosynae ex sacrae Scripturae testimoniis multifariam probari

In chapter two there is an evolution of Innocent's style mixed with a tightening of his focus. Compared to chapter one, we see a change from the methodical progression of a solitary scriptural example to prove an effect toward a more fluid approach. Innocent still uses many biblical quotes: however, the staccato structure of chapter one has been dropped. Instead of focusing on the "many" effects of almsgiving, Innocent tightens his focus on proving a distinct point: alms assist the giver more than the receiver. Here, his "mystical" view is most explicit.

Innocent begins his second chapter by stating that there are many other effects of almsgiving which can be known through sacred Scriptures.¹⁴⁸ He rhetorically asks what good work is necessary to quell the fear and anxiety of those who worry about the means of achieving

¹⁴⁶ *PL*, col. 747a-748b.

¹⁴⁷ *PL*, col. 747c: "Tobias vero, quia pergens 'per omnem cognationem suam, dividebat unicuique prout poterat de facultatibus suis, esurientes alebat, nudisque vestimenta praebebat, et mortuis sepulturam sollicitus impendebat,' cum rex jussisset illum occidi, 'fugiens nudus latuit, quia multi diligebant eum (Tob. I).' Ecce qualiter eleemosyna protegit."

¹⁴⁸ *PL*, col. 748b: "Sunt quoque et alii plures eleemosynarum effectus, quos ex subjectis testimoniis poteris cognoscere."

eternal life.¹⁴⁹ His answer to this is Christ's famous exhortation to see Christ in all the suffering and needy of the world:

Esurivi enim, et dedistis mihi manducare; sitivi, et dedistis mihi bibere; hospes eram, et collegistis me; nudus, et cooperuistis me; infirmus, et visitastis me; in carcere, et venistis ad me. Amen dico vobis, quandiu fecistis uni de minimis his fratribus meis, mihi fecistis (Matth. XXV).¹⁵⁰

For I hungered and you gave to me to eat, I thirsted, and you gave to me to drink; I was a stranger and you sheltered me; naked and you covered me; sick and you visited me; in prison and you came to me. Amen I say to you, as long as you did to one of these my littlest brothers, you did for me.

It is those who have cared for their fellow brethren who will obtain life everlasting and it is through this process that the anxiety about attaining eternal life can be quieted.¹⁵¹ This positive message is then juxtaposed to two stories of foolish rich men. The first is the story of the rich man and Lazarus who waits at the rich man's doorstep and is neglected.¹⁵² The second man is one who stores up his riches but dies suddenly in his sleep.¹⁵³ Innocent closes this example by reinforcing the view that whoever hoards his wealth will not be rich in the Lord.¹⁵⁴ This sets up Innocent's following point that the best return for those with material goods is to store them in Heaven.¹⁵⁵ Innocent reinforces this by quoting St. John who directly asks how a member of the

¹⁴⁹ *PL*, col. 748b: "Quid ergo sollicitus quaeris, cur anxius investigas, quid faciendo promerearis vitam aeternam?"

¹⁵⁰ *PL*, col. 748c.

¹⁵¹ *PL*, col. 748b: "Venite, inquit, benedicti Patris mei, possidete regnum paratum vobis a constitutione mundi."

¹⁵² *PL*, col. 748d.

¹⁵³ *PL*, col. 749a.

¹⁵⁴ *PL*, col. 749a: "Sic est qui thesaurizat sibi, et non est dives in Deum."

Church can ignore a brother in need and still have the “charitas Dei” in him.¹⁵⁶ From here Innocent embarks on a litany of biblical figures who were rewarded for their alms. They include the widow at Zarephath who sheltered the Prophet Elijah; Abdias, or Obadiah, who protected the prophets of the Lord from the queen Jezebel; Abraham and Lot who fed the angels of God; Martha and Mary from the New Testament; the disciples on the road to Emmaus; and finally the apostle Paul who collected goods for the brethren.¹⁵⁷ Likewise in the first chapter, Innocent again uses famous figures of the Bible to make his point. From here Innocent has reached the central point of the chapter:

Attende quod Dominus non tam fecit divites propter pauperes, quam pauperes propter divites; quia plus proficit pauper diviti, quam dives pauperi. Dives enim dat pauperi eleemosynam temporalem, pauper autem retribuit diviti mercedem aeternam.¹⁵⁸

Consider, that the Lord does not so much make the rich because of paupers, then paupers because of the rich; because the pauper profits the rich man more than the rich man profits the pauper. For a rich man gives to a pauper temporal alms, however the pauper returns to the rich man eternal recompense.

Innocent uses both Solomon from Proverbs and Ecclesiastics as biblical proof of this metaphysical transaction.¹⁵⁹ This is vital in Innocent’s thought. The overwhelming importance

¹⁵⁵ *PL*, col. 749a: “Facite vobis sacculos, qui non veterascunt, thesaurum non deficientem in coelis.”

¹⁵⁶ *PL*, col. 749b: “Nam juxta Joannis apostoli testimonium: ‘Qui habuerit substantiam hujus mundi, et viderit fratrem suum necessitatem habere, et clauserit viscera sua ab eo, quomodo charitas Dei manet in eo?’ (I Joan. III.)”

¹⁵⁷ *PL*, col. 749c-d: “Commendatur vidua Sareptana...Commendatur Abdias...abscondit et parvit...Commendatur hospitalitas in Abraham et Lot...Commendature in Maria et Martha...Commendatur in duobus discipulis euntibus in Emmaus...Paulus apostolus collectas faciebat.”

¹⁵⁸ *PL* col. 750a.

of the poor's special spiritual ability is outlined further when he clearly states that no temporal goods are able to be carried into eternal life other than alms which are permitted by the hands of the pauper.¹⁶⁰ One realizes that Innocent has now presented the moral of the two stories placed at the beginning of the chapter. The accumulated goods of the man who died in his sleep are worthless as the only beneficial aspect of spiritual recompense that he may have had, was wasted. The example of Lazarus and the rich man show a post-mortem view of how the rich man could have benefited from giving alms to Lazarus and how in the end, the rich man was in greater need of Lazarus than the opposite. Innocent aptly places both stories at the beginning of his chapter and slowly builds up to the full implication of both stories: in the end, rich men need the poor more than the poor need the rich.

Innocent ends his chapter by drawing a correlation between the good achieved on both sides of almsgiving. He says:

In illo cui datur sitim exstinguit, famem expellit, nuditatem operit. In eo vero qui dat, reatum exstinguit, culpam expellit, operitque peccatum.¹⁶¹

In that one whom is given to, it extinguishes thirst, expels famine, and clothes nakedness. But in the other who gives, guilt is extinguished, culpability is expelled, and sin is atoned for.

Innocent specifically uses the same verbs “exstinguit,” “expellit,” and “operit,” to show a direct correlation between the physical, visual removal of want from the pauper, and the spiritual

¹⁵⁹ *PL*, col. 750a: “Unde Salomon: ‘Foeneratur Domino, qui miseretur pauperi, et vicissitudinem reddet ei (Prov. XIX).’ Et alius item sapiens: ‘Eleemosyna viri, quasi sacculus cum ipso, et gratiam hominis quasi pupillam conservabit, et postea resurget et retribuet illis.’”

¹⁶⁰ *PL*, col. 750b: “Nihil de rebus temporalibus universis tecum ex hac vita portabis, praeter eleemosynam solam, quam per manus pauperum praemittis in coelum.”

¹⁶¹ *PL*, col. 750c.

cleansing which is at work in the philanthropist. After this, Innocent seems to burst with enthusiasm as he directly addresses the audience:

O quam digna recompensatio, ut pro eo quod eleemosyna nuditatem corporis tegit in alio, iniquitatem mentis tegat in te. ‘Beati enim, quorum remissae sunt iniquitates, et quorum tecta sunt peccata.’ (Psal. XXXI)¹⁶²

Oh what worthy recompense that because alms touches the nakedness of the body in another man, it touches the iniquity of the mind in you. “For the blessed are those whose iniquities have been sent away, and whose sins have been covered.”

The chapter has been leading up directly and precisely to this rhetorical outburst. Again, Innocent uses the same verb “tegere” to describe the physical action of the naked being clothed with the covering of the “iniquity of the mind” of the donor. As opposed to the beginning of the chapter, in which Innocent opines that there are a multitude of benefits to almsgiving, at the end of the chapter Innocent has linked his scriptural proofs and reasoning toward promoting one point: the spiritual return of alms to the giver is infinitely better than the material object received.

Innocent does not present any difficulty in obtaining this spiritual reward in chapter two. His approach is direct and assured: give alms, and receive spiritual reward. The act of giving alms seems easy and the spiritual rewards quite obtainable. This view will be altered in further chapters as Innocent will present specific criteria for giving alms. This is not the point of the second chapter, however. The chapter’s focus is to introduce and hammer home to the audience the macro-spiritual view of alms, mainly the dependence of the rich on the poor as agents of conversion. Important to note is the language of transaction which is prevalent in the chapter. While Innocent does promote the need to do good works for its own sake—one thinks of his evocation of St. John’s exhortation as the lone example—Innocent is focused primarily on the transactional portion of this spiritual exchange. The rhetoric in Innocent’s language of fusing the

¹⁶² *PL*, col. 750c.

physical evils of the pauper, with the spiritual maladies of the giver adds another layer of motivation for almsgiving. If the spiritual benefits that are produced by almsgiving are greater than the material goods given, it would seem logical to assume that the evil which the spiritual recompense blots out are in fact more hideous than the physical torments afflicting paupers. Reading or hearing this might have shocked, mortified even, a reader into realizing that the state of his soul was in a worse condition than the filth and squalor affecting the indigent. It could have been both unnerving, yet hopeful, as almsgiving is the easiest method for attaining Heaven. In chapter two we see Innocent focused on promoting the ever present necessity of giving alms for the salvation of one's soul.

Caput III: Eleemosynam in peccatis factam non valere ad meritum, nec suum effectum sortiri, esse tamen praeparatoriam ad gratiam Dei consequendam.

Chapter three begins with objections to the meritorious rewards of almsgiving. Innocent begins with the questions of sin and its relation to alms and uses this discussion to segue into a discussion about the necessity of charity. In the second half of the chapter Innocent utilizes the example of the Centurion Cornelius's conversion to Christianity as an opportunity to describe the place alms has in spiritual growth. Innocent constructs a rhetorical parallelism in which he juxtaposes the pious man who falls into sin, and the incontinent man who turns towards the road to salvation. Both revolve around alms or lack thereof. Chapter three builds upon the second chapter, introduces the aspect of charity in giving alms, and is the point in which Innocent slowly turns towards the practical matter of how to give alms.

Innocent begins this chapter with several rhetorical questions based around the premise that alms appears to have failed to produce the effects which Innocent delineated in chapters one and two. He toys with his opening Bible verse from Luke used in the first chapter regarding the cleansing of the world by alms:

Nunquid ergo facientibus eleemosynas omnia munda sunt, ebriosis, adulteris, homicidis, caeterisque vitiorum sordibus involutis?¹⁶³

For surely it cannot be that all have been cleansed by almsgiving, having been enveloped in the filth of vice with drunkenness, adulteries, murders?

He follows this up by questioning whether alms can sufficiently cleanse the world.¹⁶⁴ He quickly refutes this by quoting Leviticus that “filth that touches anything will make it filthy.”¹⁶⁵ Thus the filth of sin will stain alms. Innocent elaborates on this by parsing God’s reception of Abel’s gift:

Unde legitur quod ‘respexit Deus ad Abel et ad munera ejus (Gen. IV).’ Prius dixit: Ad Abel, et postea dixit, Ad munera; quia Deus magis attendit modum in facto, quam factum in modo, id est quomodo aliquid fiat, quam quid aliquo modo fiat.¹⁶⁶

From where it has been written that “God considered Abel and his gift.” First it is said, “Abel,” and afterwards it is said, “his gift;” because God attends more to the manner by which something has been done, than what has been done in that manner, that is, however something is done, than what is done in that manner.

Innocent pays close attention to the progression of the passage, arguing that by mentioning Abel first, and then his gift, God was more focused on the method (*attendit modum*) than on the gift itself. This investigation also gives Innocent a chance at his typical word play as he changes “*modum in facto*” to “*factum in modo*” after the comparative adjective. Innocent follows this up with St. Paul’s exhortation to the Romans that without charity, alms is profitless.¹⁶⁷ He makes a direct appeal to the listener’s disposition by using the imperative “*attende prudenter quod dicit*

¹⁶³ *PL* col. 750d.

¹⁶⁴ *PL*, col. 751a: “*Licenter ergo suas exercent turpitudines, et peragant voluptates, si eleemosyna sufficit ad redimenda peccata, si sufficit ad emundanda delicta?*”

¹⁶⁵ *PL*, col. 751a: “*Absit omnino, quia teste Scriptura: ‘Quidquid immundus tetigerit, immundum erit!’*”

¹⁶⁶ *PL*, col. 751a.

¹⁶⁷ *PL*, col. 751b: “*Attende prudenter quod dicit Apostolus: ‘Si distribuero omnes facultates meas in cibos pauperum, charitatem autem non habeam, nihil mihi prodest (Rom. XIII).’*”

Apostolus” to command attention. This use of the imperative and the command to listen mark the importance in Innocent’s thought in the preceding quote, and is also an exhortation to the listener to comprehend and internalize his quote from St. Paul. In this, his first “section” of chapter three, Innocent explains that the manner of giving alms is the most important aspect in gaining the spiritual benefits which alms produce.

Innocent is ready to launch into the defining element of the chapter: alms must proceed from true charity.¹⁶⁸ This is followed by the colloquial “golden rule” from Matthew 7.¹⁶⁹ It is interesting to note that Innocent invokes it as a warning to his readers as he reminds them that they themselves would wish to be assisted in their need.¹⁷⁰ This invocation to fortune’s wheel is telling, since the beginning of the thirteenth century saw widespread famine and devastation; most likely many had felt the effects of these disasters.¹⁷¹ Innocent then uses the allegory of a tree’s branches to its trunk to define firmly alms’ relation to charity. The fruit of alms, or the branches in this analogy, must be of a “pleasant and mature fruit” and must not be overly rich or moist.¹⁷² Undoubtedly alms are the true fruit of charity, and charity itself covers a multitude of sins.¹⁷³ These are the “good alms,” produced from charity which Innocent desires.

¹⁶⁸ *PL*, col. 751b: “Vera igitur eleemosyna de vera charitate procedit.”

¹⁶⁹ *PL*, col. 751b: “Ad quod pertinet illud: ‘Quaecunque vultis ut faciant vobis homines, et vos facite illis (Matth. VII).’”

¹⁷⁰ *PL*, col. 751b: “Sicut ergo volumus nobis ab aliis in nostris necessitatibus subveniri; sic et nos debemus aliis in suis necessitatibus subvenire, ut sicut nos, ita proximos diligamus.”

¹⁷¹ Bolton, *Hearts not Purses*, 123.

¹⁷² *PL*, col. 751b: “Nisi enim ramus eleemosynae de charitatis radice procedat, non habet pinguedinem vel humorem, ut suavem vel maturum fructum producat.”

¹⁷³ *PL*, col. 751c: “Nam vera eleemosyna, fructus est charitatis. ‘Charitas autem operit multitudinem peccatorum (I Petr. VI).’”

With this settled, Innocent poses another counter argument. He again personifies his rhetorical questioning as an actual opponent with the use of the second person “sed forte oppones.” This fictitious opponent posits that Cornelius, the Roman centurion from the Acts of the Apostles, could not possibly have charity, because charity is dependent upon faith, and good works are only pleasing to God when done with this faith.¹⁷⁴ Innocent responds that Cornelius did indeed have the sacrament of faith precisely because of his alms:

Qui tamen Cornelius per eleemosynas meruit, et ad sacramentum fidei et ad fidem sacramenti venire, quemadmodum angelus ei dixit: ‘Orationes tuae et eleemosynae tuae ascenderunt in memoriam in conspectu Dei (Act. X).’¹⁷⁵

Cornelius, who nevertheless merited through almsgiving, to come both to the sacrament of faith and to the faith of the sacrament, in that manner the Angel said to him, “your prayers and your alms have ascended into the memory and in the sight of God.”

Innocent also uses the testimony of the archangel Raphael that alms purges sin and frees the giver from death.¹⁷⁶ He goes on to explain that this is not the temporary death that all of us must undergo—Innocent reminds us that even Christ underwent this temporal death—but the death of eternal damnation.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ *PL*, col. 751c: “Sed forte oppones quod Cornelius centurio nondum fidem mediatoris habebat, sine qua justus esse non poterat, quia ‘justus ex fide vivit (Rom. I)’ nec ‘sine fide poterat charitatem habere, cum sine fide impossibile sit placere Deo (Hebr. II).”

¹⁷⁵ *PL* col. 751d.

¹⁷⁶ *PL*, col. 751d: “Item cum juxta Raphaelis angeli testimonium eleemosyna tantae sit efficaciae (Job XII), ut a morte liberet et purget peccata.”

¹⁷⁷ *PL*, col. 752a: “Nec hoc de temporali morte possit intelligi, cum omnes omnino necessitati moriendi simus addicti... Nam et “proprio Filio suo non pepercit Deus...” Restat igitur ut illud angelicum de morte intelligatur aeterna; sive culpae, quae praecedit ut causa; sive gehennae, quae succedit ut poena. Sic ergo eleemosyna liberat hominem a morte animae, qualicunque duntaxat sano accipias intellectu.”

From here Innocent has bested his opponent and now begins his discussion on the fall of a good man. He claims that sometimes “maligna suggestio” can be seen in a “homine justo.”¹⁷⁸ This is the very beginning of his large rhetorical structure, a chiasmus of sorts, which parallels the fall of the good man and the salvation of the bad. The term “maligna” has several important meanings. Lewis and Short define it as “malicious, spiteful, or envious”; however, it can additionally mean “stingy, niggardly, or barren.”¹⁷⁹ What implications would “stinginess” have as opposed to a translation of “spiteful?” Stinginess is the vice diametrically opposed to alms. If this is the first step in the corruption of a just man, then it would seem that alms would be the quickest remedy for this ill-fated path, and the easiest way to restore someone to the road of holiness. This might goad the audience into self-examination, and perhaps a bit of anxiety, as a self-examination might find that they too have the “maligna suggestio.” Innocent admits that this is not mortal sin, the death of the soul, which alms can “absolve,” but venial sin which prepares the soul for a fall into greater sin.¹⁸⁰ A prototype of this fall from grace is seen in Adam and Eve. Innocent remarks that the woman sinned by “delectatio” and thus sinned venially.¹⁸¹ This corresponds to the “improba delectatio” of the just man. Likewise, Adam sinned mortally because he consented with reason, thus showing a similarity to the weakened intellect of the just

¹⁷⁸ *PL*, col. 752b: “Praecedit enim in homine justo quaedam maligna suggestio, et succedit quaedam improba delectatio.”

¹⁷⁹ Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, eds., “maligna,” *A Latin Dictionary*.

¹⁸⁰ *PL*, col. 752b: “Licet nondum sit mortalis, sed venialis, debilitat tamen animum et praeparat ad consensum, qui cum accedit, facit hominem peccare mortaliter, cum et ipse sit mortale peccatum.”

