

Ottó Gecser

**PREACHING THE EUCHARIST:
SERMONS FOR MAUNDY THURSDAY AND CORPUS CHRISTI IN
THE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY HUNGARIAN SERMON COLLECTION
*‘SERMONES DOMINICALES’***

M. A. Thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

June 2000

**PREACHING THE EUCHARIST:
SERMONS FOR MAUNDY THURSDAY AND CORPUS CHRISTI IN THE
FIFTEENTH-CENTURY HUNGARIAN SERMON COLLECTION ‘*SERMONES
DOMINICALES*’**

by

Ottó Gecser

(Hungary)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

Chair, Examination Committee

External Examiner

Thesis Supervisor

Examiner

Budapest

June 2000

I, the undersigned, Ottó GECSER, candidate for the M.A. degree in Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of this thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 9 June 2000

Signature

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Collection	4
1.1 The ' <i>Sermones Dominicales</i> ' and its modern edition	4
1.2 Date and Place of Compilation	5
1.3 Audience and Authorship	5
1.4 The Compiler's Point of View: Unity, Structure and Sources	8
Chapter 2: Two Sermons on the Eucharist: Text and Context	15
2.1 The Feasts and the Sermons	15
2.2 <i>Auctoritates</i> in the Eucharistic Sermons	21
2.3 <i>Exempla</i> in the Eucharistic Sermons	28
Chapter 3: Two Sermons on the Eucharist: The Sociology of Communion	35
3.1 Food and Medicine: The Eucharist in its Socially Determined Field of Associations	36
3.2 Access to the Sacrament: Communion and the Structure of Communities	44
Conclusion	50
Appendix 1: Pericope Systems Related to the <i>Sermones Dominicales</i>	52
Appendix 2: The Text of the Sermons for Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi	

in the ‘<i>Sermones Dominicales</i>’	58
Sermo de coena Domini	58
A Sermon for Corpus Christi	75
Selected Bibliography	86

Introduction

Sermons, like other texts, must be interpreted in context. But what is a context here? An evident answer is that the context of a sermon consists of the preacher and his audience. If we know who spoke and to whom we may understand the message in the manner they did.¹ The majority of medieval sermons, however, produced from the thirteenth century onwards were not intended for a precisely defined group of listeners. Most of them were *model sermons*, compact outlines helping the preacher in the same way as lecture outlines help modern lecturers. Among the usual elements of such outlines we find first of all the *thema*, a short Biblical quotation forming the rhetorical focus of the sermon to be delivered. In addition to the *thema*, the compiler had to include in his schemes a number of citations from various *auctores* – a worthwhile aid, indispensable even for the most ingenious preachers. Lastly, there had to be some order brought into this host of citations by indicating the main interpretative headings or keys to the *thema* (called *divisiones*) under which the citations could be grouped. The actual preaching went along the *divisiones* commenting on the *thema* section by section or word by word (in technical terms *membrum* by *membrum*), applying the citations to underpin the commentaries and thus augmenting the laconic scheme to a lengthy delivery.²

¹ Comparisons of sermons and their immediate contexts can yield sharp, close-up pictures of religious ideas and practices; see, for example, Nicole Bériou, *L'avènement des maîtres de la Parole: La prédication à Paris au XIII^e siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1998); idem, *La prédication de Ranulphe de la Houblonnière: Sermons aux clercs et aux simples gens à Paris au XIII^e siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1987); Jacqueline Hamesse, Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Debra L. Stoudt, and Anne T. Thayer, ed., *Medieval Sermons and Society: Cloister, City, University* (Louvain: Fédération Internationale des Instituts D'Études Médiévales, 1998).

² On model sermons and the development of this new type of preaching in general, see David L. D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); for the *sermo modernus* in Hungary, see Edit Madas, *A középkori magyarországi prédikáció-irodalom forrásai* (XII-XIV. század) (The sources of medieval preaching literature in Hungary from the twelfth until the fourteenth century), Ph. D. diss. (Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1992).

There are some cases when we happen to know more or less reliably the resulting speech from notes (called *reportationes*) taken down by some member of the audience. In such cases we know how at least one listener understood the sermon, and usually we also know something about the situation in which the sermon was delivered.³ Nevertheless, as a general rule, we have to be content with the outlines. In Hungary, for example, no *reportationes* have survived. If we have merely model sermons, their context must be defined without reference to a given, known audience. Although we can only reconstruct a broader context, this is not necessarily far from the context the compiler could have in mind composing his outlines, since model sermons were made for common preachers working in much varied geographical areas and social situations. In what follows, we will try to reconstruct this broader context of two eucharistic sermons in the *Sermones Dominicales*, an anonymous collection from fifteenth-century Hungary.

In *Chapter 1* we will present the collection itself. There have been only two publications dedicated to the *Sermones Dominicales* including the introduction to the 1910 edition. We will examine the arguments and hypotheses put forward in these publications and in some cases we will also provide further arguments and hypotheses. Nevertheless, the aim of this chapter is not to answer conclusively all the important philological questions concerning the *Sermones Dominicales*, but to make the reader familiar with the characteristic features of the collection: date and place of compilation; authorship and audience; unity, structure and sources.

The idea of *Chapter 2* is to reconstruct three elements of the broader context around our eucharistic sermons. First of all we have to see the sermons before the liturgical background of the two feasts for which they were written: Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi. We will also compare some fourteenth- and fifteenth-century collections to see what main topics they offer for Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi preaching. Then we will present some central issues of medieval eucharistic theology up to the high scholastic period, its relations to popular preaching, and the theological knowledge of our compiler as reflected by his use of *auctoritates*. Finally, we will assess the role of short edifying stories (*exempla*) in the two eucharistic sermons.

In *Chapter 3* we will turn to more general and at the same time more essential constituents of the context. On the one hand we will attempt to reconstruct the semantic field

³ On *reportationes* in general, see the conference volume *Dal pulpito alla navata: La predicazione nella sua ricezione da parte degli ascoltatori (secc. XIII-XV)*, Medioevo e Rinascimento 3 (Firenze: Olschki, 1989).

in which the Eucharist as food and medicine was embedded, and thus to understand the categories stemming from social experience through which the role of the Eucharist in human life was possibly perceived. On the other hand, we will interpret certain meanings and practices associated with the sacrament in eucharistic sermons as hints towards a contemporary classification of social groups according to their relation to the holy bread.

Chapter 1: The Collection

1.1 The '*Sermones Dominicales*' and its modern edition

The text of the *Sermones Dominicales* (henceforth: SD) has survived in two codices with Hungarian and Latin glosses – one complete, one incomplete – which form the basis of Áron Szilády's 1910 edition.⁴ The complete copy is now in the Budapest University Library (Egyetemi Könyvtár, Cod. Lat. 18) and it probably belonged to some religious order until their dissolution at the end of the eighteenth century.⁵

The incomplete codex – containing only 81 out of the 127 sermons from the fifth Sunday of Lent (*Dominica Passionis*) onwards – was originally possessed by the Pauline Monastery of Remetincz. After the Reformation its ownership was transferred first to Boldizsár Batthyány and then to the Franciscan House of Németújvár (Güssing) – hence it is usually referred to in the literature as *Németújvár Sermones Dominicales*. Now it is in the Magyar Ferences Könyvtár (Hungarian Franciscan Library; Esztergomi letét, Múz. 13), Budapest.⁶

The complete Budapest copy was written by four hands, the Németújvár codex only by one. It seems that the two volumes were copied from different originals, since there are variances not only in the interlinear Hungarian and Latin glosses copied along with the text, but also in the main body of the text itself;⁷ nonetheless, if there were at least two originals, this alone gives some hint at how widespread the work was. Since the main goal of the 1910 edition was to present the Hungarian glosses in their original context (for the study of late

⁴ *Sermones Dominicales*, ed. Áron Szilády, 2 Vols. (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1910).

⁵ *Kódexek a középkori Magyarországon. Kiállítás az Országos Széchényi Könyvtárban, 1985 november 12 – 1986 február 28* (Codices in Medieval Hungary: Exhibition in the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 12 November 1985 – 28 February 1986) (Budapest: Interpress Kiadó, 1985), 157.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 157f; the first part of the sermons was presumably in a separate, already lost volume.

⁷ SD, vol. 1, Introduction, v.

medieval Hungarian) the two printed volumes encompass the whole Latin text together with the glosses from both codices.⁸ Unfortunately, however, the secondary role of the Latin text affected the quality of the critical apparatus: merely the Scriptural quotations were checked, and even this was accomplished only with many errors.

1.2 Date and Place of Compilation

The editor, Áron Szilády, dated the SD to the period between 1450 and 1456,⁹ the canonization of Saint Bernardino of Siena mentioned in the text as *novus sanctus* and the death of Saint John of Capistran (October 23, 1456) whom the author refers to as a still living person. Szilády does not differentiate between the date of the collection and the date of the separate sermons, but since the collection is a structured whole with preface and numerous cross-references, the final form of the sermons must be contemporaneous with the completion of the *sermonarium* itself. The place of the compilation, or rather the place where the compiler came from, is – according to a reference in the text: *more ecclesiae nostrae Quinqueecclesiensis*¹⁰ – the diocese of Pécs in southwest Hungary.

1.3 Audience and Authorship

Since no author is indicated explicitly in the text of the SD, one can at most specify a *type of author* depending upon the *type of audience* one attributes to the collection. Hence we relegate the discussion of authorship to a later stage of this analysis and start with the problem of audience, though without the promise of conclusive results in either case. Here we have to answer, or at least pose, two questions: how was the text *used*, and what was the immediate *environment* of its usage? The first question could also be formulated this way: was it only read, or also preached? The first option seems to be nonsensical in the case of a *sermonarium*, but in the later Middle Ages we find several collections of longer sermons which do not contain models (outlines) for preachers but, rather, meditative texts for reading, where the style of thematic sermons is mingled with narration.¹¹ Due to the length and the elaborated

⁸ For the reactions to the edition on the behalf of Old Hungarian experts, see Gedeon Mészöly, “Jegyzetek a ‘Sermones Dominicales’ szótárához” (Notes on the glossary of the ‘Sermones Dominicales’), *Magyar Nyelv* 6 (1910): 401-406; and Gyula Zolnai, “A Budapesti és Németújvári Glosszák” (The glosses of Budapest and Németújvár), *Magyar Nyelvőr* 39 (1910): 460-474.

⁹ SD, vol. 1., Introduction, vi.; within this interval 1456 seems to be the most probable date to Szilády.

¹⁰ SD, vol. 2, 427, l. 18; and vol. 1., Introduction, vi.

¹¹ For this type of sermons see Lawrence F. Hundersmarck, “Preaching the Passion: Late Medieval ‘Lives of

state of the sermons in the SD (they contain not only the *divisiones* and the *auctoritates* but also the *dilatationes*, the amplifications of the outline, in quite a detailed format) it is conceivable that these are not model sermons in the proper sense. It is also very likely, however, that they were compiled for preaching, not simply for meditative reading. This statement is affirmed by numerous remarks of the compiler regarding the supposed use of his collection – for example, *Dilata haec sicut vis*, *Dilata hoc ut vis*, or *Narra hic aliqua ex miraculis*, and so on.¹²

Now that it seems probable that we can differentiate between the primary and the secondary audience of the SD, we can proceed to the second question: what was the secondary audience of the SD? Did they belong to the laity, the secular clergy or some religious order? The possibility of a lay audience does not seem an option, for such long and elaborated Latin sermons as those in the SD, interspersed with numerous Latin etymologies and hardly translatable Latin rhymes, are quite unsuitable for vernacular preaching. One can also argue against this option, as Andor Tarnai did, by pointing out occurrences of issues pertinent only to priests, for example, the celebration of mass after a *pollutio nocturna* or detailed advices on how to confess the dying.¹³ So the problem is restricted to the choice between two possibilities: the secular clergy or some religious order.

Although Áron Szilády did not concern himself explicitly with the problem of audience (as it formed no part of the basic questions to be posed about a text at the beginning of the twentieth century) he argues against the compiler's affiliation with any religious order. According to Szilády there is no reference in the text to any founder of an order, though it was a common practice among friars to commemorate the founding father.¹⁴ Moreover, in one of the texts taken from the *Sermones Dominicales* of Jacobus de Voragine (the source of a

Christ' as Sermon Vehicles," in *De ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, eds. Thomas L. Amos, Eugene A. Greene, and Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1989), 147-168.

¹² SD, vol. 1, 39, l. 8; vol. 1, 279, l. 2; and vol. 2, 204, l. 22. See also Andor Tarnai, "A magyar nyelvet írni kezdik": Irodalmi gondolkodás a középkori Magyarországon ('Hungarian begins to be written: Theories of literature in medieval Hungary) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984), 171, n. 121; and idem, "A budapest-németújvári 'Sermones Dominicales'" (The 'Sermones Dominicales' of Budapest and Németújvár), *Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* 87 (1983): 24.

¹³ Tarnai, "A budapest-németújvári," 25. Tarnai seems to think (p. 24) that the secondary clerical audience listened to the sermons in Hungarian what is, in my view, highly improbable. Otherwise, concerning the problem of audience, one should interpret somehow the fact that the text of the SD is glossed, though to a lesser degree, also in Hungarian. Nevertheless, the arrangement of the Hungarian glosses seems to be rather clumsy – unsystematic translations of simple Latin words or expressions (e.g. "rationabiliter" or "auctoritas scripturae") –, and neither Szilády, nor Tarnai discusses their relationship to the Latin text or the Latin glosses.

¹⁴ This is a practice also stressed by Louis-Jacques Bataillon, "Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons," *Leeds Studies in English* n. s., 11 (1980): 19-35.

substantial part of the SD as we will see later) he changes the original phrase *in ordine nostro* to *in ordine fratrum praedicatorum*.” Lastly, he refers to Saint John of Capistran simply as “frater,” not indicating that they belonged to the same order.¹⁵ There is, however, an order which was not mentioned by Szilády, though it was quite important in late medieval Hungary: the Pauline order. It was Andor Tarnai who formulated the hypothesis that the compiler belonged to some Pauline monastery in the diocese of Pécs.¹⁶ The method of comparing the pericope-system of the SD with that of the Pauline missal¹⁷ seems neither to prove nor to refute Tarnai’s arguments *unambiguously*. The most convincing of these arguments stresses the frequent use of the word *congregatio* for a clerical community.¹⁸ Nevertheless, I would rather say that he was not a Pauline. As we have already mentioned, a large portion of the SD stems from the *Sermones Dominicales* of Jacobus de Voragine, and it follows the pericope-system of the latter whenever it is possible (see Appendix 1). There are four places where the Pauline missal uses pericopes different from those of Jacobus: the fourth Sunday after the octave of Epiphany, the first weekday (*Feria II*) after Easter, the feast of Trinity and the twenty-fourth Sunday *in aestate* (that is after Trinity or after Corpus Christi). There are two cases among these four when the SD follows the Pauline missal – the fourth Sunday after the octave of Epiphany and the feast of Trinity, but in both cases the Pauline missal is not the only model: the Pécs one (*missale Quinqueecclesiense*)¹⁹ offers the same pericopes. In the sermon for Trinity the compiler explains that reading the pericope from the fifteenth book of John is done according to Pécs custom: *Item Joh. XV^o [dicitur] ... et more ecclesiae nostrae Quinqueecclesiensis habetur [habent] in hodierno evangelio*.²⁰ This is striking: if he was a Pauline, why did he refer to the reading from John 15 as a Pécs custom, rather than as a Pauline one? The Pauline liturgy was, after all, much more widespread, and it was certainly much more important and familiar to a Pauline audience.

¹⁵ SD, vol 1., Introduction, vi.

¹⁶ Tarnai, “A budapest-németújvári,” 25ff.

¹⁷ *Missale Paulinorum* (Venice, 1514; OSZK RMK III. 196).

¹⁸ Tarnai, “A budapest-németújvári,” 25f; in the *Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi Hungariae* we find at *congregatio* (in ecclesiastical sense) *monachorum societas*, *coenobium*, or simply *ordo*. If the audience is a *congregatio*, then it is rational to think of a monastic community, though this is not the only possibility; if one does think of a monastic community, the Pauline option is a good choice beyond any doubt. Tarnai also stresses that, as we saw above in the first section, the Németújvár copy was originally possessed by the Pauline monastery of Remetincz. His third main argument, however, concerning the references to saints favored by the Paulines – Lawrence and Anthony the Hermit – do not seem convincing to me, since they have no outstanding position among other saints in the collection, and do not even belong to the most frequently mentioned ones.

¹⁹ *Missale Quinqueecclesiense* (Venice, 1499; OSZK Inc. 989).

²⁰ SD, vol. 2, 427, l. 15-19. Szilády used the square brackets to differentiate the glosses (or the textual variants) which occur only in the Németújvár codex. Tarnai interprets this passage differently, partly because he did not check the Pauline missal; see Tarnai, “A budapest-németújvári,” 25.

The last option concerning the secondary audience of the SD is the secular clergy. A group of clergymen to whom one can preach regularly throughout the year, and to whom the word *congregatio* may apply, is a canonry. The analysis of this option is intimately connected with the problem of authorship, since Szilády attributed the collection to a Pécs canon, a certain Denis of Mohács.²¹ His name would be the key to the *fris dios* inscription on the first page of the complete SD codex: *fris dios – Fratris Dionisii*. Unfortunately there are merely two references to a Denis in the Pécs context, one among the students of the University of Vienna from 1431 (Dionysius de Mohacz) and another naming the messenger (simply as canon Denis) who brought a letter from the Pécs chapter to Capistranus in 1456; the two references do not necessarily point to the same person.

As a last point I propose, without the aim of verification, to reutilize Tibor Klaniczay's suggestion concerning another Hungarian *sermonarium*, the so called *Pécs University Sermons*.²² Klaniczay argued that the author of the sermons on Hungarian saints must have been an official preacher of Pécs in the position established by Pope Martin V in 1428 for regular preaching against the heretics.²³ Our author, being Denis of Mohács or anyone else meeting the requirements of the papal charter, could have compiled the collection, being in this position.

1.4 The Compiler's Point of View: Unity, Structure and Sources

On what basis do we consider the first sermon in the SD a "preface?" First of all, it is evidently not related to any festive occasion in the church calendar, since it precedes the sermon to the first Sunday of Advent. This is certainly enough to be some sort of introduction: placed right at the beginning but not connected to the subsequent text in the same way as the parts of the main text are connected to each other. Moreover, the compiler himself calls the first sermon an *exordium*, and refers back to it as a *prohemium* when he later discusses a topic related to its content.²⁴ The question is, however, to what extent is it a

²¹ SD, vol. 1, Introduction, vii-x; Mohács is a city in southern Hungary not too far from Pécs.

²² *Sermones compilati in studio generali Quinqueecclesiensi in regno Ungarie*, ed. Ede Petrovich and Pál L. Timkovics, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum, Series nova 14 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó and Argumentum Kiadó, 1993). For a general assessment of the research dedicated to this collection so far, see Edit Madas, "A Dominican Sermon Collection," *Budapest Review of Books* 6 (1996): 415-419.

²³ Tibor Klaniczay, "Megoldott és megoldatlan kérdések az első magyar egyetem körül" (Solved and unsolved problems concerning the first Hungarian university), in *Hagyományok ébresztése* (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1976), 136-165.

²⁴ "in nostri operis exordio," SD, I, 13, l. 23-24; "quae [...] habes in 2^a parte prohemii huius libri," SD, II, 287, l. 3-4; see also Tarnai, "A budapest-németújvári," 24.

preface according to the accepted style of medieval prefaces in general and prefaces to sermon collections in particular? This problem is vital to an analysis of the logic of the compilation. Letizia Pellegrini analyzes some elements characteristic particularly of the *sermonaria* prefaces of Italian Dominican preachers: specifying the addressees of the given collection (who were supposed to use it), stating its utility, indicating the main editorial methods applied in the course of the compilation and providing hints towards the effective elaboration of sermons on the basis of the collected material.²⁵ In addition to these elements, the prefaces to sermon collections also contain *topoi* inherited from classical rhetoric and widely used in this context throughout the Middle Ages and beyond: the *topoi* which express, in the words of E.R. Curtius, “affected humility” on the author’s behalf.²⁶ Now, seeing the *prohemium* against this background, we can describe its structure and the typical elements it offers.

The *prohemium* of the SD is a sermon on Mark 16,15 – *Praedicate ewangelium omni creaturae* – and it is a thematic sermon which discusses the three *membra*: *praedicate*, *ewangelium*, and *omni creaturae*. The compiler also indicates that the theme is taken from the gospel read at the feast of Ascension: *Ista verba [...] preasumptive leguntur in ewangelio festi ascensionis domini*; it is possible that his source was simply a sermon for Ascension.²⁷ The topic of the sermon in general terms is the ideal figure of the Christian preacher as *seminator verbi Dei*, and as such it does not include the typical elements of a proper preface in the above sense. Nevertheless, we can point at sections in the *prohemium*, which seem to betray the intentions of the compiler regarding the function of the first sermon as a preface. The *prohemium*, not being connected to any festive occasion, was merely for the primary audience; consequently the idea of placing a sermon on preaching and the ideal preacher at the beginning of the collection expresses the compiler’s need to furnish the preachers with the basic *auctoritates* relevant to their calling, and also serves as a modest characterization, however implicit, of his own work. Apart from the application of Scriptural *topoi* and the views of the Fathers, the compiler – discussing the second requisite to the ideal preacher: *in praedicatore debet esse facilis et plana praedicatio* – attaches his own warning to those of the

²⁵ Letizia Pellegrini, *I manoscritti dei predicatori: I domenicani dell’Italia mediana e i codici della loro predicazione (secc. XIII-XV)*, Dissertationes historicae 26 (Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1999), 197ff.

²⁶ Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Series 36 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), 83ff and 407ff.

²⁷ His sermon for Ascension (SD, II, 355-373) is not related by any means to the preface: no textual parallelisms, no similar *auctoritates*, no referring back. As we will see, the *prohemium* is not a preface proper, it is only augmented with prefatory elements; it may really have been a sermon *in die ascensione Domini* transformed.

*auctoritates: Sed hew! nunc sunt nonnulli praedicatores, qui non curant sermonis plani utilitatem, sed obscuri subtilitatem.*²⁸ His opinion about lucid style is stressed once again later in a sermon of related content,²⁹ and he also formulates it as a supplication at the end of the preface: *Da in ore meo sermonem bene compositum.*³⁰

The unity of the collection is also attested, besides the existence of a preface, by the numerous cross references between single sermons: *Plura de hoc alias dicam; Alia de matrimonio alias dicam; De hoc habes superius in sermone evangelii tertiae dominicae Adventus domini, ibi vide; De luxuria multa habes in sermone Epistolae dominicae 2-ae quadragesimae [XL mae]. ibi vide [si placet]; De hoc plus audies postea;* and so on.³¹

Now we have to present what we know about the sources of the SD. I have already mentioned the *Sermones Dominicales* of Jacobus de Voragine as a main source of the collection – we will return to it soon. As far as the source of sermons not taken from or modeled upon Jacobus are concerned, I did not find any of them in Schneyer's *Repertorium*,³² what may mean that they stem from the period after 1350. Without the aid of the *Repertorium* one can only guess about the sources. Andor Tarnai alleged that the sermons of Joannes Herolt are direct sources of the SD. Tarnai refers only to one example, which he also quotes at length.³³

²⁸ SD, vol. 1, 3, l. 27-28.

²⁹ Answering a question (about Mt 8,1-13) - "quare Christus descendit ad faciendum miraculum et discipulis prius praedicavit in monte?" - he says the following: "hoc fecit Christus dominus ad instruendum praedicatores ut sc. per subtilitatem sermonum coram simplicibus non se sublevarent sed potius per praedicationem congruentem qualitati audientium descenderent," SD, I, 353, l. 13-16; see also Andor Tarnai, *Irodalmi gondolkodás*, 71f.

³⁰ SD, vol. 1, 14, l. 5; cf. Vulgate: "Domine rex deorum, et universa potestatis: tribue *sermonem compositum in ore meo* in conspectu leonis, et transfer cor illius in odium hostis nostri, ut et ipse pereat, et ceteri, qui ei consentiunt" (Est. 14,12-13) – my italics.

³¹ SD, vol. 1, 229, l. 26; 241, l. 5; 247, l. 4-5; vol. 2, 20, l. 8-9; 424, l. 17; see also Tarnai, "A budapest-németújvári," 24.

³² Johannes Baptist Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150-1350*, 11 vols. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1969-1995).

³³ Tarnai, "A Budapest-Németújvári," 27. I have changed the typography used by Tarnai, and omitted the Hungarian gloss in the SD text.

Unde Beda: **Dominus interesse voluit nuptijs, ut statum matrimonialem sua presentia comprobaret.** APPROBAVIT autem statum ipsum virginalem in eo, **quod de intemerata virgine nasci voluit.** APPROBAVIT et statum vidualem in eo, **quod ab Anna vidua benedici dignatus fuit.** NEC restabat aliud nisi ut satatum coniugalem similiter APPROBARET³⁴, **ut per hoc daretur intelligi quod in quolibet istorum statum potest salvari homo.**

Respondetur secundum Bedam, quod **dominus** Jhesus ideo **nuptiis interesse voluit, ut statum matrimonialem sua praesentia** approbaret i.e. bonum esse affirmaret. Nam prius APPROBAVERAT **statum virginalem in eo, quod de intemerata virgine** vulgo **nasci voluit.** APPROBAVERAT **statum vidualem in eo, quod ab Anna vidua benedici voluit,** ut habetur Lucae II. NON restabat i.e. non placebat **aliud nisi ut statum** matrimonialem **similiter** APPROBASSET et in hoc approbavit, quod nuptiis in quibus matrimonium celebrabatur i.e. fiebat, interesse voluit. Et haec omnino ideo facta sunt, **ut daretur intelligi quod in quolibet istorum trium statuum potest homo salvari.**

The similarity of these two excerpts is beyond any doubt. Nevertheless it is not so certain how this similarity is to be explained. Tarnai assumes without any hesitation that Herolt was the source of the SD sermon. But there is no other textual parallelism in the two sermons of roughly equal length (8-10 octavo pages). Moreover, in the SD sermon there is a direct quotation from Beda's *Homiliarum evengelii libri II* not to be found in Herolt: *Si enim thoro immaculato et nuptiis debita castitate celebratis culpa inesset, nequaquam dominus ad has uenire nequaquam eas signorum suorum initiis consecrare uoluisset*;³⁵ the above excerpts are paraphrases of a different passage from the same homily. As a consequence, it is much more reasonable to think that the two texts go back to a common original, which paraphrases Bede in the above manner.

Not having any further suggestions regarding the sources of the SD, we turn to the analysis of the relationship between our collection and Jacobus de Voragine's *Sermones Dominicales*. The SD usually offers two sermons for every Sunday: one for the Gospel and one for the epistle. In some cases there are two sermons for the Gospel, while in some others the sermon for the epistle is missing. It also contains sermons for the Christmas feasts, Epiphany, Ash Wednesday, Maundy Thursday, Ascension and Corpus Christi. It was already established by Áron Szilády that 45 sermons are taken – in some places word-for-word – from Jacobus.³⁶ It does not mean, however, that these sermons are mere copies. We have to

³⁴ Tarnai used the Nürnberg edition of 1492; in the edition I used (Venice: Sessae, 1584) instead of “approbaret” we find “comprobaret.”