¹⁸¹ *PL*, col. 752c: “Mulier, id est delectatio comedit venialiter.”

man.¹⁸² Thus in Adam and Eve, a distinct pattern of venial to mortal sin can be found, as “delectio” is the first step toward the death of the soul. Similarly to the just man who is tempted, a stinginess of spirit is the first step towards “improba delectatio” and the failing of the spirit.

One has now reached the end of the first half of Innocent’s spiritual chiasmic structure. The second half begins when he introduces the “homine impio” who begins his progression toward grace.¹⁸³ The premonition toward holiness mollifies the spirit and anticipates the arrival of grace.¹⁸⁴ This “premonition” is the good works which God will use to further enlighten the sinner to make penance.¹⁸⁵ “Quidquid boni” could then be understood as the almsgiving of the impious man, and a direct opposite to the “malignia” of the just man. Both the desire to give alms and the lack thereof are a premonition for something better or worse to come. As a result, charity and fear of the Lord infuses the soul of the wicked man.¹⁸⁶ Similar to venial sin which precedes deathly moral sin, alms precedes charity and the salvation of the soul.¹⁸⁷ It is important to note that Innocent is not suggesting that alms is sufficient for faith as we saw in the case of

¹⁸² *PL*, col., 752b: “Vir, id est ratio consentit mortaliter. Debilitat tamen animum et praeparat ad consensum Debilitate tamen animum et praeceptat ad consensum.”

¹⁸³ *PL*, col. 752c: “Sic et in homine impio quaedam praeparatoria praecedunt ad gratiam.”

¹⁸⁴ *PL*, col., 752c: “Quae mollificant animum, sicut ignis ceram, (Psal. LXVII), ut imaginem sigilli, hoc est similitudinem Dei per impressionem gratiae supervenientis accipiat.”

¹⁸⁵ *PL*, col. 752c: “Propter quod legitur: Interim fac quidquid boni potes, ut Deus cor tuum illusret ad poenitentiam.”

¹⁸⁶ *PL*, col. 752c: “Cum ergo timor Domini sit initium sapientiae (Eccle. I), profecto praeparatorius est ad gratiam, et ipse sicut cetam filum, charitatem praevious introducit.”

¹⁸⁷ *PL*, col. 752d: “Sic eleemosyna praeter charitatem, vel potius ante charitatem donata, proficit quidem, etsi non sufficit; praeparatoria, licet non promeritoria gratiae vel salutis; per quam tamen pervenitur ad gratiam et salutem.”

Cornelius, as Cornelius still calls for Peter and is subsequently baptized.¹⁸⁸ The main importance of almsgiving is the visible evidence of an interior movement toward God's grace.

Finally, Innocent ends the chapter with an allegorical correlation between the spiritual and temporal benefits of alms. Just as sustenance is fulfilled and thirst destroyed, so too by turning to the "fontem gratiae salutaris" one may be freed from death, culpability, and sin.¹⁸⁹ At this point, Innocent's litany of alms' spiritual effects is redundant. Innocent has, however, now assigned two important aspects to alms. The first is the absolute necessity that charity plays in giving alms. The second is its role as a distinct marker in the spiritual life of the giver. This chapter has acted as something of a "speed bump" in the sermon. Innocent is forced to deal with an "adversary" and from this exchange is able to bring forth a fuller understanding of the means of giving alms.

Caput IV: Eleemosynam jejunio et oratione esse meliorem, nec quemquam ab ea excusari.

Chapter four is the shortest section in the *Libellus*, running a little over 300 words in the *PL*, but is important as it shows how Innocent promotes alms as a specific lay virtue, and opens almsgiving to all. The chapter heading declares that almsgiving is better than fasting or prayer, but that none of these should be ignored.¹⁹⁰ The tradition of the Church promoting prayer, fasting, and almsgiving during Lent is well established and is seen as a means of preparing for the Easter Triduum and the Easter Season. Innocent begins his argument by saying that while

¹⁸⁸ *PL*, col. 752d: "vel potius ante charitatem donate, proficit quidem etsi non sufficit."

¹⁸⁹ *PL*, col. 752d: "Reddit enim hominem habilem, reddit aptum, reddit idoneum, velut sitientem, velut anhelantem, velut appropinquantem ad fontem gratiae salutaris; per quem liberatur a morte, mundatur a culpa, redimitur a peccato."

¹⁹⁰ *PL*, col. 752d: "Caput IV. Eleemosynam jejunio et oratione esse meliorem, nec quemquam ab ea excusari."

fasting subtracts, almsgiving bestows.¹⁹¹ While fasting may remove pleasure for a time, it only seems to increase cupidity after the fast is complete.¹⁹² Innocent accurately anticipates that upon completion of a fast (such as a Lenten fast), many turn to overeating to placate their hunger. With alms, there is a finality to the process which cannot be reversed. Further on, Innocent argues that while fasting takes away from the flesh of one, alms provides sustenance for the body of another.¹⁹³ By showing an understanding of the temptations the laity might have in regards to fasting, Innocent promotes almsgiving as a better alternative.

Innocent then turns to prayer. He says that while prayer is good, alms simultaneously descends to neighbor and ascends to God.¹⁹⁴ Innocent argues that the best prayer is to pray with work, “orare opere.”¹⁹⁵ This principle of “orare opere” appears manifestly fit for lay spirituality. It is evocative of St. Benedict of Nursia’s famous phrase, “ora et labora.” Innocent has thus taken a well-established phrase of the Benedictine community, removed the conjunction and turned the phrase into a lay-specific path to sanctity. The holiness which they might have sought, which would have appeared prevalent in a monastery or religious community, now seems quite obtainable and is placed higher than traditional ecclesiastic virtues of prayer and

¹⁹¹ *PL*, col. 753a: “Bonum est jejunium, sed melior est eleemosyna, quia quod jejunium subtrahit, eleemosyna tribuit.”

¹⁹² *PL*, col. 753a: “Alioquin quod jejunium subtrahit voluptati, reponit cupiditati.”

¹⁹³ *PL*, col. 753a: “Per jejunium enim affligitur caro propria, per eleemosynam vero reficitur aliena.”

¹⁹⁴ *PL*, col. 753a: “Rursum, bonum est orare, sed melius erogare; quoniam eleemosyna agit utrumque, descendens ad proximum, et ascendens ad Deum.”

¹⁹⁵ *PL*, col. 753b: “Qui non desinit bene agere, cum melius sit orare opere, quam sermone.”

fasting. By promoting “orare opere” through almsgiving, Innocent presents a lay option to the famous Benedictine phrase, and gives a lay alternate to monastic spirituality.

Innocent brings up a new issue: what should someone do who wishes to give alms and participate in their efficacious grace, but does not have the means to give?¹⁹⁶ Innocent’s solution is that it is not so much the quantity of the gift, but the devotion with which the gift is given.¹⁹⁷ Innocent relates the story of the widow’s mite, as a widow gave her last two pennies and received great spiritual reward.¹⁹⁸ He establishes a basic principle that one should give according to one’s means.¹⁹⁹ With this principle Innocent opines, one can store up treasure in the day of necessity.²⁰⁰ Innocent says that “Therefore a pauper himself should not be excused because it suffices that the desire be rich when the faculties are poor.”²⁰¹ Thus Innocent ends his chapter with exhorting all, rich and poor, to give.

While terse, this chapter serves an important purpose. First it lifts a quintessential urban and lay virtue above virtues proper to the clergy, such as prayer and fasting. While Innocent’s proof for this spiritual taxonomy is lacking, this very lack of esoteric proof may have resonated

¹⁹⁶ *PL*, col. 753b: “Sed dices: Ego sum pauper, egenus, et inops (Apoc. III), non habeo panem, non habeo vestem, non habeo stipem, ut quidquam valeam erogare.”

¹⁹⁷ *PL*, col. 753b: “Nec tam attendit in munere quantitatem, quam devotionem in opere; pensans magis ex quanto, quam quantum.”

¹⁹⁸ *PL*, col. 753b: “Respiciens enim Jesus, vidit eos qui mittebant munera sua in gazophylacium divites. Vidit autem quamdam viduam pauperculam mittentem aera minuta duo, et dixit: ‘Amen dico vobis quia vidua pauper plus quam omnes misit.’”

¹⁹⁹ *PL*, col. 753c: “Unde Tobias: ‘Quomodo poteris, esto misericors. Si multum tibi est, abundanter tribue; si exiguum, etiam exiguum illud libenter impartiri stude.’”

²⁰⁰ *PL*, col. 753c: “Praemium enim bonum tibi thesaurizas in die necessitates.”

²⁰¹ *PL*, col. 753c: “Non ergo se paupertas excuset, quia sufficit ut voluntas sit dives, ubi facultas est pauper.”

better with a lay audience. His proofs are short and easy to understand. They use a minimal amount of biblical quotation and stick to easily discernable evidence. The second half of the chapter then opens the virtue of alms to all the laity. As Innocent has made the virtue applicable to all, he is now ready to proceed into his fifth and longest chapter: a specific manual on the nuances of how to give alms.

Caput V: Eleemosynae faciendae quisnam debeat esse ordo, modus, causa et finis

Innocent's byzantine fifth chapter is the longest and contains lists and scriptural distinctions that are not always separate but interwoven and tortuous; the chapter demands close study to elucidate Innocent's train of thought. It also shows Innocent's canonical training, as the second half of the chapter explicitly deals with the legal issues of almsgiving. Brian Tierney believes that by the thirteenth century, canonists were describing the relationship between rich and poor in juridical terms.²⁰² Innocent blends this aspect of the sermon with the pastoral message which has been prevalent throughout. He starts the chapter with four different aspects of almsgiving, which serve as a road map for the rest of the chapter: they are "causam et finem, modum et ordinem."²⁰³ His use of "et" to group the four aspects of alms will be significant as he continues on in the chapter. "Causam" and "finem" are closely related; the former should proceed from charity while the latter should be done on account of beatitude.²⁰⁴ These two aspects are the metaphysical component which undergirds the more "material" parts of

²⁰² Brian Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law: A Sketch of Canonical Theory and its Application in England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), 7-9.

²⁰³ *PL*, col. 753d.

²⁰⁴ *PL*, col. 753d: "Causam, ut fiat ex charitate; finem, ut [Col.0753D] fiat propter beatitudinem."

almsgiving: the “modum” or “disposition,” and the order of giving.²⁰⁵ As we will see, it is “ordinem” which engrosses Innocent and creates a long-winded explanation of who should be given to and what should be given.

Innocent again provides his usual scriptural proofs for each component after this brief introduction to the sections of almsgiving. As he had already mentioned in chapter three, Innocent here again references the allegory of the good tree with the good fruit, and the necessity of charity if one is to receive any benefits from one’s eleemosynary actions.²⁰⁶ Strangely, Innocent then introduces a new idea into a concept already established; almsgiving can be “debited” *beyond* charity in three ways: the ability of receiving grace, the mitigation of eternal punishment, and the obtaining of some temporal good.²⁰⁷ What role do these new distinctions play in regards to almsgiving and charity? I speculate that these three aspects, the reception of grace, mitigation of hellish punishments, and obtaining of some temporal goods are all “lesser” reasons for giving alms. If charity is the pinnacle reason to give, then these three are the “imperfect” but still acceptable reasons for giving alms. There is some difficulty however, with the phrase “bonum aliquod temporal.” Placed immediately after this sentence, Innocent says that

²⁰⁵ *PL*, col. 753d: “Modum, ut fiat ex hilaritate; ordinem, ut fiat secundum regulam.”

²⁰⁶ *PL*, col. 753d-754a: “Ex charitate quidem danda est eleemosyna; quia sicut arbor ad fructum, ita charitas se habet ad eleemosynam. ‘Non enim potest arbor bona fructus malos facere, neque arbor mala fructus bonos facere (Matth. VII).’ Propterea dicit Apostolus: ‘Si distribuero omnes facultates meas in cibos pauperum, charitatem autem non habeam, nihil mihi prodest (I Cor. XIII).’”

²⁰⁷ *PL*, col. 754a: “Licet ad tria valeat eleemosyna extra charitatem distributa. Vel ad habilitatem suscipiendi gratiam, vel ad mitigationem aeternae poenae, vel ad obtinendum bonum aliquod temporale.”

one must only give to receive eternal reward and not the repayment of men.²⁰⁸ What then could this “acceptable” motive of temporal good be? Innocent does not elaborate on what this could mean but continues to argue that one should not give for a temporal reward. He uses Matthew 6, in which Jesus instructs the faithful to do good in such a way that the left hand does not know what the right is doing.²⁰⁹ Innocent quotes Christ reminding his disciples that if one is to hold a feast one should invite the beggars and the paupers to the dinner.²¹⁰ The retribution that will be shown to you, Innocent opines, will be the retribution of the just.²¹¹ Innocent ends his paragraph with, “It is this end, this recompense, this reward, on account of which alms must be done.”²¹²

To understand the structure of Innocent’s paragraph, one must remember Innocent’s use of “et” when he first laid out the structure of this chapter. The mention of “finis” in the preceding sentence is telling. Innocent sees the cause and end of almsgiving as similar objects which have spiritual crossover. A reader has viewed both cause and end simultaneously throughout the proceeding treatment. Innocent transitions away from these two parts toward the material aspects of almsgiving: “modum,” the “disposition” of the giver, and “order.” Innocent is quite forthright about the disposition one should have when giving alms: “hilaritate.” As with

²⁰⁸ *PL*, col. 754a: “Cum ergo quis erogat eleemosynam, debet eam propter aeternam beatitudinem erogare, non propter favorem mundanum, vel propter humanam retributionem.”

²⁰⁹ *PL* col. 754a.

²¹⁰ *PL* col. 754a-754b.

²¹¹ *PL*, col. 754c: “Sed cum facis convivium, voca pauperes, debiles, claudos et caecos, et beatus es, quia non habent retribuere tibi. Retribuetur enim tibi in retributione justorum (Luc. XIV).”

²¹² *PL*, col. 754c: “Hic finis, haec merces, hoc praemium, propter quod facienda est eleemosyna.”

charity, when one gives without happiness, one loses any meritorious recompense.²¹³ And how should this happiness be shown? With the face!²¹⁴ Innocent warns against a “tristem vultum” which could potentially lose all for an almsgiver; the very fact that Innocent even spends time on this aspect of almsgiving exhibits his legal training oriented toward a pastoral message. This is a perfect example of Innocent quoting the *Decretum* which quotes St. Paul saying that God especially loves a joyful giver.²¹⁵ Innocent does not simply want donations; rather he wants a joyous giver happily assisting his brethren with a smile upon his face. Innocent again taps into his egalitarian notion of alms by repeating that when one is not able to give the blessing of a material good, “rei,” one should return the blessing of a word, “verbum.”²¹⁶ This is complemented by Innocent’s warning that one should not taunt or berate the poor.²¹⁷ Innocent is aware of this problem; he mentions in *The Misery of the Human Condition* that the poor are often “despised and confounded.”²¹⁸ His final transition in this section is his call for swiftness when giving alms. He urges his audience to “do good while you are able, because by chance when you

²¹³ *PL*, col. 754d: “Noli propter tristem vultum totum amittere meritum, sed propter hilarem faciem gratam acquire mercedem.”

²¹⁴ *PL*, col. 754d: “Nam super omnia vultus accessere boni.”

²¹⁵ Tiereny, *Medieval Poor Law*, 52-53.

²¹⁶ *PL*, col. 754d: “Benedictionem rei, cum potes, impende, cum vero non potes, benedictionem verbi redde.”

²¹⁷ *PL*, col. 755a: “Stultus acriter improperabit, et datum indisciplinati tabescere facit oculos (Eccli. XVIII).”

²¹⁸ Lothario dei Sengi *De Miseria Conditionis Humane*, trans. Robert Lewis (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1978), 114.

will have wished to do good you will not be able to.”²¹⁹ Time moves quickly and so does the human mind; an individual should give while he is still of a mind to.²²⁰ In this instance Innocent exhibits fine exegetical ability by arguing that while at the Last Supper, Jesus’ command to Judas to “do it quickly” was regarding alms, as Judas held the purse. Since this did not surprise the other disciples, Innocent concludes that they must have often heard such a command.²²¹

Innocent ends the discussion of “modum” by introducing the necessity of preserving a regular order.

The rest of the chapter is concerned primarily with “ordinatam” or order. This will focus on who should receive alms and what should be given. Innocent begins by saying: “Triplex enim eleemosyna est, cordis videlicet, oris et operis,” “For alms is evidently of three parts, of the heart, of the mouth, and of deed.”²²² Where is the order? Why has Innocent introduced three new parts of almsgiving? Some of this may be due to Innocent’s style as a writer. Perhaps a better structured sermon would have incorporated this in a more logical fashion. As it were, Innocent has not forgotten about “order” but has rearranged his structure so that the mentions of “Triplex” will provide a brief introduction to the rest of this section. He proceeds to explain these three parts: “it is given from the heart through compassion, from the mouth through

²¹⁹ *PL*, col. 755a: “Unde sine dilatione fac bonum dum potes, quia forte cum volueris facere bonum, non poteris.”

²²⁰ *PL*, col. 755b: “Noli ergo bonum quod concepisti differre, quoniam a mane usque ad vesperam mutabitur tempus, et mens rapitur in diversa.”

²²¹ *PL*, col. 755b: “Unde namque potuissent illud putare, nisi frequenter audivissent Jesum Judae dicentem, ut cito daret egenis?”

²²² *PL*, col. 755b.

correction, and from works through generosity.”²²³ These three aspects of alms, compassion, correction, and generosity all must be given with order.²²⁴ As we have previously seen, Innocent is focused on the giver, and his emphasis on order is no exception. Once again Innocent believes that the first recipient of order is “nobis” and then “proximis.”²²⁵ Innocent juxtaposes the foolishness of caring for another’s physical body, when one’s own spiritual soul is under threat of eternal damnation.²²⁶ Overall, this aspect of the ordering of self is rather short; Innocent has implicitly promoted this thought throughout the *Libellus* and does not harp upon it here.

Before I progress into this section of the chapter, I must give an overview of the canonical debate between discriminate and indiscriminate charity which informs Innocent’s idea of order. Tierney argues that this discussion was discussed with such force, such detail, and such breadth that to go simply by the amount of ink and parchment spent on the discussion it must have been a hotly debated topic among the canonists.²²⁷ The debate originated with Gratian quoting seemingly discordant Church fathers and “hesitat[ing] between two contrary opinions.”²²⁸ The problem consisted in Gratian quoting St. John Chrysostom who appeared to argue for indiscriminate charity and St. Ambrose and St. Augustine who both argued for

²²³ *PL* col. 755b: “Ex corde datur per compassionem, ex ore per correctionem, ex opere per largitionem.”

²²⁴ *PL*, col. 755c: “Verum haec triplex elemosyna danda est ordinate.”

²²⁵ *PL*, col. 755d: “Primo nobis, secundo proximis.”

²²⁶ *PL*, col. 755d: “Si corporalem amici tui deploras mortem, et spiritualem animae tuae mortem non defleas.”

²²⁷ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 54.