³⁵ Beda Venerabilis, *Homiliarum euangelii libri II*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 122, first homily, l. 6f.

³⁶ SD, vol. 1, Introduction, xiv.

understand the logic of the compilation, the techniques our compiler, or someone else having an intermediary position between him and Jacobus, relied on during his work.

We will compare the two collections in two stages. In the first phase we will concentrate on the structural difference between two types of sermons, the *homily* and the *thematic sermon*. These were not clearly distinguished by contemporaries, but from the standpoint of the historian it is worth separating them. In the words of Louis-Jacques Bataillon, it is useful “to reserve the term ‘homily’ for the kind of preaching where a whole biblical pericope ... was explained thoroughly phrase after phrase to the listeners. ... The sermon was more properly the type where only a short quotation ... was divided and developed at length according to the technical patterns later systematized in the *Artes praedicandi*.”³⁷ In the second phase we will see the particular techniques which were used in reshaping the texts provided by Jacobus.

Jacobus’s *sermonarium* contains sermons only for the Gospels, not for the epistles, and he wrote three short sermons for each Sunday Gospel interpreting three (sometimes different, sometimes identical) lines of the pericope strictly in the form of thematic sermons. In contrast, our compiler has – with few exceptions – only one text for each pericope, and often discusses the whole pericope in the form of homilies.³⁸ He also had to write sermons for the epistles. Now we have to make it clear in which cases our compiler rearranged the sermons (by enlargement of one sermon or by combination of more than one) taken from Jacobus in a way that the resulting text could elucidate the entire pericope phrase after phrase.³⁹ We have also to check whether we can find any difference in these terms between the sermons taken from Jacobus and those written by our compiler (or taken from other sources). *Appendix 1* shows which sermons are taken from (or rather modeled upon) Jacobus, and indicates the type of each sermon in the SD using the ‘homily – thematic sermon’ distinction. The Epistle-sermons are always thematic; the case of the Gospel-sermons is much more complex. The homily type Gospel-sermons in the SD represent a mixed genre: they look as if many short thematic sermons on each phrase or section of the given pericope were attached to each other. Every subsequent phrase or section of the pericope is introduced by *sequitur*, and followed by some *distinctiones*. In this respect there seems to be no difference

³⁷ Bataillon, “Approaches,” 28. For the development of preaching style from earlier homilies towards later thematic sermons see Jean Longère, *La prédication médiévale* (Paris: Institut d’Études Augustiniennes, 1983), 35ff.

³⁸ In the SD the Gospel-pericopes are usually quoted at full length before the respective sermons.

³⁹ Even in the rare cases where Szilády says that the sermon is taken word-for-word from Jacobus there are

between the sermon taken from Jacobus and those stemming from another source(s). There is no evident stylistic rupture between the Epistle-sermons and the Gospel-sermons either.

More interesting is the way in which the Jacobus de Voragine sermons are restructured.⁴⁰ There are 21 sermons which are the combinations of two or three texts from Jacobus,⁴¹ the final form of the other 24 being entirely due to enlargement and rearrangement. As far as the editorial techniques of these enlargements and rearrangements are concerned, we can differentiate four levels according to the extent of change brought about in larger sections of the original texts. A parallel section in the SD text could be

1. almost word-for-word the same: there are only additional synonyms or short tautological explanations introduced by “i.e.” to make some difference;
2. structurally congruent: the divisions and the distinctions are the same but the *dilatationes* are more voluminous – it resembles the relationship between model sermons and *reportationes*;
3. roughly paraphrased: it follows the same line of thought, but the divisions and distinctions are changed by omitting some of them or by adding new ones, and the *dilatationes* are also augmented;
4. newly inserted: totally new passages introduced by phrases like *nota quod*, *nota consequenter*, or *notandum est*.

Since all four techniques are used in almost every sermon stemming ultimately from Jacobus de Voragine, only a new critical edition of the SD could indicate the extent of the sophisticated rewritings made by our compiler or someone else between him and Jacobus. Nevertheless, in the newly inserted parts we occasionally find passages which must have come from a Hungarian, since they contain Hungary-specific material. Here belong the references to the Pécs custom of reading from John 15 at Trinity,⁴² or to St. Stephen (1000-1038) and St. Ladislaus (1077-1095) kings of Hungary.⁴³ It is still worth to mention, as a

important differences.

⁴⁰ For the different techniques used for restructuring sermons in the late Middle Ages, see Ildikó Bárczi, *Ars compilandi – a szövegformálás középkori technikája: Forráshasználat, hivatkozási gyakorlat és tematikus szerkezet a későközépkori prédikációirodalomban* Laskai Osvát életműve alapján (*Ars compilandi – the medieval technique of word processing: Application of sources, practice of references, and thematic structure in late medieval preaching literature on the basis of the works of Osvaldus de Laskó*), Ph. D. diss. (Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1993).

⁴¹ For a list see SD, vol. 1, Introduction, xiv-xviii; this list does not reflect all the changes, but the information regarding which sermons of Jacobus are combined is correct.

⁴² *Ibid.*, vol. 2, 427, l. 15-19 (Epistle-sermon for Trinity); see also above in 1.3.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, 470, l. 31 (additional Gospel-sermon for the third Sunday in Lent); and *ibid.*, vol. 2, 457, l. 28 (Gospel-sermon for “prima dominica post octavas festi corporis christi”). Hungary-specific material in the non-Voragine sermons are, for example, the *exemplum* about a Győr priest (*ibid.*, vol. 2, 446, l. 23-27) we will

closing remark of this chapter, that the comparison of the sermons in the SD and those of Jacobus de Voragine resulted also in the refutation of a hypothesis formulated by Andor Tarnai. Tarnai alleged that our compiler had direct access to the *Summa Theologiae*, since he quotes Aquinas in sermons taken from Jacobus even if Jacobus did not do so.⁴⁴ The textual comparison makes clear that our compiler (or the intermediary one) used not only Aquinas, but several other *auctoritates* in the newly inserted sections of his sermons.⁴⁵

In sum, we know that the SD is a mid fifteenth-century collection from the diocese of Pécs. We also know that out of its 127 sermons 45 are taken from Jacobus de Voragine with substantial modifications. The extent of the modifications hints towards intermediary stages in the transmission of these 45 texts. A part of the rewritings was certainly made in Hungary as newly inserted passages contain Hungary-specific materials. The collection was probably made for a clerical audience, and it seems a bit more convincing that the supposed addressees were secular rather than regular clergymen. They may have belonged to the chapter of Pécs, and it is also possible, though not proven, that the compiler occupied the official post for preaching established by Pope Martin V in 1428.

discuss below in 2.3; the miracle – modeled upon a similar one of St. Benedict –, which happened to bishop Peter of Vác (ibid., vol. 1, 443, l. 6-7); or further references to the legends of St. Emerich and St. Ladislaus (ibid., vol. 2, 379, l. 5-6) and St. Stephen (ibid., vol. 1, 336, l. 28f).

⁴⁴ Tarnai, “A Budapest-Németújvári,” 26.

⁴⁵ See for example the passage inserted into the sermon for the fourth Sunday of Advent: SD, vol. 1, 117, l. 12 – 118, l. 22 (Unde Chrysostomus ... investigare non potuit).

Chapter 2: **Two Sermons on the Eucharist: Text and Context**

In the first chapter we made a short description of, and presented some arguments concerning, the basic philological features of the collection as a whole. In this respect the individual sermons were taken into consideration only in that final version in which they were integrated into the collection; we emphasized merely those elements which connected the different texts and formed a whole out of them. Now we will focus on two particular texts from the SD, two sermons on the Eucharist, one for Maundy Thursday and one for Corpus Christi. We will assess in some detail their liturgical context, the feasts of the Eucharist, and specify a range of main topics usually preached on these days. We will also present some central elements of eucharistic theology and its relation to eucharistic sermons. Finally, we will examine the form and function of short edifying stories (*exempla*) in our two sermons.

2.1 The Feasts and the Sermons

The celebration of Maundy Thursday,⁴⁶ being the commemoration of the first mass, belongs to the oldest Christian observances. In the course of the centuries and among the variety of different traditions its liturgy contained many optional elements; some of them emerged at a certain point and later disappeared, some others have remained until today. The consecration of the holy oils, for example, did not cease taking place on Maundy Thursday. The *pedilavium*, the ritual washing of the feet,⁴⁷ is still practiced (though not in a compulsory manner) within Catholicism. Conversely, the reconciliation of penitents shared a common

⁴⁶ cf. *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, s.v. "Pâque;" and *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Holy Thursday."

⁴⁷ The English word "maundy" refers both to the *pedilavium* and to the alms distributed among the poor on this day.

fate with the practice of public penance, which essentially came to an end during the thirteenth century.⁴⁸ Although the practice of public penance was no longer customary in the middle of the fifteenth century, when the SD was compiled, it had left an important trace behind: the timing of the yearly, compulsory confession and communion. Before the regulations of the fourth Lateran council, people, according to the practice of public penance, usually confessed their sins collectively and publicly on Ash Wednesday in the presence of the bishop, did their penance during the whole of Lent, and lastly, were re-accepted as fully-fledged members of the community on Maundy Thursday, becoming entitled to the reception of the Eucharist on Easter Saturday or Sunday. This rhythm of the yearly, compulsory confession and communion was encouraged by the clergy even after 1215, though the fourth Lateran council did not specify the date of the confession only that of the communion: *ad minus in Pascha*.⁴⁹

In contrast to Maundy Thursday, Corpus Christi – the fourth weekday after Trinity – was one of the most recent feasts of the Church in the later Middle Ages. It was born in thirteenth-century Liège, in an environment of pious women, who were in general, independently of their social affiliations (as beguines, recluses, tertiaries, nuns or even laywomen) or their place of living, especially dedicated to eucharistic devotion throughout the whole century and even beyond.⁵⁰ One of these pious women, who lived a godly life as a nurse in the leper-hospital of Mont Cornillon in Liège, Juliana of Cornillon, had a later repeated vision in which the full moon appeared to her with a dark spot on its surface. The meaning of the visions was revealed to her in a dream by Christ himself: the full moon stood for the Church, the dark spot for the absence of a feast proper for the celebration of the Eucharist. Following a few years of restricted, local observance, the first promoter of the feast

⁴⁸ For the transformation of penance during the thirteenth century due, first of all, to the mendicants see Roberto Rusconi, “De la prédication à la confession: transmission et contrôle de modèles de comportement au XIII^e siècle,” in *Faire Croire: Modalités de la diffusion et de la réception des messages religieux du XII^e au XV^e siècle*, Collection de l’École Française de Rome 51 (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1981), 67-85; and the conference volume *Dalla penitenza all’ascolto delle confessioni: il ruolo dei frati mendicanti* (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, 1996).

⁴⁹ *Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum Commentariis glossatorum*, ed. Antonio García y García. Documenta Iuris Canonici, series A: Corpus Glossatorum 2 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1981), 67; for the timing of the communion in relation to the public penance, see Peter Browe, “Die Kommunionvorbereitung im Mittelalter,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 56 (1932): 388ff; and also idem, *Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster: Regensbergische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940), 3ff.

⁵⁰ On this theme, the relation of pious women to the Eucharist, see Caroline Walker Bynum, “Women Mystics and Eucharistic Devotion in the Thirteenth Century,” in *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone, 1991): 119-150; and also idem, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987).

on a universal scale was James Pantaleon, archdeacon of Campines in the diocese of Liège, Bishop of Verdun, patriarch of Jerusalem and finally, from 1261, Pope Urban IV (1261-1264). It was the first time that a pope had founded a universal feast, when Urban did so in his bull *Transiturus* in 1264, some fifty years after Juliana's visions. Unfortunately the pope died soon thereafter in the same year, and the feast, still too young to take roots, died with him. In 1317, however, it was reestablished in Avignon by Pope John XXII (1316-1334) and became widespread in the subsequent decades.⁵¹ It seems probable that the mass and office of Corpus Christi was written by Thomas Aquinas, while the most famous part of its liturgy, the hymn *Lauda Syon* (quoted also in the SD) is undoubtedly the work of the *doctor angelicus*.⁵²

Being a new feast, Corpus Christi was to be absorbed into the annual cycle of religious practice along with the insertion of its liturgy into the missals. In order to achieve this aim preachers had to accomplish a twofold task: firstly, they had to make people understand why it was necessary to introduce a further feast of the Eucharist in addition to Maundy Thursday; secondly, they had to make the attendance of its celebration attractive in the eyes of their flock. The means to achieve the latter task was, first of all, to outline the indulgences provided by Urban IV and two subsequent popes, Martin V (1417-1431) and Eugene IV (1431-1447), to those who attended the office of Corpus Christi; such indulgences were already attached to the participation in the processions characteristic of this feast by John XXII.⁵³ The sermon for Corpus Christi in the SD starts precisely with an enumeration of these indulgences: *Urbanus papa quartus ... concessit largissima dona spiritualia omnibus pie et devote tunc festivitatem celebrantibus. Indulgentiis enim donavit multiplicibus ... Martinus papa quintus ... praedictas indulgentias geminavit, et duplicavit*.⁵⁴

Why was it necessary to establish an additional feast of the Eucharist? According to Pope Urban IV's view, Christ deserves a feast dedicated entirely to him just as saints have their own feast days. He argued in his bull on the one hand that Maundy Thursday was part of the Holy Week, a period of grief and sorrow when people are expected to concentrate on the passion of the Lord, whereas Corpus Christi is a joyful celebration, and on the other that there

⁵¹ For the emergence of the feast, see Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 164ff; and Peter Browe, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter* (Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1933), 71ff.

⁵² Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 185ff.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 211f.

⁵⁴ SD, vol. 2, 435, l. 12-32; Appendix 2, 76, l. 2-16.

were so many liturgical services taking place on Maundy Thursday that the main theme of the feast became almost invisible.⁵⁵ This argumentation is partly reproduced in the SD:

*Et quemvis charissimi haec festivitas locum habuisset ipso die coenae domini, quia tunc hoc sacramentum venerabile per Christum institutum est; tamen quia tunc ecclesia occupata est circa alia, sc. circa poenitentium reconciliationem, et sanctorum unctionum consecrationem et consimilia: ideo pro tunc tantae festivitati exequendae vel celebrandae vacare seu intendere non potuit, unde rationabiliter [o k o s o n] institutum est (m e l t a n e s o k o s o n), ut expletis aliis festivitibus, puta [i.e. scilicet] resurrectionis, ascensionis, spiritus sancti missionis, et beatissimae trinitatis, hoc festum in honorem tanti sacramenti liberius ac cunctis fidelibus immediate feria quinta post festum dictae gloriosissimae trinitatis veneraretur i.e. celebraretur.*⁵⁶

Although the liturgy for Corpus Christi was inserted into the *temporale* part of the missals, the Corpus Christi sermons, due to the close association with the feasts of saints, are often to be found in the *de sanctis* collections.

These two tasks related to the spreading and popularizing of the feast, however important they were, were absent in much Corpus Christi sermons.⁵⁷ The reason for this lies in the peculiarity of the feast itself and in the relationship between sermons for Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi. In many *sermonaria*, even in the fifteenth century, we do not find sermons written explicitly for Corpus Christi, and preachers used Maundy Thursday sermons instead of them. Moreover, in the collections where we do find Corpus Christi sermons, these are evidently modeled upon their counterparts for Maundy Thursday.⁵⁸ The topics discussed in a typical Maundy Thursday sermon were usually similar to those in a typical Corpus Christi one. Often, especially in the case of *Quadragesimales* (collections for preaching during Lent), already the sermons for some of the first three days of the Holy Week were dedicated to eucharistic themes. A preacher of the Franciscan Observance around the end of the fifteenth century kept a diary of his Lent preaching in Foligno. In this diary he noted the duration of the sermons, the reactions of the public and his use of the ready-made

⁵⁵ Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 179f.

⁵⁶ SD, vol. 2, 435, l. 33 - 436, l. 9; Appendix 2, 76, l. 17-25. In the quotations from the SD sermons, following Szilády and the practice introduced in the first chapter, the square brackets contain the glosses from the Némétújvár codex, and the round brackets those of the Budapest one. It would be interesting to know how the expression *poenitentium reconciliatio* was understood in a period when public penance had not been customary anymore; it probably referred to some symbolic remnant of the earlier practice.

⁵⁷ We do find this popularizing attitude in the Corpus Christi sermons of the following preachers (within the body of texts I studied): Pelbartus de Temesvár, Gottschalcus Hollen, Johannes Herolt and Osvaldus de Laskó.

⁵⁸ Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 231ff.

tools characteristic of thematic sermons (*auctoritates, exempla*, and so on).⁵⁹ In the entry *Feria quarta* (that is, Holy Wednesday) we find the following notes: “On the sacrifice of communion. Parts: essence, dignity, diversity - as you usually preach it. It took one hour and fifteen minutes.”⁶⁰ The remark, occurring only in this entry, “as you usually preach it” stresses the firm association between Holy Wednesday and the theme of communion.⁶¹

What were the usual topics in the sermons for Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi? Since I did not have the opportunity to make a representative survey of Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi preaching, I can merely indicate the range of topics on the basis of some fourteenth- and fifteenth-century *sermonaria*. Some of these topics will be discussed below from different aspects; here I only enumerate them in a comparative table, and emphasize a few of their characteristics. The topics are listed not in the order of their frequency, since the sample is not representative, but in a series reflecting an increasing “distance” from the main eucharistic concerns. The second and the third column contains the names of the preachers who discuss a given topic either on the occasion of Maundy Thursday or on that of Corpus Christi. Next to the name of the preacher there is a number which refers to the particular texts in his collection under the heading of the two feasts. The lack of numbers means that there is only one sermon for that feast in that collection. In the case of one preacher (Caracciolo) I also included sermons for the first three days of the Holy Week.

THE MAIN TOPICS OF THE SERMONS	MAUNDY THURSDAY SERMONS	CORPUS CHRISTI SERMONS
A full tableau of eucharistic themes: institution, priestly consecration, transubstantiation, reception, effects, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caracciolo: s. for Feria II, Feria IV⁶² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herphius: s. 1, 2⁶³ • Herolt: s. 2, 3⁶⁴ • Hollen: s.1⁶⁵ • Osvaldus: s.1, 2⁶⁶

⁵⁹ A shortened text of the diary in Italian translation is to be found in a collection of sources related to preaching: Roberto Rusconi, ed., *Predicazione e vita religiosa nella società italiana da Carlo Magno alla controriforma* (Torino: Loescher Editore, 1981), 198-199. Since I could not consult the original, I will quote from this edition.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 199; in Rusconi’s Italian version: “Feria quarta. Sul sacrificio della comunione. Parti: essenza, dignità, diversità, come sei solito predicare. Durò un ora e un quarto.” Most of his sermons lasted between one hour and one and a half, only the Good Friday sermon lasted for five hours and fifteen minutes.

⁶¹ The other topics in the Holy Week according to this diary are: on *eleemosyna* (Feria II), on prayer (Feria III), on the passion of Christ (Feria VI).

⁶² Robertus Caraccioli (Roberto da Lecce), *Sermones* (Lyon: Johann Clyn, 1502; ÖNB 19.H.41).

⁶³ Henricus Herphius, *Sermones fratris Henrici Herp ... de tempore et sanctis* (Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1509; ÖNB 18. G. 22).

⁶⁴ Joannes Herolt, *Sermones Discipuli de tempore et de sanctis cum exemplorum promptuario* (Venice: Sessae, 1584; ÖNB 18.R.14).

⁶⁵ Gottschalcus Hollen, *Sermonum opus exquisitissimum ... super epistolas dominicarum per anni circulum* (Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1520; ÖNB 20. CC. 113).

⁶⁶ Osvaldus de Laskó, *Sermones Dominicales perutiles* (Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1516; MTA RM III 81a).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pelbartus: s. 1, 2, 3, 4⁶⁷ • SD • Vincent Ferrer: s. 1, 3, 4⁶⁸
Transubstantiation	• Caracciolo: s. for Feria III	
Institution of the Eucharist	• Maillardus ⁶⁹	• [Paratus] ⁷⁰
Reception of the Eucharist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capistranus⁷¹ • Herolt • Osvaldus • SD 	• Herolt: s. 1
Effects of the Eucharist	• Ferrer: s. 5	
Interpretation of the mass: parts, vestment, vessels, gestures, effects, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caracciolo: s. 2 • [Paratus] 	• Hollen: s. 2, 3
The passion of Christ		• Ferrer: s. 2
What Christ taught us by his exemplary life	• Caracciolo: s. 1	
Washing of the feet	• Peregrinus de Opole ⁷²	
Baptism	• Caracciolo: s. 3	

This list is all the more unrepresentative as some preachers have five sermons for Corpus Christi, like Vincent Ferrer, some others have only one, like the compiler of the SD, and if one has a selection of sermons for each feast, he can dedicate them to different topics offering the possibility of choice to the users of his collection. This is the case, for example, with Vincent Ferrer: he has three sermons for proper sacramental education (this is what I call “a full tableau of eucharistic themes”) and he can dedicate the two remaining ones to a more particular problem, the effects of the Eucharist,⁷³ or even to the Passion of Christ. The same holds for the sermons of Johannes Herolt. Caracciolo, on the other hand, devotes the entire Holy Week to Eucharist-related topics – a practice not uncommon at all, as we saw in the

⁶⁷ Pelbartus de Temesvár, *Pomerium sermonum de Sanctis* (Rouen, 1521; MTA RM III 104).

⁶⁸ Vincent Ferrer, *Sancti Vincenti Ferreri Opera seu sermones de tempore et sanctis cum tractatu de vita spirituali*, 2 vols. (Augsburg: Joannis Strötter, 1729; ÖNB 21.P.13).

⁶⁹ Oliverius Maillardus, *Sermones de adventu, quadragesimales, dominicales et de peccati stipendio et gratie premio etc.* (Strasbourg: Knoblauch, 1506; ÖNB 19. F. 43).

⁷⁰ [Paratus], *Sermones parati de tempore et de sanctis* (Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1513; ÖNB 32. F. 36).

⁷¹ Joannes a Capistrano, *XLIV sermones Vratislaviae habiti a. D. MCCCCCLIII*, ed. Eugen Jacob. Johannes von Capistrano, part 2: Die auf der Königlichen und Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Breslau befindlichen handschriftlichen Aufzeichnungen von Reden und Traktaten Capistrans 3 (Wrotzlaw: Trewendt & Granier's Verlag, 1911).

⁷² Peregrinus de Opole, *Sermones de tempore et de sanctis*, ed. Richard Tatarzynski, *Studia “Przeglądu Tomistycznego”* 1. (Warsaw: Institutum Thomisticum, 1997). This sermon has two main topics: washing of the feet as an act of humility and the institution of the Eucharist as an example of purity.

⁷³ This forms an entire *quaestio* consisting of eight *articuli* in Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*: “De effectibus huius sacramenti,” 3, q. 79; Ferrer, as all late medieval preachers, uses St. Thomas excessively.

case of Holy Wednesday in the diary of the Observant Franciscan – hence he can write Maundy Thursday sermons also on Baptism or the exemplary life of Christ.

The connections between Maundy Thursday and the Corpus Christi sermons are not confined to the resemblance of the main topics: preachers tend to provide explicit cross-references between the sermons of the two feasts. Johannes Herolt, for example, has three sermons for Corpus Christi and only one for Maundy Thursday, nevertheless, the latter concludes with a suggestion to look for similar topics in the Corpus Christi sermons. Gottschalcus Hollen purposely omits the Maundy Thursday sermon, and the *Coena Domini* entry of his collection contains merely the laconic advice: *Requirere alibi*.

2.2 *Auctoritates* in the Eucharistic Sermons

The function of quotations in modern literary culture lies predominantly in establishing and emphasizing certain relations between two contexts: the original one, where the quoted excerpt stems from, and the later one, where it is inserted. This function presupposes that the reader of the actual text knows, at least to some extent, the original context. In the Middle Ages there was a peculiar type of quotation where this latter presupposition was evidently not valid, where the quoted text was de-contextualised, or rather re-contextualised from time to time during its endless journey from one book to another. This was the *auctoritas*. *Auctoritas: id est sententia digna imitatione*, says the canonist Hugh of Pisa (Hugoccio) in his crisp and compact definition.⁷⁴ According to this, *auctoritas* is first of all a *sententia* – that is, not a person – and has the distinctive characteristic of being *digna imitatione*, worth quoting in every writing or speech on a suitable topic. It consists of a fairly short text asserting some important truth and an attributed *auctor* without much concern for the correctness of the attribution. Due to this twofold fact, that *auctoritates* were not quoted from the original and even the correctness of attributions had only restricted relevance, it is impossible to understand the theological message of a sermon through the views of the *auctores* to whom the directly quoted or paraphrased truths are ascribed. Nonetheless, studying the way a

⁷⁴ Hugotius Pisanus, *Magnae derivationes*, s.v. “augeo,” quoted in Malcolm Beckwith Parkes, “The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book,” in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, eds. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 116, n.1; for the question of *auctoritates* see also Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, “*Statim invenire*: Schools Preachers and New Attitudes to the Page,” in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, eds. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable and Carol D. Lanham (Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto

preacher *uses* the *auctoritates*, the way he reflects upon and elucidates them can yield at least some hints as to his theological erudition. In what follows we will highlight a few such hints, but before doing so, we have to see the main elements of the theological context in general terms, and the relationship between the problems of high-level theology and low-level sermons.

Western eucharistic theology as such, being more or less independent of other concerns, especially Christology, having its own questions and problems, emerged in the ninth century.⁷⁵ From this point onwards, according to the thorough investigations of Gary Macy, three main approaches are distinguishable on the basis of the role the Eucharist is thought to play in salvation, within orthodox, or at least not heretical, theology. When we say “orthodox theology,” we mean first of all the acceptance of Christ’s real presence in the sacrament. It was Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corbie, who first formulated, in his treatise *De corpore et sanguine domini* ca.831-833, the very strong claim that the body of Christ present in the consecrated host is *identical* with the body born of the Virgin. A few years thereafter, around 843-4, his fellow monk of Corbie, Ratramnus, wrote a work under the same title, though with the opposite content: the Lord appears in the Eucharist not *in veritate*, but *in mysterio*, and his mode of existence is open merely to intellectual discernment by the mind of the faithful.⁷⁶ The latter position became widespread not in association with Ratramnus, whose treatise was latter attributed to Erigena, but as the heresy of Berengar, the *scholasticus* of the church of Saint Martin in Tours ca.1040-1080.⁷⁷ It was Berengar who introduced the Aristotelian categories of substance and accidents in eucharistic theology as technical terms to describe the consecrated host and the type of change occurring to it.⁷⁸ Although Berengar was repeatedly condemned both during his life and afterwards, and the mainstream of later theologians accepted the real presence, transubstantiation became a dogma only in 1215, in the first constitution of the fourth Lateran council.⁷⁹ Moreover, even after 1215 the interpretations of the change in question which were considered orthodox covered a reasonably wide range of opinions until the more precise formulations of the

University Press, 1982), 201-225.

⁷⁵ Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians c.1080-c.1220* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 18ff.

⁷⁶ Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist*, 27ff.

⁷⁷ On the Berengarian controversy, see *ibid.*, 35ff; and Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of the Doctrine*, vol. 3 (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), 184ff.

⁷⁸ Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist*, 40f.

⁷⁹ see *Constitutiones*, 41f.

Council of Trent. Gary Macy argues convincingly that all three of the following interpretations of “transubstantiation” were valid up till the end of the thirteenth century, and only the first one was condemned officially during the fourteenth: (i) “bread and wine remain present along with the body and blood of the Lord;” (ii) “the substance of the bread and wine is annihilated, the substance of the body and blood alone remaining;” (iii) “the substance of bread and wine is changed into the substance of the body and blood.”⁸⁰

Theologians holding one or other view of how transubstantiation exactly happens, while faithfully accepting the fact itself, can be assigned to three categories on the basis of their different approaches. Following Gary Macy again, the *differentia specifica* of each approach, as we already mentioned, lies in the role the Eucharist is meant to play in salvation. According to the first approach, called “Paschasian” by Macy and represented by theologians like Lanfranc of Bec, Guitmund of Aversa, Alger of Liège or Rupert of Deutz, the natural, sensual contact between the Lord *sub specie panis* and the believer, the bodily union with Christ, is necessary for salvation.⁸¹ Others, such as Anselm of Laon, Hugh of Saint Victor and their schools, believed that the Eucharist – even the substantial presence of Christ in it – is predominantly a *sign* which refers to the mystical union between man and God, to a union beyond corporeal contact – this is Macy’s “mystical approach.”⁸² There was a semiotic terminology inherited from Augustine, the dichotomy of the *sacramentum*, the consecrated bread and wine, as a sign, and the *res sacramenti* as its reference and, in a sense, the *meaning* of the sacrament. For these latter theologians and for the proponents of the third approach, called “ecclesiastical” by Macy, the question of the salvific function of the Eucharist was a question concerning the nature of the *res sacramenti*. According to the ecclesiastical approach,⁸³ associated with Gerhoh of Reichersberg, Peter Lombard and the schools of Peter Abelard and Gilbert of La Porée, the *res sacramenti* – and thus the prerequisite for salvation – is not an individually achieved union with the Lord, but a union achieved through membership of the Church, a union between Christ and the Church itself. Although Macy’s description of the three approaches covers only the early scholastic period until the beginning of the thirteenth century, the later views can also be situated within this framework, even if

⁸⁰ Gary Macy, “The Dogma of Transubstantiation in the Middle Ages,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 13. The first interpretation became regarded as heretical due, above all, to the severe criticisms of Thomas Aquinas, who defended the third one. Wycliff was condemned for proclaiming the first one – see below.

⁸¹ see Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist*, 44ff.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 73ff.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 106ff.

not as pure types. In the thirteenth century there was a tendency to emphasize more and more the necessity of the bodily reception of the sacrament, that is, to debate the mystical approach and to some extent the ecclesiastical one as well.⁸⁴ Albert the Great and Aquinas, for example, denied the possibility of an entirely *spiritual* communion where prayer and meditation would be a substitute for bodily reception.⁸⁵

How was this high-level theology – being, of course, much more complex and manifold than the summary above – related to low-level sermons? What was the difference between the problems of the theologians and those of the preachers? It seems to me that the differentiation between learned and popular religious thought is justified only insofar as it concerns the resources of thinking – philosophical traditions, logical theories, terminology, and so on – and the problems arising partly or wholly from the application of these resources. There are a number of “genuine” problems appearing on both levels, posed by the tension between scriptural or ecclesiastical authority on the one hand, and everyday experience (distilled into taken for granted patterns of thought) on the other.⁸⁶

For a comparison of the eucharistic problems in high-level theology and low-level sermons, one can use as a sample, at least in the case of the late Middle Ages, the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas, the theological work *par excellence* from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards.⁸⁷ Thomas discusses the Eucharist in the third part of his *Summa* from the seventy-third until the eighty-third *quaestio*. These eleven *quaestiones* contain eighty-four *articuli*. As a rule, he starts with the more general problems (for example, q.73 a.1: *Utrum Eucharistia sit sacramentum*) and goes on to the more particular ones (for example, q.81 a.1: *Utrum Christus sumpserit suum corpus et sanguinem*). Out of the eleven *quaestiones* three are dedicated to the most abstract group of problems, those related to transubstantiation (q.75-77: *De conversione panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Christi*; *De modo quo Christus existit in hoc sacramento*; *De accidentibus remanentibus in hoc*

⁸⁴ Only to some extent; after the fourth Lateran council, yearly communion was required for membership of the Church: “alioquin et vivens ab ingressu ecclesie arceatur et moriens christiana careat sepultura,” *Constitutiones*, 68.

⁸⁵ For the problem of the salvific function of the Eucharist in high scholasticism, see Heinz Robert Schlette, *Die Lehre von der geistlichen Kommunion bei Bonaventura, Albert dem Großen und Thomas von Aquin*, Münchener Theologische Studien, Systematische Abteilung 17 (München: Max Hueber, 1959). We will discuss these problems further from a sociological point of view in the third chapter.

⁸⁶ One of my Philosophy teachers – Ferenc Huoránszki – said once that there are two kinds of philosophical problems: one comes to the mind of almost everybody – the problems of time-travel, for example –, the other can only be understood (even as a problem) by advanced students of philosophy, because it is based on a series of other problems – the problem of *supervenience* in contemporary analytical philosophy can be a case in point.

⁸⁷ I used the following edition: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 5 vols. (Madrid: La Editorial Catolica, 1958).

sacramento). A further three *quaestiones* discuss problems related to the rite of consecration and the priestly role (q.78 and 82-83: *De forma huius sacramenti*; *De ministro huius sacramenti*; *De ritu huius sacramenti*). Two more *quaestiones* are aimed at the elucidation of problems related to the reception of the sacrament (q. 79-80: *De effectibus huius sacramenti*; *De usu sive sumptione huius sacramenti*). Finally, among the three remaining *quaestiones* there is the starting one (q.73: *De sacramento eucharistie*) which defines the sacrament, and two others relate to the *species* of the Eucharist (q.74: *De materia huius sacramenti*) and its institution by Christ (q.81: *De usu huius sacramenti quo Christus usus est in prima sui institutione*). In sermons for Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi we find the counterparts of almost all *quaestiones* and *articuli*. In the previous section we saw the range of main topics covered in these sermons. The thematic cluster that I called “a full tableau of eucharistic themes” contain minor *summae* of eucharistic theology. Vincent Ferrer, for example, breaks down his first sermon for Corpus Christi into five *divisiones*: *mutatio substantialis*, *operatio sacerdotalis*, *habitatio sacramentalis*, *perceptio sensualis*, *receptio usualis*.⁸⁸ The first discusses transubstantiation, the second the priestly role, and the third Christ’s mode of existence in the sacrament, while the fourth provides reasons for instituting the Eucharist under sensible *species*, and the last one depicts the fruits of worthy reception. A single sermon, of course, cannot employ all the richness and complexity of eighty-four *articuli* composed by the *doctor angelicus*, but there is a tendency, at least in this thematic cluster, to provide a full overview of problems – a tendency which was certainly not independent of the structure of high scholastic *summae*. Assuming, for the sake of simplicity, that the *Summa Theologiae* encompasses the widest range of eucharistic problems, we could analyze particular sermons *as if* the preachers would have chosen from this assortment, and thus we could compare and explain the different choices. Vincent Ferrer, for example, was not sensitive to the different readings of that peculiar change which occurs in the bread and the wine as they become the body and blood of the Lord. Roberto da Lecce, on the other hand, poses explicitly the relevant question – *Utrum in consecratione sit vera transmutatio sive conversio panis in corpus Christi an panis simul maneat cum corpore* – in his sermon for Holy Wednesday.⁸⁹ This problem is far-reaching, since – as St. Thomas pointed out – it involves idolatry: *contriaretur venerationi huius sacramenti, si aliqua substantia esset ibi*

⁸⁸ Ferrer, *Opera seu sermones*, “In festo Corporis Christi,” sermo 1.

⁸⁹ Robertus Caraccioli (Roberto da Lecce), *Sermones*, “Feria quarta hebdomade sancte.”

quae non posset adorari adoratione latraie.⁹⁰ This problem was also at the center of the controversies around John Wycliff (ca.1335/38-1384),⁹¹ who thought, above all, that – because of the unperishable nature of substance in general – the substance of bread and wine remain along with Christ's body after the consecration. He was also very much aware of the consequences of his position and taught that the veneration of the consecrated host is idolatrous due to the imperfect divine presence.

Now, we are in the middle of the last question of this section: what can we know about the theological erudition of our compiler? First of all, what was his attitude (or the attitudes of the one who wrote the eucharistic sermons) towards the most important heretical phenomenon of his times, the Hussite movement?⁹² From the point of view of eucharistic theology, the central issue of Hussite religious practice was *Utraquism* – communion in both kinds. In theory, *concomitance*, the view that after consecration Christ is present in his totality in each of the two species, became established in quite an elaborated form already in the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard (ca.1155/58); in practice, however, it acquired the force of universal law only sometimes during the fourteenth century, though no exact date can be specified.⁹³ Moreover it seems that Bohemia did not see the radical decline of Utraquism even in the fourteenth century, since the Hussite practice in this respect goes back to the doctrines of the extremely influential bohemian preacher Milicius de Chremsir (or Jan Milič, d. 1374).⁹⁴ On the one hand, Utraquism was a revival of a practice which represented the ideal Christianity of the early Church; on the other, it was an implicit critique of priestly authority, since only priests communicated in both kinds – a privilege explained by the assertion that their communion was also sacrifice, the sacrifice of the mass, and at the same time, by reference to the dangers of spilling out the precious blood.

⁹⁰ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 3 q.75 a.2.

⁹¹ See Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992[1977]), 225ff; for the role Wycliffian eucharistic theology and especially eucharistic sermons played in the outbreak of the 1381 peasant revolt see Margaret Aston, "Corpus Christi and Corpus Regni: Heresy and the Peasant's Revolt," *Past and Present* 143 (1994): 3-47.

⁹² For the movement in general, see Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 284ff; and Howard Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967).

⁹³ The basic argument in favor of concomitance is based on the idea of corporeal unity – the idea that if it is the living Christ (born of the Virgin, suffered on the Cross and risen from the dead) who is present in the consecrated *species*, he cannot be present as flesh separated from blood, since in the latter case he would not be alive. For a history of the problem, see James J. Megivern, *Concomitance and Communion: A Study in Eucharistic Theory and Practice*, Studia Friburgensia, new ser. 33 (Fribourg and New York: The University of Fribourg Press and Herder Book Center, 1963).

⁹⁴ For Milič, see Peter C. A. Morée, *Preaching in Fourteenth-Century Bohemia: The Life and ideas of Milicius de Chremsir (+1374) and His Significance in the Historiography of Bohemia* (Slavkov: Eman, 1999).

The compiler of the SD (or the one who wrote the eucharistic sermons) claimed to have met personally John of Capistran,⁹⁵ one of the leading opponents of the Hussite movement, and yet in his eucharistic sermons we cannot find even the smallest reference to Utraquism, either explicitly or by discussing the differences between priestly and lay communion. As for the problem of concomitance, he says merely the following: *credi debet quod ibi est verus sanguis Christi, quia corpus [sc. vivum] sine sanguine non existit.*⁹⁶ This is a recapitulation of the main argument in favor of concomitance, but does not say anything about the practice of Utraquism, which is also possible without debating Christ's total presence under each *species*, simply by imitating what the priests do. The latest *auctor* mentioned in the text is Petrus de Palude (ca.1280-1342).⁹⁷ It is eminently reasonable to think that both sermons stem from the second half of the fourteenth century, preceding the birth of the Hussite movement. What is certain, however, is that the compiler of the SD, putting together the sermons in a very much structured collection, as we saw above in the first chapter, did not feel it necessary to include a passage against the Hussites.

As for other theological questions, the two sermons represent an absolutely orthodox position. Their compiler (whoever he was) does not mention any controversies, and does not seem to know about the different though equally orthodox interpretations of the salvific function of the sacrament. There is a sort of appendix attached to the Maundy Thursday sermon which consists of lengthy quotations from Aquinas' sentence-commentary and *summa* on the one hand, and the *De consecratione* and the *Liber extra* on the other.⁹⁸ The excerpts from Thomas concern problems of canon law as well. These quotations are not *auctoritates* in the proper sense, but rather notes from the books themselves. These notes were probably written by someone different from the compiler of the non-Voragine sermons (the sermons *not* taken from or modeled upon Jacobus de Voragine), since in these sermons material from canon law is used very infrequently. As a last telltale feature, the compiler of the two eucharistic sermons quotes the famous hymn by St. Thomas, *Lauda Sion*, under Gregory's name: *Gregorius: sumunt boni, sumunt mali, sorte tamen inaequali vitae vel interitus. mors*

⁹⁵ "Audiui enim a fratre Johanne Capistrano, quod..." SD, vol. 2, 376, l. 27.

⁹⁶ SD, vol. 2, 437, l. 32-34; Appendix 2, 78, l. 8-11.

⁹⁷ It would be interesting to know through what channels this (in comparison with Aquinas, Gregory, Augustine and the other big names quoted frequently in the SD) less significant theologian was known in late medieval Hungary; one of the contemporary readers of the SD was able to insert the missing "de Palude" after "Peter," see SD, vol. 2, 68, l. 30, Appendix 2, 62, l. 21. Unfortunately I could not consult Jean Dunbabin's book on Petrus de Palude: Jean Dunbabin, *A Hound of God: Pierre de la Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

⁹⁸ For the latter two books in general see Péter Erdő, *Az egyházi jog forrásai: történeti bevezetés* (The Sources of

est malis, vita bonis.⁹⁹ A hymn which is part of the Corpus Christi liturgy is not an *auctoritas*; hence the wrong attribution is much more relevant. He was certainly not a Dominican. He did not even perceive that the hymn must be much later than Gregory, as it is the summary of Thomas' eucharistic theology using the whole conceptual repertoire of high-scholastic theology; so he was certainly not a theologian with a university degree either. He probably did not know anything about the *Lauda Sion* and the origin of the Corpus Christi liturgy, and attributed the hymn to Gregory, the father of Catholic liturgy.

2.3 *Exempla* in the Eucharistic Sermons

The term *exemplum* refers to a whole range of rhetorical devices, from the short and simple *similitudo* to the long and complex *fabula*, and no popular literary work between classical antiquity and the eighteenth century could have done without it.¹⁰⁰ Their most ubiquitous common characteristics are the explicit moralizing, edifying aim and the persistence of main motifs for very long periods of time. In comparison with *auctoritates*, however, the variations of the same basic structure are much more diverse, and authors (preachers, hagiographers, historiographers, and so on) tended to adapt this basic structure to the requirements of the actual context by more substantial modifications. Local people are substituted for the "original" protagonists, local customs and places are introduced, the same narrative roles are assigned to different persons or groups occupying equivalent social positions, and so on. Among other kinds of *exempla*, eucharistic ones are conspicuous by their superabundantly miraculous nature. Peter Browe in his *Die eucharistischen Wunder des Mittelalters* enlists nineteen main categories, according to the type of miracle involved.¹⁰¹ The nineteen categories are arranged along two main lines: wonders brought about by transubstantiation and wonders independent of the change itself. Instead of enumerating each and every category

ecclesiastical law: Historical introduction) (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1998).

⁹⁹ SD, vol. 2, 65, l. 22-23; Appendix 2, 59, l. 15-16; see S. Thomas Aquinas, "De Officium Festo Corporis," in *Opera omnia*, ed. Roberto Busa (Stuttgart: Friedrich Fromman, 1980), vol. 6, 581f.

¹⁰⁰ For a general survey of *exempla* in the Middle Ages see Claude Brémond, Jacques Le Goff, and Jean-Claude Schmitt, *L'exemplum*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 40 (Brepols: Turnhout, 1996); for the possibility of distinguishing *similitudines* and *exempla* in the way they are used in sermons see Louis-Jacques Bataillon, "Similitudines et exempla dans le sermons du XIII^e siècle," in *The Bible and the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, eds. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 191-205.

¹⁰¹ Peter Browe, *Die Eucharistischen Wunder des Mittelalters*, (Breslau: Müller & Seifert, 1938); Miri Rubin has suggested three such categories, see Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 118ff.

differentiated by Browe, it is better to analyze the *exempla* in the SD sermons following these two lines and the relevant types attached to them; a comparative analysis of *exempla* in late medieval eucharistic sermons, just because of the diversity of types and variants, would require a separate study.

Although we can also regard as *exempla* the short references, such as *Hoc patet de judaeo, de quo facit mentionem b. Gregorius in libro Dialogorum*, or *Ita faciebat s. Alexius, sicut habetur in ejus legenda*,¹⁰² providing hints as to the knowledge which was taken for granted among the audience, their shortened form impedes further examination until the immediate source is discovered. For the moment I will leave aside also the *similitudo* attributed to Pliny in the Corpus Christi sermon – we will come back to it later in the third chapter. Thus I restrict my inquiry to the five proper miracle stories in the Corpus Christi sermon. Out of these five *exempla* one belongs to wonders not involving transubstantiation, three are proper transubstantiation stories, and the remaining one is also a transubstantiation miracle, though of a different background. Let us start with this one:

*Secundum miraculum est de quadam muliere, quae de consilio cujusdam pythonissae (n e z e) [n e z e w] hostiam in quodam alveolo apum, ut apes remanerent, reposuit. Tandem veniens ad alveolum reperit ibi beatam virginem suum filium in brachiis bajulantem, (et tunc mulier hoc videns, ivit festinanter ad sacerdotem. Et hic cum veniret cum processione, recipiens corpus dominicum cum reverentia portabat.)*¹⁰³

The first known occurrence of this story is in the *De miraculis* by Peter the Venerable.¹⁰⁴ Here it is a peasant who – following the advice of *sortilegi* – brings home the consecrated host and throws it into a beehive; he is motivated by the same expectations concerning the miraculous power of the host. Later, suffering from bad conscience for putting the host in the hive, kills the bees in order to take it back, but instead of the host he finds there a newborn child, who disappears right at the moment he takes him in his arms. In most variants, however, a woman is substituted for the peasant, the bees build a wax altar (or even an entire chapel) for the host, and no change occurs to the latter.¹⁰⁵ Siegfried Ringler has made a

¹⁰² SD, vol. 2, 69, l. 33-34; 444, l. 13-14; or Appendix 2, 63, l. 24. The ultimate source of the first one is unambiguous, see Grégoire Le Grand, *Dialogues*, III, 7, 3-9, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, Sources Chrétiennes 260 (Paris: Cerf, 1979), vol. 2, 280ff; the Alexius story probably comes either from the *Gesta Romanorum* or the *Legenda aurea*, though it is not evident for me what the author/compiler precisely thinks of.

¹⁰³ SD, vol. 2, 446, l. 11-18; or Appendix 2, 86, l. 7-11.

¹⁰⁴ Petrus Cluniacensis, *De miraculis libri duo*, I, I, ed. Dyonisia Bouthillier, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1988), 7f; see also Browe, *Die Eucharistischen Wunder*, 78ff.

¹⁰⁵ In Tubach's index we find only this version; see Frederic C. Tubach, *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales* (Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science, 1981), 209, tale no. 2662.

comparative analysis of the different versions of the story and found five recurrent central motifs:

a) menschliche Verunehrung der Eucharistie zum Zwecke der Magie oder (sekundär) durch Kirchenraub; b) Aufbewahrung der Eucharistie durch die Bienen; c) Bau einer Wachskapelle oder (sekundär) einer Monstranz, teilweise mit dem Nebenmotiv wunderbarer Begleiterscheinungen (Lichtwunder); d) Verehrung der Eucharistie durch die Bienen: Bienenprozession der schwärmenden und musizierenden Tiere; e) Auffindung der Hostie sowie der Wachskapelle und Verehrung durch die Kirchliche Gemeinde.¹⁰⁶

It is striking that the figure of the *sortilegus* is not among these motifs, though we find it both in Peter and the SD. Either the SD variant came through a separate hidden transmissional chain from Peter, or it was the compiler of the eucharistic sermons who introduced the sorcerer motif independently. The second option is all the more interesting as the word *pythonissa* is glossed in Hungarian with an expression – “néző” – especially characteristic of local popular culture. The feature which seems to be absolutely peculiar to the SD version is the appearance of the Virgin in the hive. Why does she enter the scene? There was a certain implicit contradiction already in the variant of Peter, namely the aim to demonstrate real presence on the one hand, and the presupposed miraculous power of the host, on the other: what else would have endowed the host with its charm, if not Christ’s real presence? This contradiction was eliminated from the subsequent, much more widespread versions, where the religious lesson lies in a warning: if the smallest creatures adore the host so much, what extent of adoration can be required from humans?¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, in the SD the contradiction has returned with the apparent intention to use the story as a transubstantiation wonder: Mary’s presence is intended to emphasize the point that the body which hides its substance beneath the visible form of corporeal food is identical with the body born of the Virgin.

The first proper transubstantiation miracle is a basic token of a famous type which happened to Gregory the Great:

¹⁰⁶ Siegfried Ringler, “ ‘Die Bienenkirche’ (‘Die Hostie im Bienenstock’),” in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, vol 1 (1977), 860.

¹⁰⁷ This is the moral of other such stories employing animals as well; the most famous of them is the miracle which happened to St. Anthony of Padua in Toulouse, when an Albigensian heretic was converted upon the sight of his ass adoring the host instead of eating hay after three days of starving. See Browe, *Die Eucharistischen Wunder*, 81ff.

Primum miraculum accidit b. Gregorii propter cuiusdam faeminae haesitationem [i.e. dubitationem], cui b. Gregorius dabat communionem (i.e. hostiam). Unde legitur quod matrona quaedam ipsi b. Gregorio singulis diebus dominicis panes offerebat [i.e. dabat vel portabat], qui cum post missarum solemnia corpus domini sibi (sc. mulieri) offerret et diceret: corpus domini nostri Jhesu Christi custodiat te in vitam aeternam: at illa subrisit (m u s u l l a). Ille continuo dextram ab ejus ore retrahens, partem illam dominici corporis super altare deposuit, postmodum coram populo matronam interrogavit: quam ob causam ridere praesumpserit? At illa: Quia panem materiale[m] quem propriis manibus feceram, tu corpus dominicum appellabas. Tunc b. Gregorius se in oratione prostravit, et surgens, particulam illam panis ad instar digiti carnem factam reperit, et sic matronam ad fidem reduxit. Oravit iterum, et carnem illam in panem conversam vidit, et matronae sumendam tradidit.¹⁰⁸

The first known version of this story stems from Paul the Deacon.¹⁰⁹ Although there was another variant first written down by John the Deacon, in which the host turned simply into flesh, instead of a bloody finger, the “original” story of Paul became the customary one, finding its way also into the *Legenda aurea*. Even if it is not peculiar to the SD, it is still important that Gregory has to pray for the change back to make communion possible. In the reflections, both theoretical and practical, by theologians and canonists concerning eucharistic wonders we find it as a recurring topic: what should a priest do if the host in his hand loses not only its substance but also its accidents. According to the general advice, he must ascertain first whether the miracle is seen only by him or by everyone in the Church. If the latter is the case, he must start praying for a counter-miracle.¹¹⁰ As for the direct source of the SD version I, compared it with variants in the *Legenda aurea* and the *Scala Coeli* – two frequently used *exemplaria* in late medieval Hungary¹¹¹ – and it seems very probable that the text was taken from the *Legenda aurea*.

¹⁰⁸ SD, vol. 2, 445, l. 33 - 446, l. 11; or Appendix 2, 85, l. 25 - 86, l. 6. This story is the ancestor of the famous pictorial theme represented frequently in medieval art, the so called Mass of Gregory, where the bloody finger is replaced with the man of sorrows; see Uwe Westfeling, ed., *Die Messe Gregors des Grossen: Vision, Kunst Realität*, exhibition catalogue (Cologne: Schnütgen Museum, 1982).

¹⁰⁹ Browe, *Die Eucharistischen Wunder*, 113ff.

¹¹⁰ See idem, “Die scholastische Theorie der eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder,” *Theologische Quartalschrift* 110 (1929): 305-332; and idem, *Die Eucharistischen Wunder*, 184ff.

¹¹¹ Edit Madas, “A Legenda aurea a középkori Magyarországon” (The Legenda aurea in medieval Hungary), *Magyar Könyvszemle* 108 (1992): 93-99; Lajos Katona, “Temesvári Pelbárt ‘Stellarium’-a és a ‘Scala coeli’ ” (The ‘Stellarium’ of Pelbartus de Temesvar and the ‘Scala coeli’), *Irodalomtudományi közlemények*, 1900: 158-164.

SCALA COELI

quedam matrona communicaretur ab eo et in porrigendo diceret quod Corpus Christi custodieret eam, illa incepit ridere. Tunc sanctus manum retrahens sub conjuratione requirit causam sui risus. Tunc illa: 'Heri hunc panem manibus meis paravi, et nunc miror quomodo potestis dicere quod sit Corpus Christi.' Tunc flens beatus Gregorius una cum populo ceperunt Dominum rogare ut dignaretur suam potentiam ostendere; statim species panis mutata est in speciem carnis etcetera. Quod videns mulier conversa recognovit suum peccatum.¹¹²

SD

matrona quaedam **ipsi** b. Gregorio singulis diebus dominicis PANES offerebat, qui cum **post** missarum SOLEMNIA corpus domini sibi offerret et diceret: corpus domini nostri Ihesu Christi custodiat te in vitam AETERNAM: **at illa** subrisit. Ille continuo dextram ab ejus ore **retrahens**, partem illam dominici corporis super altare deposuit, postmodum coram populo matronam interrogavit: quam ob causam ridere praesumpserit? At illa: Quia panem **materialem** quem propriis manibus feceram, tu corpus dominicum appellabas. Tunc **b.** Gregorius se in oratione prostravit, et surgens, particulam illam panis **ad** instar digiti carnem factam reperit, et sic matronam ad fidem reduxit. Oravit iterum, et carnem illam in panem conversam vidit, et matronae SUMENDAM tradidit.¹¹³

LEGENDA AUREA

matrona quaedam beato Gregorio singulis diebus dominicis PANEM offerebat. Qui cum **per*** missarum SOLLEMPNIA corpus domini sibi offerret et diceret: 'Corpus domini nostri Ihesu Christi custodiat te in uitam ETERNAM,' **lasciua** subrisit. Ille continuo dexteram ab ejus ore **conuertens** partem illam dominici corporis super altare deposuit. Postmodum coram populo matronam interrogavit quam ob causam ridere presumpserit. At illa: 'Quia panem, **inquit**, quem propriis manibus feceram tu corpus dominicum appellabas.' Tunc Gregorius **pro incredulitate mulieris** se in oratione prostravit et surgens particulam illam panis instar digiti carnem factam reperit et sic matronam ad fidem reduxit. Oravit iterum et carnem illam in panem conuersam uidit et matronae SUMENDUM tradidit.¹¹⁴

The second transubstantiation *exemplum* in the SD represents a mixed type:

*Tertium miraculum est de quodam Iudaeo, qui deridens christianos dicebat: quod christiani panem, pro deo colerent, qui cum christianis quinta feria magna iuit ad ecclesiam, ubi christiani communicabant, et vidit cuilibet christiano unum puerum [pulchrum] dari per sacerdotem, et sic conversus, vitam in bono finivit.*¹¹⁵

I could not find its source, but it seems to be a mixture of the previous one – the laughing woman is here replaced with the laughing Jew – and another type of transubstantiation miracles involving the appearance of a child instead of a piece of bloody meat. Such replacements of *liminal* characters¹¹⁶ – those on the margins of society, such as women, Jews, thieves, and so on – are quite frequent in eucharistic *exempla*, and these characters are usually

¹¹² Jean Gobi, *La Scala Coeli*, s.v. "De communione," ed. Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu (Paris: Édition du CNRS, 1991), 266.