²²⁸ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 54.

discriminate charity.²²⁹ *Distinctio* eighty-six lays forth Gratian's arguments of the "deserving" poor versus the "undeserving" poor and that one should "give first to the just, then to sinners, to whom, nevertheless, we are forbidden to give not as men but as sinners."²³⁰ The *Glossa Ordinaria* explained the last phrase of "not as men, but as sinners" to mean that "the vice is not to be nourished, but nature is to be sustained:" a similar conclusion which Innocent will reach in *Date Eleemosynam*.²³¹ Gratian also quotes St. Ambrose's work, who, as bishop of Milan, was accustomed to care for the poor as outlined in his work *De Officiis*.²³² As delineated in the *Glossa Ordinaria*, St. Ambrose is used to create a list that states that "man ought to love first God, then his parents, then his children, then the other members of his household, and then strangers."²³³ St. Ambrose, along with the canonists who quote him, established a general hierarchy of charity. Thus, the canonists were forced to reconcile these divergent texts. They came to the conclusion that if one has enough for all, then St. John Chrysostom's idea of indiscriminate charity should be followed. However, if there is not enough to cover the needs of all, then the St. Ambrose and St. Augustine approach should be applied.²³⁴ This rule was

²²⁹ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 55. *Decretum*, *Dist.* 42 *post* C.I., "In hospitality there is to be no regard for persons, but we ought to welcome indifferently all for whom our resources suffice." *Dist.* 86 C. 9, "Those who give to gladiators give not to the man but to his evil art. For if he was only a man and not a gladiator, you would not give."

²³⁰ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 55-56. *Decretum*, *Dist.* 86. *Post* C. 6.

²³¹ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 56. *Glossa Ordinaria*, *ad Dist.* 86 C. 7.

²³² Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 56.

²³³ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 57. *Glossa Ordinaria*, *ad Dist.* 42 C. 2.

²³⁴ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 60. *Summa Iuris*, X, 70, "Either you have enough for all or not. In the first case you ought to give to all indiscriminately, . . . and this is true except when by being made sure of his food a man would neglect justice, for in that case 'it is more useful to take away bread from the needy, etc.' . . . except when he is dying of hunger, for then he ought to

amended when there was desperate need on the part of the pauper: any distinctions should then be cast aside and the pauper should be helped.²³⁵ This wide-ranging and careful discussion led canonists to create a multiplicity of distinctions regarding who should be assisted.

Returning now to *Date Eleemosynam*, we see that Innocent again demands order. The first who should be served are the faithful, then the household, and finally neighbors, similarly to St. Ambrose's ideal.²³⁶ Never lacking ability to gloss an obscure biblical quotation, Innocent quotes the Canticles of Canticles in which the bride remarks that "the king led me into the wine cellar and ordered charity in me" as reason for ranking charity.²³⁷ This discussion of the ordering of charity in regards to the "proximis" is an subject where Innocent appears to contradict himself at several turns. Innocent tells his audience that when all other circumstances are equal, one should prefer the just.²³⁸ He opposed this with a quote from Luke chapter 6 that states to "love your enemies, do good, etc, and pray for those who persecute and calumniate you."²³⁹ Innocent's response to this strong objection is weak. He says that one should love with

be fed however much he may neglect justice. In the second case, namely, when you have not enough to suffice for all, then you ought to consider nine things."

²³⁵ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 60.

²³⁶ *PL*, col. 756a: "post te da proximis eleemosynam, et in eis quoque ordinem serva, praeferens fideles, domesticos, propinquos."

²³⁷ *PL*, col. 7546a: "Nam hoc exigit charitas ordinata, de qua dicit sponsa in Canticis: 'Introduxit me rex in cellam vinariam, et ordinavit in me charitatem (Cant. II).'"

²³⁸ *PL*, col. 756a: "Sed inter hos praeferendi sunt justii, si caeterae circumstantiae pares existant."

²³⁹ *PL*, col. 756a: "Unde forsitan oppones quod Dominus ait: ... Propter quod alibi dicit: 'Diligite inimicos vestros, benefacite, etc., et orate pro persecquentibus et calumniatibus vos.'"

the heart, pray with the mouth, and do good with works.²⁴⁰ This is followed with an elaborate, explanation:

Cum enim omnis homo tam bonus quam malus nobis ratione naturae sit proximus, et ex praecepto divino teneamur diligere proximos sicut nos ipsos: profecto videtur, quod passim omni homini teneamur indigenti cum possumus subvenire, et cum majoris meriti videatur, inimicis benefacere quam amicis, juxta sententiam Veritatis dicentis: Si diligitis eos qui vos diligunt, quam mercedem habebitis? Nonne publicani hoc faciunt?²⁴¹

For when everyman, as much the good as the bad is neighbor to us by reason of nature, and from the divine command we are held to love our neighbors just as ourselves, certainly it seems that everywhere we are bound to each poor man when we are able to assist him, and while it seems to be of greater merit to do good to our enemies than to friends, according to the statement of Truth saying: “If you love those who love you, what reward will you have? Do not the tax collectors do this?”

The key aspect to Innocent’s thinking is “cum possumus subvenire.” Just as the canonists concluded, if one has the means to give to all, the good and the bad, one should do so. However Innocent appears to accept the fact that most will need to make a decision regarding who should receive alms.

Innocent now embarks on something of a bitter diatribe against giving alms to the wicked. He begins this with a quote from Matthew 10, that states that whoever receives the just, receives the reward of the just.²⁴² He glosses the passage in a pedantic fashion, by remarking that “justum” is not an indefinite word, but defined. If Christ had assumed all men, he would have used the indefinite word “hominem.” Innocent quotes the sharp tongued Ecclesiastics that he who is wicked should never receive alms and the Most High hates sinners.²⁴³ One should

²⁴⁰ *PL*, col. 756a: “Diligite corde, orate ore, benefacite opere.”

²⁴¹ *PL*, col. 756a-756b.

²⁴² *PL*, col. 756c: “Econtra Veritas ipsa testatur: ‘Quicumque recipit justum in nomine justii mercedem justii accipiet (Matth. X).’”

²⁴³ *PL*, col. 756c: “Non enim est ei bene qui assiduus est in malis, et eleemosynam non danti; quoniam et Altissimus habet peccatores odio, et misertus est poenitentibus.”

give only to the merciful and never receive sinners; in fact one should return vindication to their lot.²⁴⁴ Again Tobias is quoted: one should not sit at table with sinners.²⁴⁵ What is one to make of these Scriptures which Innocent quotes? It would appear that Innocent uses the very harshest biblical quotations regarding sinners and denying them sustenance. The gravity and acerbity of the preceding quotes do not match with parts to come. How is this to be resolved? One might speculate that this is a rhetorical effect, one meant to fully convince the audience of his point, remind them of the evilness of sin (in fact, jar them a bit as they might then doubt offerings of charity if they ever lose their sustenance), and only this rhetorical delivery does Innocent return to a much more reasonable position. This part of the *Libellus* is certainly difficult to understand, especially in the context of the document as a whole.

The problem, then, with discerning between good and evil men is that judgments take time. Innocent is quite aware of this fact and realizes that such deliberation can only retard the dispersion of alms, a problem he had previously warned against.²⁴⁶ Innocent rhetorically asks whether one should ever give alms to the wicked, as only the prayers of the good are pleasing before God.²⁴⁷ Innocent appears to recant his previous invective with a surprisingly open explanation:

²⁴⁴ *PL*, col. 756c: “Da misericordi, et ne recipias peccatorem, et impiis, et peccatoribus redde vindictam. Da bono, et ne receperis peccatores.”

²⁴⁵ *PL*, col. 756d: “Item Tobias: ‘Panem tuum et vinum tuum super sepulturam justi constitue: et noli ex eis manducare et bibere cum peccatoribus (Tob. IV).’”

²⁴⁶ *PL*, col. 756d: “Multum ergo contingeret eleemosynam retardari, si semper oporteret inter bonos et malos discerni.”

²⁴⁷ *PL*, col. 756d: “Sed cur in eleemosyna danda non praeferas justum iniquo, cum ipse tibi meritis et precibus suis plus valeat apud Dominum promereri?”

Sane benefaciendum est et bonis et malis, et justis et impiis, et amicis et inimicis, cum necessitas exigit, et facultas permittit; sed in talibus ponderandae sunt circumstantiae, ut possit discerni, quando, et quomodo, et ubi, et cui magis debeat subveniri.²⁴⁸

Truly good works must be done both to the good and the bad, both to the just and to the impious, both to friend and to enemies when obligation is required and ability permits, but in such situations circumstances must be weighed so that it is able to be discerned when, and how, and where and to whom should be owed the greater assistance.

This is quite surprising given Innocent's previous diatribe against the sinner. Innocent proceeds to list several reasons as to when the sinner actually has a greater right to alms. The first is when the "malo" has greater need, or when there is danger in giving alms to, presumably, the good.²⁴⁹ This last part, "praesertim cum absque periculo non potest subventio prorogari" is especially interesting as it could be that Innocent is warning his flock not to endanger themselves while giving alms. If this is the case, then it is a small but telling aspect of the *Libellus* which points toward practical advice for real people bent on doing good works. The last aspect is slightly ambiguous, as Innocent says that the giver receives a strength of spirit from God when giving to enemies.²⁵⁰ At this point, Innocent has modified his position on giving alms to sinners, allowing for it in some circumstances.

Innocent makes another distinction: if your parents lose their sustenance they should receive preferential treatment with your alms as there is a special mandate to honor your father

²⁴⁸ *PL*, col. 756d.

²⁴⁹ *PL*, col. 756d: "Contingere enim potest, ut aliquando magis subveniendum sit malo, quam bono si videlicet majori premitur egestate, praesertim cum absque periculo non potest subventio prorogari."

²⁵⁰ *PL*, col. 757a: "Et licet magni fit meriti benefacere inimicis, quia tunc maxime propter Deum animo vis infertur; unde: 'A diebus Joannis Baptistae regnum coelorum vim patitur, et violenti diripiunt illud (Matth. XI).'"

and mother.²⁵¹ With this Innocent appears ready to close his multitude of distinctions and arguments:

Licet ergo benefaciendum sit generaliter omnibus proximis, amplius tamen bonis quam malis, justis quam impiis, nisi regulae generali detrahat aliqua specialis exceptio, circumstantiis ponderatis, quemadmodum praelibavi.²⁵²

It is permitted therefore to do good works generally to all near, nevertheless more to the good than the bad, the just than the impious, unless somehow a special exception circumvents the general rule, with circumstances having been weighed, just as I have touched over.

In the end, Innocent appears to present a tempered opinion, compared to other condemnations of giving alms to the wicked. While his discussion about giving alms to the wicked is not finished, at this point it could be assumed that his position appears to be: follow the general rule which was laid forth, and make exceptions based upon the giver's judgment.

Innocent returns one more time to his discussion of the sinner and his worthiness in receiving alms. He again presents Ecclesiastes' prohibition against giving to the sinner.²⁵³ Innocent turns to his final distinction in this drawn-out discussion by arguing that one should love men, and not their errors.²⁵⁴ The main thrust of Innocent's thought, and the capstone to his reasoning comes out in the next two sentences:

²⁵¹ *PL*, col. 757a: "Si tamen parentes indigeant, eis credo potius succurrendum, propter illud speciale mandatum: 'Honora patrem tuum, et matrem tuam (Exod. XX).'"

²⁵² *PL*, col. 757a.

²⁵³ *PL*, col. 757b: "Quod autem alibi legitur: 'Da misericordiam, et ne suscipias peccatorem;' et iterum: 'Benefac humilibus, et ne dederis impio.'"

²⁵⁴ *PL*, col. 757b: "Sane debet intelligi, juxta regulam illam: Sic diligendi sunt homines, ut eorum non diligentur errores."

Unde peccator prohibetur suscipi, et impio dari vetatur, videlicet ne per susceptionem vel dationem hujusmodi foveatur impius in peccato. Non ergo subveniendum est talibus occasione fovendae culpae; sed subveniendum est eis ratione sustentandae naturae.²⁵⁵

Whence the sinner is being prohibited from being supported, and the impious are to be rejected from being given alms, clearly the impious, should not be maintained in sin, neither through sustenance or alms. Therefore, he must not by such means be assisted to the chance of favoring sin, but it must be given to them for the reason of sustaining their nature.

Thus Innocent returns to familiar intellectual territory: alms must not allow someone to maintain their sin, or to deprecate their character, just as the canonists had taught. Alms, in Innocent's thought, revolve around a spiritual aid for eternity and are not primarily focused on the sustenance of the corporeal body. If we apply Vauses' belief of Innocent's mystical understanding of the world, then Innocent's words make sense: if alms are perpetuating sin, then alms are failing in its mystical role. By this point, Innocent has appeared to retract much of the harshness which was prevalent in his invective in col. 756d. While acerbic, Innocent has mollified his tone and reworked his position. The differences between sections are startling and difficult to understand; both sections are original to Innocent as laid forth in Vat Lat 700 and 10902. Faced with this I believe that Innocent had three objectives. The first was rhetorical to remind one of the evils of sin. The second was the mystical view of alms as the means for eternal reward. By sustaining a recipient in sin, a giver has committed a grave error, cutting his alms off from their true worth. The third was the influence of the *Glossa Ordinaria* that alms must not assist sin. To understand the harshness of this section, one must view it in a rhetorical, mystical and legal sense.

There are two final aspects to order which Innocent must examine before the end of this chapter. The first is "alms of the heart."²⁵⁶ Innocent reminds his audience with Matthew 6 that if

²⁵⁵ *PL*, col. 757c.

they do not forgive those who harm them, neither will their Heavenly Father forgive them.²⁵⁷ Innocent backtracks to Matthew 5, in which one is reminded that if one approaches the Altar of the Lord with an offering, he should turn back if he remembers that his brother has cause of anger against him.²⁵⁸ From this, Innocent concludes that God does not prefer alms if they are not superseded by offerings of the heart.²⁵⁹ When one gives alms one must have settled grievance committed against both oneself and committed against others.²⁶⁰ Innocent mentions that one ought to forgive all according to the command to love your enemies.²⁶¹ He concludes:

Optima igitur eleemosyna est indulgere peccantibus, dimittere debitoribus, et miseris misereri. De qua Veritas ait: ‘Dimittite, et dimittetur vobis (Luc. VI).’ ‘Misericordiam autem volo, non sacrificium (Matth. IX).’²⁶²

Therefore, the best alms is to be kind to sinner, to forgive debtors, and to be merciful to the wretched. Concerning which Truth said, “Forgive and you will be forgiven,” “However I wish mercy, not sacrifice.”

²⁵⁶ *PL*, col. 757c: “Caeterum solerter attende, quod nisi dederis eleemosynam cordis, Deus non acceptat eleemosynam operis, ipso attestante qui ait.”

²⁵⁷ *PL*, col. 757c: “Si dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum, dimittet vobis Pater coelestis delicta vestra. Si autem non dimiseritis, nec Pater vest vobis dimittet.”

²⁵⁸ *PL*, col. 757d: “Propter quod in eodem sermone ipse praeceperat: ‘Si offers munus tuum ad altare, et ibi recordatus fueris quia frater tuus habet aliquid adversum te, repone ibi munus tuum ante altare, et vade prius reconciliari fratri tuo, et tunc veniens offeres manus tuum.’”

²⁵⁹ *PL*, col. 757d: “Vides aperte, quod Deus non approbat munus operis, nisi prius offeras munus cordis.”

²⁶⁰ *PL*, col. 757d: “Eleemosynam vero cordis prudenter impendis, cum aut offendentem dimittis, aut satisfacis offense, ut nec ille contra te rancorem vel odium in corde retineat, nec tu contra ipsum retineas rancorem vel odium in corde.”

²⁶¹ *PL*, col. 758a: “De offensa debes omino dimittere, cum ex praecepto divino tenearis diligere inimicum.”

²⁶² *PL*, col. 758a.

Innocent has expanded upon his sentiments in chapter four, promoting the idea of “alms of the heart” so that even the needy can give. Tierney says that St. Augustine is quoted by Gratian, saying, “there are two kinds of almsgiving, one of the heart and one of money.”²⁶³ These “alms of the heart” according to St. Augustine would be sufficient if one does not have the means to give.²⁶⁴ He also presents it as a means toward peace, as one should not give alms when at odds with others. At this point in Innocent’s thought “alms” no longer simply means “material goods given to the poor,” but encapsulates a wide spiritual, mystical role.

Innocent turns to the final aspect of his chapter and the final division of “ordo.” This is what should be given.²⁶⁵ This was another issue the canonists argued about as it was thought that a thief could not give stolen goods, as these goods were not his, yet a prostitute could, as her goods were truly hers only acquired through illicit means.²⁶⁶ Innocent in general, follows this principle as he says that one should give only that which he has acquired justly and rationally.²⁶⁷ He supports this with quotes from Ecclesiastes and Deuteronomy which forbid sacrifices of “unjust” material.²⁶⁸ This is opposed by two other biblical quotes which appear to condone the use of unjust goods.²⁶⁹ Innocent creates a distinction of objects between ones which are received

²⁶³ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 53.

²⁶⁴ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 53.

²⁶⁵ *PL*, col. 758b: “Restat dicendum, de quibus sit eleemosyna facienda.”

²⁶⁶ Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law*, 50.

²⁶⁷ *PL*, col. 758b: “Videtur profecto de his que juste possides, et rationabiliter acquisisti.”

²⁶⁸ *PL*, col. 758b-759a.

through legitimate transfer of ownership, and ones which violated the previous owner's rights. The former is business and "warfare" in which the ownership was transferred by one's own work. The latter is more insidious, such as theft, sacrilege, and usury. Objects acquired by these means may not be given.²⁷⁰ Innocent gives the example of Zacchaeus the tax collector mentioned in the Gospel of Luke, who returned his ill-gotten gains first to their rightful owners and then to the poor.²⁷¹ Innocent then says that the proper formula for distinguishing how much one should then give to the poor does not pertain to the intellectual depth of "ad praesentem libellum ille."²⁷² The issue of restitution, particularly regarding usurers, was a topic which inspired many discussions among Parisian theologians and is probably what Innocent is referring to.²⁷³ It also indicates that he was most likely not speaking to other scholars, as they would have in turn wondered why the pontiff would not address this issue. The implications of this

²⁶⁹ *PL*, col. 758c: "Contrarium autem videtur Dominus in Evangelio docuisse: 'Facite, inquiens, vobis amicos de mammona iniquitatis, ut, cum defeceritis, recipient vos in aeterna tabernacula.' In Ecclesiastico quoque legitur: 'Noli avarus esse in divitiis injustis.'"

²⁷⁰ *PL*, col. 758c-758d: "De illis ergo in quibus transfertur dominium, ut in negotiatione, militia et hujusmodi licite potest eleemosyna erogari, quia, cum effecta sint tua, licet offenderis illicite quirendo, jam tamen quasi de tuis licit poteris erogare. De illis autem in quibus dominium non transfertur, ut de furto, rapina sacrilegio et usura, non licet eleemosynam erogare; quia, cum sint aliena, non tua, teneris ea his, quorum sunt, restituere, non autem ea invitis dominis contrectare."

²⁷¹ *PL*, col. 758d-759a: "Unde Zachaeus bene distinxit... Quod autem de mammona iniquitatis in Evangelio (Luc. XVI), et quod de divitiis injustis in Ecclesiastico (cap. XIV) legitur, ad illas acquisitiones injustas, in quibus transfertur dominium, refertur, de quibus licite potest eleemosyna erogari: quamvis et alio modo sane possint intelligi, sed ad praesentem libellum ille non pertinet intellectus."