¹¹³ Here I omitted the glosses.

¹¹⁴ Jacobus de Voragine, "De sancto Gregorio," in *Legenda aurea*, ed. Giovanni Paolo Maggioni (Firenze: Sismel, 1998), 299; *in one manuscript: post

¹¹⁵ SD, vol. 2, 446, l. 18-23; or Appendix 2, 86, l. 11-14.

¹¹⁶ For the concept of *liminality*, see Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969).

associated with doubt.¹¹⁷ On the other hand, Peter Browe argues that the main difference between stories where the host turns into flesh and those where it turns to a child is that the former motif stresses the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist and its immediate relation to the Passion, whereas the latter emphasizes a more attractive aspect of the living bread as an object of love. The first type of transmutation happens always during consecration, the second during communion:¹¹⁸ awe-inspiring *veneration* and warmth-inspiring *love*. Now it is strange to introduce a Jew into this context since Jews were much more closely linked to transubstantiation miracles involving Christ in passion – to scenes where they could be depicted as obdurate enemies of the Lord, desecrators of his precious Body.¹¹⁹

As for the only non-transubstantiation *exemplum*, although it seems very simple, I could not find its type. It is interesting, however, regarding the just mentioned interchanges between liminal figures, that a contemporary reader transformed the protagonists of the story from simple youngsters to young plunderers adding the gloss *latrones* to the word *juvenes*. We will come back to this *exemplum* in the next chapter.

legitur, quod [erant] tres juvenes (latrones) satis malitiosi, transeuntes per quamdam viam ad latrocinia exercendum. Tunc de coelo facta est vox dicens: percutite primum, ne amplius ambulet in terra, et mox fulminatus est (m e g h i t e m e n); et iterum dixit: percutite secundum, et illico secundus fulmine percussus expiravit. Tunc tertio vox insonuit dicens: percutite et tertium. Statim clamor daemonis auditus est sic: non possum, quia dum sacra communio fiebat i.e. missa celebrabatur, interfuit.

Perhaps the fourth *exemplum* is the most important one, since it places a basic type in an entirely Hungarian environment:

Quartum miraculum in regno nostro accidit cuidam sacerdoti, qui facta consecratione haesitabat, an ibi esset verum corpus Christi. Statim hostia ad visum pro medietate in carnem versa fuit, quae nunc est Jaurini (g e r e t h). Similiter accidit cuidam sacerdoti de sanguine.¹²⁰

The aim of the story is evident: the miracles prove the truth of transubstantiation. In most cases, however, where also blood miracles are involved, it is the host which tends to bleed,

¹¹⁷ See Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 121-122.

¹¹⁸ Browe, *Die Eucharistischen Wunder*, 93ff. The other important function of the child miracles is to accentuate the relation between Christ born of the Virgin and Christ present in the sacrament.

¹¹⁹ For the desecration accusations, see Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999).

¹²⁰ SD, vol. 2, 446, l. 23-27; or Appendix 2, 86, l. 14-17. The city where the story said to have happened is Győr in North-West Hungary.

and the whole story is used not simply as a proof of transubstantiation, but as a proof of concomitance.¹²¹ It is striking that our compiler in the middle of the fifteenth century – who also met Capistran in person – uses the material in a way which has nothing to do with concomitance or Utraquism. This *exemplum* amounts to the image of our compiler as someone not sensitive to religious movements and theological controversies.

¹²¹ See Dóra Sallay, *The Eucharistic Man of Sorrows: Evolution, Function, and Interpretation*, M.A. Thesis, (Budapest: Central European University, 1999), 41ff; Gábor Tüskés and Éva Knapp, “A szent vér tisztelete Magyarországon” (The veneration of the holy blood in Hungary), in *Művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok a magyar középkorról*, ed. Erik Fügedi (Budapest: Gondolat, 1986), 76-116.

Chapter 3: Two Sermons on the Eucharist: The Sociology of Communion

The idea of the previous chapter was to reconstruct the broader context of the two eucharistic sermons. First we presented the liturgical peculiarities of the two feasts, Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi, and a range of main topics frequently preached on these two days. Then we sketched an outline of medieval eucharistic theology up to the high scholastic period, its relations to popular preaching, and the theological knowledge of our compiler as reflected by his use of *auctoritates*. Finally we analyzed the form and function of eucharistic *exempla* in the SD sermons. These three aspects – the feasts, the *auctoritates* and the *exempla* – represent the three ultimate resources which shaped the composition of the sermons (whether by our Pécs cleric or someone else) *as texts*: the feasts, or more precisely the liturgies of the feasts, provide Biblical *themata*, references to the mass (for example through the hymn *Lauda Sion*) and guidance for the choice of main topics; the *auctoritates* form channels to learned theology both as selections of related questions and as hints towards answering these questions convincingly; lastly, the *exempla* offer the essential points of reference known, or possibly known, by the audience, the most appealing and familiar side of eucharistic discourse.

Now that we have seen some basic philological features of the collection (chapter 1) and the way the two eucharistic sermons are related to liturgy, theology, and the rhetoric of miracles (chapter 2), the remaining part of our thesis will be dedicated to somewhat more general problems. Preaching on the Eucharist had to accomplish a twofold task: (1) it had to *disseminate* the dogmas of the Sacrament, which every Christian had to believe and observe; and (2) it had to *display* the functions of the Sacrament, the role it was meant to play in human life, embedding it in the conceptual scheme of ‘simple folk.’ In the first section of this chapter we will discuss such a display, which inserts the Eucharist into a semantic field defined by the concepts of food and medicine. In the last section we will change the sequence, and instead of the manner in which the Eucharist is referred to, we will focus – resembling

the method of some medieval theologians – on its referent, on the “*res sacramenti*,” the social structure of communities as determined by differences in access to the living bread.

3.1 Food and Medicine: The Eucharist in its Socially Determined Field of Associations

It is bread and wine that we find in the center of religious concerns in an age, which was characterized impressively by Jacques Le Goff as a “universe of hunger.”¹²² Since the first premise of all human history is, of course, the existence of living human individuals, we cannot overemphasize this deep-rooted tension underlying eucharistic discourse. Life involves before everything else eating and drinking, a habitation, clothing and many other things, which can be summed up in two words: nutrition and health.

The immediate importance of these two concepts for the material subsistence of man influenced the language of apprehending and describing the spiritual realm in the Old Testament – God cures the sick and feeds the needy: “For I will restore health unto thee, and I will heal thee of thy wounds, saith the LORD; because they called thee an Outcast, saying, this is Zion, whom no man seeketh after” (Jer 30,17);¹²³ “O LORD my God, I cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me” (Ps 30,2); “Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help ... which giveth food to the hungry” (Ps 146,5-7). An even closer parallelism between the material and the spiritual in these terms is created by the juxtaposition of sin and illness: “I said, LORD, be merciful unto me: heal my soul; for I have sinned against thee” (Ps 41,4); “Bless the LORD, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits: Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases” (Ps 103,2-3).

In the New Testament, Jesus, the Son, becomes the heavenly food, the true bread, which the provident Father sends to the Earth to feed his people: “For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world ... he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst” (Jn 6,33-35). And it is also Jesus who embodies the full healing power of God both in the physical and in the spiritual sense, removing corporeal sickness from the body, and sins from the soul. Christ’s twofold mission, feeding and healing, is merged in the concept of his Body being food and medicament at the

¹²² Jacques Le Goff, *La civilisation de l’Occident médiéval* (Paris: Arthaud, 1964), 290.

¹²³ I used the King James version.

same time: “For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.” (Jn 6,55); “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed” (1 Pet 2,24).

The image of Christ as the heavenly bread, the food for eternal life, is one of the main *topoi* of Christian literature from patristic times onwards. There is, however, another – less ubiquitous, but still important – *topos* as well, in direct connection with the former one: the image of Christ as *medicus*. Apart from the Biblical tradition, we find at its origin the Greek-Roman idea of the healer-gods *Apollo medicus* and *Asklepios soter*.¹²⁴ In the West, a writer as early as Tertullian refers to Christ as *salutificator* and *artifex salutis*. Somewhat later, in the words of Novatianus Romanus (d. 250), Christ is *corporum et animarum medicus*. Evodius in the next century calls him *Medicus Salvator Christus*.¹²⁵ Augustine, who has an explicit predilection for this medical imagery, in one of his sermons compares humankind to an enormous sick body stretching oneself out across the whole world from the East to the West, while Christ, the *omnipotens medicus*, descends to his bed to heal it:

*aegrotat humanum genus, non morbis corporis, sed peccatis. iacet toto orbe terrarum ab oriente usque in occidentem grandis aegrotus. ad sanandum grandem aegrotum descendit omnipotens medicus. humiliavit se usque ad mortalem carnem, tanquam usque ad lectum aegrotantis. dat salutis praecepta, contemnitur: qui audiunt, liberantur*¹²⁶

There is nothing unfamiliar, then, nothing to surprise the audience, when Vincent Ferrer in his first sermon for Corpus Christi, explaining why Christ does not appear on the altar in human shape instead of the disguise of bread and wine, compares the Lord to a physician who wraps the bitter pill in a host: *Christus medicus noster, cujus caro est pilula nostrae salutis, quia aliter non possemus salvari, nisi per communionem, cooperit ne videatur, neque sapor carnis sentiatur*.¹²⁷

Nevertheless, the use of medical imagery in medieval sermons is not restricted to the ancient *topos* of *Christus medicus noster*. Hervé Martin argues that in Northern France in the

¹²⁴ Heinrich Schipperges, *Die Kranken im Mittelalter* (München: C. H. Beck, 1993), 203; Karl Kerényi, *Der göttliche Arzt: Studien über Asklepios und seine Kultstätten* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1948).

¹²⁵ Schipperges, *Die Kranken*, 204; see also Hans Martin von Erffa, “Christus als Arzt,” in *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 2 (München: C. H. Beck, 1948), 639f.

¹²⁶ Augustine of Hippo, “Sermo LXXXVII,” in *Sermones*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, Patrologia Latina 38 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1861), col. 537; see also “Sermo CLXXV,” “Sermo CCXLVII,” and “Sermo CCXCIX.”

¹²⁷ Vincent Ferrer, *Opera seu sermones*, “In festo Corporis Christi,” sermo 1. Its popularity notwithstanding no pictorial representation of *Cristus medicus* is known from the Middle Ages. The first such picture seems to appear only in 1510, in a Dutch book of engravings – see von Erffa, “Christus als Arzt,” 640ff.

later Middle Ages, it is the semantic field of sickness and healing that most metaphors of preaching stem from.¹²⁸ General medical knowledge is frequently mobilized to apprehend religious problems in vivid images. It is especially true of the discourse on sin. Heresies, erroneous religious ideas, were correlated with various diseases; the more mysterious a disease and the more heavily loaded with Biblical associations – like leprosy, paralysis, epilepsy, etc. – the more suitable it is for moralizing parallels.¹²⁹ We also find contemporary principles of healing used in a religious context. John of Capistran, for example, in his sermon for Maundy Thursday applies the “law of opposites” to the relation between Adam’s sin in the garden and Christ’s Passion on the cross:

*Deus non potuit conventiorem modum et aptissimum excogitare quam quod pro nobis moretur in cruce quia sicut contraria contrariis curantur regula medicorum Sic sicut Adam extendit manus suos ad lignum sic cristus ad crucem peccavit in voluptate gustus cristus est potatus amaro gustu aceti et fellis Audivit Adam verba blanditoria cristus blasphemias Adam nudus in paradiso cristus nudus in cruce.*¹³⁰

At the heart of this “law of opposites” resides the seminal idea of *natural balance* which characterizes all ancient medical practices, in particular those of the Galenian heritage reaching the medieval West through Arabic intermediaries. Illness lies in the imbalance of the four bodily fluids, the four humors. This is why methods of influencing the ratio between these humours – by bloodletting, vomiting, and so on – had a prominent place in the repertoire of late medieval doctors of every social rank.¹³¹ The general character of the physician which Capistran and his audience could have in mind, inventing and understanding, respectively, the above simile, was quite different from that of patristic times. According to Katharine Park “the period after about 1050 witnessed two processes that were to transform the practice of medicine. The first was a series of moves to limit the number and variety of healers by excluding certain groups from legitimate medical practice; the second was a process of differentiation among the practitioners themselves.”¹³² Lay doctors and municipal

¹²⁸ “La métaphore du malade (le pécheur) et du médecin (le prêtre ou le Christ) est sans doute celle qui revient le plus souvent dans l’ensemble du corpus.” Hervé Martin, *Le métier de prédicateur en France septentrionale à la fin du Moyen Âge (1350-1520)* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 452.

¹²⁹ Joseph Ziegler, “Medical Similes in Religious Discourse: The Case of Giovanni di San Gimignano OP (ca. 1260 - ca. 1333),” *Science in Context* 8 (1995): 112ff.

¹³⁰ Capistran, “Sermo de sacramento,” in *XLIV sermones*, 177.

¹³¹ For the widespread application of the Galenian physiological model in medieval medicine, see Danielle Jacquart and Claude Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, trans. Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), 48ff; and Heinrich Schipperges, *Der Garten der Gesundheit: Medizin im Mittelalter* (Zürich: Artemis, 1985), 103ff.

¹³² Katharine Park, “Medicine and Society in Medieval Europe, 500-1500,” in *Medicine and Society: Historical*

hospitals were to take the former role of monasteries in larger scale healing; the profession as such was governed more and more by guilds, protecting some and deterring others; the emergence of medical education at the universities opened a gap between high-level specialists and barber-type polymaths. Still, even the barbers, the surgeons, the apothecaries and the like were to become clearly distinguished from midwives and benevolent family members by their guild membership. They had to undergo some sort of apprenticeship and prove their abilities in the end.¹³³ Capistran's imaginary doctor was a popular empiricist, rather than a charlatan, who based his diagnosis on materialistic inspections and, above all, on his own experiences. Here is another, very impressive medical *similitudo* from the same sermon:

*Medicus cognoscit infirmitates hominis sepe ex urina et sanguinis exterioribus sed magis ex experientia s. quando per se patitur hanc infirmitatem Jesus ab inicio cognovit infirmitates hominum sed antequam fuit expertus nostras infirmitates plagavit horribiliter peccatores in lege antiqua. Sed quando venit et expertus est infirmitates nostras et dolores Nunc misericors est omnibus*¹³⁴

We should see the holy bread *as host* in the light of this medical practice. When Vincent Ferrer in fifteenth-century Spain (a country especially developed in medicine due to Arabic influences) compares Christ to a doctor who wraps the bitter pill in a host, just as the Lord hides his precious body beneath the accidents of corporeal bread, he had in mind not merely the *Christus medicus* of the Fathers, but also a late medieval professional – if not an expert with a university degree, at least a barber with an earned guild membership.

The idea of natural balance as one of the essential features of the new professional medicine of Galenian origin is vital, though in a much simpler sense, also to nutrition, the other definitive element of the semantic field where the Eucharist was embedded.¹³⁵ One has to eat day by day, counterbalancing the disequilibrium caused by hunger. In the long run, however, eating is built on a slightly different idea of balance, that of *dynamic equilibrium*. One can remain healthy for a long time without any significant change in one's physical state: this is a *static equilibrium* – “They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Mk 2,17). Satiety, at the

Essays, ed. Andrew Wear (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 76.

¹³³ Ibid., 80ff. cf. Schipperges, *Der Garten der Gesundheit*, 190ff.

¹³⁴ Capistran, “Sermo de sacramento,” 178.

¹³⁵ For the importance of natural balance to the ideals of “healthy lifestyle”, see Schipperges, *Der Garten der Gesundheit*, 241ff.

same time, is constantly undermined by digestion, though we take pains to re-establish this fragile balance at least every single day. This daily rhythm of becoming hungry and satiating oneself with food is used as an essential metaphor in connection with the effects of the Eucharist. Thomas Aquinas discussing the question *Utrum per hoc sacramentum remittantur peccata venialia* writes the following:

*Nam hoc sacramentum sumitur sub specie cibi nutrientis. Nutrimentum autem cibi necessarium est corpori ad restaurandum id quod quotidie deperditur ex calore naturali. Spiritualiter autem quotidie in nobis aliquid deperditur ex calore concupiscentiae per peccata venialia, quae diminuunt fervorem caritatis.*¹³⁶

There is another difference between the concepts of food and medicine, closely connected to the former one: medicaments can be taken in advance, preventively, while food cannot. According to the Italian preacher Giovanni di San Gimignano, the righteous who do not suffer from any spiritual sickness need only *medicina praeservativa vel confortativa*.¹³⁷ Thus in the context of the problem of frequent communion, the Eucharist as food on the one hand, and the Eucharist as medicament on the other, represent the two opposing views, frequent and infrequent reception of the sacrament. If it is a medicament, one can be content with taking it only a few times a year as prevention against sin, for it was believed to strengthen the soul in case of temptation. Here belongs the *exemplum* from the Corpus Christi sermon in the SD about the three *juvenes* seen above in 2.3. In the Maundy Thursday sermon one of the effects of the Eucharist is referred to as *contra temptationes diaboli armatio*.¹³⁸ Vincent Ferrer in the same context calls it *medicamentum universale*; in Caracciolo it is *spiritualis medicina*, which *defendit ... preservando a peccatis futuris*.¹³⁹

On the other hand, living exclusively on celestial food, on the Lord's body, was a common theme in devotional literature, especially in the environment of pious women like Juliana of Cornillon, the initiator of the process which led to the establishment of Corpus Christi as a universal feast. For these women, daily reception – whether in reality or merely in visions – was the inversion of priests' daily consecration, a practice from which they were excluded by definition; but it was also an inversion of their social role as providers of daily

¹³⁶ *Summa Theologiae*, 3 q.79 a.4.

¹³⁷ Ziegler, "Medical Similes," 111.

¹³⁸ SD, vol. 2, 77, l. 26; Appendix 2, 71, l. 2; cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 3 q.79 a.6: "Utrum per hoc sacramentum praeservetur homo a peccatis futuris."

¹³⁹ Ferrer, *Opera seu sermones*, "In festo Corporis Christi," sermo 5; Caracciolo, *Sermones*, "Feria secunda hebdomade sancte." In Johannes Herolt the sacrament was instituted by Christ partly "in medicamentum nostrae infirmitatis," Herolt, *Sermones Discipuli de tempore*, "In festo Corporis Christi," sermo 2.

food. Fasting in the material world, and eating in the spiritual one was the only ascetic way of life which was open to medieval women. In the words of Caroline Bynum, “since women were usually not able to renounce property ... they chose to renounce food, the one pleasure they not only fully controlled but were also chiefly responsible *by role* for preparing for all society.”¹⁴⁰

Nonetheless, fasting in general was not restricted to pious women. Abstaining from food was an occasional duty for all Christians. “The medieval year resembled a chessboard of black and white squares. It was patterned with periods of fast and feast, each distinct and limited in time, yet each dependent on the other for its significance and worth.”¹⁴¹ Apart from Lent, people were required to fast on Wednesdays, remembering the day when Judas made his deal with the high-priest to betray Jesus, on Saturdays, for Mary’s virginity, and most importantly of all on Fridays in memory of the Passion. This last one was to be observed strictly. There were also special fasting periods four times a year, the so called *quattuor tempora*, when severe fasting was called for on each of the above three days: in the third week of Advent, in the first week of Lent, in the week after Pentecost, and in the week following 14 September.¹⁴² The most important time for fasting was, of course, Lent – a period of extraordinary religious activity, when preachers were urged to deliver sermons every single day, and their flocks were not only deprived from meat and eating before evening, but they had to moderate themselves in all joyful aspects of life. Lent was also a main structuring element of the entire Church year being a preparation for Easter, the focal point of the calendar. It was argued by Dietz-Rüdiger Moser that Pope Urban IV had placed Corpus Christi on the Thursday after Trinity with the intention to create a symbolic counterpoint to *Dominica Septuagesima* – the third Sunday before Lent and the beginning of the Carnival.¹⁴³ Certainly the two feasts are arranged symmetrically around Easter, and Easter must really have been perceived as a threshold. The pre-Easter period was marked by *sin*,

¹⁴⁰ Bynum, “Women Mystics and Eucharistic Devotion,” 142; see also idem, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*, 189ff; and Rudolph M. Bell, *Holy Anorexia* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987), 84ff. Caracciolo relates the example of St. Catherine of Siena who “sepius communione suscepta per dies plurimos sine cibo et potu persistebat absque aliqua sui corporis lesione,” Caracciolo, *Sermones*, “Feria secunda hebdomade sancte.”

¹⁴¹ Bridget Ann Henisch, *Fast and Feast: Food in Medieval Society* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976), 28.

¹⁴² Ibid., 29ff; and Andrew Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 12f.

¹⁴³ Dietz-Rüdiger Moser, “Fastnacht und Fronleichnam als Gegenfeste: Festgestaltung und Festbrauch im liturgischen Kontext,” in *Feste und Feiern im Mittelalter*, eds. Detlef Altenburg, Jörg Jarnut and Hans-Hugo Steinhoff (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1991), 359-376.

either through over-accentuating it in colorful excess during the Carnival, or – as a sharp contrast – through repressing it in sorrowful repentance during Lent. The post-Easter period was characterized by the theme of *salvation*, hence joy and solemn celebration culminating in the feasts – closely related in both time and meaning – of Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity and Corpus Christi. Easter, the threshold, was the first time that people could consume meat again. In Hungarian “Húsvét,” the word for Easter, literally means “taking meat.” The fourth Lateran council set the date of the yearly, compulsory communion at Easter; thus the Body of the Lord was, so to say, the first piece of meat given to the faithful after six weeks of fasting.¹⁴⁴ But fasting meant first all of relying on bread, since fish was very expensive, even in salted form, or entirely unavailable due to problems of transportation.¹⁴⁵ Communion at Easter, then, merged the symbols of Before and After by offering the precious Body *sub specie panis*.¹⁴⁶ The following table sums up the main dichotomies which determine this semantic field of food and medicine:

ILLNESS	HEALTH
SIN	SALVATION
STARVING	SATIATING
BEFORE EASTER	AFTER EASTER

There is, however, a problem with the right side of the table, one also perceived by the compiler of the SD (or the one who composed the eucharistic sermons): health and satiating oneself are associated not only with salvation and the post-Easter period but also with *richness*. Richness was a recurring problem throughout the history of the Church; it was either accepted or refused, but never praised.¹⁴⁷ There is a digression about food in the sermon for Corpus Christi which occupies almost the third of the whole text. It starts thus:

Et ex quo fit mentio de cibo, nota quod scriptura sacra quadruplicem cibum commemorat sc. mundi prosperitatem (divitias), doctrinae veritatem, aeternae gloriae delectabilitatem, et animae satietatem. Primus ergo cibus est mundi prosperitas i.e.

¹⁴⁴ There were constant debates concerning the extent of the still acceptable delay of the Easter communion. From the point of view of the parish priests it was a real burden to communicate everybody within two days; see Browe, *Die Pflichtkommunion*, 71ff.

¹⁴⁵ Massimo Montanari, *Éhség és bőség: A táplálkozás európai kultúrtörténete* (Hunger and abundance: A cultural history of eating in Europe), trans. Katalin Kövendy (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1996), 95ff.

¹⁴⁶ Mary Douglas places this twofold nature of the consecrated Host as bread and meat in the context of the Old Testament dichotomy of cereal and animal sacrifice; see Mary Douglas, “The Eucharist: Its Continuity with the Bread Sacrifice of Leviticus,” *Modern Theology* 15 (1999): 209-224.

¹⁴⁷ For attitudes to richness in medieval sermons, see Jussi Hanska, “*And the Rich Man Also Died; and He Was Buried in Hell.*” *The Social Ethos in Mendicant Sermons* (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1997).

*mundanarum rerum copiositas (i.e. multitudo), unde Eccli XXX° dicitur:*¹⁴⁸ **confundet te** sc. *diabolus vel mundus in cibis tuis i. e. in divitiis.*¹⁴⁹

According to this *distinctio* food has four meanings out of which one refers to corporeal – *mundi prosperitas* – and three to spiritual food – *doctrinae veritas, delectabilitas aeternae gloriae, and satietas animae*. The first meaning is glossed in the Budapest codex with the word *divitias* leaving no doubt concerning the central issue. The quotation from Ecclesiasticus 13,8 – *confundet te in cibis tuis* – also contains two telltale glosses. The dangers of richness, however, stem only from its abuse:

*Et vere confundet, si homo divitiis abutitur i.e. male utitur, quia tria bona ab eo aufert, sc. bonum naturae a corpore, bonum gratiae ab anima, et bonum gloriae ab utroque. Nota [quod] prosperitas dicitur cibus propter cibi proprietates. Primo cibus superflue sumptus nocet: ita prosperitas rerum.*¹⁵⁰

The three benefits which follow from richness – *bonum naturae a corpore, bonum gratiae ab anima, bonum gloriae ab utroque* – are again spiritual rather than material. The first *distinctio* made clear that food must be understood predominantly in the spiritual sense, since in the latter sense it had three meanings, while in the corporeal sense it had merely one. Now the second *distinctio* (left without further elucidation in the text) distinguishes three additional meanings of this sole corporeal interpretation, stressing again the spiritual side. The goal is a total *dissociation* of the concept of food from that of richness. After a reference to the story of the rich man from Luke 16¹⁵¹ – to the torments he has to suffer in Hell – and to some affirmative *auctoritates* (Aristotle, Boethius and Augustine) the process of dissociation gets a powerful underpinning in the form of a *similitudo* about wolves:

Et certe divitibus avaris accidit sicut lupo famem patienti; dicit enim Plinius (talīs magister), quod lūpus quando esurit, tunc fame artatus i.e. compulsus [k e z e r e t t e t h i k], praedam invadit, et cibis multum se replet, et si videt venatorem advenire, tunc ut possit evadere, propter levificare se, evomit cibum sumptum, sic multi qui esuriunt in paupertate, tandem per fas et nefas congregant divitias, eisdem divitiis cupidine [i.e. cupiditate] ducti, se nimium replentes, et si infirmantur et vident

¹⁴⁸ Eccl 13,8

¹⁴⁹ SD, vol. 2, 439, l. 8-14; Appendix 2, 79, l. 19-23.