²⁷² *PL*, col. 758d: "Quamvis et alio modo sane possint intelligi, sed ad praesentem libellum ille non pertinet intellectus."

²⁷³ Baldwin, *Paris 1200*, 55.

phrase, however, are much larger than Innocent referencing contemporary theological debate. The use of the word “libellum” is certainly interesting. Both Vat Lat 700 and 10902 contain the word “tractatum” instead of “libellum.”²⁷⁴ Lewis and Short mention that “tractatus” means “homily” or “sermon” in Ecclesiastical Latin.²⁷⁵ Stelten’s Ecclesiastical Latin dictionary defines it as a fourth declension word for “tract, treaties, sermons, discourse, homily.”²⁷⁶ This word change first occurred in the 1552 edition and was subsequently copied to the 1575 and then *PL*. If the 1552 editor made this change on his own volition, then it shows he understood the text, and that he knew in order for his title to make sense, this word needed to be changed. A further treatment of this and speculation as to why this vital word was changed will be offered in chapter three. Finally, Innocent briefly mentions the pay of prostitutes and whether they can give their wages as alms. Innocent offhandedly mentions that the “scholastici” dispute about this, and seems to forbid prostitutes from giving their wages as alms.²⁷⁷ This is another reference to the intellectual circle of Peter the Chanter who argued with his fellow “scholastici” about prostitutes’ wages and the legitimacy of offering such as alms. Oddly enough, Innocent appears at odds with his former teacher and the above mentioned canonists, as Peter in particular believed that alms from a prostitute were lawful.²⁷⁸ In all, Innocent is a bit flippant about the topic and does not

²⁷⁴ Vat Lat 700 fol. 28 v; Vat Lat 10902 fol. 66 r.

²⁷⁵ Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, ed., “tractatus,” *A Latin Dictionary*.

²⁷⁶ Leo F Stelten, ed., “tractatus,” *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995).

²⁷⁷ *PL*, col. 758d: “Alias autem auctoritates ad eas referas acquisitiones injustas, in quibus dominium non transfertur: licet de mercede prostibuli soleant scholastici disputare, quae si transire dicatur in dominium meretricis (Deut. XXIII), dicendum est sane, quod ratione mysterii, sicut et pretium canis, in domo Domini prohibetur offerri.”

²⁷⁸ John Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants*, 133-35.

seem to pay it much heed; it seems that he does not think such a discussion is necessary for his lay audience. He ends chapter five by addressing his audience with a final exhortation for almsgiving. By reading the Latin aloud, one can detect a certain cadence and flow to the words.

Perhaps these words were actually preached by the pontiff:

Quia vero ‘non auditores legis, sed factores iusti sunt apud Deum,’ rogo te, frater, et hortor, et precor, et moneo, quisquis es, Christiane, si vis esse quod diceris, ut studeas facere quod audisti, tenens pro certo, quod eleemosyna quae datur ‘de corde puro, et conscientia bona, et fide non ficta (I Tim. I),’ magnam praestat fiduciam apud Altissimum, et ipsa contra omne periculum salutaris est medicina.²⁷⁹

But because “they are not hearers of the law but doers of justice in the house of God,” I ask you, brother, and I exhort, and I pray, and I warn, whoever you are, Christian, if you wish to be what you are said to be you to strive to do what you have heard, holding for certain that alms which are given, “of a pure heart both with a good conscience and with faith, not falsity,” fulfill the great faith before the Most High and alms itself is a medicine of salvation against all danger.

With this, Innocent has finished presenting the most important topic of his sermon: the necessary way to give alms correctly.

Caput VI: Ad eleemosynam sicut ad quodlibet bonum opus, necessario requiri perseverantiam.

Before I examine this chapter it should be reminded that chapter six does not appear in either Vat Lat 700 or 10902. In both manuscripts, Innocent ends his sermon with the last block quote of Latin given in the preceding page. When examining chapter six, its absence from the manuscripts is not surprising. It mentions the word “eleemosyna” only once. However, the style and scriptural invocation which Innocent makes are consistent with the rest of the text. Chapter six is present in both the 1552 and 1575 editions and it still remains a mystery to me where this chapter came from. I have searched the other sermons in the *PL* and none of them work as potential originators for this chapter. Innocent uses similar biblical quotes in other sermons, but the exegesis and words do not match. Even though chapter six is not original to the sermon in

²⁷⁹ *PL* col. 759a.

Vat Lat 700 or 10902, it certainly appears “Innocentian.” Since chapter six is present exclusively in the printed editions, I will examine what Innocent, or potentially a “pseudo-Innocent” has to say about perseverance and its relation to alms.

This small virtue is so necessary that without it, not only alms, but also fasting and prayer are not pleasing to God or able to merit eternal reward.²⁸⁰ After giving his typical biblical proofs Innocent reminds his audience that many left Sodom but looked back, and that many left Babylon, but died on the way and did not arrive at the “eternal city of peace.”²⁸¹ Innocent has a pithy sentence which sums up the entirety of his thinking: the finish, not the fight crowns.²⁸² Innocent spares no laurels in his praise of perseverance and its importance. He provides a typical distinction between “temporal” perseverance and “final” perseverance.²⁸³ Temporal perseverance is tantamount to hay, which lasts for but a moment until it ultimately perishes.²⁸⁴ Final perseverance lasts until the end and is the sustenance of cloistered ascetics and holy

²⁸⁰ *PL* col. 759b: “Quoniam autem nec eleemosyna, nec jejunium, nec oratio Deo placere, vel homini esse meritoria ad vitam beatam possunt, sine perseverantia, idcirco vel pauca hic de virtute perseverantiae connectenda sunt. Et in primi sequentibus auctoritatibus monetur quilibet ad perseverantiam.”

²⁸¹ *PL* col. 759c: “Multi aggrediuntur magna, sed deficiunt in via; multi exeunt Sodomam, sed retrospectiunt (Gen. XIX); multi egrediuntur Babylonem, sed morantur in via, nec perveniunt ad aeternam pacis civitatem.”

²⁸² *PL* col. 759c: “Finis enim, non pugna coronat.”

²⁸³ *PL* col. 760a: “Et notandum quod quaedam perseverantia est temporalis, ut ita loquar, quaedam finalis.”

²⁸⁴ *PL* col. 760a: “Temporalis est, quae ad tempus viret, et in tempore perversitatis effloret, feno comparabilis, quod nunc virescit, nunc in clibanum mittitur (Luc. XII): nunc floret, nunc conteritur, nunc consequen moritur.”

virgins.²⁸⁵ Could it be that Innocent was attempting to draw a comparison between the virgins and hermits of the Church and the urban masses? If not explicitly, Innocent is certainly making an implicit connection between the two as perseverance is the support of both. To “begin well” but “end poorly” is a strange monster that Innocent says is a “chimaera.”²⁸⁶ He uses a strange analogy, that to begin a task well, but to end it poorly is similar to when a painter depicts a figure with the head of a man but the neck of a horse.²⁸⁷ Innocent warns his audience against creating such a monster with their actions.²⁸⁸ The persistent man does not have the spirit of a young boy but rather that of an adult.²⁸⁹

Likewise, Innocent reminds his audience that one always has the opportunity to turn away from their sin and return to the straight and narrow path. He says:

Si obtulisti florem juventutis diabolo, saltem faeces senectutis immola Deo tuo. In vespera laudatur serenitas diei, in fine status boni operis. Vide a quanto bono decidit Judas, qui in bono non perseveravit (Matth. XXVI); vide quid Salomon per inconstantiam animi et instabilitatem perdidit (III Reg. XI); in quantam calamitatem Saul decidit (I Reg. XIII).²⁹⁰

²⁸⁵ *PL* col. 760a: “Finalis vero perseverantia est, quae durat usque in finem.... Haec est fons vivus, hortus signatus (Cant. IV), cui non communicat alienus, qui semper fluit, semper scaturit labores fideles, ut hanc habeant claustrales, ut hanc retineant virgines, ut hac se informet viduae, et in hac omnes requiescant.”

²⁸⁶ *PL* col. 760b: “Bona enim inchoare, et malo fine concludere, est monstruosa confingere. Illa enim actio chimaera est, quae initium habet a ratione, finem vero a sensualitate.”

²⁸⁷ *PL* col. 760b: “Cum enim sic agitur: humano capiti cervicem pictor depingit equinam, et sic varias inducit infructuosasque plumas [(34) 1Kb].”

²⁸⁸ *PL* col. 760b: “Cave ergo, o homo, ne actio tua monstra pariat, neque gignat praestigia.”

²⁸⁹ *PL* col. 760d: “Perseverantia bonum producit tenerum in maturitatem, perducit propecta perseverantia in maturitatem; perseverantia non quaerit animum puerilem, sed adultum: maturos quaerit mores, et non teneros et inermes.”

²⁹⁰ *PL*, col. 760d.

If you have offered the flower of youth to the Devil, at least offer the dredges of old age to your God. In the evening the favorable condition of the day is being praised, in the end is the amount of good work. See from how much good Judas fell, who did not persevere in goodness; see what Solomon lost through inconstancy and instability of the spirit; and in what great tragedies Saul died.

This is one final call, one final exhortation that God will accept even the “dredges” of old age.

Innocent continues to praise perseverance and ends the treatise with a final panegyric to perseverance that the one who holds it is happy; perseverance excludes impenitence, expels stubbornness, eliminates contempt, and expunges obstinacy.²⁹¹ Innocent’s main focus is promoting a life-long habit of giving alms. Once is not enough; alms must be continued throughout the giver’s life. It is on this note that Migne’s *PL* edition of the *Libellus de Eleemoysna* ends.

Date Eleemosynam provides several examples of Innocent’s involvement with the laity, and how his education was brought from Paris and Bologna into a pastoral setting. The anonymous author of the *Gesta Innocentii* mentions that Innocent was “learned in Divine and secular literature” and (with a bit of hyperbole) “surpassed his contemporaries both in philosophy and theology.”²⁹² This scriptural ability is certainly present; Innocent possesses a adept exegetical mind, such as when he glosses Christ’s words to Judas to “do it quickly” as an impetus for speed when almsgiving, or the “ordering of charity” in Cantic of Canticles as proof for a hierarchy of charity. Innocent’s thoughts regarding alms are generally straightforward, easily discernable, and generally in line with contemporary canon law: one should give alms in

²⁹¹ *PL* col. 762a: “Felix ergo perseverantia, quae impenitentiam excludit, obstinationem expellit, contemptum eliminat, obdurationem expugnat.”

²⁹² *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III by an Anonymous Author*, trans. James Powell (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 3.

order to receive spiritual benefit. The reference to canonical theory, as well as Innocent's use of "corde" "ore," and "opera," a phrase favorite to the Parisian school masters, shows Innocent taking the elite education he had received and translating it into a pastoral sermon. We can view this sermon as placing the impetus on the lay: give alms and the world will be cleansed by you. Not only does Innocent exhort, but his language of transaction would also resonate with people who thought in these terms on a daily basis in shops and market places. Alms are a good deal, spiritually. In addition, Innocent also places this virtue above fasting and prayer, two virtues which could be seen as clerical. Perhaps prayer and fasting would be difficult to achieve for the average layman, obsessed with the cares of the world, but alms, done quickly as Innocent suggests, is a virtue in which all can easily participate. Would there have been a sense of pride, then, amongst Innocent's audience? Perhaps, and this may have been the effect Innocent wished to achieve. I would argue that Innocent specifically sees the laity, from the "mystical perspective," in this capacity. They have a special place, ordained to them by their livelihood. They, the ordinary people can cleanse the world, if first they can purify themselves to "orare opere." Innocent was obsessed with cleansing and renewing the Church: perhaps this is an insight into his hope for the flock. From this perspective, *Date Eleemosynam* is a special example of a pontiff willing to translate his education from the elite to the laity.

While *Date Eleemosynam* clearly sets forth Innocent's thought regarding almsgiving, examining the document itself is not enough. How can we tell if this sermon had an impact in Innocent's time and beyond? The third chapter will attempt to show, through examining the manuscript tradition, how widely dispersed Innocent's model sermon collections were, and how often *Date Eleemosynam* is present within these collections. I will also compare the number of Innocent's manuscripts to other preachers of the twelfth- and thirteenth-centuries. Finally, I shall

also investigate the printed editions of the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* and provide several theories as to why the change from *Date Eleemosynam* to *Libellus de Eleemosyna* occurred. For a better picture, the investigation must move beyond the text itself, to examine the influence of Innocent's manuscript tradition.

CHAPTER III

“Go, and Preach to all Nations:” The Diffusion of *Date Eleemosynam*

The importance and innovation of *Date Eleemosynam* was shown in chapter two:

Innocent III translated the education he had received at Paris and Bologna into a sermon for the laity to exhort them to a specific function in the spiritual life. Innocent exhorted the laity to “orare opera,” and that they should give alms quickly, happily, and according to order. All of this is important; however, how widely dispersed was this message? *Date Eleemosynam* “traveled” in Innocent’s model sermon collections usually between the sermons *Hoc est majus jejunium* and *Ductus est Jesus in desertum*, two sermons for early Lent. Thus, to understand the diffusion and popularity of *Date Eleemosynam*, one must track the manuscript diffusion of Innocent’s model sermon collections. It would be easy simply to assume that Innocent’s sermons, and especially *Date Eleemosynam* were popular because Innocent was an important pope. His *De Miseria Conditionis Humane* was widely disseminated throughout Europe, did his sermons match this popularity? John Tolan warns of overreliance on name recognition to assume medieval popularity in his work *Petrus Alfonsi and His Medieval Readers*:

In order to judge the importance of individual texts or authors, the extent and nature of their influence must be examined. In this way one may find that a text that has previously been judged as important and influential (because, for example, of the prominence of its author or the existence of a good modern study of the work) is in fact minor, in that it enjoyed little readership in the Middle Ages.²⁹³

I will demonstrate in this chapter that Innocent’s sermon collections, and *Date Eleemosynam* in particular, gained contemporary popularity with sermon manuscripts located in all parts of Europe. In addition to the manuscripts, Innocent’s sermons were printed in four early modern

²⁹³ John Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi and His Medieval Readers* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993), 159.

and modern editions.²⁹⁴ These include editions printed in 1552 and 1575 in Cologne, Germany, a Venetian edition in 1578, as well as Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, the starting point for this study.²⁹⁵ To understand fully how Innocent's message was received, the popularity of Innocent's sermon collections must be demonstrated.

This chapter will accomplish several things. First, it will present the secondary literature on the manuscript tradition of Innocent III through the works of Katherine Jansen, Keith Kendall, Johannes Schneyer, and Connie Munk. Schneyer's *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters* in particular will play a crucial role in elucidating the number and geographical diffusion of Innocent's sermons. I will add my own small part to the historiography by examining the manuscripts, which Schneyer lists in the *Repertorium*, at the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*. According to Schneyer, the *Bibliothèque* has the highest count, with eleven known manuscripts, of any library in Europe. I have discovered through my research trip there that Schneyer's list is drastically inaccurate. Correcting Schneyer's lists was done by Kendall in appendix six of his dissertation; Kendall, however, mainly focused on emending Bavarian and Iberian manuscript lists.²⁹⁶ My research will lead to a more accurate overall count of Innocent's model sermon collections and of the manuscripts of *Date Eleemosynam*. Finally, in order to provide context for Innocent's popularity I will present the manuscript lists of several other late twelfth-century and early thirteenth-century clerics and theologians in order to determine how

²⁹⁴ Katherine Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," in *Innocenzo III: urbs et orbis: atti del Congresso Internazionale* ed. Andrea Sommerlechner (Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1998), 372.

²⁹⁵ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 372-73.

²⁹⁶ Keith Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III: The Moral Theology of a Pastor and Pope" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, 2003), 264-65.

Innocent stands in contrast to these. The other half of the chapter will look at the second part of Innocent's sermon diffusion: the Cologne printed editions. Finally, I will examine the manuscript catalogues for Vat Lat 700 and 10902. This approach reveals how the editors of these catalogues viewed *Date Eleemosynam* as both a sermon and *Libellus* simultaneously. This investigation sheds light on the mentality of the editors and how the mistake of the 1552 edition lived on into the twentieth century. I will argue in this chapter that Innocent's sermons, and *Date Eleemosynam* in particular, had value and popularity in the thirteenth and fourteenth century.

The best work on the manuscript tradition of Innocent III was a dissertation written in Rome by a priest, Giuseppe Scuppa called, *I sermoni di Innocenzo III* which was never published.²⁹⁷ Jansen relies upon this dissertation in her article "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," and Kendall is dependent upon Jansen as he bemoans that he was unable to access the dissertation, held in the Vatican Library.²⁹⁸ Jansen believes that the total number of sermons by Innocent is eighty-one, and she includes the *Libellus* in this number as a miscategorized sermon.²⁹⁹ She holds that the sermon collections were written between 1202 and 1204 as Arnold, abbot of Cîteaux, is referred to as an "abbot" and not by his later acquired title of "legate."³⁰⁰ Thus, Jansen follows Scuppa's conclusion that the sermons added from the Fourth Lateran Council were "outside the original collection."³⁰¹ This led Scuppa to argue that there are in fact two different versions of Innocent's sermons, a long version and a short version. The

²⁹⁷ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 370.

²⁹⁸ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 372.

²⁹⁹ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 373.

³⁰⁰ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 376.

³⁰¹ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 376.

long version consisted of manuscripts such as Vat Lat 700 and 10902 which hold at least seventy sermons. The shorter edition consists of fifty or sixty sermons, and Kendall believes that the “long version” did not travel beyond the Alps.³⁰²

Kendall actually differs from Scuppa (through Jansen’s article) and offers a more nuanced view of the sermon editions. He argues that there are three editions.³⁰³ The first is the edition sent to Arnold. The manuscripts which Kendall believes best reflect this stage is Paris, BnF Lat. 3277 and Salzburg St. Peter a. VI.31. The second, which Kendall argues is the “standard” or “second” version, is the one written after 1215 in which five new sermons were included. Kendall uses two new sermons, *Si dormiatis inter medios clericos* and *Cum audisset Joannes in vinculis*, as a marker for the edition evolution.³⁰⁴ Neither of these sermons is present in BnF Lat. 3277 nor Salzburg St. Peter a. VI. 31. Kendall relies upon comparing Bavarian and Iberian manuscripts against BnF Lat 3277 and St. Peter a. VI.31 for this conclusion. He believes that the Bavarian and Iberian manuscripts represent an “updated edition.”³⁰⁵ Thus the long, Vatican version constitutes the final third edition which remained within Italy.³⁰⁶ *Date Eleemosynam* is present within each of these three editions of the sermons manuscripts. Kendall has a list, in appendix three, of all the sermons by folio number in the manuscripts he examined. *Date Eleemosynam* was certain a mainstay in the all three editions. Kendall’s addition of a third

³⁰² Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 80, 85.

³⁰³ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 80.

³⁰⁴ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 80-81.

³⁰⁵ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 85.

³⁰⁶ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 85.

edition to the manuscript tradition shows that these sermons were in use and evolving through the first half of the thirteenth century and that *Date Eleemosynam* was part of this evolution.

How often does *Date Eleemosynam* appear in these sermon collections? As I will discuss later, *Date Eleemosynam* is in the regular Lenten liturgical order in the French manuscripts BnF Lat. 3277 and 14938, but does not appear in the oddly written BnF Lat. 18173.³⁰⁷ It is also present in Vat Lat 700 and 10902, the manuscripts used in the previous chapter. One of the manuscripts listed by Schneyer, Bordeaux 308, also includes *Date Eleemosynam*.³⁰⁸ Milan, Ambros. P. 259 sup. which I accessed through the University of Notre Dame's microfilm collection, is also a model sermon collection but does not have *Date Eleemosynam*. *Date Eleemosynam* appears often in libraries from Austria to Iberia in the sermon list Kendall provides.³⁰⁹ The one exception is Salzburg St. Peter's Abbey, Cod S. Petri Salisburgensis A. VI. 31 which does not include *Date Eleemosynam*.³¹⁰ From this limited look at just nineteen manuscripts of Innocent's sermons, we see that *Date Eleemosynam* appears sixteen times: about eighty-four percent. Thus, when we speak of an Innocentian model sermon collection in France or Italy or Spain, we can usually conclude that *Date Eleemosynam*'s message was present and read in that area. Thus, to understand the influence of *Date Eleemosynam*, we need to understand the influence of Innocent's model sermon collections.

³⁰⁷ BnF Lat 3277, fol., 24v; BnF Lat 14938 fol., 22v.

³⁰⁸ Bordeaux 308, fol., 7r.

³⁰⁹ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 269-272. Austria Cod. Wilheringensis IX, 35; Toledo Biblioteca del Cabilo Cod. 13-16 and 15-4; Tortosa, Archivo de la Catedral Cod 99; Tortosa Archivo de la Catedral Cod. 87; Lilenfeld, Cod. Campililiensis 37; Kremsmünster, Cod. Cremifanensis 2; München Clm 12205 and 14389; S. Pölten, Cod. Sanlippolytensis 57; and Salsburg St. Peter A VI 31.

³¹⁰ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 269.

From here we must now begin to count the number of manuscripts according to Jansen, Kendall, and Schneyer. Kendall says:

The geographical and chronological breath of the manuscript tradition for Innocent's sermon collection is staggering. A leading scholar of medieval sermons, David d'Avray. . . suggested, "if one could find the collection in even a couple of manuscripts originating from each of, say, four different sectors of Europe, that would be a rough and ready indication of real international diffusion."³¹¹

Kendall believes that Innocent influenced attitudes for some time, as manuscripts were copied and disseminated right up to the advent of the printing press.³¹² Jansen offers Schneyer's total of fifty-nine manuscripts and, through her research (which she mentions is not yet exhausted) adds twenty-seven more manuscripts, bringing the total up to eighty-six.³¹³ Jansen is amazed at this number as it "exceeds the number of extant manuscripts of Jacques de Vitry, one of the most famous preachers of the period."³¹⁴ She states that there are twenty-two in Italy, twenty in France, fifteen in both Germany and Austria, seven in Spain, three in both England and Switzerland and one in the Czech Republic.³¹⁵ The influence of Innocent's sermons is truly international, and thus *Date Eleemosynam*'s is as well.

The number Jansen gives is impressive, but she is overly reliant upon Schneyer who has several errors. His originally tally is fifty-nine, and the diffusion matches the length and breadth

³¹¹ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 71.

³¹² Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 71.

³¹³ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 374. The locations of the manuscript are on the same page of Jansen's article, footnote nineteen.

³¹⁴ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 374

³¹⁵ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 374

of Europe that Jansen describes.³¹⁶ One of Kendall's achievements is correcting several of Schneyer's errors, and he lists in appendix six emendations to the manuscript list.³¹⁷ Kendall first backs up several of Schneyer's claims about Innocent's manuscripts on eight counts.³¹⁸ Kendall adds four more manuscripts, with S. Polten 57; Toldeo, Bibl. Del Cab. 10-13 and 15-4; Tortosa, Arch de la Cat 87 as authentic Innocentian manuscripts which went unnoticed by Schneyer.³¹⁹ There are, however, some problems, as Kendall shows that six manuscripts listed by Schneyer either are not Innocent's sermons, or contain only single sermons.³²⁰ Through this analysis of Kendall, Jansen, and Schneyer, along with several other manuscripts which Schneyer missed, I conclude that at this point, before adding my own research, there are eight-six manuscripts.³²¹ This number will shrink after the analysis of the French manuscripts.

³¹⁶ Johannes Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters: Für die Zeit von 1150-1360* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1972), vol. 4, 48-49.

³¹⁷ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 284.

³¹⁸ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 284., Graz UB 348; Innsbruck UB 238; Kremsmunster 2; Lilenfeld 37; Munchen Clm 12205 and 14389; Salzburg, St. Peter a. VI.31; and Wilhering IX, 35

³¹⁹ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 284.

³²⁰ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 285. Admont 161; Graz UB 302, and 791; Melk 1922; and Munchen Clm 4636 and 7775.

³²¹ Beginning with a previous total of fifty-nine manuscripts from Schneyer, four additions by Kendall brings the total to sixty-three. Schneyer fails to mention the obviously Innocentian Vat Lat 700 in his catalogue, so the number progresses to sixty-four. The six manuscripts should then be subtracted from this number to reach a manuscript total of fifty-eight. We can add one more manuscript, British MS 18311, used by Corinne Munk in her dissertation "A Study of Pope Innocent III's Treatise: *De Quadripartita Specie Numptiarum*" to get an estimated low total of fifty-nine. Finally we add Jansen's total of twenty-seven new manuscripts for a total of eighty-six.

I now add my own findings from the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*. Schneyer lists a total of eleven manuscripts at Paris: BnF Lat. 3277, 3278, 1007A, 1250, 1251, 3349, 3611, 12414, 14938, 18173, and NAL 270.³²² While at the *Bibliothèque*, I examined each manuscript in a methodical fashion. First, I looked to see if the collection was prefaced with Innocent's letter to Arnald. This was a good indicator that Innocent's sermons would follow after. I also examined the manuscript catalogue by using the search tool on the "Archives et manuscrits" web page of the *Bibliothèque*. When I examined the manuscripts, I compared the first scriptural invocation, or *incipit* along with the first several lines of each sermon, to the *Patrologia Latina* and the other established Innocentian sermon manuscripts, such as Vat Lat 700 and 10902, seeing if the sermon on the manuscript matched one in the *PL*. From this, I was able to decide whether or not the manuscript contained, all, most, some or none of Innocent's sermons. This proved to be a valuable way to check the authenticity of the sermon and sermon manuscript. The overall in-depth analyses of each manuscript, such as size, decoration, et cetera, are all available in appendix one.

Of the eleven manuscripts Schneyer lists, only three are legitimate Innocentian model sermon collections. They are BnF Lat. 3277, 14938, and 18173. BnF Lat. 3277 is a small collection which has around fifty sermons of Innocent's. The ordering of the sermons is along the liturgical year with four Advent sermons, several Christmas sermons, Lenten and Easter sermons, and followed by sermons for certain saints' feast days.³²³ Kendall uses this manuscript as the "first" edition of the collection, and *Date Eleosynam* is present in the manuscript between *Hoc est majus jejunium*, and *Ductus est Jesus in desertum*. BnF Lat. 14938 provides new insight

³²² Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, 48.

³²³ BnF Lat 3277, fol., 1r-27v.

into the popularity of the “long” version. As mentioned, Kendall believes that the “long” edition did not “travel” north of the Alps. BnF Lat. 14938 potentially refutes this assertion, as it contains eighty-seven Innocentian sermons. Some of the sermons at the end did not have any correlation to the sermons in the *PL*, however, and so there is a possibility the scribe placed non-Innocentian sermons at the end. Nevertheless, there is a real possibility that the “long” version of Innocent’s sermon manuscripts were more popular than previously thought. Similarly to BnF Lat. 3277, and Vat Lat 700 and 10902, *Date Eleemosynam* is here present in its regular place.³²⁴ The last model sermon is BnF Lat. 18173. While this is a model sermon collection of Innocent’s, the scribe broke from the established ordering. The manuscript begins with a sermon for Advent, *Cum venit plenitudo temporis*, then a Christmas sermon, *Ecce ego mitto angelum meum*, then a second Christmas sermon, *Verbum caro factum est*. However, one then finds an Advent sermon immediately after the Christmas sermon, *Ecce Venit propheta magnus et renovabi*.³²⁵ The manuscript does not contain *Date Eleemosynam*. The ordering throughout is garbled and very different than any Innocentian sermon manuscript I have viewed to date. Establishing the exact ordering of the manuscript and comparing it to other manuscripts may open the door for a fourth edition, but this is beyond the purview of this chapter and thesis. It is a manuscript of Innocent’s sermons, but it is a maverick in the manuscript tradition. Overall, it was a bit disappointing that the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France* did not have the total number of sermon manuscripts that Schneyer listed. However, these three offer new insight into Innocent’s popularity as preacher.

³²⁴ BnF Lat 14938, fol., 18v-22v.

³²⁵ BnF Lat 18173, fol., 5r-14r.

I would like to focus on BnF Lat. 3277 for a brief moment. The catalogue lists this manuscript as originally from the library of Cîteaux.³²⁶ As mentioned before, Kendall uses this as one of the “first editions” of the manuscript tradition. Kendall admits that he has never actually seen the manuscript, but mentions that Jay Rubenstein viewed the manuscript for him and reported that the manuscript is, in fact, not the original source which Innocent sent to Arnald abbot of Cîteaux.³²⁷ I bow to Rubenstein’s experience on this matter. It is, however, very close to the original sent to Arnald and was possibly copied from the original source. Arnald himself was an interesting character. Arnald was born in Narbonne France, and as abbot of Cîteaux he was directly linked to Innocent’s first attempts at squelching the Cather heretics.³²⁸ Not only did he supply monks for the preaching missions, he is also credited with writing an eye witness account to Innocent of Peter Castelnau’s murder.³²⁹ Thus, Arnald’s request for sermons from Innocent put this first edition in a new light. Kendall says:

In the years 1204-1208, Arnald and the Cistercians were heavily involved in preaching to and debating against Cathars in Languedoc. A sermon collection put together by the pope and containing doctrinally sound, unassailably orthodox sermons ‘preached and composed’ by the pope himself may have seemed to be an appropriate request. In essence, such a collection would become a theological weapon with which to combat, convert, or conquer persons with ‘heretical’ views. So, such a collection could have been put together at Arnald’s request with Cathar doctrines in mind.³³⁰

This aspect of the collection should be kept in mind.

³²⁶ Latin 3278.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/3278/cc61152k>.

³²⁷ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 81-82, see footnote 32.

³²⁸ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 96-97.

³²⁹ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 97.

³³⁰ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 98-99.

How does this impact *Date Eleemosynam*, present in BnF Lat. 3277 and probably also the original source? The knowledge that Arnald or other Cistercians monks would use this sermon against Cathars would have influenced Innocent to some degree. Innocent, relative to the Cathars, is positive about the material world and sees it as a means to overcome sin. This message could have been used to attack the Cathar position regarding the inherent evilness of the material world. In addition, an appeal of the Cathars, Waldensians, and later, the Mendicants as well, was that they assumed responsibility for the poor. In *Date Eleemosynam* Innocent, in a direct way, turns this responsibility to all the laity. It would show that the Cathars were not the only ones concerned for the poor: the Church was as well. A sermon on almsgiving could thus be used as a preemptive attack to Cathar criticisms. The type of audience could have been very similar: Innocent preached in the urban-heavy Italian peninsula, the Cistercians in the equally urbane Southern France. It is also interesting to note that the manuscript itself is rather small and thin: twenty-seven by sixteen and a half centimeters. This manuscript could have been mobile if need be. When I viewed the manuscript, it was in very good condition, which makes me believe that it was not dragged along roads by Cistercians debating heretics. If this manuscript was copied from the original source Innocent sent Arnald, however, there may have been others with similar dimensions which fulfilled this function. This manuscript shows that *Date Eleemosynam* could, in addition to its pastoral role, have also been used as an anti-heretical tool.

What of the other manuscripts which Schneyer lists? BnF Lat. 3278 and 121414 have some of Innocent's sermons within them, but these are mixed with those of other authors. BnF Lat. 3278 in particular shows Innocent's continued popularity through the fourteenth century. The manuscript catalogue says that this manuscript is from the library of the Avignon popes

around 1369, and it is titled *Lectionarium Romanum pars aestivalis*.³³¹ This manuscript is quite large, and has many sermons, *vitas* of popes and saints, and *passio* accounts of martyrs. Innocent is well represented, with ten sermons in the manuscript. His sermons can be found next to those of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose. Innocent's ten sermons do not match St. Augustine's twenty-five, but the manuscript begins with one of his sermons and occupies the last folios with several of his sermons. While this manuscript is not a model sermon collection of only Innocent's sermons, it does show that Innocent had some popularity over a century after his death, and that his sermons found company with those of other important Patristic fathers. BnF Lat. 12414 is similar to 3278. This manuscript has eighty-four total sermons, and I identified twenty-one as Innocentian. The manuscript did not list the authors as BnF Lat. 3278 did. By viewing the scribes' decisions to place Innocent along with other popular Patristic authors, I conclude that Innocent as preacher had influence into the fourteenth century. Unfortunately, neither manuscript contains *Date Eleemosynam*. This could be a mark against the sermon's popularity, yet none of Innocent's Lenten sermons is present in either of these manuscripts.

There are some manuscripts listed by Schneyer that have nothing to do with Innocent's sermons: BnF Lat. 1250, 1251, 1149, 1007A, 3611, and NAL 207. Most of these have works of Innocent's such as *De Miseria Conditionis Humane* or the *Mysteries of the Altar*, but none of his sermons. It appears that when Schneyer was compiling the *Repertorium*, he included any manuscript which had Innocent listed as the author. BnF NAL 207 does have sermons, but upon viewing it I could not find a single of Innocent's sermons. Therefore, in my emendation of Schneyer's manuscript lists for the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, I suggest that these six

³³¹ "Latin 3278." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/3278/cc61152k>.

should be removed completely. While the *Repertorium* lists Paris as the single largest depository of complete Innocent sermon collections, this location must now give way to the Vatican, which holds four manuscripts.

This investigation of Schneyer's manuscript list has certainly cut down the previously exaggerated manuscript number from eleven to three, but it also offers a more nuanced view of the manuscript tradition. Innocent appears well remembered by the fourteenth-century Church as he has a substantial number of sermons within BnF Lat. 3278, the Avignon manuscript. Before I analyzed the Parisian manuscripts the estimated number of manuscripts was eighty-six. With eight errors, the manuscript number currently stands at seventy-eight. Even with these subtractions, Innocent's manuscript tradition is still expansive and impressive. Innocent's name recognition on its own allows one to suppose his popularity; investigating the manuscript tradition turns this supposition into fact. I assume that *Date Eleemosynam* was present in most of these manuscripts, and shows that Innocent's pastoral message was widely read. This work has been tedious, but the information it has provided is important: we now have a more accurate estimation of Innocent's sermon manuscript diffusion.

In order to provide context to my estimate of seventy-eight model sermon collections, I have scanned the *Repertorium* for other preachers and theologians from both before and after Innocent's lifetime. Two famous twelfth-century theologians, Peter Abelard and Peter Lombard, each have nine and fifty-eight sermon manuscripts to their name; respectively.³³² Peter Comestor, a Parisian theologian in the late twelfth century, boasts 119 manuscripts.³³³ One of the most famous preachers of the early thirteenth-century was Jacques Vitry, and Innocent's

³³² Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, vol. 1, 39. Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, 703-704.

³³³ Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, 649-650

manuscript number eclipses even this famed preacher's fifty-six.³³⁴ Nicholas of Lyra, a late thirteenth-century Franciscan theologian and exegete is credited with twenty-eight.³³⁵ One of the largest number of sermon manuscripts is St. Bonaventure, minister general of the Franciscans, with 169.³³⁶ As I showed previously Schneyer's numbers are incorrect on certain aspects, which means that these numbers should be viewed as rough gauge to the overall popularity of preachers over the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Innocent's seventy-eight manuscripts do not measure close to the gargantuan number of St. Bonaventure, or even Peter Comestor, but they do show Innocent's sermons to have been more popular than those of Jacques Vitry, Nicholas of Lyra, Peter Lombard and Peter Abelard. Kendall makes the point that in the thirteenth century, Innocent's sermons were just as popular as his legal rulings.³³⁷ The siren call of legal rulings and political machinations have led historians to overemphasize these roles at the expense of the pastoral; Innocent's influence in this regard was not lost to contemporaries. Innocent's views and ideas of almsgiving might not have been original or particularly ground breaking in the intellectual circles. We see, however, that Innocent's sermons, (*Date Eleemosynam* among them, no doubt) were far more popular than a great deal of other preachers' and clerics' sermons of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. From comparing the manuscript tradition to other Church figures, it seems that contemporaries viewed Innocent very highly as a preacher of ability, which merited his remembrance in manuscripts copied across Europe.

³³⁴ Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, vol. 3, 195.

³³⁵ Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, 338, 356, 346, 354.

³³⁶ Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters*, vol. 1, 615, 624, 657.

³³⁷ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent," 67.

With this examination of Innocent's manuscript tradition complete we must now turn to examining the early printed editions of his works. Innocent's sermons were first printed in the *Opera Omnia*, in 1552, Cologne Germany, which including sixty-two sermons and the newly transformed *Libellus de Eleemosyna*.³³⁸ The second edition was again printed in Cologne in 1575 and offered a faithful rendition of the 1552 edition with the addition of six sermons.³³⁹ A Venetian edition came out in 1578 which was close to the Cologne printed editions.³⁴⁰ Finally in the nineteenth century, Angelo Mai, an archivist at the Vatican, published twelve sermons in his *Spicilegium Romanum*, volume eight, and finally the Jacques Paul Migne edition was printed in 1890 which was a combination of the Cologne and Mai editions.³⁴¹ Connie Munk describes the line of transmission between the 1552 and 1575 Cologne editions and the *Patrologia Latina* in her dissertation, "A Study of Pope Innocent III's Treatise: *De Quadripartita Specie Nuptiarum*." The stemma she creates is very patchy and much work needs to be done in this regard.³⁴² She speculates as to whether the 1575 edition copied the 1552 edition or whether they both used the same manuscript.³⁴³ Jansen believes that 1575 copied 1552, and I am inclined to agree with her. I demonstrate this in appendix two, through my in-depth analysis and comparison between the *Libellus* in the 1552 and 1575 editions. The *Libellus* in the 1575 and 1552 edition are exactly the

³³⁸ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 372.

³³⁹ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 372.

³⁴⁰ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 372.

³⁴¹ Jansen, "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession," 372.

³⁴² Connie Munk, "A study of Pope Innocent III's Treatise: *De Quadripartita Specie Nuptiarum* volume two," ii-iii.

³⁴³ Connie Munk, "A study of Pope Innocent III's Treatise: *De Quadripartita Specie Nuptiarum* volume two," ii-iii. ii.

same, apart from some spelling variances and the higher use of abbreviations in the 1552 edition: I conclude that the 1575 was an expert transcription of the 1552 edition. Migne explicitly mentions that he drew from the 1575 edition. Thus when one views the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* in the *PL*, one is essentially viewing the work of the 1552 editor, transcribed to the *PL* through the 1575. Corinne Vause agrees with this conclusion as well and says that that the “Migne collection is taken from the 1575 Cologne editions of the sermons, which is a somewhat faithful repetition of the first edition of 1552.”³⁴⁴ Unfortunately, I have not been able to find much scholarship done on these editions. How many copies were printed? Was Innocent’s *Opera Omnia* popular? Who purchased it and where did copies reside? It is a shame that many of these questions remain unanswered as, for better or worse, the printed editions have influenced the study of Innocent’s papacy through the editor’s decisions. Discovering more about them might help explain how Innocent’s historiography has been shaped since Migne printed the *PL*.