¹⁵⁰ SD, vol. 2, 439, l. 14-19; Appendix 2, 79, l. 23-26.

¹⁵¹ According to most missals this story was read on the first Sunday after Trinity, that is, three days after Corpus Christi. In mendicant sermons commenting upon this parable, gluttony was usually discussed as a sin typical of the rich; see Hanska, *The Social Ethos*, 50f.

*eis advenire mortem tamquam venatorem: tunc non misericordia ducti, sed timore coacti, evomunt ipsa temporalia.*¹⁵²

Here the useless transience of wealth is displayed through the tangible contradiction between eating and vomiting. Vomiting then becomes a symbol of vanity reinforced by quotations from Job: *quos devoravit evomet* (Job 20,15) and Peter: *canis reversus ad vomitum* (II Pet 2,22). The original context of the first quotation can convey directly the message of vanity; the second one, however, is taken from a passage about false prophets who teach erroneous doctrines. Richness, namely, and particularly the desire for richness, is an erroneous doctrine. The image of the *multi qui esuriunt in paupertate, tandem per fas et nefas congregant divitias*, is not an image of reality, of course; it is a warning against vain desire. People must not long for abundance of corporeal food, that is, richness – they will throw it up in their last hour; nevertheless, a modest quantity of corporeal food is not detrimental provided that it is not longed for:

*Aliquando autem iste cibus, sc. mundi prosperitas, non nocet; immo prodest, sicut cibus moderate sumptus, puta his qui habent divitias, sed non amant eas; unde ... b. Augustinus dicit: Quis [i.e. aliquis] divitias potest habere sine peccato, sed non amare sc. sine peccato.*¹⁵³

3.2 Access to the Sacrament: Communion and the Structure of Communities

We cannot live without categories. Sciences of culture depend on various classifications of social groups. One can invent the required clusters quite easily on a statistical basis, say, by ranges of yearly income. Such *statistical* clusters, however, will not necessarily be homologous with those categories by which real individuals map their social world. Real individuals have their own clusters, and if we want to understand their behavior, we have to know how they categorize others, what groups they distinguish, and what criteria they use. Of course, we cannot take a peek at the thoughts in their heads – not to mention the even more difficult case which obtains if they happen already to be dead. Nevertheless, there are certain tangible signs, reifications of potential thinking, which can satisfy our intellectual voyeurism and reveal important elements of real social categorization. Regarding the 1960s, long hair

¹⁵² SD, vol. 2, 439, l. 36 - 440, l. 9; Appendix 2, 80, 11-17. The simile probably comes from some bestiary; in the *Historia naturalis* I could not find its original.

¹⁵³ SD, vol. 2, 440, l. 23-29; Appendix 2, 81, l. 2-6.

and jeans could provide a case in point. In what follows, I will argue that in medieval society the Eucharist is such a tangible sign as well. Differences in access to the sacrament are congruent with the perceptual categories of social difference.¹⁵⁴

In the previous section our initial premises were the real individuals and the material conditions under which they lived: their health and nutrition. Now we turn men and their circumstances upside-down as in a *camera obscura*, and take the image as a starting point: it is the Eucharist which represents men's social relationships. The basic criterion of difference, the basic structuring principle of these relationships is *sin*. St. Thomas writes in his famous hymn, a central part of the Corpus Christi mass, *Lauda Sion*, which is quoted under Gregory's name in the SD:

Sumunt boni, sumunt mali:
sorte tamen inaequali,
vitae vel interitus.
Mors est malis, vita bonis:
vide paris sumptionis
quam sit dispar exitus¹⁵⁵

In the context of communion one can be considered a *sinner* in two ways: either because eating the Eucharist undeservedly and hence committing a sin, or because of previous sins which make communion impossible. From a theological point of view both are mortal sins leading to eternal damnation. From a sociological one, however, they are different. In the first case, since the sin remains hidden, no earthly punishment can be given. In the second case the priest has to know who the sinner is to be able to refuse communion: sinners in this sense must be easily distinguishable. The *Lauda Sion* stresses the first type of sin, and most sermons did so, for preachers saw the problem from the theological point of view; their task was to save from the fires of Hell those who cannot be persuaded by means of earthly correction.

Probet autem seipsum homo et sic de pane illo edat et de calice bibat (I Cor 11,28) – this is the *thema* for Maundy Thursday in the SD, and the whole sermon concentrates on the problem of worthy reception. At the heart of this problem we find the opposition of spiritual and sacramental communion. This opposition means first of all, using the terms of Heinz

¹⁵⁴ For another such contemporary system of classification reflected in the canon of the mass, see John Bossy, "The Mass as a Social Institution 1200-1700," *Past and Present* 100 (1983): 36ff.

¹⁵⁵ S. Thomas Aquinatis, "De Officium Festo Corporis," in *Opera omnia*, ed. Roberto Busa (Stuttgart: Friedrich Fromman, 1980), vol. 6, 581f.

Robert Schlette,¹⁵⁶ an opposition between the *personal* and the *sacramental* aspect of communion, that is between what is required from the receiver and what is given by the holy bread. If nothing is required from the receiver, if there is no personal side, the Eucharist is conceived as pure sacramental *power*. If, on the other hand, only the personal aspect is emphasized, the Eucharist becomes irrelevant. This problem has much in common with the healing miracles performed by Jesus, and later imitated by the saints. In these miracles it is first of all faith which is required on the invalid's or on his intercessor's behalf: "Fear not: believe only, and she shall be made whole" (Lk 8,50); "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt" (Mt 15,28); "Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole" (Mk 10,52). Healing is the reward of faith, not simple miraculous power, a mere unintentional flow of energy from the healer to the sick.¹⁵⁷ According to one interpretation, then, the difference between spiritual and sacramental communion means a difference between worthy and unworthy reception: *Sacramentaliter igitur tantum mali i.e. in peccatis mortalibus existentes manducant, et tamen non manducant: manducant quidem, quia corpus Christi sacramentaliter sumunt, et tamen non manducant sc. spiritualiter, quia animae salutem non percipiunt*.¹⁵⁸ Why does someone communicate if he knows that for him this is a mortal sin which leads to eternal damnation? What are his motives? Let us see who these obdurate sinners are according to the same sermon:

*Sed nota, quod sacramentaliter tantum, et indigne manducantium tria sunt genera: primi sunt qui ad corpus Christi accedunt cum peccandi voluntate ... Secundi sunt ypocritae, qui latent in peccatis sub pulchra specie religionis. ... Tertii sunt praesumptuosi, qui non timent communicare vel celebrare in magnis criminibus et manifestis.*¹⁵⁹

In the first group we find those who want to commit sin voluntarily. The author/compiler of the sermon presents no explicit motives, but surely they are moved by their belief in the power of the sacrament: they think that it is worth eating it anyway. This is the group of

¹⁵⁶ Heinz Robert Schlette, *Die Lehre von der geistlichen Kommunion*, 5ff (this is a differentiation used throughout the whole book).

¹⁵⁷ Sofia Boesch Gajano pointed to an exception in Luke 8,43-46: "And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, which had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could be healed of any, came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: and immediately her issue of blood stanch'd. And Jesus said, Who touched me? When all denied, Peter and they that were with him said, Master, the multitude throng thee and press thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? And Jesus said, Somebody hath touched me: for I perceive that virtue is gone out of me." Here the healing power (*virtus*) works automatically, see Sofia Boesch Gajano, *La santità* (Rome and Bari: Laterza, 1999), 9.

¹⁵⁸ SD, vol. 2, 72, l. 1-5; Appendix 2, 65, l. 25-27.

¹⁵⁹ SD, vol. 2, 72, l. 15-33; Appendix 2, 66, l. 5-18.

people we meet in various *exempla*, those who steal the consecrated host and use it for sorcery, as did the peasant (or female) protagonist of the beehive story above.¹⁶⁰ The second category consists of the hypocrites who want to conform to the requirements of community life. One should remember that the fourth Lateran council threatened those who failed to communicate at Easter with exclusion from the Church. Sins can remain hidden, neglecting the duty of communion cannot, since everybody had to communicate at the same time. In the last group we find those who simply do not care about the dangers. This is a strange group anyway, since their sins are significant and manifest; maybe they are the powerful who can go to the church, listen to the mass and communicate, though everybody knows that they are sinners. These three categories of sinners have to be persuaded that they will not gain the benefits of the sacrament, and what is more, they will be severely punished in Hell. The author/compiler lists the *octo mala* which happen to those who receive the Lord's body merely *sacramentaliter*.¹⁶¹

There is, however, another interpretation of the difference between spiritual and sacramental communion; in this respect the question is whether the sacramental part is necessary at all if the receiver prepares himself thoroughly and keeps longing for the host in meditation. Here both types of receivers – those who communicate only spiritually, and those who communicate spiritually *and* sacramentally at the same time – are good Christians: *triplex est modus manducationis corporis Christi sc. sacramentalis tantum, spiritualis tantum, sacramentalis et spiritualis simul ... Primo modo manducant mali christiani, secundo et tertio modo manducant solum boni*.¹⁶² The author/compiler of the SD sermon does not perceive the difference between the two, either in terms of the “mystical approach,” which stresses the primacy of a mystical, non-sensual union with Christ, or in terms of Aquinas' distinction according to which spiritual communion is imperfect communion justifiable only in case of necessity.¹⁶³ In Johannes Herolt, on the other hand, we find a perfect formulation of the “mystical approach,” when he answers the question *qui sunt isti, qui sic spiritualiter hoc sacramentum accipiunt*:

¹⁶⁰ For abusing the host in the context of popular religion, see Peter Browe, “Die Eucharistie als Zaubermittel im Mittelalter,” *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 20 (1930): 134-154; and Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 334ff. These people could also have been associated with Jews: it was believed that there were Christian host-thieves working for malicious Jews who ordered hosts to desecrate them.

¹⁶¹ SD, vol. 2, 73, l. 11 - 75, l. 2; Appendix 2, 67, l. 1 - 68, l. 19.

¹⁶² SD, vol. 2, 71, l. 28 - 72, l. 1; Appendix 2, 65, l. 18-25.

¹⁶³ *Summa Theologiae*, 3 q.80 a.1.

*qui ex puro corde Deo serviunt & cum magno desiderio hoc sacramentum appetunt attamen ex humilitate & reverentia sacramenti non audent ad hoc sacramentum accedere: sic omni die quilibet homo qui habet magnum affectum et devotionem ad hoc sacramentum potest sic spiritualiter communicare.*¹⁶⁴

The history of spiritual communion as a legitimate and widespread form of popular devotion started as the elevation of the host became common practice by the middle of the thirteenth century.¹⁶⁵ The role of the elevation is to mark the moment of the consecration and to offer the Lord's body for veneration. The practice of elevation was latter complemented by various forms of festive display, when the sacrament was shown to the faithful outside the mass. As a main element of Corpus Christi processions, the Host was carried around in a monstrance. The growing number of such occasions was due to the growing awe the Eucharist tended to inspire during the last centuries of the Middle Ages.¹⁶⁶ From our point of view, the distance which a given form of devotion keeps from the sacrament defines a category of good Christians in relation to the Eucharist. Let us see such a classification from the Corpus Christi sermon in the SD:

*Quaeritur utrum omnes christiani obligantur ad istius sacramenti manducationem? Respondetur primo quod aliqui obligantur solum ad credendum et amandum, sicut illi qui [sunt] in servitute paganorum (i n s e g b e n), et hoc sufficit eis ad salutem ... Secundo aliqui non solum ad credendum et amandum, sed etiam ad venerandum obligantur. Quilibet enim christianus non impeditus tenetur ad minus in diebus dominicis, et praecipuis i.e. colendis festivitibus, secundum praeceptum ecclesiae missam audire ... Tertio dico quod aliqui non solum obligantur ad credendum, amandum et venerandum (i.e. audiendum) hoc divinissimum sacramentum, sed etiam ad sumendum. Sed an quotidie? Dico, quod prius christiani quotidie solebant communicare, quia erant devotiores (quam nunc). Tandem non qualibet die, sed solum diebus dominicis, et postea tepescente charitate, solum ter in anno, sc. in festo nativitatis, resurrectionis, et pentecostes, et secundum alios in festo assumptionis virginis gloriosae. Sed quia (jam) charitas refriguit, et iniquitas praevaluit tenentur homines sub praecepto cessante legitimo impedimento tempore paschae communicare ... Quarto aliqui non solum tenentur ad credendum, amandum, venerandum et sumendum, sed etiam ad conficiendum i.e. ad consecrandum (a l d a n i), sicut sacerdotes.*¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ Herolt, *Sermones Discipuli de tempore*, "In festo Corporis Christi," sermo 3.

¹⁶⁵ For the beginnings of this practice, see Peter Browe, "Die Elevation in der Messe," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1929): 20-66; idem, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie*, 26ff; and Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 55ff.

¹⁶⁶ Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 288ff.

¹⁶⁷ SD, vol. 2, 443, l. 11 - 444, l. 17; Appendix 2, 83, l. 16 - 84, l. 16.

There are four types of good Christians arranged in four concentric circles around the Eucharist. Those who belong to the outermost circle have only *credere* and *amare*. Those in the next one have *credere*, *amare* and *venerare*. In the third circle Christians have *credere*, *amare*, *venerare* and *sumere*. Finally those who belong to the innermost circle have *credere*, *amare*, *venerare*, *sumere* and *consecrare*. The first and the fourth groups are explicitly defined: those living under pagan rule, and priests, respectively. In the second and the third groups are the “ordinary” Christians. All of them have to hear the mass, which is a form of spiritual communion, but it seems that only some of them have to communicate *sacramentally as well*, beyond the compulsory communion at Easter.

These good Christians are easily distinguishable through their characteristic religious practices. But who are those easily distinguishable sinners we mentioned above, who can be (and must be) deprived from the possibility of communion? On what basis other than sin can someone be deterred from eating the Lord’s body? In the appendix attached to the Maundy Thursday sermon of the SD we find various guidelines concerning who can receive the Lord’s body and who cannot. The arguments are taken word by word either from Thomas or from two important canonical collections the *De consecratione* and the *Liber extra*, hence it does not make sense to discuss them as if they were characteristic of the SD sermons. It is enough to see which groups are mentioned at all: *istriones*,¹⁶⁸ *amentes*, *pueri*. Johannes Herolt in a similar discussion mentions *pueri*, and *amentes*.¹⁶⁹ Gottschalcus Hollen declares that *excommunicanti* and *interdicti* cannot even be present at the mass.¹⁷⁰ Osvaldus de Laskó has maybe the longest list: *pueri*, *amentes*, *histriones vel ioculatores*, *notorii et manifesti infames*, *aleatores*, *usurarii*, *excommunicati*, *interdicti* and *suspensi*.¹⁷¹ We find such lists also in sermons which were certainly not written for a priestly audience, though the problem pertains to priests alone. There was an explicit tendency in sermons written for Coena Domini and Corpus Christi – the feasts which celebrate the union of the Church through the common spiritual meal partaken in the memory of Christ – to remind the members of the community to its own social borders; and to strengthen these borders by specifying who can and who cannot sit to the Lord’s table.

¹⁶⁸ For the communication of actors, see Browe, *Die Pflichtkommunion*, 93ff.

¹⁶⁹ Herolt, *Sermones Discipuli de tempore*, “In Coena Domini.”

¹⁷⁰ Hollen, *Sermonum opus exquisitissimum*, “In festo corporis Christi,” sermo 2.

¹⁷¹ Osvaldus de Laskó, *Sermones Dominicales perutiles*, “In Cena Domini.”

Conclusion

In this thesis I made an attempt to reconstruct the context of two eucharistic sermons in the *Sermones Dominicales*, an anonymous sermon collection from fifteenth-century Hungary. As for the *sermonarium* itself, I argued that the 45 sermons taken from the *de tempore* collection of Jacobus de Voragine, are rewritten to such an extent which hints towards intermediary stages in the transmission of these 45 texts. A part of the rewritings was certainly made in Hungary as newly inserted passages contain Hungary-specific materials. The compiler probably had a clerical audience in mind composing his sermons, and it seems a bit more convincing that the supposed addresses were secular rather than regular clergymen. They may have belonged to the chapter of Pécs, and it is also possible, though not proven, that the compiler occupied the official post for preaching established in the city by Pope Martin V in 1428.

Since Corpus Christi was a quite recent feast even in the fifteenth century, preachers had to take part in its promotion. The Corpus Christi sermon in the *Sermones Dominicales*, like many other contemporary sermons written especially for Corpus Christi, fulfills this requirement. The main topics of our two sermons are related very closely, as Corpus Christi sermons were frequently modeled upon their forerunners on Maundy Thursday.

As for the theological erudition of the author/compiler of the two eucharistic sermons, we could assert that he was not sensitive to the different, though still orthodox, interpretations of central issues like transubstantiation or the salvific function of the sacrament. In contrast, some other fifteenth-century preachers did show such sensitivity. We also tried to detect his attitudes towards the most significant religious phenomenon of his time, the Hussite movement. It turned out, however, that he did not refer to the problem either in terms of theological arguments or in terms of miracle stories which would otherwise be capable of conveying the relevant theological message. As a consequence it seems probable that the original texts of the two sermons stem from a period preceding the birth of the Hussite

movement, and the compiler of the *Sermones Dominicales* did not feel it necessary to adapt them to the problems of his age.

In the last chapter I argued that the Eucharist, regarding the perception of its role in human life, was embedded in a semantic field defined by the concepts of food and medicine. We find medical imagery in sermons from, at least, Augustine onwards, but in the course of the centuries new allusions and new metaphors appeared, following the profound changes in the medical profession. I also argued that the main principles behind both medical and nutritional imagery are natural balance and the yearly rhythm of life as determined by the Church calendar. Finally, I discussed the relationship between access to the Eucharist and the categorization of Christians in eucharistic sermons. The Eucharist in this sense is a tangible symbol of social differentiation and the boundaries of the community; those who were deterred from communion could not be fully-fledged members of the community.

Appendix 1: Pericope Systems Related to the *Sermones Dominicales*

This table is intended to be a summary of the philological data used in *chapter 1*. First of all it shows the feasts encompassed in the *temporale* part of the missals and in the SD. Secondly, it shows the Biblical *themata* in the SD and in one of its main sources (the only one which has been identified so far), the Sunday sermons of Jacobus de Voragine; those sermons in the SD which were taken from/modeled upon Jacobus have doubly underlined *thema* references. The table also indicates which sermons stemming from Voragine were restructured into homilies (H) and which were not (T). Lastly, the table shows the pericopes in three related missals (the identical pericopes have the same colored background).

Sunday/Feast ¹⁷²	Themes/Pericopes in the SD ¹⁷³	Themes in Jacobus de Voragine ¹⁷⁴	Missale Quinqueecclesiense	Missale...ordinis s. Dominici	Missale Paulinorum
D. I. Adv.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 13,11 T¹⁷⁵ Mt 21,1-9¹⁷⁶ H 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Amos 4,12 Mt 21,5 Jn 12,13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 13,11-14 Mt 21,1-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 13,11-14 Mt 21,1-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 13,11-14 Mt 21,1-9
D. II. Adv.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 15,4 T <u>Lc 21,25-33</u> H/T 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lc 21,25 Lc 21,27 Lc 21,27 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 15,4-13 Lc 21,25-33 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 15,4-13 Lc 21,25-33 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 15,4-13 Lc 21,25-33
D. III. Adv.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 4,1 T <u>Mt 11,2-10</u> T 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mt 11,2 Mt 11,7 Mt 11,2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 4,1-5 Mt 11,2-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 4,1-5 Mt 11,2-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 4,1-5 Mt 11,2-10
D. IV. Adv.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phil 4,4 T <u>1. Jn 1,19-28</u> H <u>2. Jn 1,23</u>¹⁷⁷ T 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Jn 1,19 Jn 1,23 Jn 1,23 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phil 4,4-7 Jn 1,19-28 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phil 4,4-7 Jn 1,19-28 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phil 4,4-7 Jn 1,19-28

¹⁷² The sequence of the Sundays/feasts follows that in the SD (the *names* of the feasts also follow those in the SD; if a name was not indicated, I took the respective name from the *Missale Quinqueecclesiense*).

¹⁷³ The SD contains the whole Gospel-pericopes, but usually there is no theme given for the subsequent sermon. If a sermon in the SD is taken partially or entirely from Jacobus de Voragine, the reference to its theme is doubly underlined.

¹⁷⁴ In the *Sermones Dominicales* of Jacobus de Voragine there are three Gospel-sermons for each Sunday, but there are no Epistle-sermons.

¹⁷⁵ The letters T and H are to indicate the type of the sermon. The T refers to “thematic sermon,” the H to “homily;” the T/H means that the sermon consists of two differently structured parts.

¹⁷⁶ Henceforth the first reference is for the Epistle, the second for the Gospel. From time to time either of them is missing in the SD - in this case I do not use the bullets.

¹⁷⁷ The numbers indicate that in this case there are two sermons for the same Gospel-pericope. Those sermons where I refer only to one verse have a proper theme, but the whole pericope is not written out. If both the entire pericope and the proper theme is given, then the reference to the theme is put into brackets after the reference to the pericope.

Vig. nat. Domini	Mt 1,18-21 H	-	• Is 62,1-4 • Rom 1,1-6 • Mt 1,18-21	• Is 62,1-4 • Rom 1,1-6 • Mt 1,18-21	• Is 62,1-4 • Rom 1,1-6 • Mt 1,18-21
M. in gallicantu	Lc 2,1-14 H	-	• Is 9,2-7 • Tit, 2,11-15 • Lc 2,1-14	• Is 9,2-7 • Tit, 2,11-15 • Lc 2,1-14	• Is 9,2-7 • Tit, 2,11-15 • Lc 2,1-14
Nativitas Domini	<u>Ephes 2,17</u> ¹⁷⁸ T	-	-	-	-
D. infr. oct. nat.	• Gal 4,4-5 T • <u>Lc 2,33-40</u> (Lc 2,34) T	13. Lc 2,33 14. Lc 2,34 15. Lc 2,34	• Gal 4,1-7 • Lc 2,33-40	• Gal 4,1-7 • Lc 2,33-40	• Gal 4,1-7 • Lc 2,33-40
Circumcisio Domini	2,21 Lc ¹⁷⁹ T	-	• Tit 3,4-7 • Lc 2,15-20 / Lc 2,21 ¹⁸⁰	• Tit 3,4-7 • Lc 2,21	• Tit 3,4-7 / Gal 3,23-4,2 • Lc 2,15-20 / Lc 2,21 ¹⁸¹
Epiphania	Mt 2,1-12 H	-	• Is 60,1-6 • Mt 2,1-12	• Is 60,1-6 • Mt 2,1-12	• Is 60,1-6 • Mt 2,1-12
D. infra oct. Ep.	• Rom 12,2 T • <u>Lc 2,42-52</u> H	16. Lc 2,42 17. Lc 2,43 18. Lc 2,48	• Rom 12,1-5 • Lc 2,42-52	• Rom 12,1-5 • Lc 2,42-52	• Rom 12,1-5 • Lc 2,42-52
D. I. post oct. Ep.	• Rom 12,14 T • 1. Jn 2,1-11 T • 2. Jn 2,1 T	19. Jn 2,1 20. Jn 2,1 21. Jn 2,1	• Rom 12,6-16 • Jn 2,1-11	• Rom 12,6-16 • Jn 2,1-11	• Rom 12,6-16 • Jn 2,1-11
D. II. post oct. Ep.	• Rom 12,16 T • Mt 8,1-13 H	22. Mt 8,2 23. Mt 8,2 24. Mt 8,6	• Rom 12,16-21 • Mt 8,1-13	• Rom 12,16-21 • Mt 8,1-13	• Rom 12,16-21 • Mt 8,1-13
D. III. post. oct. Ep.	• Rom 13,10 T • 1. Mt 8,23-27 H • 2. Mt 8, 24 T	25. Mt 8,23 26. Mt 8,23 27. Mt 8,23	• Rom 13,8-10 • Mt 8,23-27	• Rom 13,8-10 • Mt 8,23-27	• Rom 13,8-10 • Mt 8,23-27
D. IV. post. Oct. Ep.	• Coloss 3,17 T • Mt 11,25-30 H	28. Mt 13,24 29. Mt 13,27 30. Mt 13,30	• Coloss 3,12-17 • Mt 11,25-30	• Coloss 3,12-17 • Mt 13,24-30	• Coloss 3,12-17 • Mt 11,25-30
(D. V. post. Oct. Ep.)¹⁸²	<u>Mt 13,24-30</u> T	-	-	-	-
D. septuagesima	• I. Cor 9,24 T • <u>Mt 20,1-16</u> T	31. Mt 20,1 32. Mt 20,4 33. Mt 20,8	• I. Cor 9,24-10,4 • Mt 20,1-16	• I. Cor 9,24-10,4 • Mt 20,1-16	• I. Cor 9,24-10,4 • Mt 20,1-16
D. sexagesima	• Ps 43,23 et 26 (Introitus) T • Lc 8,4-15 T	34. Lc 8,5 35. Lc 8,11 36. Lc 8,15	• Ps 43,23 et 26 (Introitus) • II. Cor 11,19-12,9 • Lc 8,4-15	• Ps 43,23 et 26 (Introitus) • II. Cor 11,19-12,9 • Lc 8,4-15	• Ps 43,23 et 26 (Introitus) • II. Cor 11,19-12,9 • Lc 8,4-15

¹⁷⁸ This is the only case that the SD follows a sermon in Jacobus de Voragine's *sermones de sanctis* instead of his *sermones de tempore*. The source is the ninth sermon *in die nativitatis domini*.

¹⁷⁹ It is a whole pericope written out.

¹⁸⁰ The two different pericopes belong to the *missa prima* and the *missa magna* respectively.

¹⁸¹ *prima missa / summa missa*

¹⁸² The occurrence of this additional Sunday depends on the date of Easter.