As previously mentioned, *Date Eleemosynam* was first detached and separated from the other sermons, and changed into the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* in the 1552 edition. I would like to propose two hypotheses as to why this change occurred. First, there may be an unknown manuscript which the 1552 originally edition drew from, which had this variation. The editor simply copied the manuscript and a late medieval scribe was the culprit for the variation. This would fit Carlo Delcorno’s observation that some popular Lenten sermons on virtues and vices were turned into *libelli* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Thus, in this hypothesis, the editors of 1552 were following the tradition of scribes who had already detached the sermon and converted it into a *libelli* in the fourteenth or fifteenth century. The main strength of this idea is

³⁴⁴ Corinne Vause, Introduction to *Between God and Man: Six Sermons on the Priestly Office*, Pope Innocent III, ed. and trans. Corinne Vause and Frank Gardiner (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press), xxvii.

the fact that 1552 has a sixth chapter while the manuscript tradition does not. I have viewed four manuscripts of *Date Eleemosynam*, and not a single one has “caput six.” Where else might the editor have gotten this extra part of the sermon if not from a medieval impersonator of Innocent? As I mentioned in the second chapter, the Latinity and biblical invocations are similar to the rest of *Date Eleemosynam*, and so the culprit was most likely medieval and not an early modern pseudo-Innocent. The second hypothesis is that the editor of the 1552 edition willingly took *Date Eleemosynam* from the manuscript he was working with, detached it from the *de tempore* section, and added the chapter divisions on his own volition. This would seem to make sense as the editor was already in the process of rearranging the ordering of the sermons and might have decided that he already had too many sermons for the beginning of Lent to add *Date Eleemosynam*. The use of the self-referential term “tractatum” within the sermon might also have aided the editor in his decision as it might not have carried the same self-defining weight as the word “sermo.” A problem with this hypothesis is the use of the word “libellum” instead of “tractatum.” I believe that the editor must have known that this was an important word to change as it is one of the few instances in the sermon where Innocent acknowledges himself and his work. If the editor had known this, would he been more careful to make such a crucial change?

I waver between the two theories. The first is certainly the better one for arguing for the document’s importance. It shows that the sermon was popular enough to merit a pseudo-author to write a sixth chapter and for scribes to believe that the Church would profit from exhuming this sermon from the corpus of Innocent’s sermons. Delcorno’s statement that some Lenten sermons were turned into “libelli” demonstrates that there is a possibility this happened, but without a handwritten late medieval manuscript which refers to *Date Eleemosynam* as a “libellum” I cannot confirm this theory. The second possibility is more mundane. The editor of

the 1552 edition was already in the process of rearranging the order of the sermons and he may have felt justified to detach *Date Eleemosynam* as well. One of the manuscripts I viewed at the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France* shows that perhaps the editor made an honest mistake. In BnF Lat. 3349, there is a work of Innocent which says: “Incipit tractatus venerabilis Innocentii pape III editus super expositione misterii altaris et sacramentorum ecclesiasticorum.”³⁴⁵ Perhaps the editor saw the word “tractatum” in the manuscript and translated the word to mean “treatise” and not “sermon.” But there is a problem with this. If he did mistranslate “tractatum,” why then does the word “libellum” appear in 1552? What would necessitate such a change? In many ways, this is a frustrating investigation. It opens more doors than it closes and leaves two theories as to why the change happened, both strong in their own ways.

While it is the 1552 edition which first detaches *Date Eleemosynam* from the sermon collection, we are able to trace a seemingly continued reliance on this error in the finding aides of the Vatican Library. In the manuscript catalogue for Vat Lat 700, Augustus Pelzer, the editor for *Codices Vaticani latini*, vol. 2 pt. 1, *Codices 679-1134* explicitly labels the sermon *Date Eleemosynam* as *Libelli de eleemosyna capita 1-5*.³⁴⁶ Immediately after, the catalogue reads “(in ms. *Sermo de eodem*).”³⁴⁷ This is strange for two reasons. First the sermons are listed by folio number and by feast day. No other indication of their contents or *incipit* is revealed *except* in the case of this particular sermon. The second reason is that the editor specifically mentions the double life of this sermon. The “*sermo de eodem*” refers to the previously indicated *in initio quadragesime* for the previous sermon. The editor specifically knows the function of *Date*

³⁴⁵ BnF Lat 3349, fol. 35.

³⁴⁶ Augustus Pelzer ed., *Codices Vaticani Latini: Tomus II, Pars Prior Codices 679-1134* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1931), 21.

³⁴⁷ Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani Latini*, 21

Eleemosynam in the manuscript as a Lenten sermon. He also decided, however, to provide the information that it was the *Libelli de eleemosyna*, and furthermore points out that this is only chapter one through five, thus indicating that he is aware Vat Lat 700 does not contain “caput six.” In a vacuum, unspoiled by the 1552 edition’s mistake, *Date Eleemosynam* follows the exact same pattern as the rest of the *de tempore* sermons in the manuscript. Each sermon starts with a large hanging letter at the start of the *incipit* and ends with “amen.” There is nothing to indicate this as a “libellum” within the manuscript. The only source for this is knowledge of 1552’s modification. One sees even in the manuscript catalogue published in 1931 the continued influence of the 1552 edition’s error.

What of the manuscript catalogue for Vat Lat 10902? This catalog was printed in 1955 and edited by Giovanni Battista Borino.³⁴⁸ In this catalogue, *Date Eleemosynam* is again misrepresented and called *Libelli de eleemsoyna*.³⁴⁹ Oddly, the editor chose to place the entry at the very end of the manuscript description, almost as an afterthought. Within the progression of the Lenten sermons, *Date Eleemosynam* is not mentioned at all.³⁵⁰ This catalogue also offers the column numbers of the *Patrologia Latina* for each sermon and does this as well for the “libelli de eleemosyna.” Again, by simply looking at the manuscript, there is no reason to assume anything else other than viewing *Date Eleemosynam* as a regular sermon.³⁵¹ If this is the case, why did both editors, roughly thirty years apart, use a distinguishing title for an undistinguished

³⁴⁸ Iohannes Borino ed., *Codices Vaticani Latini: Codices 10876-11000* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1955).

³⁴⁹ Iohannes Borino ed., *Codices Vaticani Latini*, 120.

³⁵⁰ Iohannes Borino ed., *Codices Vaticani Latini*, 118.

³⁵¹ Vat Lat 10902, fol. 58r.

sermon? Even more surprising is Vat Lat 700's catalogue entry as both sermon and as *Libellus*. These editors are both aware of *Date Eleemosynam*'s double function as sermon and small book.

Throughout this chapter and thesis I have viewed *Date Eleemosynam* as primarily a sermon, with an understanding that the 1552 Cologne editor either had a maverick manuscript to work from or simply decided to detach the sermon from the corpus of Innocent's sermons. It is however a bit close-minded to view *Date Eleemosynam* as only a sermon and the *Libellus* as a strange mutation. Created around 1204, *Date Eleemosynam* was primarily seen as a sermon up until 1552, a period of about three hundred and thirty years. Yet, since 1552 up until our own day, historians and scholars have viewed it as its own freestanding work: a little book. We see this in the manuscript catalogues of the Vatican library, the work of Jacques-Paul Migne, and in the scholarship of Brenda Bolton and James Brodman. These modern scholars both used the work to show Innocent's idea of almsgiving and poor relief. They were certainly missing the function of the document and thus a chance to expand their analysis of Innocent and understand the audience. But for untold numbers of people from 1552 onward who read the first printed edition of the *Opera Omnia*, the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* should be considered in its own right a little book as for most of its existence it was perceived and used as such. If a book is adapted (authentically) into a movie, it would be unfair to say that viewers *only* perceived the book through the medium of film. Rather, while this movie began as a book, it can rightfully be considered a movie in its own right. Similarly, in the use of *Date Eleemosynam*, it would be unfair to overemphasize its first form, as a sermon, and discard its second form, as a *Libellus*, as illegitimate. Its existence as a little book far surpasses its lifespan as a sermon. Discovering how this booklet was used in the Renaissance and early modern world is the other half to the medieval manuscript tradition of *Date Eleemosynam*. Innocent's sermon collections, with *Date*

Eleemosynam inside, were quite popular: so popular in fact that perhaps, according to the first hypothesis, a late medieval scribe exhumed the sermon to stand as its own book: whether this is the case or not, Innocent's sermons and *Date Eleemosynam* found their way into library and monasteries across Europe. Innocent's pastoral message must have been read and preached in all corners of Europe, influencing almsgiving and religiosity in urban centers. The medieval popularity of *Date Eleemosynam* is fairly certain; perhaps from this we can assume its early modern popularity as well.

CONCLUSION

Eleemosyna: The Virtue of the Laity

Alexander Murray attempts to upend the idea of an “age of faith” in his article “Piety and Impiety in Thirteenth-Century Italy.” By using Italy as a focal point, he argues that previous studies of faith and religion in the Middle Ages were done with “mainly clerical sources, worked over by mainly clerical historians.”³⁵² One of the sources Murray uses is collections of sermons. Murray scans the sermon manuscripts of six different Dominicans and Franciscans to elucidate which sin concerned these men the most. He says:

The trio of lust, pride and avarice reflected scholastic ethics. It also reflected contemporary society; and this can be told, once again, from the detail, and stresses, given by the preachers. It can be told above all by the precedence given, within the trio to the last, *avaritia*, which meant, not just hoarding, but money-mindedness. There is every reason, quite apart from sermons, for believing that thirteenth-century Italy saw a growth in competitive spirit, of a kind finding special outlet in money making. The friar’s life was a reaction to this spirit, and their sermons staunchly confirm its prevalence.³⁵³

Further on he mentions that “lust pride and avarice, were what they [the friars] saw around them; and the greatest of these was avarice.”³⁵⁴ This “competitive spirit” would have been growing while Innocent was composing *Date Eleemosynam* around 1204. Most likely he was aware of it; if avarice was becoming the sin of choice, then almsgiving, the willful giving up of material wealth, was Innocent’s solution.

³⁵² Alexander Murray, “Piety and Impiety in Thirteenth-Century Italy,” in *Popular Belief and Practice: Papers Read at the Ninth Summer meeting and the Tenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, vol. 8, ed. G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 83.

³⁵³ Murray, “Piety and Impiety,” 89.

³⁵⁴ Murray, “Piety and Impiety,” 91.

This thesis has accomplished several things. While most historians such as Brenda Bolton and James Brodman have used this “little book” in a cursory way to understand Innocent’s views on alms, they miss the fact that this document is miscategorized in the *Patrologia Latina*: it was originally a sermon. Bolton and Brodman studied the document as “libellus,” thus missing the very specific function which might have changed their treatment of it. While both used it to understand Innocent’s mindset regarding alms, such an analysis of this attitude would have been aided with the knowledge that Innocent was preaching this to the laity. Thus, this thesis attempts to understand the *Libellus de Eleemosyna* through the lens of preaching. I have demonstrated that *Date Eleemoysnam* shows Innocent promoting an active lay spirituality, in line with his education at Paris and Bologna. By arguing that the *Libellus* should be understood as originally a preached sermon, I offer insight into Innocent’s view of the laity, his propensity for the *vita apostolica* as later personified by the Franciscans, and make inroads into how clerical culture and education were translated into a lay setting.

In the first chapter, or “Interpreting Alms,” I provided the short historiography of the document and the historical context in which to analyze this sermon. Innocent as pastor has become the popular interpretation, shying away from the overt focus on his legal dealings. Innocent would learn this pastoral role while at the university of Paris. Peter the Chanter and his circle were intellectually dominant at the time, and influenced the young Innocent with their view that theologians needed to be active social reformers and not distant academics. Peter himself saw preaching as the crowning feature of a theologian. A favorite phrase of the Parisian masters was that good words needed to be done with “cordis, “oris” et “operis,” by heart, mouth, and deeds. Innocent would also spend some time at Bologna studying canon law. In regards to preaching, the religious activity was evolving radically at that time. Spurred on, no doubt, by

Peter the Chanter's exhortations and the population increase in urban areas, preaching was changing from solely a monastic activity, towards playing a role in an urban setting. This evolution should be juxtaposed to the increase of religious charity. Hospitals and caritative orders were dramatically increasing at the end of the twelfth century and, similarly to preaching, the *opus caritatis* was turning into a lay endeavor. *Date Eleemosynam* is a sermon on almsgiving: thus the work straddles both of these contemporary social and religious changes.

Chapter two, "Alms, Spiritual Reward, and Engaging the Laity," examines the *Libellus* as a sermon. Jacques-Paul Migne drew the text in volume 217 of the *Patrologia Latina* from an older edition printed in Cologne Germany in 1575. This edition drew from an even earlier 1552 edition. It is the first instance where *Date Eleemosynam* is referred to as a "libellus" as far as I have discovered.

In the *Patrologia Latina* the *Libellus* is divided up into six chapters. None of the manuscripts I have viewed include the sixth chapter, and it is still a mystery where it came from or who wrote it. The first chapter begins with Innocent's bold proclamation that alms have the ability to cleanse the entire world of sin. The second chapter is where we begin to see Innocent's "mystical" view of alms come into greater focus. In several instances he rhetorically draws comparison between what alms accomplishes in the physical world, and what it accomplishes in the spiritual one by using the exact same words, such as "extinguish," and "expel." In addition, Innocent presents this spiritual exchange in the language of a business deal. The rich need spiritual goods, and the poor are the agent of conversion in this spiritual transaction. These two chapters present the spiritual basis for almsgiving. The third chapter examines the problem with Innocent's original proclamation: how can alms achieve this when sin is present in the world?

His conclusion will occupy the rest of the sermon: alms must stem from true charity and must be performed correctly.

In chapter four of the *Libellus*, Innocent places the spiritual efficacy of almsgiving above that of fasting and prayer. Innocent explicitly opens almsgiving to all and exalts a virtue most easily associated with the laity above “clerical” virtues. Innocent says that almsgiving is better than prayer or fasting, but that none should be ignored. Almsgiving supersedes fasting, because while fasting subtracts, almsgiving bestows. Innocent accurately anticipates that upon completion of a fast, many turn to overeating to placate their hunger. Innocent then compares almsgiving to prayer. He says that while prayer is good, alms simultaneously descends to neighbor and ascends to God. Innocent argues that the best prayer is to pray with work, “orare opere.” By promoting “orare opere” through almsgiving, Innocent presents a lay option to the famous Benedictine phrase “ora et labora,” and gives a lay alternative to monastic spirituality.

In the fifth chapter, Innocent presents the order, manner, reason, and end of almsgiving. End and reason are both done for eternal reward. The manner in which one gives, Innocent opines, must be with cheerfulness: a clear reference to Gratian’s *Decretum*. The discussion of order is long, and winding, reflecting the canonical debate between discriminate and indiscriminate charity. Innocent takes the middle course of the canonists and believes that if one has enough for all, then the indiscriminate approach of St. John Chrysostom should be followed. However, if there is enough to cover the needs of all, then the discriminate approach of Saints Ambrose and Augustine should be applied. When Innocent discusses what should be given, he makes reference to his writing as a “libellum.” By examining the manuscript, I have found that the editor for the 1552 edition substituted the word “libellum” for “tractatum.” “Tractatum” in

Ecclesiastical Latin refers to homily, treatise, or sermon. This adds further, perhaps conclusive evidence to my argument that the *Libellus* was originally a sermon.

Chapter six in the *Patrologia Latina* does not appear in any manuscript I have viewed and appears to be written by a pseudo-Innocent. This chapter focuses mainly on the necessity of perseverance when giving alms.

In chapter three of my thesis, “Go and Preach to All Nations,” I examine the manuscript tradition of *Date Eleemosynam* and Innocent’s model sermon collection. *Date Eleemosynam* was a mainstay, and appears in all three manuscript editions. These manuscripts, with *Date Eleemosynam* within them, can be found in libraries from Italy to England, Iberia to the Czech Republic. Through my work at the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France* I have produced an updated number of Innocent’s sermon manuscripts: seventy-eight. This number far exceeds the famous preacher Jacques de Vitry, or the theologian Nicholas of Lyra. Ultimately, I have two theories why *Date Eleemosynam* ended up as the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*. The first is that there was some late medieval manuscript which already had changed the sermon into the “little book” and the editor of the 1552 edition merely followed this manuscript. Carlo Delcorno mentions that popular Lenten sermons on virtues and vices were turned into “libelli” in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This might explain then where the sixth chapter came from: a medieval impersonator. The second theory is that the editor of the 1552 edition willingly changed the sermon *Date Eleemosynam* into the *Libellus de Eleemosyna*. The editor was already changing the ordering of the sermons and may have decided to detach the sermon from the corpus of Innocent’s other sermons. To finish the transformation, he added chapter heading and title, and changed the one self-referential term “tractatum” into “libellum.”

At the end of his book, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants*, John Baldwin asks a vital question:

Because of the close agreement between the pope and the theologian over ordeals, marriages, and other questions, because of Innocent's studies at Paris, and the Chanter's trip to Rome, is it too much to include Pope Innocent III within the Parisian circle of Peter the Chanter?³⁵⁵

I believe it is not. Innocent does flippantly refer to his teachers, the "scholastici," in the sermon, but the overall message is in line with Peter's belief that theologians needed to be active social reformers. Innocent exhorts almsgiving through the whole person, by "corde," "ore," and "opere," a mentality learned at Paris. Peter the Chanter, along with other twelfth-century masters, saw poverty as primarily a pastoral problem.³⁵⁶ Through studying this sermon, it is apparent that Innocent believed this as well.

Innocent had, at this time, become discouraged and upset by intransigent clergy, especially Berengar II, archbishop of Narbonne. Perhaps Innocent wrote *Date Eleemosynam* with this in mind and turned to the laity. By the mid-twelfth century the laity had begun to circumvent the established clerical channels for almsgiving and gave directly to the poor themselves.³⁵⁷ Innocent's direct appeal to the laity may not have been that strange. What is certain, however, is that Innocent did have the foresight to endorse another important movement, the Mendicants. Towards the end of her dissertation, Vause states:

It should not be overlooked that Innocent III and St. Francis of Assisi were contemporaries. Hauck had said, "Innocent was no kindred soul of the poor man of Assisi." Yet, somehow they recognized each other. The legend says that Innocent saw Francis in a dream. That dream might well have been an expression of the desire for

³⁵⁵ Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants*, 343.

³⁵⁶ Michel Mollat, *The Poor in the Middle Ages: an Essay in Social History*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 107.

³⁵⁷ Mollat, *The Poor in the Middle Ages*, 95.

universal order and unity. Both Francis and Innocent were trying, as Brentano says, “to produce a new sort or new sorts of Christian total society.” Both were striving for some means of bringing a fragmented world into union with God.³⁵⁸

Should we not see St. Francis and the Franciscans as attempting to live out the mystical view outlined by Innocent in *Date Eleemosynam*? Discovering whether or not the Franciscans copied and preached *Date Eleemosynam* would need a careful study all of its own; however, we do know that Innocent’s sermons were read widely and copied extensively. If Innocent was sincere when he wrote and preached *Date Eleemosynam*, he may very well have recognized the “poor man from Assisi’s” lifestyle as one that correlated with his own hope for the renewal of the world. Innocent’s and Francis’ idea of the material world may not have been very different.

In a wider context, I hope that this study leads to more investigations of Innocent’s other Lenten sermons. *Date Eleemosynam* is but one of nine Lenten and three Ash Wednesday sermons. Lent is a spiritually reflective time, and because of this, there must be other clues about how Innocent viewed the world during this time of prayer, fasting, and almsgiving. Thus, while Kendall focused on several Christmas sermons and Vause on the important coronation and Lateran sermons, perhaps we should focus more on Innocent’s Lenten sermons. These sermons were preached with the understanding that the renewal of Easter was approaching. For a pope who quoted Jeremiah in his coronation, saying that his role was “to root up and to plant,” what better liturgical time to try and understand the uprooting? How then did he view this renewal, and how did this shape his political machinations? This thesis has made one part of the renewal clear: Innocent associated the laity with a specific virtue that was worthy of their station, almsgiving.

³⁵⁸ Vause, “The Sermons of Innocent III,” 152.

Appendix I: Manuscripts Descriptions

This appendix gives a detailed explanation for each manuscript I viewed at the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*. In chapter three I offered a decision regarding whether I thought these manuscripts were Innocentian model sermon collections. Here, I provide the in-depth and meticulous observations and evidence which led me to these conclusions.

BnF Lat 3277

This manuscript is easily categorized as a collection of Innocent's sermons. As I stated above, Kendall insists that this manuscript is part of the first edition of the sermon collection. Kendall however is reliant upon the manuscript catalogue.³⁵⁹ By viewing the actual manuscript I can confirm that this is indeed a collection of Innocent's sermons. The manuscript is rather thin and in good condition. It is prefaced with the letter to Arnald and begins with Innocent's first sermon for Advent, *Cum venit plenitudo temporis*.³⁶⁰ The manuscript follows a familiar pattern of three more Advent sermons trailed by Innocent's well-known Christmas sermon *Verbum caro factum est*.³⁶¹ Lent follows a familiar pattern as the first Lenten sermons is *Tu cum jejunaveris, unge caput tuum*, followed by *Hoc est majus jejunium, Date Eleemosynam*, and *Ductus est Jesus in desertum*.³⁶² My total count of forty eight sermons is different from Kendall's fifty-one. Oddly enough, Kendall asserts that one of the last sermons, *Post passionem suam*, was added later as an "after-thought."³⁶³ This might be the case, but by examining the script, one can detect

³⁵⁹ Kendall, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III," 82.

³⁶⁰ BnF Lat 3277, fol. 1r-v.

³⁶¹ BnF Lat 3277, fol. 3v-8r.

³⁶² BnF Lat 3277, fol. 19v-27v.

a similar hand throughout the manuscript. The idea that this last sermon was an addition does not appear to be the case. Without a doubt, this manuscript is one of Innocent's sermon collections.

BnF Lat 3278

This is not an Innocentian model sermon collection and should be moved to the “singuli sermones” section of the *Repertorium*. While it does not add to the total number of Innocent's model sermons, it does show his influence by association with other Church figures. The online manuscript catalogue is very long for this collection, twenty three pages when the web page is downloaded as a PDF, and documents the contents of the manuscript quite precisely.³⁶⁴ It says that the manuscript itself is from the library of the Avignon popes around 1369 and is labeled *Lectionarium romanum, pars aestivalis*.³⁶⁵ The manuscript itself is quite large and heavy. Its length is about thirty-six point eight centimeters and the width is twenty three and one quarter, containing 383 folios: this manuscript was certainly meant to be on a lectionary stand and was not a mobile book. The structure is double columned on each folio, with a large red hanging letter indicates the beginning of a sermon, *vita*, or *passio*. Most of these sermons indicate who the author is as they mention either Augustine, Ambrose, or Innocent in red letters at the beginning of the sermon.

The manuscript begins with a large elaborate liturgical calendar on the first six folios. The rest of the manuscript continues with short sermons and some *vitae* and *passiones* of saints and popes. The first entry after the liturgical calendar is a sermon by Innocent: *Inter natos*

³⁶³ Kendall, “Sermons of Pope Innocent III,” 83.

³⁶⁴ “Latin 3278.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc61152k>.

³⁶⁵ “Latin 3278.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc61152k>.

mulierum non surrexit, a sermon for the feast of John the Baptist.³⁶⁶ Various other sermons, mostly by Augustine and Ambrose, and *vitae* and *passiones* follow, until we reach another sermon of Innocent's *Evangelium cum legeret attentissima audistis*, attributed to Innocent by the manuscript itself.³⁶⁷ Oddly enough, at 81 verso, instead of a sermon of Innocent, there are several *Decretals* by the pontiff. In addition there is Innocent's sermons on the birth of Mary, the birth of the apostle Peter, and the feast of Mary Magdalene, St. Lawrence, and the feast of the assumption.³⁶⁸ This unit of Innocent's sermons occupies the back of the manuscript from folios 359 to 377 verso.

According to the index of BnF Lat 3278 there are a total of nine Church figures whose sermons are recorded in this manuscript: Ambrosius Autpertus, Ambrosius Mediolanensis, Augustinus Hipponensis, Faustus Reiensis, Innocentius III, Leo Magnus, Maximus Taurinensis, Paulus Diaconus, and Petrus Chrysologus.³⁶⁹ Many other popes and bishops make appearances in BnF Lat 3278, but as the subject of hagiographic accounts rather than as authors. With a total of roughly nine or ten sermons, Innocent's presence in the overall manuscript does not match with the number of about twenty-five of Augustine's sermons.³⁷⁰ Innocent does, however, play the important role of beginning the entire collection with one of his sermons, and occupying a large swath of space at the very end of the manuscript. What this manuscript shows is that

³⁶⁶ BnF Lat 3278, fol. 7r-8v.

³⁶⁷ BnF Lat 3278, fol. 66r.

³⁶⁸ BnF Lat 3278, fol. 177v, 359r, 364r, 363v, 369r, 373r.

³⁶⁹ "Latin 3278." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc61152k>.

³⁷⁰ "Latin 3278." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc61152k>.

Innocent's reputation as a preacher was not limited to the thirteenth century, but continued into the Avignon papacy. While not a model sermon collection, this manuscript certainly does possess Innocentian sermons and argues for a continued Church acceptance of Innocent as an authoritative preacher, worthy to be remembered.

BnF Lat 1007 A

This manuscript is also miscategorized. The manuscript catalogue itself states that while it does have a work of Innocent III, it is his *Liber de missarum mysteriis* and not his sermons. Examining the manuscript itself proves the catalogue's accuracy. The codex itself is rather small, twenty-five point two centimeters by sixteen point seven, with small neat letters and thin parchment pages. One views a table of contents for the *missarum mysteriis* on two verso and three recto. According to the catalogue, the manuscript contains Innocent's work until fifty-two recto, which introduces Johannes de Rupella's *Tractatus de articulis fidei*. The manuscript concludes with the anonymous *Tractatus de poenitentia* from 74-75 verso and finally Hugo de Sancto's *Speculum Ecclesiae* from 76-80 verso. The last few pages have some short writings by St. Bernard. Overall, making a judgment is easy: it is not an Innocentian sermon collection, nor does it even contain a single sermon by anyone.

BnF Lat 1250 and 1251

I decided to combine my analysis of both of these sermons together because they follow Schneyer's trend of miscategorizing Innocent's other works as sermons. I did not access either of these manuscripts while at the BnF but manuscript 1250 is available on the BnF's online digitized collection, *Gallica*. The manuscript catalogue, which thus far has proven accurate, lists

both as containing Innocent's work *Liber de missarum mysteriis*.³⁷¹ The catalogue for both titles the manuscripts as *Innocentius III papa, Liber de missarum mysteriis*. Neither of these manuscripts should be considered sermon collections of Innocent's.

BnF Lat 3349.

Once again, Schneyer miscategorizes a theological work of Innocent as a sermon collection. This manuscript is smaller; the length is twenty-five point five centimeters with fairly ornate hanging letters and almost no marginalia. The first entry in the manuscript seems to be anonymous and reads "*Breviloquium de horis canonicis discens*." Most of this section of the manuscript seems to be dealing with works and aids for the Mass. It is no surprise then, that when we reach folio thirty-five we encounter, once again, Innocent's *missarum mysteriis*. The *incipit* reads: *Incipit tractatum venerabile Innocentus papae editus super expositione misterii altaris et sacramentorum ecclesiasticorum*.³⁷² This is the final portion of the manuscript and continues until 114 verso. Again, Schneyer makes the mistake of miscategorizing one of Innocent's theological works for his sermons.

BnF Lat 3611

This manuscript shows a consistent trend of Schneyer miscategorizing Innocent's popular theological works as sermons. Studying the manuscript, I observed that it contains Innocent's work, *De miseria conditionis humanae*, as well as his work *de officio missae secundum*

³⁷¹ "Latin 1250." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc59192d>. "Latin 1251." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc59193n>.

³⁷² "Latin 3349." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc61237j>.

consuestudinem sedis apostolicis.³⁷³ The manuscript is a medium size and 172 folios long. The librarian added the title “Innocentii III de miseria conditionis” to signal the beginning of Innocent’s work in the middle of the manuscript. A blank page precedes Innocent’s next work, *Incipit liber Innocenti III, de officio missas secundum consuestudinem sedis apostolicis*.³⁷⁴ This section is enhanced with decorative lettering and the work consumes the majority of the manuscript, up until folio 162 verso, which has Anslem’s *Prosologen*. The final verdict on this manuscript is that it is most certainly not an Innocentian sermon collection.

BnF Lat 12414

Lat 12414 is another manuscript which is categorized as an Innocentian model sermon collection, but should more likely be placed in the “singuli sermons” of the *Repertorium*. Very little is written in the manuscript catalogue, other than “[Sermons], Vita S. Leodegarii (183), Vita S. Christiane (192v).”³⁷⁵ The title given in the catalogue is only “[Sermones].”³⁷⁶ The manuscript is a medium size, thirty centimeters by twenty, with about 199 folios. The librarian scrawled on the front cover: “multi sermones auctoris vestri” and then mentions the two *vitae* that are in the catalogue. The first two folios contain a single block of text, and then begin to use the typical double column folio layout. This manuscript, unlike the other manuscripts I viewed at the BnF, made use of green shade in some of the capital letters. The beginning of each sermon was marked with a hanging decorative head letter to indicate the next sermon.

³⁷³ “Latin 3611.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc615528>.

³⁷⁴ BnF Lat 3611, fol. 29r.

³⁷⁵ “Latin 12414.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc73692n>.

³⁷⁶ “Latin 12414.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc73692n>.

The body of the manuscript does not have the preface to Arnold. Similarly to BnF 18173, a manuscript to be discussed later, the text launches into the first sermon: *Hora est iam nos de somno surge*, a sermon by Innocent for the first Sunday of Advent.³⁷⁷ I have verified the next three sermons as Innocentian: *Gaudete in Domino semper*, *Verbum caro factum est*, *Novum faciet Dominus super terram*, and *Puer natus est nobis*.³⁷⁸ At this point in the manuscript there is a stretch from 10 verso to 31 recto, consisting of eleven sermons which are not Innocent's. Then standing by itself is Innocent's sermon for the conversion of Saint Paul, *Nolo mortem peccatoris, sed ut convertatur*.³⁷⁹ The manuscript proceeds in a similar fashion with long stretches of unidentified *incipits* with a solitary Innocentian sermon. There are other areas of extended Innocentian sermons such as from folio seventy-eight verso to eighty-three verso which have Innocent's sermons regarding Martha, the feast of the Assumption, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, *Duo seraphim clamabant*, for the feast of all the saints, and *Nescitis quia corpora vestra templum sunt*, a sermon for the consecration of the altar.³⁸⁰ In all, I tallied eight-four sermons in the entire manuscript, and identified from the *incipit* and first lines twenty-one Innocentian sermons.

This manuscript appears to favor Innocent's sermons regarding Christmas, the feast of communal saints, and feasts for the Blessed Virgin Mary. With twenty-six percent of all sermons being attributed to Innocent, he appears well represented in relation to the other "auctoritas vestri." This manuscript shows Innocent's influence, and also the focus of the scribe.

³⁷⁷ BnF Lat 12414, fol. 1r.

³⁷⁸ BnF Lat 12414, fol. 2v-8r.

³⁷⁹ BnF Lat 12414, fol. 33v.

³⁸⁰ BnF Lat 12414, fol. 146v-148r.

Further research would have to be made into the life of the manuscript to illustrate a better idea of Innocent's influence and what other authors he was connected with. Due to time constraints I was not able to identify the authors of the other sermons. Due to the Lat 3278 which has Saints Augustine and Ambrose as Innocent's sermonic neighbors, I assume the same is true for Lat 12414. My conclusion for BnF Lat 12414 is similar to BnF Lat 3278: this is not a "pure" Innocentian sermon manuscript, but it does show that Innocent's sermons were used in conjunction with other popular preachers.

BnF Lat 14938

This manuscript is available digitally on the BnF's *Gallica* website, but I was also able to access it in person. My conclusion regarding this manuscript is that it is a model sermon collection of Innocent's and potentially challenges Kendall's assertion that the "long version" of Innocent's sermon collection did not travel beyond the Alps. This manuscript is medium size. Oddly, the section for Innocent's sermons is lacking the large hanging letter, and there is a blank space where a large ornate letter should have been drawn. This is not the same for the entire manuscript as later sections unconnected to the sermons present a finished project. The catalogue titles the manuscript "Innocentii III sermons" and explains the contents as Innocent's sermons, a book of Aristotle, and several other theological works by other Church figures such as Alexander III, Radufi, and Gaudrifo.³⁸¹ Innocent's sermons take up the first 126 folios of the 279 folios.

In total, there are eighty-seven total sermons attributed to Innocent all written in the same hand. The manuscript starts with Innocent's preface to Arnald and proceeds to presents

³⁸¹ "Latin 14938." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc75667h>.

Innocent's sermon for Advent, *Cum venit plenitudo temporis*.³⁸² The sermons follow a familiar pattern with three more assumed Advent sermons and then *Verbum Caro factum est* and *Novum faciat Dominus*, two Christmas sermons.³⁸³ Further on the Lenten sermons are in the regular sequence of, *Tu cum jejunaveris, unge caput tuum, Hoc est majus jejunium, Date Eleemosynam*, and *Ductus est Jesus in desertum a spiritu*.³⁸⁴ Overall, the manuscript appears to follow the typical progression for an Innocentian sermon collection. The fascinating difference that this manuscript presents, however, is the total number of sermons attributed to Innocent. I counted eighty-seven total sermons within this section of the manuscript. Beginning on folio 90 verso, I was not able to find any *incipit* in the *Patrologia Latina* which matched. This trend was consistent as the next twenty sermons did not have any matches in the *Patrologia Latina* or Kendall's list of Innocent's sermons. If we take the sermon number at face value from the manuscript, then Kendall's assertion that the "long version" of seventy plus Innocentian sermons did not travel north of the Alps is incorrect. It shows that this edition of the sermons was more widely circulated than given credit for by Kendall, and potentially more popular than once thought. It would not be unheard of, however, for a scribe to attribute others' sermons to Innocent in order for these sermons to gain popularity under a famous author. If we assume this might be the case, then the total number of Innocent's sermons shrink to sixty-seven: still a substantial number, but not reaching the length of the "long edition" as proscribed by Scuppa and Kendall. This could be rectified by a detailed study and comparison between BnF Lat 14938 and Vat Lat 700 and 10902, both Vatican "long editions."

³⁸² BnF Lat 14938, fol., 2r-2v.

³⁸³ BnF Lat 14938, fol., 8v-10r.

³⁸⁴ BnF Lat 14938, fol., 18v-22v.

Similarly to BnF Lat 18173, to be discussed next, such a comprehensive study of this manuscript is outside the purview of this chapter. It does however open an interesting door into the study of Innocent's popularity in the decades after his death. This manuscript is most certainly an Innocentian model sermon collection and potentially opens the diffusion of the "long edition" beyond the Alps.

BnF Lat 18173

This manuscript adds a different dimension to the model sermon collection. Not much is provided on the online manuscript catalogue except for the title of the manuscript: "Innocentius III [Lotharius Segni], Sermones."³⁸⁵ This manuscript is larger than BnF Lat 3277 but still double columned. This collection also has the added feature of red lettering before each sermon indicating what the sermon is to be used for. For example, the sermon *Laetare Jerusalem* has in red, above the *incipit*, "*sermo in media quadragesima*."³⁸⁶ While I would categorize this as an Innocentian sermon collection, it does not have any preface to Arnald and simply begins with the first sermon *Cum venit plenitudo temporis*, a sermon for Advent, then *Novum faciet Dominus super terram*, a Christmas sermon followed by *Ecce ego mitto angelum meum*, and then *Verbum caro factum est*.³⁸⁷ What is difficult to understand is the next sermon, *Ecce Venit propehta mangus et renovabi* is described as an Advent sermon, placed immediately *after* one of Innocent's most popular Christmas sermons, *Verbum caro factum est*.³⁸⁸ The ordering of the sermons in this manuscript continues to break from the conventional ordering, and is followed by

³⁸⁵ "Latin 18173." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc89041>.

³⁸⁶ BnF Lat 18173, fol., 26r.

³⁸⁷ BnF Lat 18173, fol., 5r-12r.

³⁸⁸ BnF Lat 18173, fol., 14r.

the Lenten sermons, *Tu cum jejunaveris, unge caput tuum, Hoc est majus*, and *Cum immundus ipsem exierit*.³⁸⁹ What is surprising is that both *Date Eleemosynam* and *Ductus est Jesus in desertum a spiritu* are both missing from this progression as they are normally placed in other Innocentian sermon manuscripts such as Vat Lat 700 and 10902, BnF 3277 and 14938.³⁹⁰ The effect is discombobulating and implies that this manuscript was created in an entirely different fashion and order from what was orthodox for the well-known Innocentian manuscripts. One prominent example of this is the placement of *Puer natus est nobis*, a Christmas sermon and described as such in the manuscript with *Item sermo in natali domini*, all the way at folio 86 verso near the end of the sermon. The manuscript ends with *Hora est jam nos de somno surge*, an Advent sermon.³⁹¹ The collection boasts forty-four total sermons, most of which I have identified as Innocentian with very few (potential) exceptions.

Overall this manuscript is easily categorized as Innocentian. The librarian who originally examined the manuscripts believes this as well, since on one of the back blank pages he scribbled “In hoc volumine sermons Innocentii papae.” As most of the sermons match other sermons in other manuscripts as well as the *Patrologia Latina* it seems the librarian was correct. The fascinating aspect about this manuscript is the ordering of the sermons. As stated before, Kendall uses the ordering of the sermons in other Innocentian sermon collections to delineate how the sermon collection grew and evolved over the course of the thirteenth century. A full investigation of the exact ordering of each sermon compared against the sermon spreadsheet which Kendall provides in appendix three of his dissertation is beyond the scope of this chapter,

³⁸⁹ BnF Lat 18173, fol., 17r-24r.