D. quinquagesima	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 13,13 T Lc 18,31-43 H 	1. Lc 18,31 2. Lc 18,35 3. Lc 18,43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 13,1-13 Lc 18,31-43 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 13,1-13 Lc 18,31-43 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 13,1-13 Lc 18,31-43
Feria IV. Caput ieiunii	Mt 6,16-21 T	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ioel 2,12-19 Mt 6,16-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ioel 2,12-19 Mt 6,16-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ioel 2,12-19 Mt 6,16-21
D. I. in quadr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 6,2 T Mt 4, 1-11 H 	4. Mt 4,1 5. Mt 4,1 6. Mt 4,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 6,1-10 Mt 4,1-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 6,1-10 Mt 4,1-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 6,1-10 Mt 4,1-11
D. II. in quadr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Thess 4, 3 T <u>Mt 15,21-28</u> T 	7. Mt 15,21 8. Mt 15,22 9. Mt 15,22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Thess 4,1-7 Mt 15,21-28 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Thess 4,1-7 Mt 15,21-28 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Thess 4,1-7 Mt 15,21-28
D. III. in quadr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 5,1 T 1. <u>Lc 11,14-28</u> H 2. <u>Lc 11,15</u> T 	10. Lc 11,14 11. Lc 11,14 12. Lc 11,15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 5,1-9 Lc 11,14-28 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 5,1-9 Lc 11,14-28 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 5,1-9 Lc 11,14-28
D. IV. in quadr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is 66,10 (Introitus) T <u>Jn 6,1-15</u> H 	13. Jn 6,1 14. Jn 6,5 15. Jn 6,9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is 66,10 (Introitus) Gal 4,22-31 Jn 6,1-14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is 66,10 (Introitus) Gal 4,22-31 Jn 6,1-14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is 66,10 (Introitus) Gal 4,22-31 Jn 6,1-14
D. in passione	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hebr 9,11 T <u>Jn 8,46-59</u> H 	16. Jn 8,46 17. Jn 8,59 18. Jn 8,59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hebr 9,11-15 Jn 8, 46-59 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hebr 9,11-15 Jn 8, 46-59 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hebr 9,11-15 Jn 8, 46-59
D. in ramispalmarum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thren 2,19¹⁸³ T Mt 21,1 H/T 	19. Mt 21,1 20. Mt 21,5 21. Mt 21,8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phil 2,5-11 Mt 26,2-27,66 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phil 2,5-11 Mt 26,2-27,66 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exod 15,27-16,10 Phil 2,5-11 Mt 21,1-9 Mt 26,2-27,66
Coena Domini	I. Cor 11,28 T	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 11,20-32 Jn 13,1-15 & 13,16-14,12 & 14,12-31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 11,20-32 Jn 13,1-15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 11,20-32 Jn 13,1-15 & 13,16-31
Parasceve	Is 33,17 ¹⁸⁴ T Jer 9,1 ¹⁸⁵	-	-	-	-
D. resurrectionis Domini	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 5,7 T <u>Mt 16,1-7</u> T 	22. <u>Mt 16,1</u> 23. <u>Mt 16,6</u> 24. <u>Mt 16,7</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 5,7-8 <u>Mt 16,1-7</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 5,7-8 <u>Mt 16,1-7</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 5,7-8 <u>Mt 16,1-7</u>
Feria II. post Pascha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Mt 16,6¹⁸⁶</u> T Lc 24,13 T 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 10,37-43 Lc 24,13-35 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 10,37-43 Lc 24,13-35 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 10,37-43 Lc 24,13-35
Feria III. post Pascha	Lc 24,36 T	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 13,16-33 Lc 24,36-47 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 13,16-33 Lc 24,36-47 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 13,16-33 Lc 24,36-47

¹⁸³ Gloss: “sequitur alter sermo sextae dominicae in XL et primo de confessione” (SD II: 30) - it is a sermon which is possibly not attached to any pericope given by some missal.

¹⁸⁴ Title: “Sermo optimus de passione domini nostri Jhesu Christi” (SD II: 82). Its type is neither T nor H

¹⁸⁵ Gloss: “secundus sermo de passione domini” (SD II: 140). Its type is neither T nor H: it is a dialogue between St Bernard and the Virgin Mary.

¹⁸⁶ Gloss: “sequitur sermo post resurrectionem domini sive quarto die” (SD, vol. 2, 172.).

D. I. post Pascha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 5,4 T <u>Jn 20,19-31</u> T 	25. Jn 20,19 26. Jn 20,19 27. Jn 20,27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 5,4-10 Jn 20,19-31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 5,4-10 Jn 20,19-31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 5,4-10 Jn 20,19-31
D. II. post Pascha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,21 T <u>Jn 10,11-16</u> T 	28. Jn 10,11 29. Jn 10,11 30. Jn 10,15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,21-25 Jn 10,11-16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,21-25 Jn 10,11-16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,21-25 Jn 10,11-16
D. III. Post Pascha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,11 T <u>Jn 16,16-22</u> T 	31. Jn 16,19 32. Jn 16,21 33. Jn 16,21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,11-19 Jn 16,16-22 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,11-19 Jn 16,16-22 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 2,11-19 Jn 16,16-22
D. IV. post Pascha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,17 T <u>Jn 16,5-14</u> T 	34. Jn 16,5 35. Jn 16,7 36. Jn 16,8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,17-21 Jn 16,5-14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,17-21 Jn 16,5-14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,17-21 Jn 16,5-14
D. V. post Pascha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,22 T <u>Jn 16,23-30</u> T 	37. Jn 16,23 38. Jn 16,24 39. Jn 16,27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,22-27 Jn 16,23-30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,22-27 Jn 16,23-30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 1,22-27 Jn 16,23-30
Dies rogationum	Lc 11,5-13 H	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 5,16-20 ¹⁸⁷ Lc 11,5-13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 5,16-20 Lc 11,5-13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jac 5,16-20 Lc 11,5-13
Dies rogationum	Mt 6,9 T	-	-		
Ascensio Domini	Mc 16,14-20 T	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 1,1-11 Mc 16,14-20 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 1,1-11 Mc 16,14-20 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 1,1-11 Mc 16,14-20
D. Exaudi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 4,7 T <u>Jn 15,26-16,4</u> T 	40. Jn 15,26 41. Jn 16,2 42. Jn 15,26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 4,7-11 Jn 15,26-16,4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 4,7-11 Jn 15,26-16,4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 4,7-11 Jn 15,26-16,4
Pentecostes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 2,4 T <u>Jn 14,23-31</u> T 	43. Jn 14,23 44. Jn 14,23 45. Jn 14,26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 2,1-11 Jn 14,23-31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 2,1-11 Jn 14,23-31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 2,1-11 Jn 14,23-31
Feria II. post Pent.	Jn 3,16 T	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 10,34-48 Jn 3,16-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 10,34-48 Jn 3,16-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 10,34-48 Jn 3,16-21
Feria III. post Pent.	Jn 10,1 T	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 8,14-17 Jn 10,1-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 8,14-17 Jn 10,1-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Act 8,14-17 Jn 10,1-10
Sancta Trinitas	<u>Rom 11,33</u> ¹⁸⁸ T	46. Jn 3,1 47. Jn 3,3 48. Jn 3,11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 11,33 Jn 15,26-16,4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 13,11-13 Jn 3,1-15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 11,33-36 Jn 15,26-16,4
Corpus Christi	Jn 6,56-59 T	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 11,23-29 Jn 6,56-59 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 11,23-29 Jn 6,56-59 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 11,23-29 Jn 6,56-59
D. I. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 4,16 T <u>Lc 16,19-31</u> T 	49. Lc 16,19 50. Lc 16,19 51. Lc 16,22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 4,8-21 Lc 16,19-31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 4,8-21 Lc 16,19-31 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 4,8-21 Lc 16,19-31
D. II. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 3,14 T <u>Lc 14,16-24</u> T 	52. Lc 14,16 53. Lc 14,20 54. Lc 14,24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 3,13-18 Lc 14,16-24 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 3,13-18 Lc 14,16-24 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Jn 3,13-18 Lc 14,16-24
D. III. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 5,6 T <u>Lc 15,1-10</u> T 	55. Lc 15,1 56. Lc 15,1 57. Lc 15,10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 5,6-11 Lc 15,1-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 5,6-11 Lc 15,1-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 5,6-11 Lc 15,1-10

¹⁸⁷ *Miss Quinq.*: “Missa in letania.”

¹⁸⁸ Although this is an Epistle-sermon, it is based on Jacobus’ Trinity sermons.

D. IV. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,18 T <u>Lc 6,36-42</u> T 	58. Lc 6,36 59. Lc 6,36 60. Lc 6,39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,18-23 Lc 6,36-42 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,18-23 Lc 6,36-42 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,18-23 Lc 6,36-42
D. V. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 3,10-11 T <u>Lc 5,1-11</u> T 	61. Lc 5,1 62. Lc 5,3 63. Lc 5,5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 3,8-15 Lc 5,1-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 3,8-15 Lc 5,1-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Pt 3,8-15 Lc 5,1-11
D. VI. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,3 T <u>Mt 5,20-24</u> T 	64. Mt 5,20 65. Mt 5,23 66. Mt 5,22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,3-11 Mt 5,20-24 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,3-11 Mt 5,20-24 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,3-11 Mt 5,20-24
D. VII. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,23 T <u>Mc 8,1-9</u> (Mc 8,2) T 	67. Mc 8,1 68. Mc 8,2 69. Mc 8,6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,19-23 Mc 8,1-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,19-23 Mc 8,1-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 6,19-23 Mc 8,1-9
D. VIII. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,12 T <u>Mt 7,15-21</u> (Mt 7,15) T 	70. Mt 7,15 71. Mt 7,15 72. Mt 7,17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,12-17 Mt 7,15-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,12-17 Mt 7,15-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rom 8,12-17 Mt 7,15-21
D. IX. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 10,6 T <u>Lc 16,1-9</u> T 	73. Lc 16,1 74. Lc 16,3 75. Lc 16,9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 10,6-13 Lc 16,1-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 10,6-13 Lc 16,1-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 10,6-13 Lc 16,1-9
D. X. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 12,2 T <u>Lc 19, 41-47</u> (Lc 19,43) T 	76. Lc 19,41 77. Lc 19,43 78. Lc 19,46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 12,2-11 Lc 19, 41-47 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 12,2-11 Lc 19, 41-47 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 12,2-11 Lc 19, 41-47
D. XI. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 15,10 T <u>Lc 18,9-14</u> (Lc 18,13) T 	79. Lc 18,10 80. Lc 18,13 81. Lc 18,14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 15,1-10 Lc 18,9-14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 15,1-10 Lc 18,9-14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 15,1-10 Lc 18,9-14
D. XII. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 3,4-5 T <u>Mc 7,31-37</u> T 	82. Mc 7,31 83. Mc 7,32 84. Mc 7,37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 3,4-9 Mc 7,31-37 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 3,4-9 Mc 7,31-37 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Cor 3,4-9 Mc 7,31-37
D. XIII. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 3,16 T <u>Lc 10,23-37</u> T 	85. Lc 10,23 86. Lc 10,27 87. Lc 10,30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 3,16-22 Lc 10,23-37 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 3,16-22 Lc 10,23-37 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 3,16-22 Lc 10,23-37
D. XIV. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,22 T <u>Lc 17,11-19</u> T 	88. Lc 17,12 89. Lc 17,12 90. Lc 17,13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,16-24 Lc 17,11-19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,16-24 Lc 17,11-19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,16-24 Lc 17,11-19
D. XV. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,25 T <u>Mt 6,24-33</u> T 	91. Mt 6,24 92. Mt 6,24 93. Mt 6,32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,25-6,10 Mt 6,24-33 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,25-6,10 Mt 6,24-33 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gal 5,25-6,10 Mt 6,24-33
D. XVI. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 3,17-18 T <u>Lc 7,11-16</u> T 	94. Lc 7,11 95. Lc 7,14 96. Lc 7,?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 3,13-21 Lc 7,11-16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 3,13-21 Lc 7,11-16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 3,13-21 Lc 7,11-16
D. XVII. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,3 T <u>Lc 14,1-11</u> T 	97. Lc 14,1 98. Lc 14,2 99. Lc 14,8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,1-6 Lc 14,1-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,1-6 Lc 14,1-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,1-6 Lc 14,1-11
D. XVIII. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 1,5 T <u>Mt 22,34-46</u> T 	100. Mt 22,34 101. Mt 22,37 102. Mt 22,40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 1,4-8 Mt 22,34-46 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 1,4-8 Mt 22,34-46 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Cor 1,4-8 Mt 22,34-46
D. XIX. in aestate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,23 T <u>Mt 9,1-8</u> T 	103. Mt 9,1 104. Mt 9,2 105. Mt 9,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,23-28 Mt 9,1-8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,23-28 Mt 9,1-8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ephes 4,23-28 Mt 9,1-8

D. XX. in aestate	• Ephes 5,18 T	106.Mt 22,2	• Ephes 5,15-21	• Ephes 4,23-28	• Ephes 4,23-28
	• Mt 22,1-14 H	107.Mt 22,2 108.Mt 22,12	• Mt 22,1-14	• Mt 9,1-8	• Mt 9,1-8
D. XXI. in aestate	• Ephes 6,13 T	109.Jn 4,46	• Ephes 6,10-17	• Ephes 6,10-17	• Ephes 6,10-17
	• <u>Jn 4,46-53</u> T	110.Jn 4,52 111.Jn 4,53	• Jn 4,46-53	• Jn 4,46-53	• Jn 4,46-53
D. XXII. in aestate	• Phil 1,10 T	112.Mt 18,23	• Phil 1,6-11	• Phil 1,6-11	• Phil 1,6-11
	• <u>Mt 18,23-35</u> T	113.Mt 18,24 114.Mt 18,32	• Mt 18,23-35	• Mt 18,23-35	• Mt 18,23-35
D. XXIII. in aestate	• Phil 3,20 T	115.Mt 22,15	• Phil 3,17-4,3	• Phil 3,17-4,3	• Phil 3,17-4,3
	• <u>Mt 22,15-21</u> T	116.Mt 22,15 117.Mt 22,21	• Mt 22,15-21	• Mt 22,15-21	• Mt 22,15-21
D. XXIV. in aestate	• Coloss 1,12-14 T	118.Mt 9,18 119.Mt 9,22	• Coloss 1,9-11	• Coloss 1,9-11	• Jer 23,5-8
	• <u>Mt 9,18-26</u> T	120.Mt 9,18	• Mt 9,18-22	• Mt 9,18-26	• Jn 6,5-14
D. XXV. In aestate¹⁸⁹	-	Jn 6,5	• Jer 23,5-8	• Jer 23,5-8	-
		Jn 6,5	• Jn 6,5-14	• Jn 6,5-14	
		Jn 6,12			

¹⁸⁹ In the SD not included.

Appendix 2: The Text of the Sermons for Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi in the ‘*Sermones Dominicales*’

This is not a new edition proper, merely a reproduction of the two texts from Szilády’s edition. Since I did not make new research in the manuscripts, I let the orthography and the punctuation as it was. I did change, however, the typography: I provided the major sections with indents; I put the biblical references in bold, the identified *auctoritates* in small caps; references to already quoted passages are, additionally, in italics (that is, in the case of biblical references in bold and italics, in that of *auctoritates* in small caps and italics). Finally, I tried to identify the *auctoritates*.

Sermo de coena Domini¹⁹⁰

Probet autem seipsum homo, et sic de pane illo edat, [et de calice bibat]. Haec verba originaliter prima ad Cor. XI^o ¹⁹¹ scribuntur, transsumptive autem in hodierna epistola
5 leguntur. Hodie fratres charissimi, sancta mater ecclesia recolit solennitatem
[b u c h u l e t e s s e g e t] illius coenae, in qua Christus dominus verus deus et homo instituit
[i. e. ordinavit], et dedit discipulis suis illud dignissimum sacramentum, sc. corpus et
sanguinem suum, sub specie panis et vini, nobisque sumendum reliquit. Et quia b. apostolus
Paulus videbat multos accedere ad coenam istam imparatos, et indevotos, propter quod multi
10 dormiunt in culpa, qui sibi hoc sacramentum non ad remedium sed sumunt ad iudicium i. e. ad
dampnationem: ideo idem apostolus tamquam doctor sapientissimus, et magister
benignissimus ortatur fideles ad praeparationem probabilem, ut inde habeant receptionem
laudabilem, dicens: ***Probet autem seipsum homo, et sic de pane illo edat.*** Et certe nobis hoc
sacramentum sumentibus haec praeparatio et probatio summe est necessaria, quia non est
15 medium, aut accedimus ad vitam, aut ad mortem. Ideo dicit GREGORIUS: SUMUNT BONI,
SUMUNT MALI, SORTE TAMEN INAEQUALI VITAE VEL INTERITUS. MORS EST MALIS, VITA BONIS,¹⁹²
et ergo praevigili mente considerandum est de quibus nos probare debemus: certe de tribus sc.

¹⁹⁰ SD, vol. 2, 65-82.

¹⁹¹ I Cor 11,28

¹⁹² Correctly: this is the famous hymn *Lauda Sion* composed by St. Thomas, see S. Thomas Aquinatis, “De Officium Festo Corporis,” in *Opera omnia*, ed. Roberto Busa (Stuttgart: Friedrich Fromman, 1980), vol. 6, 581f.

de dei filiatione, de virtutum magnitudine, et Christi amicitate. Qui enim non dei, sed filii sunt diaboli per peccatum, non magni (in) virtutibus sed parvi, non Christi amici sed inimici, hoc divinissimum sacramentum non ad vitam sed ad mortem sumunt aeternam. Unde de primo dicitur Matth. XV^o ¹⁹³: **non est bonum sumere panem filiorum, et mittere canibus** 5 **ad manducandum.** De secundo dictum est Augustino: CIBUS SUM GRANDIUM [i. e. magnorum], CRESCERE ET MANDUCABIS ME.¹⁹⁴ Tertio autem habetur Lucae XI^o,¹⁹⁵ ubi dicitur: **Amice, accomoda mihi tres panes**, quia in hoc venerabili sacramento tres substantiae continentur, sc. caro Christi, anima, et deitas, et ideo dico quod non alii, nisi filii Dei, magni in virtutibus, et amici Christi digne sumunt hoc sacramentum. Et charissimi, ut sacer ille theologus 10 Arriopagita Dionysius in libro De divinis nominibus dicit: Omnia AB ORATIONE INCIPERE EST UTILE¹⁹⁶; igitur pro gratia impetranda, quae mentem illuminat, affectum purgat, gressus dirigit, charitatem accendit, et in bonis operibus perseverare facit, cum devota oratione ad matrem illius benedictam, qui hoc venerabile sacramentum hodie in sui memoriam (instituit, recurramus) eique cum Gabriele archangelo pia voce dicamus: Ave Maria (etc. **probet autem** 15 **se ipsum homo** etc.). In his verbis b. apostolus Paulus nos ad hoc dignissimum [divinissimum] sacramentum accedentes instruit ad duo. Primo ad modum debitae praeparationis, secundo ad modum debitae [devotae] receptionis. Primum ponit ibi: **probet autem se ipsum homo**; secundum subjungit ibi: **et sic de pane illo edat**. Et ut haec verba apostoli sano [sane] capiantur intellectu, est considerandum quod, homo qui vult hoc 20 saluberrimum sacramentum manducare, tria debet probare. Primo se ipsum quantae sit puritatis; secundo indigne sumentis periculum quantae [sit] perniciositatis. Tertio digne sumentis fructum quantae sit utilitatis?

Primo ergo sumens hoc venerabile sacramentum debet probare se ipsum, quantae sit puritatis? et certe multum debet esse puritatis, debet enim esse mundus a carnali delectatione 25 seu pollutione [pollutione], a terrena affectione, ab inutili et vana cogitatione et ab otii vacatione: haec omnia signata sunt Exodi XII^o ¹⁹⁷ in agno paschali, qui hoc sacramentum in figura repraesentabat. Legitur enim ibi de agno paschali: **sic comedetis, renes vestros accingetis, calceamenta in pedibus habebitis, baculos in manibus tenebitis, et festinanter comedetis etc.** Primo ergo ad hoc sacramentum accedentes debent esse mundi a carnali

¹⁹³ Mt 15,26

¹⁹⁴ Confessionum libri tredecim, VII, X.

¹⁹⁵ Lc 11,5

¹⁹⁶ De divinis nominibus, 127, col. 1.

¹⁹⁷ Exod 12,11

delectatione seu pollutione, ideo dicitur: *renes vestros accingetis*; ubi dicit Glossa: renes accingere est carnis delectationem restringere. Legitur II Reg. VI^o et II [secundum] Paralipomenon VI^o.¹⁹⁸ quod Oza a Deo est percussus et mortuus eo quod arcam domini tetigit, cum boves recalcitrassent. Et assignatur istius percussio-
 5 nis causa, quia nocte praecedenti cum uxore jacuerat, et ideo arcam domini tangere dignus non erat. Si ille igitur percussus est, qui arcam tangens jacuerat cum uxore, qua percussione dignus est, qui sumit corpus Christi, et jacuit cum meretrice; si ille percussus [est], qui (solum) tetigit arcam ligneam, qua percussione dignus est, qui recipit indigne carnem Christi veram: si ille percussus est, qui arcam tetigit ut juvaret, qua percussione dignus est qui corpus Christi non juvat, sed in
 10 latrinam cordis inmundi proicere curat. Legitur etiam I Reg. XXI^o ¹⁹⁹ quod Abimalech sacerdos noluit dare panes propositionis i. e. sanctos panes [i. e. sanctificationis] David et pueris suis (i. e. servis), ut [nisi] a mulieribus mundi essent. Si igitur requirebatur munditia ad recipiendum panem materiale: quanta munditia requiritur ad sumendum hunc panem spiritualem? Et secundum doctores ad sumendum hoc salutare sacramentum requiritur
 15 munditia corporalis, puritas mentalis, et devotio actualis. Quaero²⁰⁰ tamen hic, ex quo fit mentio de munditia corporali, utrum pollutio nocturna [exiens] sompnialis impediatur communionem seu missae celebrationem? Respondetur secundum sanctum Thomam in III^o, distinctione IX^a,²⁰¹ quod distinguendum est de pollutione tali, quae potest multipliciter accidere. Primo quidem contingit ex sola dispositione naturae, et non ex praecedenti cogitatione, et tunc non est signum alicujus peccati, sed potest ebetudinem mentis inducere et
 20 inmunditiam [munditiam] habet corporalem, et ideo si necessitas imineat, vel devotio exposcat, communionem non impedit, praecipue (i. e. spiritualiter) quando sine imaginatione accidit. Tamen si propter reverentiam sacramenti quis abstineat, laudandus est; et maxime quando talis naturae dispositio non est perpetua (i. e. sana). Secundo potest contingere talis pollutio nocturna ex praecedenti cogitatione. Et haec cogitatio turpium [i. e. peccatis] quandoque potest (esse) sine peccato, sicut cum est cogitatio tantum, vel cum quis disputat (i. e. legit) de talibus, oportet quod cogitet de ipsis. Aliquando est cum peccato veniali, quando scilicet cogitatio pertingit ad affectionem, et in sola delectatione finitur, sine ullo [velle] deliberato consensu. Quandoque autem est mortale peccatum, sc. cum consensus delectationi
 25 adjungitur, et quia cogitationi tali de propinquo est delectatio et delectationi consensus: ideo

¹⁹⁸ II Sam 6,6 and (correctly) I Paralip 13,9

¹⁹⁹ I Sam 21,4ff

²⁰⁰ Marginal gloss: [Quaeritur primo].

²⁰¹ In quattuor libros sententiarum, 4 ds.9 qu.1 ar.6, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1.

in dubium verti potest utrum sequens pollutio ex peccato acciderit, vel non et an veniali vel mortali. Quando ergo sic dubitatur de praecedenti consensu, omnino abstinendum est [a communione]. Si autem non dubitatur, sed praecise inveniatur quis consensum non praecessisse, et necessitas urgeat, aut si aliqua potior i. e. major causa; potest homo communicare, aut sacerdos missam celebrare. Et si causa vel necessitas non sit [i. e. non fuerit], communicans vel celebrans non peccat mortaliter sed venialiter, melius tamen est abstinere propter reverentiam sacramenti. Tertio modo potest contingere ex cibo vel potu praecedenti, et tunc idem est iudicium sicut de illa pollutione quae ex turpi cogitatione processit. [Verum tamen non ita de facili contingit peccare mortaliter in susceptione cibi, sicut in cogitatione turpi.] Quarto haec pollutio potest contingi ex illusionem i. e. deceptionem diabolicam, et quidem [i. e. certe] si illusionis causa ex nobis praecessit, idem est iudicium sicut de cogitatione praecedenti. Si autem in nobis causa non praecessit, immo potius contraria causa, et hoc frequenter accidit, et praecipue in diebus (in) quibus quis communicare debet, signum quod diabolus homini fructum eucharistiae auferre conatur. Unde in tali casu consultum fuit cuidam monacho, ut [et] in collationibus patrum legitur, quod communicaret, et sic diabolus, videns se non posse consequi intentum, ab illusionem cessavit. Generaliter tamen quia causa ex qua pollutio contingit, non ita de facili potest percipi (i. e. sciri): tutius est semper abstinere nisi necessitas incumbat, et debet homo sic pollutus abstinere usque ad viginti quatuor [quinque] horas, quia in tali spatio natura quae per corporalem immunditiam et mentis ebrietatem deordinata fuerat, reordinatur [i. e. repurgatur]. Haec sanctus Thomas, sed Petrus [de palude]²⁰² breviter sic dicit de hac materia, quod quando pollutio habet ortum ex peccato mortali, [vel de hoc dubitatur, homo debet abstinere a communione de necessitate: si autem non habet ortum ex peccato mortali] est abstinendum de honestate. De pollutione nocturnali tales, ponuntur versus:

25

Crimen habet noctis pollutio cum jacuisti
 Ebrius aut primo meditatus turpe fuisti.
 Crimen adest [abest] tua, si natura superflua pellit,
 Aut si debilius vacua se ventre resolvit,
 Aut si inimicus illusit nocte iniquus.

30

²⁰² This is the fourteenth century Paris master Petrus de Palude (Pierre de la Palud); I could not identify the reference – as far as I know his works are not edited.

Secundo accedentes ad hoc sacramentum debent esse mundi a terrenorum affectione, quod notatur cum dicitur: *calciamenta in pedibus habebitis*; non enim debent tangere terram i.e. terrena per inordinatum amorem, sed inter se et terram debent ponere calciamenta i.e. sanctorum patrum exempla, qui terrena omnia contempserunt. Qui enim terram inordinate diligunt, efficiuntur abhominabiles sicut terra; unde Oseae IX^o ²⁰³ dicitur: **facti sunt abhominabiles, sicut ea quae dilexerunt**; immo talibus vae est pronuntiatur, unde Abakuk II^o ²⁰⁴ dicitur: **vae ei, qui multiplicat non sua usquequo aggregat contra se densum** [k e m e n t h] **lutum**. Ille igitur [dicitur] qui corpus Christi sumit, et terrena inordinate diligit, ipsum venerandum corpus Christi in terram, immo in lutum proicit. Ecce quanta abominatio et magna irreverentia.

Tertio volentes sumere hoc sacramentum debent esse puri [mundi], ab inutili et vana cogitatione quod notatur cum dicitur: baculos in manibus tenebitis. Debemus namque baculum crucis Christi semper in manu cordis tenere, et cum ipso canes i.e. cogitationes daemonum [i.e. malas cogitationes] mentem mordentes abigere, expellere [abicere i.e. repellere] ne ad mensam dei [domini] praesumant accedere. Tunc enim diabolus maxime nos infestare nititur, quando communicamus, et dei sacrificia immolamus. Unde b. Augustinus dicit: NON DESINIT HOSTIS ANTIQUUS NOBIS LAQUEOS PECCATI UBIQUE PRAETENDERE, ET TUNC MAXIME ADVERSUS CHRISTI MEMBRA SAEVIT [k e g e t l e n l e d i k], QUANDO AB EIS SACRAMENTA SUNT CELEBRANDA MYSTERIA.²⁰⁵ Et hoc dico non ut vos terream, sed ut efficiamini tutiores. Haec ille. Legitur Genes. XV^o:²⁰⁶ **quod descendebant volucres super cadavera**, sed baculo **abigebat** i. e. repellebat **eas Abraham**; quia quando [nos] hostiam deo offerimus, aut ipsam sumimus, omnes cogitationes volatiles et nocivas a mente nostra abigere debemus, et hoc baculo crucis Christi, quia sicut dicit Chrysost.:²⁰⁷ ubicunque daemones signum crucis viderint, territi fugiunt, timentes baculum quo plagam acceperunt. Hoc patet de judaeo, de quo facit mentionem b. Gregorius in libro Dialogorum.²⁰⁸ Quarto accedentes ad hoc sacramentum debent esse mundi ab otio et torpore (t h w n y a s a g t o l). Ideo dicitur: festinanter comedetis. Glossa: ille festinanter comedit, qui cum ferventi desiderio accipit; et

²⁰³ Os 9,10

²⁰⁴ Hab 2,6

²⁰⁵ cf. Leo Magnus, *Tractatus septem et nonaginta*, tract. 41, l. 53: “non desinit nobis hostis antiquus laqueos peccati ubique praetendere, et tunc maxime adversum christi membra saeuire, quando ab eis sacratiora sunt celebranda mysteria.”

²⁰⁶ Gen 15,11

²⁰⁷ ?

²⁰⁸ Grégoire Le Grand, *Dialogues*, III, 7, 3-9, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, Sources Chrétiennes 260 (Paris: Cerf, 1979), vol. 2, 280ff.

super illo I^{ae} ad Cor. XI^o.²⁰⁹ **qui manducat et bibit indigne**, dicit Glossa : indigne sumit qui non devota mente accedit. Unde Exodi XII^o ²¹⁰ praecipitur: ut nihil ex agno paschali comedatur crudum, quod abominationem facit, nec coctum aqua quod plene non sapit, sed assum igni quod appetitum acuit, quia tanto fervore desiderii debet recipi hoc sacramentum, ut
 5 magis et magis quotidie animus inflammetur. Qui ergo non habet hanc quadruplicem puritatem, non est dignus tantum recipere sacramentum.

Legitur Exodi XII^o ²¹¹ quod ab esu i.e. comestione agni paschalis quatuor personae excludebantur sc. servus incircumcisis [k e r n e l m e t e l t e t e t z o l g a], mercenarius, advena, et alienigena. Servus incircumcisis signat illos qui non (sunt) mundi a carnali delecta-
 10 tione, sicut sunt luxuriosi qui sc. motus carnales contra animam militantes non circumcidunt; nam ad Gal. V^o ²¹² dicitur: **qui sunt Christi, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitiis et concupiscentiis**; mercenarius significat illos, qui non sunt puri a terrenorum affectione, sicut sunt avari qui sunt mercenarii pecuniae, et quia tales terrena diligunt, terra efficiuntur, quia unusquisque talis est, qualis est dilectio sua: unde b. Augustinus²¹³ (dicit): talis est
 15 unusquisque, qualis est dilectio sua. Si deum diligis, deus es. [Et] hoc (debet intelligere) participative (non de se per se): si terram, terra es etc. Tales non sunt digni recipere corpus Christi, quia cum sint terra, projicerent ipsum in terram. Advena signat neophitos i.e. de novo ad poenitentiam conversos, qui adhuc vanis et carnalibus desideriis agitantur, et ideo dulcedinem hujus sacramenti experiri non possunt, quia **muscae morientes perdunt**
 20 **svavitatem unguenti** Eccli X^o.²¹⁴ Unde b. Augustinus dicit:²¹⁵ indigne accipit si tunc accipit cum debet poenitentiam agere, [et] ergo prius se judicet poenitentiam agendo, ut a se ipso judicatus, a domino non judicetur. Alienigena autem signat tepidos et indevotos, qui sunt alienigeni [alieni] a fervore sancti desiderii. Tales enim hoc venerabile sacramentum non digne sumpunt; unde praecipitur Exodi XII^o ²¹⁶ de agno paschali: **in una domo comedetis, nec deferetis** i.e. portabitis **de eo foras**. In domo quidem comedit, qui in intimo sui cordis Christum manducat per meditationem, et sibi incorporat per imitationem. Ille vero foras effert, qui in intimo cordis non manens, nulla devotione afficitur, nulla desiderii fervore movetur. Si talis hoc sacramentum sumit, est ei ad iudicium non ad meritum: cibus enim potius obest illis,

²⁰⁹ I Cor 11,29

²¹⁰ Exod 12,9

²¹¹ Exod 12,43ff

²¹² Gal 5,25

²¹³ ?

²¹⁴ Eccl 10,1

²¹⁵ ?

qui habent stomachum malis humoribus aggravatum, vel aliis cibis repletum, aut palatum insanum [i. e. infirmum]. Spiritualiter primi significant illos, qui habent stomachum cordis noxiis humoribus i.e. nocivis carnalis concupiscentiae occupatum. Unde sicut cibus corporalis, cum ventrem invenerit a diversis humoribus occupatum, amplius laedit, magis nocet, nullum praestat auxilium: ita iste cibus spiritualis, si aliquem reperit malignitate i.e. peccato pollutum, magis eum impedit non sui natura sed recipientis culpa. Secundi sunt qui sunt referti i.e. pleni diversis cibis avaritiae, et isti desiderant cucumeres, pepones, porros [vulgo p a r h a g m a t] caepas et allia [f o g h a g m a t], et ideo manna istud fastidiunt (i. e. abhominantur). Tertii sunt qui habent palatum cordis insipidum vel insanum per pravam consuetudinem peccandi. Tales non sunt digni comedere panem angelicum, sed olus porcinum ad Rom. XIII^o:²¹⁷ **qui infirmus est** (sc. per peccatum) **olus manducet**. Et b. Augustinus: PALATO NON SANO (POENA EST PANIS, QUI SANO) EST SUAVIS.²¹⁸ Et ergo fratres charissimi, ut iste panis caelestis nobis dulcis existat, secundum doctrinam apostoli conscientias nostras probemus, et examinemus, et si quid fermenti i.e. peccati ibi repertum fuerit, expurgemus, et sic hunc panem manducemus.

Secundo, sumens hoc divinissimum sacramentum debet probare indigne sumentis periculum quanta sit perniciositas? Sed hic est notandum,²¹⁹ quod triplex est modus manducationis corporis Christi sc. sacramentalis tantum, spiritualis tantum, sacramentalis et spiritualis simul. Sacramentalis manducatio est corpus Christi invisibile sub visibili panis specie manducare; spiritualis vero est virtus sive effectus sacramenti ut [et] peccatorum remissio, ab aeterna dampnatione liberatio et caelestis vitae collatio; sacramentalis autem et spiritualis manducatio est corpus Christi sub specie panis sumere, et effectus sacramenti jam dictos ex digna communione percipere. Primo modo manducant mali christiani, secundo et tertio modo manducant solum boni. Sacramentaliter igitur tantum mali i.e. in peccatis mortalibus existentes manducant, et tamen non manducant: manducant quidem, quia corpus Christi sacramentaliter sumunt, et tamen non manducant sc. spiritualiter, quia animae salutem non percipiunt. Unde ad Ebr. ultimo²²⁰ dicit apostolus: **habemus altare, de quo edere non habent potestatem, qui tabernaculo** (i. e. templo) **deserviunt** sp. corporis sui i.e. peccatis

²¹⁶ Exod 12,46

²¹⁷ correctly: Rom 14,2

²¹⁸ *Confessionum libri tredecim*, VII, XVI.

²¹⁹ Marginal gloss: [Triplex est manducatio]

²²⁰ Hebr 13,10

carnalibus. Et I^a ad Cor X^o.²²¹ **non potestis mense domini participes esse** i. e. communicare de ea, **et mensae daemoniorum** i.e. vitiorum, quae vobis dominantur per concupiscentiam. Unde b. Augustinus:²²² qui discordat a Christo et affectum cordis avertit ab eo, et convertit ad peccatum, non manducat ejus carnem sp. spiritualiter, licet sacramentum premat dentibus, quia non ad salutem sed ad iudicium manducat illud. Sed nota, quod sacramentaliter tantum, et indigne manducantium tria sunt genera: primi sunt qui ad corpus Christi accedunt cum peccandi voluntate, de quibus dicitur Isayae XXIX^o:²²³ **appropinquat populus iste ore suo** sp. per sacramenti sumptionem: **cor autem ejus longe est a me**, sp. per peccandi voluntatem. Unde et b. Ambrosius dicit:²²⁴ indignus est qui non devota mente accedit ad eucharistiam, aut in voluntate peccandi manens. Hic [i. e. alii], reus est corporis et sanguinis domini, et ac [hac] si Christum occiderit, punietur. Secundi sunt ypocritae, qui latent in peccatis sub pulchra specie religionis. De talibus dicitur Matth. XXIII^o:²²⁵ **vae vobis ypocritae qui similes estis sepulchris dealbatis, quae a foris apparent hominibus speciosa, intus autem plena sunt ossibus mortuorum, et omni spurcitia** i. e. putredine, verme, et foetore: **sic et vos a foris** (i. e. exterius) **apparetis hominibus boni, et justi, intus autem estis pleni ypocrisi** i. e. amore vanae laudis, et cupiditate, et odio veritatis. Ideo vae vobis quia extra bonorum consortium [i.e. societatem] proiciemini miserabiliter. Tertii sunt praesumptuosi, qui non timent communicare vel celebrare in magnis criminibus et manifestis, de quibus dicitur per dominum: **appropriant super me nocentes ut edant carnes meas**. Psmo XXVI^o.²²⁶ Appropriant ore, non corde, verbis, non operibus bonis; et tales deberent considerare illud Apostoli primae ad Cor. XI^o [VI^o]:²²⁷ **qui manducat et bibit indigne: sibi iudicium manducat et bibit**; non quia corpus Christi sit malum, sed quia malus, quod bonum est. accipit male. Hujus rei exemplum evidens i.e. manifestum est in sole, vino, et flore, nam eandem solis lucem sanus in oculis suscipit ab delectationem, (et) aeger ad perturbationem; et vinum, quod sanus accipit [i.e. bibit] ad iocunditatem [i.e. sanitatem], febritans sumit ad majorem infirmitatem, vel forte ad mortem. Unde Glossa dicit: Petrus et Judas ad dominicam coenam pariter accesserunt, quando coenam Petrus accepit ad vitam, et Judas ad mortem. Item apis de flore colligit mel, aranea vero accipit venenum et [veneni] fel.

²²¹ I Cor 10,21

²²² ?

²²³ Is 29,13

²²⁴ ?

²²⁵ Mt 23,27f

²²⁶ Ps 26,2

²²⁷ I Cor 11,29

Et est diligenter considerandum, quod octo mala incurrunt [i. e. cadunt] (n y o c z n a u a l a b a e s n e k), qui indigne communicant, quae ipsis interpretatur David dicens: **fiat mensa eorum coram ipsis in laqueum** (sc. diaboli), **et in retributiones** [tribulationes], **et in scandalum: obscurentur oculi eorum ne videant: et dorsum** [deorsum] **eorum semper incurva. Effunde super eos iram tuam: et furor irae tuae comprehendat eos. Fiat habitatio eorum deserta, et in tabernaculis suis non sit qui inhabitet.** Psmo LXVIII^o.²²⁸

Primum malum est, quia indigna communio hominem peccatis illaqueat, et hoc tangitur ibi: **fiat mensa eorum coram ipsis in laqueum**, unde Jerem. XI^o ²²⁹ per dominum dicitur: **quid est quod dilectus meus in domo mea facit scelera** [i.e. peccata] **multa?** Numquid carnes sanctae auferunt a te malitias tuas? Quasi diceret: non auferunt sed augmentant. Unde et ISIDORUS dicit: QUI SCELERATE VIVUNT IN ECCLESIA ET COMMUNICARE NON DESINUNT, PUTANTES SE TALI COMMUNICATIONE MUNDARI: DISCANT SIBI sacramentum NON AD EMUNDATIONEM PROFICERE,²³⁰ sed ad maiorem peccatorum illaqueationem. Unde et Judas per indignam communionem pervenit ad Christi traditionem. Secundum malum, quia indigna communio dampnationem parat, et hoc notatur (ibi): **et in retributiones** sc. in mortem (et) in dampnationem, et in gratiae amissionem. Unde B. BERNHARDUS (dicit) : VAE HOMINI ILLI CUI [SALUS MUNDI JUDICIUM EST, CUI] VITA [MORS EST, CUI ABSOLUTIO] DAMPNATIO, CUI GRATIA IRA, CUI CALIX PROPINATIONIS VAS EST INDIGNATIONIS.²³¹ Tertium malum, quia proximum scandalizat, unde dicitur: **et in scandalum**. Unde traditio Judae, quae venit non solum ex cupiditate, sed etiam ex indigna communione, omnes apostolos ad scandalum perduxit, ut sc. dubitarent in fide, et Christum abnegarent, sicut fecit Petrus, unde ipsis per Christum dominum Matth. XXVI^o ²³² dictum fuit: **omnes vos scandalum patiemini in me, in ista nocte**; et vere ita factum fuit, quia postquam judaei tenuerunt [Christum] (Jhesum) mox discipuli relicto eo omnes fugierunt. Quartum malum (est) [quia] indigna communio temptatione subjugat, unde dicitur: **et dorsum eorum semper incurva** sc. diabolo ut ipsis (insidiat et sedat) [insideat] sp. per temptationem et peccatum. Unde de Juda dicit Remigius:²³³ diabolus qui Judam ante communionem tenebat per suggestionem et temptationem, postea tenuit ad possidendum, ita ut nihil aliud posset cogitare aut facere nisi quod voluntas diaboli fuit:

²²⁸ Ps 68,23-26

²²⁹ Jer 11,15

²³⁰ *Sententiarum libri tres*, lib. 1, col. 589.

²³¹ cf. Balduinus de Forda, *Tractatus de sacramento altaris*, pars 2, cap. 4, p. 398: "Vae homini illi, cui salus mundi iudicium est, cui vita mors est, cui absolutio damnatio est, cui gratia ira est, cui calix propitiationis calix indignationis est."

²³² Mt 26,31

dicitur enim Joh. XIII^o ²³⁴ quod : **post buccellam** [i. e. sumtam] **statim introivit in eum satanas** [diabolus], ut malum quod eo instigante [tenuerat i. e.] tractaverat (i. e. cogitaverat), eo concitante perficeret. Quintum malum (est) quia mentem excoecat, quod notatur cum dicitur: **obscrentur oculi eorum ne videant**. Magna enim coecitas est secundum b. Augustinum, libere peccare, Christum conculcare, et corpus ejus absque timore indigne manducare. Sextum malum, quia deum irritat (i n g h e r l y), unde dicitur: **effunde super eos iram tuam, et furor irae tuae comprehendat eos**. Unde dominus Ihesus secundum b. Augustinum peccatori dicit:²³⁵ o peccator, noli me amplius affligere peccatis tuis, plus enim laedit me vulnus peccati, quam vulnus lateris mei; et subdit idem b. Augustinus:²³⁶ magis delinquent (i. e. peccant) qui contempnunt jam regnantem in caelis, quam qui crucifixerunt eum ambulanti in terris, quia illi semel crucifixerunt, isti vero quantum in eis est, quotidie crucifigunt: illi occiderunt mortalem, isti [vero] crucifigunt immortalem. Haec ille. Septimum malum (est), quia indigna communio vitam temporalem abbreviat. Ideo dicitur: **fiat habitatio eorum deserta**; unde Hilarius:²³⁷ deum ad vindictam concitat, sanctos a se fugat, hostem suum laetificat, vitam abbreviat sibi, qui corpus Christi indigne lacerat et manducat. Octavum malum, quia gratuitis et aeternis bonis se spoliatur et privat. Ideo in verbis praemissis jungebatur: **et in tabernaculis eorum non sit qui inhabitet**. In tabernaculis enim i.e. cordibus indigne communicantium, nulla (bonitas) virtutum inhabitat i.e. repellit et recedit [immo repellitur et recedit]. Unde Genes. III^o ²³⁸ Adae dictum est de fructu ligni vetiti, per quem iste cibus sanctissimus figurabatur: **quia comedisti [comedistis] de ligno i.e. de fructu ligni ex quo praeceperam tibi, ne comederes, maledicta terra in opere tuo. Spinis et tribulos germinabit tibi**, et sic per illius fructus indignam comestionem, ineffabilia bona a deo gratuite [gratuitus] sibi concessa amisit, et de paradiso expulsus fuit, et nisi poenituisset, et bona aeterna amisisset. Et Numeri XI^o ²³⁹ dicitur de filiis Israël: **adhuc erant carnes in dentibus earum : et ecce furor domini concitatus in populum, percussit eum plaga magna nimis**. Unde et Judas propter indignam communionem, gratiam quam a Christo domino acceperat amisit, et de apostolatu est ejectus: immo post festum paschae propter indigne communicantes frequenter dominus peste et fame affligit. Sicut [sic] etiam legitur Romanis tempore sancti

²³³ Remigius of Auxerre? – I could not identify the reference.

²³⁴ Io 13,27

²³⁵ ?

²³⁶ ?

²³⁷ Hilary of Poitiers? – I could not identify the reference.

²³⁸ Gen 3,17-18

²³⁹ Num 11,33

Gregorii papae accidisse. Cum igitur tot mala indigne tractantes et sumentes corpus dominicum incurrant, necesse est ut unusquisque se probet, et diligenter examinet, qualiter ad illud terribile accedat sacramentum, ne sit in peccato mortali, nec habeat de cetero intentionem peccandi, sed cum timore et reverentia accedat et dicat cum accedit ad altare: Domine, non
 5 sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum, sed confisus de tua magna pietate et clementia, accedo sicut infirmus ad medicum vitae, sitiens ad fontem misericordiae, egenus ad dominum caeli et terrae, ovis ad pastorem, figmentum i. e. creatura ad creatorem, desolatus et tristis ad meum consolatorem pium et liberatorem. Et sic corde humili accipiat corpus Christi, et dabitur ei sine dubio effectus (i.e. utilitas) sacramenti sc. peccatorum remissio, gratiae collatio i.e.
 10 donatio, sanitatis recuperatio, vitae hujus prolongatio, et tandem caelestis curiae perpetua inhabitatio. Et tantum de secundo principali.

Tertio sumens hoc divinissimum sacramentum, debet videre et considerare digne sumentis fructum, quanta sit utilitatis, nam inter alia digne sumentes corpus Christi decem bona consequuntur. Primum bonum est charitas (charitatis) et passionis Christi
 15 commemoratio. Unde Christus dominus tradens discipulis suis corpus suum sub specie panis manducandum dixit Matth. XXVI^o: **accipite, et comedite** [manducate]: **hoc est corpus meum**.²⁴⁰ **hoc facite in meam commemorationem**²⁴¹ sc. passionis meae et vestrae redemptionis. Fecit enim dominus Ihesus more hominis, qui appropinquans morti, munus aliquod dimittit dilecto amico dicens: habe i.e. tene hoc cum omni diligentia penes te in
 20 memoriam mei, ut quotiens illud videris, recorderis mei. Qui accipiens illud munus amici sui charissimi, si eum toto corde dilexit, non potest non dolere et non tristari de morte amici, quotienscunque munus sibi dimissum conspexerit. Similiter nos quotienscunque [accedimus] ad considerandum [consecrandum] vel percipiendum [i.e. accipiendum] sacramentum muneris aeterni, quod nobis dominus passurus in memoriam sui dimisit tenendum cum timore et
 25 conpunctione cordis, omnique reverentia debemus accedere recolentes (i.e. recordantes) quanto amore dilexit, qui pro nobis se ipsum obtulit [i.e. dedit] ut nos redimeret. Unde apostolus I^a ad Cor. [XI^o]²⁴² dicit: **quotienscunque manducabitis panem hunc, et calicem bibetis: mortem domini annunciabitis donec veniat** sp. ad iudicium. Secundum bonum est interior animae vivificatio, quia panis vitae est, secundum illud Joh. VI^o:²⁴³ **ego sum panis**
 30 **vitae, qui de caelo descendi**. Si enim in paradiso terrestri lignum vitae comestum, vitam

²⁴⁰ Mt 26,26

²⁴¹ Lc 22,19 or I Cor 11,24

²⁴² I Cor 11,26

²⁴³ Io 6,41

prolixam dabat: multo magis hic [i.e. iste] panis vitae qui Christus est et donator vitae aeternae. Qui ergo vitam manducat, mori nequit Joh. VI^o:²⁴⁴ **qui manducat ex hoc pane: vivet in aeternum.** Imitetur [mutet] igitur vitam qui vult accipere vitam: alias ad mortem aeternam accipiet vitam. Tertium bonum est corporis Christi mystici incorporatio, unde

5 dominus in evangelio Joh. VI^o ²⁴⁵ dixit: **qui manducat nostram carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in eo.** Et beato AUGUSTINO dictum est per dominum: CRESCE ET MANDUCABIS ME, NEC TU ME MUTABERIS [mutabis] IN TE, SED TU MUTABERIS IN ME,²⁴⁶ sp. per charitatem. Quartum bonum est spiritualis refectio. Unde Psta: **in loco pascuae ibi me collocavit** Psmo XXII^o:²⁴⁷ deus enim qui instituit baptismum, ut nos in esse gratiae i.e.

10 secundum gratiam generaret, et confirmationem, ut nos in fide roboraret, ipse dedit nobis eucharistiam, ut nos roboratos [per confirmationem] in via ne deficeremus enutrirer. Cum enim homo constet ex corpore et anima, Christus dominus utrumque dedit pro homine, corpus suum pro salute nostra corporis, animam pro anima (nostra). Sed quia sedes animae in sanguine consistit, Christus ut totum hominem salvum faceret, sanguinem suum fundi

15 permisit. Quintum bonum est amoris quoad deum et proximum excitatio. Unde b. Bernhardus [dixit]:²⁴⁸ disce christiane quantum debeas diligere deum, qui dedit nobis carnem suam in cibum, et sanguinem in potum, animam in pretium [i.e. redemptionem], et aquam lateris in lavacrum [i.e. in munditiam]. Qui enim panem calidum de clibano i.e. de fornace jam acceptum comederit. cum pane sumet et calorem: sic qui corpus Christi comedit [i. e.

20 manducat], cum eodem sumit et charitatem, ignitus quippe amor [dei] suscipitur in corpore ejus, quo sumto et nos inardescimus, et ipsum semper amplius esurimus. Sextum bonum est gratiae collatio. Figura hujus habetur Exodi XVI^o,²⁴⁹ ubi dicitur: descendente manna descendebat et ros. Spiritualiter per manna corpus Christi, et per ros gratia dei significatur, unde hoc sacramentum graecae eucharistia dicitur, quod latine bona gratia interpretatur, quia

25 in ipso nobis nova gratia donatur, immo salus corporis et animae, et omne bonum caeleste datur. Unde venerabilis Beda, loquens de hoc sacramento dicit:²⁵⁰ omne quidem donum caelestis gratiae sancta eucharistia tribuitur mediante. Septimum bonum est contra temptationes diaboli armatio. Unde [et] Psta: **parasti in conspectu meo mensam, adversus**

²⁴⁴ Io 6,52

²⁴⁵ Io 6,57

²⁴⁶ *Confessionum libri tredecim*, VII, X.

²⁴⁷ Ps 22,2

²⁴⁸ ?

²⁴⁹ Exod 16,13

²⁵⁰ ?

eos, qui tribulant me Psmo XXII^o.²⁵¹ Et ISIDORUS: SUSCIPE HOMO DOMINUM IHESUM TUAE MENTIS HOSPITIO: CUM AUTEM ADVERSARIUS TUUS HOSPITIUM TUUM VIDET OCCUPATUM CAELESTIS FULGORIS POENITENTIAE, STATIM INTELLIGIT LOCUM TEMPTAMENTIS [temptationis] SUIS INTERCLUSUM (i. e. clausum) ESSE PER CHRISTUM.²⁵² Nam secundum quod dicit

5 Chrysost.:²⁵³ ut leones flammam [flammanes] spirantes ab illa mensa discedimus, terribiles effecti diabolo. Octavum bonum est peccatorum remissio. Unde dicitur in oratione dominica: **panem** [nostram] **quoditiamam da nobis hodie**, et statim sequitur: **et dimitte nobis debita nostra**, Matth. VI^o et Lucae XI^o.²⁵⁴ Et ISIDORUS [dicit]: ACCEDITE AD EUM ET SATIEMINI, QUIA PANIS EST. ACCEDITE AD EUM ET ILLUMINAMINI, QUIA LUX EST. ACCEDITE AD EUM ET LIBERA-

10 MINI, QUIA UBI SPIRITUS DOMINI, IBI LIBERTAS. ACCEDITE AD EUM ET ABSOLVEMINI, QUIA REMISSIO EST PECCATORUM.²⁵⁵ Haec Isidorus. Et hoc debet intelligi de peccatis venialibus [et] non mortalibus, quia sicut cibus corporalis prodest viventi et non mortuo: similiter et iste cibus spiritualis prodest illis, qui sunt tantum in venialibus et non [in] mortalibus peccatis spiritualiter scientibus. Nonum bonum est malae concupiscentiae extinctio et a gravioribus

15 sicut mortalibus peccatis diligens custodia seu protectio, ne ipsis [homo] consentiat. Nam sicut aqua extinguit ignem, sic istud sacramentum fervorem concupiscentiae. De hoc dicit b. BERNHARDUS: DUO SACRAMENTUM DOMINI OPERATUR IN NOBIS, QUIA ET SENSUS NOSTROS MUNIT (I. E. FORTIFICAT) ET IN GRAVIORIBUS PECCATIS TOLLIT OMNINO CONSENSUM, verbi gratia: SI QUIS NOSTRUM NON TAM CREBROS UT SOLEBAT, NEC TAM ACROS SUSTINET

20 IRACUNDIAE, INVIDIAE, LUXURIAE AC CETERORUM VITIUM MOTUS: GRATIAS AGAT CORPORI ET SANGUINI DOMINI NOSTRI IHESU CHRISTI, QUONIAM VIRTUS SACRAMENTI OPERATUR IN EO.²⁵⁶ Haec ille. Decimum bonum est caelestis regni collatio (i.e. datio). Unde per dominum Ihesum Joh. VI^o ²⁵⁷ dicitur : **Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam**. Haec, immo et alia infinita bona proveniunt ex digna huius sacramenti

25 perceptione; sic ergo charissimi, disponamus [nobis] ut non solum sacramentum sed et

²⁵¹ Ps 22,5

²⁵² cf. Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *Expositio psalmi cxviii*, littera 8, cap. 48, pag 180: "Suscipe ante dominum Iesum tuae mentis hospitio; ubi corpus eius, ibi Christus est. Cum hospitium tuum adversarius uiderit occupatum caelestis fulgore praesentiae, intellet locum temptationis suis interclusum esse per Christum."