³⁹⁰ Vat Lat 700, 21r-28v; Vat Lat 10902, 58r-66v; BnF Lat 3277, 14938.

³⁹¹ BnF Lat 18173, fol., 105r.

but opens a possible investigation and addition to the growing knowledge of the different editions of Innocent's model sermon collections.

BnF NAL 270

This manuscript is not an Innocentian sermon collection, but it does provide a very interesting glimpse into what a working sermon handbook might have looked like. I was unable to confirm that there was an Innocent sermon in this manuscript, and to my dismay, I had to work with sub-par microfilm. The manuscript catalogue from the BnF website titles NAL 270 as *Sermones et textes à l'usage des prédicateurs.*³⁹² The manuscript consists of 269 folios in many different hands. The manuscript appears to be quite battered and water stained, perhaps explaining the reason for its microfilm production and showing that the title was well deserved as it appears used. While I was not able to see the shape and size of the manuscript itself, it potentially could have been mobile to move about with the preacher that was using it. There heavy use of marginalia at the bottom of the pages as well, in a different hand from the body of the work, and is quickly written, perhaps by the preacher next to his favorite sermon. Notes, long paragraphs on all three sides of the folio and small manicules all point towards heavy usage by the manuscript's original owner.

This manuscript also shows a fascinating way a preacher might construct a sermon. Beginning at 89 recto, the script consolidates the text into one large block. This is where things become different. At parts throughout the folios, a single line will be given next to the text. The text for this area has been "moved" about one tab space to make way for this sentence. Then lines are drawn from the passage to different areas of the main body. Sometimes there are two

³⁹² "NAL 270." *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017. <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc70842j>.

lines connecting the passage to the body of the text and sometimes as many as five. This leads me to believe that a preacher might view the “intro” to his next sermon by reading the first sentence and then have different choices about where to take the sermon. This occurs on many occasions in this manuscript and seems to be a standard device. Sometimes this process is quite extensive as one heading will lead to three other headings which in turn each have their own text. The options and paths a preacher might have in constructing a sermon would have been extensive. While very interesting, this manuscript should most likely not be considered “Innocentian” and should most likely be removed from Schneyer’s *Repertorium* as such.

Appendix II: Comparison of the Cologne Editions

In chapter three I also argued that the 1552 and 1575 Cologne editions were essentially exact replicas. The evidence for the conclusion is provided here, in appendix II. The table of contents shows many similarities between the 1552 and 1575 editions. 1552 has two added sections: a letter to the archbishop of Treuerensem, and the life of Innocent which are rearranged in 1575 to function as a preface.³⁹³ Following this difference, the two volumes are identical. They both begin with a section on the *de tempore* sermons, followed by the *de sanctis* sermons, the sermons on special saints' feast days, Innocent's coronation sermon, and finally *De eleemosyna, Liber I.*³⁹⁴ 1552 has eleven more sections, most of them Innocent's other theological works such as the *misery of the human condition*, and his commentary on the psalms, while 1575 has ten. Other than the similarities between the two one should also notice that 1552 rearranges the sermons. None of the manuscripts I have worked with divides the sermons into distinct categories. Most follow a basic liturgical pattern and are not segregated due to feast versus solemnity. This is an important point to be discussed later in the chapter.

Moving from general comparisons of the contents of 1552 and 1575, we turn to *De eleemosyna* specifically. I have completed a detailed and meticulous comparison between the two editions and have found that they are essentially the same. As a testimony to the faithfulness of the two editions, the biggest change I could identify was "optinendum" in 1552 and

³⁹³ *Opera Innocentii pontificis maximi, eius nominis III . . .* (Coloniae: excudebat Ioannes Nouesianus, 1552), ii.

³⁹⁴ *Opera Innocentii pontificis maximi, eius nominis III . . .* (Coloniae: excudebat Ioannes Nouesianus, 1552), ii. *D. Innocentii pontificis maximi eius nominis III . . . opera . . .* (Coloniae: apud M. Cholinum, 1575).

“obtinendum” in 1575.³⁹⁵ The use of “p” instead of “b” was most certainly a spelling error on the part of the 1552 editor, and it was recognized and corrected in 1575. The other differences between the two consist of spelling variations, the use of uppercase letters, and abbreviations. In two instances, 1552 spells Tobias, “Thobias” and “Zodomam” for Sodom.³⁹⁶ 1575 is also more prone to uppercase the word “Deus,” “Vertias,” and “Sapiens,” but this is not standardized across the entire treatise.³⁹⁷ Finally, the two editions differ regarding their use of word abbreviation. 1575 only abbreviates the accusative with several instances of abbreviating the middle of the words. 1552 on the other hand uses abbreviations extensively. Not only does 1552 abbreviate the accusative ending, but also the suffix “que,” the diphthong “ae,” and some relative pronouns and conjunctions. 1552 is highly reliant upon abbreviations and it is interesting to see the drastic decrease in their use after only twenty three years. Word for word, the 1575 is a masterful and correct reproduction of the 1552 edition.

The page layouts of the two are slightly different. 1552 has all six chapters, but uses double columns.³⁹⁸ 1552 only marks the upper right hand corner of the page with Roman numerals to indicate folio numbering. 1575 on the other hand has one long body of text and has Arabic numbers at the top left and right hand corners respectively acting as modern page

³⁹⁵ *Opera Innocentii pontificis maximi, eius nominis III . . .* (Coloniae: excudebat Ioannes Nouesianus, 1552), fol. XCIII r. 203.

³⁹⁶ *Opera Innocentii pontificis maximi, eius nominis III . . .* (Coloniae: excudebat Ioannes Nouesianus, 1552), 1552 fol. XCV v.-XCVI v.

³⁹⁷ *D. Innocentii pontificis maximi eius nominis III . . . opera . . .* (Coloniae: apud M. Cholinum, 1575), 200.

³⁹⁸ *Opera Innocentii pontificis maximi, eius nominis III . . .* (Coloniae: excudebat Ioannes Nouesianus, 1552), fol. XCII.

numbering.³⁹⁹ The title on the heading page is the same for both: “D. Innocentii Pontificis Maximi, Hvius Nominis III. De Eleemosyna Libellvs Piisimvs. Eleemosynae encomium, quid sit, et de eius fructus multiplici.”⁴⁰⁰ One stylistic change which 1575 makes to the opening lines is raising “*Date Eleemosynam, et ecce Omnia munda sunt vobis,*” above the body of the text as a precursor or introduction to the first chapter which then begins with “Nemo dignius posset eleemosynam.”⁴⁰¹ 1552 begins with “Date Eleemosynam, et ecce Omnia munda sunt vobis” as the opening line in the body of caput I. On either side of the columns, 1552 has Biblical citations for the different Scriptural quotes Innocent gives in *Date Eleemosynam* which 1575 copies exactly. These are the most significant differences between the two editions. If the differences listed seem to be pedantic this is because they are: the 1552 and 1575 are almost exactly the same. Migne advertises at the front of the *Libellus* in the *Patrologia Latina* that this text is taken from “Ex edit. Opp. Innocentii III. Colon., 1575, in-fol. P. 198.”⁴⁰² The largest difference Migne makes in the *Patrologia Latina* from 1575 is returning the *Libellus* to a double column layout, bringing the scriptural citations within the body of text, and providing small markers to indicate when Scripture is being quoted. Migne also removes all abbreviations from his edition. These small alterations aside, when one looks at the *Libellus* in the *Patrologia Latina*, one is essentially looking at an almost exact replica of the 1552 Cologne edition.

³⁹⁹ *D. Innocentii pontificis maximi eius nominis III . . . opera . . .* (Coloniae: apud M. Cholinum, 1575), 198.

⁴⁰⁰ *Opera Innocentii pontificis maximi, eius nominis III . . .* (Coloniae: excudebat Ioannes Nouesianus, 1552), fol. XCII v; *D. Innocentii pontificis maximi eius nominis III . . . opera . . .* (Coloniae: apud M. Cholinum, 1575), 198.

⁴⁰¹ *D. Innocentii pontificis maximi eius nominis III . . . opera . . .* (Coloniae: apud M. Cholinum, 1575), 198.

⁴⁰² *PL*, vol. 217, col. 746.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts Consulted

Bordeaux, *Bibliothèque municipale*, Bordeaux lat. 308.

Milan, *Biblioteca Ambrosiana*, Ambros. P. 259 sup.

Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, MS lat. 3277.

_____. MS lat. 3278.

_____. MS lat. 1007A.

_____. MS lat. 1250.

_____. MS lat.1251.

_____. MS lat. 3349.

_____. MS lat. 3611.

_____. MS lat. 12414.

_____. MS lat. 14938.

_____. MS lat. 18173.

_____. MS NAL 270.

Vatican City, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, MS Vat. Lat. 700.

_____. MS Vat. Lat. 10902.

Manuscript Catalogues Consulted

Borino, Iohannes. *Codices Vaticani Latini: Codices 10876-11000*. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1955.

“Latin 3278.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc61152k>.

“Latin 1007A.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc59193n>.

“Latin 1250.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc59192d>.

“Latin 1251.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc59193n>.

“Latin 3349.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc61237j>.

“Latin 3611.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc615528>.

“Latin 12414.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc73692n>.

“Latin 14938.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc75667h>.

“Latin 18173.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc89041>.

“NAL 270.” *BnF Archives et manuscrits*. Accessed March 6, 2017.
<http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc70842j>.

Pelzer, Augustus ed. *Codices Vaticani Latini: Tomus II, Pars Prior Codices 679-1134*. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Vatican, 1931.

Published Primary Sources

Cholinum, M., ed. *D. Innocentii ponificis maximi eius nominis III . . . opera . . .* Coloniae: apud M. Cholinum, 1575.

Dijk, Stephen J.P., O.F.M. and Joan Walker, ed. *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and Related Documents*. Fribourg: The University Press of Fribourg, 1975.

Gratian. *The Treatise on Laws (Decretum dd. 1-20) with The Ordinary Gloss*. Translated by Augustine Thompson, O.P., James Gordley, introduction by Katherine Christensen. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.

Lothario dei Segni. *De Miseria Conditionis Humane*. Translated by Robert Lewis. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1978.

Migne, Jacques-Paul, ed. *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 214-217: *Innocentii Papae III Opera Omnia*. Paris, 1855.

Nouesianus, Ioannes, ed. *Opera Innocentii pontificis maximi, eius nominis III . . .* Coloniae: excudebat Ioannes Nouesianus, 1552.

Salimbene de Adam. *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*. Edited and Translated by Joseph Baird, Giuseppe Baglivi, John Kane. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986.

The Deeds of Pope Innocent III by an Anonymous Author. Translated by James Powell. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004.

Secondary Sources

Andrews, Frances, Christoph Egger, Constance Rousseau ed. *Pope, Church, and City: Essays in Honour of Brenda M. Bolton*. Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2004.

Baldwin, John. *Masters, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circles*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

_____. *Paris, 1200*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Bolton, Brenda. "Hearts not Purses? Pope Innocent III's Attitude to Social Welfare." In *Innocent III: Studies on Papal Authority and Pastoral Care*, edited by Brenda Bolton. Aldershot: Variorum, 1995.

_____. *The Medieval Reformation*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1983.

_____. "Received in His Name: Rome's Busy Baby Box." In *Innocent III: Studies on Papal Authority and Pastoral Care*, edited by Brenda Bolton. Aldershot: Variorum, 1995.

_____. "Setting the Prisoners Free: Innocent III's Papal Leadership in Action." In *Medieval Italy, Medieval and Early Modern Women: Essays in Honour of Christine Meek*, edited by Conor Kostick. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010.

_____. "Too Important to Neglect: the *Gesta Innocentii PP III*." In *Innocent III: Studies on Papal Authority and Pastoral Care*, edited by Brenda Bolton. Aldershot: Variorum, 1995.

_____. "*Qui Fidelis est in Minimo*, The Importance of Innocent III's Gift List." In *Pope Innocent III and His World*, edited by John Moore. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1999.

Brentano, Robert. *Rome Before Avignon: The Social History of Thirteenth-Century Rome*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

- _____. *Two Churches: England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Brodman, James. *Charity and Religion in Medieval Europe*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2009.
- Brundage, James. *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Buhrer, Eliza. "From *Caritas* to Charity: How Loving God became giving Alms." In *Poverty and Prosperity in the Middle Ages*, edited by Cynthia Kosso and Anne Scott. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.
- Cushing, Kathleen. *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- D'Avray, D.L. *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Delcorno, Carlo. "Medieval Preaching in Italy (1200-1500)." In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 449-560. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Egger, Christoph. "The Growling of the Lion and the Humming of the Fly: Gregory the Great and Innocent III." In *Pope, Church, and City: Essays in Honour of Brenda M. Bolton*, edited by Frances Andrews, Christoph Egger, Constance Rousseau. Leiden: Brill Publishers: 2004.
- _____. "A Theologian at Work: Some Remarks on Methods and Sources in Innocent III's Writings." In *Pope Innocent III and His World*, edited by John Moore. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1999.
- Jansen, Katherine. "Innocent III and the Literature of Confession." *Innocenzo III: urbs et orbis: atti del Congresso Internazionale: Roma, 9-15 settembre 1998*, ed. Andrea Sommerlechner, (1998): 369-382.
- Hyde, J.K. *Society and Politics in Medieval Italy: The Evolution of the Civil Life, 1000-1350*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.
- Johnstone, Hilda. "Poor-Relief in the Royal Households of Thirteenth-Century England." *Speculum* 4, no. 2 (April 1929): 149-167.

- Kay, Richard. "Innocent III as Canonist and Theologian: The Case of Spiritual Matrimony," In *Pope Innocent III and His World*, edited by John Moore. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1999.
- Kendall, Keith, "Sermons of Pope Innocent III: The Moral Theology of a Pastor and Pope." PhD diss., The Maxwell School of Syracuse University, 2003.
- Kosso, Cynthia and Anne Scott, ed. *Poverty and Prosperity in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.
- Kienzle, Beverly Mayne ed. *The Sermon*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- _____. Introduction to *The Sermon*, Edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- _____. "The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon." In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 271-317. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Kuskowski, Ada-Maria. "The Poor, the Secular Courts, and Access to Justice in Thirteenth-Century France." In *Poverty and Prosperity in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, edited by Cynthia Kosso and Anne Scott. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *Your Money or Your Life: Economy and Religion in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Patricia Ranum. New York: Zone Books, 1988.
- Little, Lester. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Maurer, Armand, C.S.B. *Medieval Philosophy*. Edited by Etienne Gilson. New York: Random House, 1965.
- Mollat, Michel. *The Poor in the Middle Ages: an Essay in Social History*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Moore, John, ed. *Pope Innocent III and his World*. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1999.
- _____. *Pope Innocent III (1160/1-1216): To Root Up and To Plant*. Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2003.
- _____. "The Sermons of Pope Innocent III." *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 36, (1994): 81-142.

- Munk, Connie. "A Study of Pope Innocent III's Treatise: *De Quadripartita Specie Nuptiarum*, volume two." PhD diss., University of Kansas, 1975.
- Mundy, John. "Charity and Social Work in Toulouse, 1100-1250." *Traditio* 22, (1966): 203-287.
- Murray, Alexander. "Piety and Impiety in Thirteenth-century Italy." In *Popular Belief and Practice: Papers Read at the Ninth Summer Meeting and the Tenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, vol. 8, edited by G. J. Cuming and Derek Baker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Niermeyer, J.F. and C. Van de Kieft, eds. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Pennington, Kenneth. *Pope and Bishops: The Papal Monarchy in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.
- _____. "Further thoughts on Pope Innocent III's Knowledge of Law." In *Popes, Canonists and Texts, 1150-1550*, ed. Kenneth Pennington, II. Aldershot: Variorum, 1993.
- _____. *Popes, Canonist and Texts, 1150-1550*. Brookfield: Variorum, Ashgate Publishing, 1993.
- Poole, Reginald. *Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery Down to the Time of Innocent III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Powell, James. Forward to *God and Man: Six Sermons on the Priestly Office*, Edited by Corinne Vause and Frank Gardiner. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- Powell, James. *The Crusades, The Kingdom of Sicily, and the Mediterranean*. Aldershot: Variorum, 2007.
- _____. "Forms of Spirituality and the Quest for 'Buon Governo' in the Thirteenth Century." In *The Papacy, Frederick II, and Communal Devotion in Medieval Italy*, edited by Edward Peters. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.
- _____. "Innocent III and Petrus Beneventanus: Reconstructing a Career at the Papal Curia." In *Pope Innocent III and His World*. Edited by John Moore. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.
- _____. "Innocent III, the Trinitarians, and the Renewal of the Church, 1198-1200." In *The Crusades, The Kingdom of Sicily, and the Mediterranean*. Edited by James Powell. Aldershot: Variorum, 2007.
- _____. *The Papacy, Frederick II, and Communal Devotion in Medieval Italy*. Edited by Edward Peters. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.

- _____. "Pastor Bonus: Some Evidence of Honorius III's use of the Sermons of Pope Innocent III." *Speculum* 52, no. 3 (July 1977): 522-537.
- _____. "The Prefatory Letters to the Sermons of Pope Honorius III and the Reform of Preaching." In *The Papacy, Frederick II, and Communal Devotion in Medieval Italy*, edited by Edward Peters. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.
- _____. "Religious Diversity and Communal Politics in Thirteenth-Century Italy." In *The Papacy, Frederick II, and Communal Devotion in Medieval Italy*, edited by Edward Peters. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.
- Ritchey, Sara. *Holy Matter: Changing Perceptions of the Material World in Late Medieval Christianity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014.
- Robinson, Jonathan. "Innocent IV, John XXII and the Michaelists on Corporate Poverty," in *Poverty and Prosperity in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, edited by Cynthia Kosso and Anne Scott. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.
- Rosenwein, Barbara and Lester Little. "Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities." *Past and Present* no. 63 (May, 1974): 4-32.
- Sayers, Jane. *Innocent III: Leader of Europe 1198-1216*. New York: Longman, 1994.
- Smith, Charles. *Innocent III: Church Defender*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1951.
- Smith, Damian. *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon: the Limits of Papal Authority*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Stelten, Leo F, ed. *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.
- Thompson, Augustine, O.P. *Cities of God: The Religion of the Italian Communes 1125-1325*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.
- Tierney, Brian. *Medieval Poor Law: A Sketch of Canonical Theory and Its Application in England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.
- Tillman, Helena. *Pope Innocent III*. Translated by Walter Sax. New York: North Holland Publishing, 1980.
- Schneyer, Johannes. *Repertorium Der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters: Für Die Zeit Von 1150-1350*. Münster: Aschedorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1972.
- Tolan, John. *Petrus Alfonsi and his Medieval Readers*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993.

- Ullmann, Walter. *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages*. London: Methuen and Co., 1972.
- Vause, Corinne. Introduction to *God and Man: Six Sermons on the Priestly Office*, Edited by Corinne Vause and Frank Gardiner. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- _____, ed. and trans. *Pope Innocent III: Between God and Man, Six Sermons on the Priestly Office*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- _____. "The Sermons of Innocent III: A Rhetorical Analysis." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1984.
- Zier, Mark. "Sermons of the Twelfth Century schoolmasters and Canons." In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 325-362. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.