²⁵³ ?

²⁵⁴ Mt 6,11f and Lc 11,3f

²⁵⁵ cf. Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *Expositio psalmi cxviii*, littera 18, cap. 28, pag 411: "Accedite ad eum et satiamini, quia panis est; accedite ad eum et potate, quia fons est; accedite ad eum et illuminamini, quia lux est; accedite ad eum et liberamini, quia ubi spiritus domini, ibi libertas; accedite ad eum et absoluimini, quia remissio peccatorum est."

²⁵⁶ *Sermo in cena domini*, par. 3, vol. 5, pag. 70

²⁵⁷ Io 6,55

effectus ejus percipere valeamus, quod nobis per intercessionem virginis Mariae praestare dignetur dominus Ihesus hujus sacramenti institutor, qui est benedictus secula seculorum Amen.

- 5 Sed circa hunc sermonem quaedam quaestiones movebuntur, et quia jam dictum est, quomodo homo volens accedere ad hoc sacramentum debet se praeparare et probare: quaeritur ergo jam consequenter et primo post [hoc] sacramentum sumptum quamdiu debet a cibi sumptione abstinere, et utrum liceat statim comedere? Respondetur secundum Thomam in quarto, distinctione nona,²⁵⁸ quod post sumptionem eucharistiae convenit quidem i.e. certe a cibo aliquamdiu [abstinere] sed non oportet multum diu, quia cito fit illarum specierum consumptio et alteratio. Decretum autem quoddam, quod dicit diu abstinendum, ut De consecratione [a n a z e n t h e g h a z z e r z e s e], distinctione II^a [secunda],²⁵⁹ tribus loquitur secundum antiqua tempora, quando raro celebrabantur missae. Secundo quaeritur utrum hoc sacramentum tantum a jejunis sumi debeat? Respondetur quod generaliter corpus Christi a jejunis sumi [percipi] debet, 7^{ma} quaestione I^a «Nihil»²⁶⁰, et De consecratione II^a [distinctione] secunda «Liquido»²⁶¹, quod in reverentiam tanti sacramente institutum est: causaliter tamen necessitate mortis imminente (i.e. instante) ne contingat sine viatico (i.e. eucharistia v t i E l e s e g h n e k w l) ex hac vita transire, (ut) potest et post alios cibos sumi. Ratio vero sumendi hoc sacramentum ante cibum est, una ex parte cibi sc. ejus reverentia, ut ante alios cibos (os) christiani hic cibus (ingreditur), ingrediatur. Alia est ex parte cibati sc. digna praeparatio, quia jejuni magis consueverunt esse sobrii et devoti. Est tamen sciendum, quod duplex est jejunium sc. naturae et ecclesiae. Jejunium naturale est quod importat privationem cujuscunque cibi vel potus, et tale jejunium requiritur ad hoc sacramentum; et ideo post assumptionem [sumptionem] aquae vel alterius potus aut cibi vel etiam medicinae in quantacunque parvitate [parva quantitate] non licet hoc sacramentum accipere, et [ad] hoc si necessitas mortis non incumbat. Reliquiae tamen cibi (i.e. remanentiae) remanentis in ore (si) casualiter transglutiantur, non impediunt susceptionem hujus sacramenti, quia non traiciuntur (i.e. non sumitur) per modum cibi, sed per modum salivae [saliphae salivae] (n y a l z e r e n t h); et hoc vitari non potest. Aliud est jejunium ecclesiae,
- 10
15
20
25

²⁵⁸ In quattuor libros sententiarum, 4 ds.8 qu.1 ar.4

²⁵⁹ I could find it in Gratian.

²⁶⁰ I could find it in Gratian.

²⁶¹ De Cons., D. II, C. LIV, p. XVIII, in *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, ed. Emil Friedberg (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1879), 1333f.

quod institutum est ad carnis macerationem, et tale non solvitur per praedicta, quia non multum nutraverit, sed magis ad alterandum (i.e. ad diligendum) sumuntur. Et quia ecclesia diem naturalem incipit a media nocte, ideo si post mediam noctem aliquis sumpserit aliquid cibi vel potus, non potest (ea) die hoc sacramentum sumere. Potest vero si ante mediam

5 noctem (i. e. non est differentia) [nec refert] utrum post cibum vel potum dormierit, aut etiam digestus ait quantum ad rationem percepti (i.e. sumpti cibi); refert autem quantum ad perturbationem mentis quam percipiunt (i.e. manducarunt) homines propter insomnietatem vel indigestionem, ex quibus si mens multum perturbetur, homo redditur ineptus [i.e. indignus] ad sumptionem hujus sacramenti. Haec Thomas, in tertia [3^a] parte, quaestione

10 octuagesima [LXXX^a].²⁶² Tertio quaeritur utrum peccet qui accedit ad hoc sacramentum contritus et non confessus? Respondetur secundum Petrum quod:²⁶³ peccator contritus ante confessionem, quando vult communicare, aut habet copiam confessoris, qui eum possit absolvere, et tunc peccat sine confessione communicando, quia ad hoc sacramentum requiritur etiam reconciliatio secundum iudicium ecclesiae; aut non habet. Si ergo imminet aliqua

15 necessitas communicandi vel celebrandi, ut qui [quia] timet scandalum populi, vel jam [quia], incepit ministerium sacramenti, vel amisit loquelam, et tunc non peccat cum proposito confitendi quando poterit, si autem tale propositum non haberet, peccaret. Quarto quaeritur, utrum peccator videndo corpus Christi peccet? Respondetur secundum (S.) Thomam quod non peccet [peccat]; tamen si interdum se abstinere a videndo [audiendo] propter humilitatem

20 laudandus est. Albertus autem dicit;²⁶⁴ quod peccator videre potest et debet, sed non multo aspectu propter humilitatem, immo potius viso corporis, (sibi) debet percutere pectus, et dicere quod non est dignus ut in conspectu et visu remaneat tantae sanctitatis. Quinto quaeritur utrum sacerdos possit dare corpus Christi (ei) quem scit in peccato mortali? Respondetur secundum Thomam in (libro) [quarto] distinctione IX^a,²⁶⁵ quod SI PECCATUM EST OCCULTUM;

25 puta [ut puta] per confessionem vel alias [alia] secrete scitum, et ille IN OCCULTO PETIT, DEBET EI; [DENEGARI ET MONERE EUM NE IN PUBLICO PETAT: SI AUTEM IN MANIFESTO PETAT, DEBET EI] DARE, [ut habetur] De consecratione, dist. II^a «Non prohibeat».²⁶⁶ Et [sed] hoc propter quatuor. Primo quia pro peccata [occulto] poenam inferens publicam revelator est confessionis aut proditor criminis. Secundo quia quilibet christianus habet jus in perceptione

²⁶² *Summa Theologiae*, 3 q.80 a.8 (Madrid: La Editorial Catolica, 1958), vol. 4, 698f.

²⁶³ Petrus de Palude? – I could not identify the reference.

²⁶⁴ ?

²⁶⁵ *In quattuor libros sententiarum*, 4 ds.9 qu.1 ar.5a

²⁶⁶ De Cons., D. II, C. LXVII, in *Decretum*, 1338.

eucharistiae, nisi illud per peccatum mortale amittat. Unde cum in facie ecclesiae [i.e. ante ecclesiam] non constet ipsum amisisse jus suum, non debet ei in facie ecclesiae denegari, alias daretur facultas [i.e. potestas] malis sacerdotibus pro suo libito i.e. voluntate punire maxima poena quos vellent. Tertio propter incertitudinem status summentis, quia **spiritus ubi vult spirat** Joh. III^o;²⁶⁷ unde talis subito potest esse compunctus et a peccato mundatus, et divina inspiratione ad sacramentum accedere. Quarto quia esset scandalum si ei denegaretur. Idem [item] dicit Albertus in libro De missa:²⁶⁸ si vero peccatum est manifestum, debet ei denegare sive (et) in occulto sive in manifesto petat. Sexto quaeritur utrum corpus Christi debet dari instrionibus [istrionibus] (a z s i p o s o k n a k)? Respondetur quod non, quia nec divinae majestati, nec ecclesiasticae disciplinae competit, quod eis corpus Christi daretur. De Consecratione, distinct. II^a «Pro dilectione».²⁶⁹ Septimo quaeritur utrum corpus Christi debet dari amentibus? Respondetur secundum Thomam in quarto, dist. IXa [nona]²⁷⁰ quod DISTINGUENDUM EST, QUIDAM ENIM DICUNTUR LARGE AMENTES, QUIA DEBILEM HABENT MENTEM, SUNT TAMEN DOCIBILES EORUM, QUAE AD FIDEM ET DEVOTIONEM PERTINENT SACRAMENTI [ET TALIBUS NON OPORTET CORPUS DENEGARI]. QUIDAM VERO SUNT OMNINO AMENTES JUDICIO RATIONIS, ita quod non habent amentiam sine lucido intervallo, ET TALIBUS NON DEBET DARI CORPUS CHRISTI, QUIA hujusmodi NON POSSUNT INDUCI AD DEVOTIONEM, QUAE REQUIRITUR AD HOC SACRAMENTUM. Si autem INCIDERUNT IN AMENTIAM POST FIDEM ET DEVOTIONEM SACRAMENTI, TUNC DEBET EIS DARI NISI TIMEATUR PERICULUM DE VOMITU VEL DE EXPUITIONE, AUT ALIQUO HUIUSMODI, Vicesima VI^a quaestione (distinctione III^a) «His qui».²⁷¹ – Octavo quaeritur, utrum hoc sacramentum (debet dari pueris) vel sit dandum [pueris]? Respondetur secundum Thomam ubi supra,²⁷² (quod) PUERIS CARENTIBUS USU RATIONIS, QUI NON POSSUNT DISTINGUERE INTER CIBUM CORPORALEM ET SPIRITUALEM, NON DEBET DARI CORPUS CHRISTI, QUIA AD IPSUM EXIGITUR ACTUALIS DEVOTIO, QUAM TALES PUERI HABERE NON POSSUNT; SED PUERIS INCIPIENTIBUS HABERE devotionem [DISCRETIONEM] ETIAM ANTE PERFECTAM AETATEM. Ut enim fuerint DECEM VEL XI [UNDECIM] ANNORUM, POTEST DARI, SI IN EIS SIGNA DISCRETIONIS ET DEVOTIONIS APPAREANT. Nono quaeritur utrum qualibet [quolibet] die sit communicandum? Respondetur secundum Thomam in quarto, distinct. nona,²⁷³ quod

²⁶⁷ Io 3,8

²⁶⁸ ?

²⁶⁹ De Cons., D. II, C. XCV, p. XXVIII

²⁷⁰ In quattuor libros sententiarum, 4 ds.9 qu.1 ar.5c

²⁷¹ I could find it in Gratian.

²⁷² In quattuor libros sententiarum, 4 ds.9 qu.1 ar.5d

²⁷³ In quattuor libros sententiarum, 4 ds.12 qu.3 ar.1b

IN RECIPIENTE HOC SACRAMENTUM DUO REQUIRUNTUR SC. DESIDERIUM CONJUNCTIONIS AD
 CHRISTUM, QUOD FACIT AMOR ET REVERENTIA SACRAMENTI, QUAE AD DOMINI TIMORIS
 PERTINET. PRIMUM INCITAT AD FREQUENTATIONEM HUIUS SACRAMENTI QUOTIDIANAM, SED
 SECUNDUM RETRAHIT; IDEO SI QUIS EXPERIMENTALITER COGNOSCERET ES QUOTIDIANA
 5 SUECEPTIONE FERVOREM AMORIS AUGERI ET REVERENTIAM NON MINUI; TALIS DEBERET
 QUOTIDIE COMMUNICARE: SI AUTEM SENTIAT REVERENTIAM MINUI, ET FERVOREM NON MULTUM
 AUGERI, DEBET INTERDUM ABSTINERE, ET POST MODUM CUM MAJORI REVERENTIA ET DEVOTIONE
 ACCEDAT. UNDE (QUANTUM) AD HOC, UNUSQUISQUE RELINQUENDUS EST SUO JUDICIO. Decimo
 quaeritur utrum homo debeat frequenter corpus Christi sumere? Respondetur secundum
 10 Thomam in quarto, distinct. nona [XIX]²⁷⁴ quod EA QUAE IN HOC SACRAMENTO GERUNTUR,
 HABENT SIMILITUDINEM CUM HIS, QUAE ACCIDUNT IN CORPORALI NUTRIMENTO, QUIA ENIM FIT
 QUASI CONTINUA DEPERDITIO NATURALIS HUMORIS, PER ACTIONEM CALORIA NATURALIS, ET
 EXERCITIUM LABORIS. IDEO OPORTET FREQUENTER CORPORALEM CIBUM ASSUMERE, ET
 RESTAURATIONEM DEPERDITI, NE PERDITIO CONTINUA MORTEM INDUCAT. SIMILITER (AUTEM) EX
 15 CONCUSPISCENTIA INNATA, ET OCCUPATIONE CIRCA EXTERIORA FIT DEPERDITIO DEVOTIONIS ET
 FERVORIS SECUNDUM QUAE HOMO IN DEUM COLLIGITUR. UNDE OPORTET QUOD pluries [PLURES]
 DEPERDITA RESTAURENTUR, NE HOMO TOTALITER alienetur [AMOVETUR] A DEO. Sed tamen
 SALTEM SEMEL IN ANNO communicare est necesse [extra] de poenitentiis et remissionibus,
 OMNIS UTRIUSQUE SEXUS etc.²⁷⁵

²⁷⁴ *In quattuor libros sententiarum*, 4 ds.12 qu.3 ar.1a

²⁷⁵ It is a reference to the so called *Liber extra* which I could not consult; the ultimate source is: *Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum Commentariis glossatorum*, ed. Antonio García y García. Documenta Iuris Canonici, series A: Corpus Glossatorum 2 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1981), const. 21, p. 67f.

A Sermon for Corpus Christi²⁷⁶

Charissimi, istam festivitatem tam solemnem instituit et ordinavit Urbanus papa quartus, in honorem et reverentiam salutiferi sacramenti corporis et sanguinis Christi, et concessit largissima dona spiritualia omnibus pie et devote tunc festivitatem celebrantibus. Indulgentiis enim donavit multiplicibus, unde legitur in ejus bulla verbo ipsius sic: Nos enim Christi fideles ad colendum et celebrandum venerabiliter tantum festum, donis volentes spiritualibus ditare, omnibus vere poenitentibus et confessis, qui matutinali officio festi ejusdem in ecclesia, in qua illud celebratur, interfuerint, C[entum]; qui vero missae interfuerint, totidem; qui autem in primis istius festi vespers interfuerint, similiter C[entum]; qui autem in secundis vespers, totidem. Illi quoque, qui primae, tertiae, sextae, nonae ac completorii officiis interfuerint, pro qualibet horarum ipsarum XL^{ta}; eis autem, qui per octavam ipsius festi matutinalibus, vespertinis, missae, ac praedictarum horarum officiis interfuerint C[entum] dies singulis ipsarum octavarum diebus de omnipotentis dei misericordia, et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus autoritate confisi, de injunctis sibi poenitentiis misericorditer relaxamus. Et jam proxime felicis recordationis Martinus papa quintus, habens specialem devotionem ad hoc venerabile sacramentum, praedictas indulgentias geminavit, et duplicavit, ut patet ex ejus bulla efficaci i.e. vera. Et quemvis charissimi haec festivitas locum habuisset ipso die coenae domini, quia tunc hoc sacramentum venerabile per Christum institutum est; tamen quia tunc ecclesia occupata est circa alia, sc. circa poenitentium reconciliationem, et sanctarum unctionum consecrationem et consimilia: ideo pro tunc tantae festivitati exequendae vel celebrandae vacare seu intendere non potuit, unde rationabiliter [o k o s o n] institutum est (m e l t a n e s o k o s o n), ut expletis aliis festivitibus, puta [i.e. scilicet] resurrectionis, ascensionis, spiritus sancti missionis, et beatissimae trinitatis, hoc festum in honorem tanti sacramenti liberius ac cunctis fidelibus immediate feria quinta post festum dictae gloriosissimae trinitatis veneraretur i.e. celebraretur. Nota quod modus institutionis hujus salutiferi sacramenti manifeste patet ex evangeliiis Matth. XXVI°, Lucae XXII°, et Joh. XIII°, ex quorum dictis colligitur, quod appropinquante tempore illo amarissimo, quo Christus voluit subire crucis passionem: pro memoriali perpetuo voluit et decrevit [v e g e z t h e] instituere sacram communionem seu sacramentum salutiferum corporis et sanguinis sui, ut ad demonstrandum nobis suam dulcissimam dilectionem, se ipsum nobis deum et hominem in cibum tribueret. Unde ipse ultimam coenam cum discipulis faciens dixit: **desiderio**

²⁷⁶ SD, vol. 2, 435-447.

desideravi hoc pascha manducare vobiscum antequam patiar Lucae XXII^o.²⁷⁷ Fecit autem Christus in hoc sicut amicus fidelis, qui recessurus a suis amicis, aliquod memoriale ipsis reliquit, per quod semper ipsius memoriam haberent. Unde ipse dominus Jhesus Matth. XXVI^o dixit:²⁷⁸ **hoc facite in meam commemorationem**. Eusebius dicit:²⁷⁹ quia Christus

5 corpus assumptum de virgine ablaturus erat ab oculis nostris, et portaturus ad sidera i.e. ad coelos, necessarium erat quod sacramentum sui corporis et sanguinis nobis consecraret, ut offerretur jugiter per mysterium, qui offerebatur semel contra peccatum, ut haec victima perennis i.e. aeterna, vigeret in memoria et [ut] semper praesens esset in gratia. Et b. Gregorius dicit:²⁸⁰ **cujus munus et donum frequentius aspicimus, in ejus memoriam et amorem**

10 **strictius astringimur**. Et Christus qui se ipsum dedit in pabulum i.e. in escam [cibum] in terris, daturus est se in praemium in coelis.

Nota quod corpus Christi dicitur panis quadruplici de causa. Primo quia infundit et tribuit vitam, unde Dionysius dicit:²⁸¹ **iste panis est summe bonus et est idem cum summo bono** [i.e. cum deo], et prima vita, et ideo aliis vitam tribuit et infundit. Et Aristoteles primo

15 **Coeli et mundi dicit:**²⁸² **a primo quidem ente cunctis derivatum i.e. datum est esse et vivere, his quidem clarius [sc. Angelis] his vero obscurius, [sicut hominibus].** Et Christus dominus Joh. VI^o ait:²⁸³ **panis quem ego dabo vobis caro mea est pro mundi vita**. Secundo quia iste sanctissimus panis continet vitam veram sc. verum deum et hominem unde dominus Jhesus Joh. V^{to} inquit:²⁸⁴ **sicut pater habet vitam in semet ipso**, sic et filius: ergo bene dicitur de

20 **hoc pane Eccli XXVIII^o:**²⁸⁵ **cibavit illum pane vitae et intellectus**. Tertio quia panis iste conservat vitam, unde sicut naturaliter nullus cibus est homini, ita conservativus sicut panis materialis, et vinum materiale sic nihil conservat hominem in vita spirituali sicut panis iste. Unde Hugo, de sacramentis dicit:²⁸⁶ **Satis mirum est de homine quomodo potest infirmari, vel qualiter mori spiritualiter, cujus cibus est panis optimi frumenti; et cujus potus est vinum**

²⁷⁷ Lc 22,15

²⁷⁸ Lc 22,19 or I Cor 11,24

²⁷⁹ Eusebius of Emesa? – cf. De Cons., D. I, C. XXXV: “Item Eusebius Emisenus ... Quia corpus assumptum ablaturus erat ab oculis, et illaturus sideribus, necessarium erat, ut die cenae sacramentum nobis corporis et sanguinis consecraret, ut coleretur iugiter per misterium, quod semel offerebatur in precium, ut quia cottidiana, et indefessa currebat pro hominum salute redemptione, perpetua esset redemptionis oblatio, et perhennis uictima illa uiueret in memoria, et semper praesens esset in gratia.”

²⁸⁰ ?

²⁸¹ ?

²⁸² ?

²⁸³ Io 6,52

²⁸⁴ Io 5,26

²⁸⁵ Eccl 15,3; correctly: *cibabit illum panem vitae et intellectus*.

²⁸⁶ Hugo de Sancto Victore? – I could not identify the reference.

bonae vitis, et ex his utitur quiete [i.e. sine labore]. Unde Eccli XXX^o dicitur:²⁸⁷ initium vitae hominis panis et aqua; aqua i.e. vinum, quod est aqua vitis. Quarto quia panis iste nutrit hominem non solum in tempore [i.e. aliquo] sed semper, unde Joh. VI^o ²⁸⁸ per dominum Jhesum dicitur: **ego sum panis vitae, qui venit ad me non esuriet, et qui credit in me non**
 5 **sitiet in aeternum.** Et b. Augustinus in hodierna omelia dicit:²⁸⁹ hoc cibo et potu homines non esurient neque sitient, immo incorruptibiles et immortales facit, et sociat ipsis sanctis, ubi pax erit plena atque perfecta. Ex his ergo patet quare corpus Christi dicitur panis, et sanguis ejus potus. Sed dicis: quid in hoc venerabili sacramento est credendum? Respondetur, quod firmissime credi debet primo quod ibi est verum corpus Christi de virgine natum, in cruce
 10 passum, mortuum et sepultum. Et in tanta quantitate i.e. magnitudine sicut fuit in cruce. Secundo credi debet quod ibi est verus sanguis Christi, quia corpus [sc. vivum] sine sanguine non existit; et e converso alias esset cruor et non sanguis; unde Eberhardus [graecista].²⁹⁰

Sanguis alit (i.e. nutrit) corpus: cruor est de corpore fusus.

15 Et hoc debet intelligi de corpore vivo, et similiter de sanguine vivo etc. Tertio credi debet, quod ibi est anima, quae vivificat illud corpus. Quarto credi debet quod ibi [est] divinitas humanitati unita. et sic ibi est verus deus et homo. Quod autem haec praedicta sint ibi, declarat b. Ambrosius in quarto De sacramentis ita dicens:²⁹¹ omnia quae fuerunt in utero
 20 virginis, inveniuntur seu continentur in hoc sacramento. Ibi autem fuerunt caro, sanguis, anima et divinitas: igitur etc. Hoc idem dicit Anselmus in libro De conceptu virginali,²⁹² et b. Gregorius in Omelia paschali dicit,²⁹³ quod in hoc sacramento aliud est quod cernitur (i.e. videtur), et aliud quod creditur. Illud enim quod cernitur, est species panis in hostia, et species vini in calice: illud autem quod creditur, est veritas carnis et sanguinis Christi, et sic virtute
 25 verborum divinorum panis mutatur in corpus Christi, et vinum in sanguinem. Sed quaeris quomodo haec mutatio possit esse? Respondetur quod sufficiat tibi credere ita esse; et hanc credulitatem (i.e. fidem) possumus probare vel juvare auctoritate scripturae (I r a s n a k b i z o n s a g h a u a l), similitudine naturae, explanatione [exprolatione] figurae, miraculorum

²⁸⁷ correctly: Eccl 29,28

²⁸⁸ Io 6,35

²⁸⁹ ?

²⁹⁰ ?

²⁹¹ ?

²⁹² ?

²⁹³ ?

ostensione, et verissima ratione. Primo ergo possumus fidem de hac mutatione probare seu juvare scripturis veteris et novi testamenti; unde dicit propheta in Psmo: **memoriam fecit mirabilium suorum, misericors, et miserator dominus; escam dedit timentibus se**, Psmo CX^o.²⁹⁴ Item: **panem angelorum manducavit homo**, Psmo LXXII^o.²⁹⁵ Item Sap. XVII^o.²⁹⁶

- 5 **angelorum esca nutritiisti populum tuum, et panem de coelo praestitisti eis, omne delectamentum in se habentem.** Et quamvis literaliter hoc dicatur de manna, quo dominus pavit populum judaicum in deserto, ut habetur Exod. sedecimo: tamen (secundum) sensum mysticum debet intelligi de corpore Christi. Unde Rupertus (quidam doctor) dicit:²⁹⁷ Ista autoritas (i.e. scriptura) [angelorum esca] convenientius (a l k o l m a s b a n) [i.e. melius]
- 10 intelligitur de corpore Christi, quam de manna, quia manna proprie non dicitur panis angelorum, eo quod angeli in eo nullum nutrimentum et delectamentum habuerunt, et dominus Jhesus Joh. VI^o istum panem angelorum, panem vivum appellavit pro mundi vita. Manna autem non erat vivum, immo cum multum de eo accipiebatur, vermibus scaturiebat (f o r u o t h) et foetebat, qnod utique [i.e. certe] non est de corpore Christi, quod ipse Christus
- 15 nobis contulit, pro memoria passionis suae. Item in hodierno evangelio dominus Jhesus probando hanc mutationem dicit: **caro mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus**;²⁹⁸ et quomodo esset cibus caro sua, et suus sanguis potus, nisi panis mutaretur in corpus Christi et vinum in sanguinem.

- Et ex quo fit mentio de cibo, nota quod scriptura sacra quadruplicem cibum
- 20 commemorat sc. mundi prosperitatem (divitias), doctrinae veritatem, aeternae gloriae delectabilitatem, et animae satietatem. Primus ergo cibus est mundi prosperitas i.e. mundanarum rerum copiositas (i.e. multitudo), unde Eccli XXX^o dicitur:²⁹⁹ **confundet te** sc. diabolus vel mundus **in cibis tuis** i. e. in divitiis. Et vere confundet, si homo divitiis abutitur i.e. male utitur, quia tria bona ab eo aufert, sc. bonum naturae a corpore, bonum gratiae ab
- 25 anima, et bonum gloriae ab utroque. Nota [quod] prosperitas dicitur cibus propter cibi proprietates. Primo cibus superflue sumptus nocet: ita prosperitas rerum. Dicit enim Aristoteles:³⁰⁰ propter divitias multi periere i.e. perierunt, et Boethius, tertio De consolatione:

²⁹⁴ Ps 110,4-5

²⁹⁵ Ps 77,25

²⁹⁶ Correctly: Sap 16,20

²⁹⁷ Rupert of Deutz? – I could not identify the reference.

²⁹⁸ Jo 6, 56

²⁹⁹ Eccl 13,8

³⁰⁰ ?

- DIVITIAE, HABENTIBUS PERSAEPE i.e. saepe NOCUERUNT.³⁰¹ Nonne nocuerunt epuloni, qui sepultus est in inferno, ut habetur Lucae XVI^{mo[to]}? et vere nocuerunt in anima et in corpore. In anima quia quemquam [aliquem] hominem superbum, aliquem invidum, interdum avarum, et quemquam gulosum efficiunt, et hoc occasionaliter (w r w z e r e n t) [w r u z e r e n t h].
- 5 Item nocent in corpore, quia propter divitias multi traduntur morti, et si mors non sequitur, tamen quies amittitur; unde b. Augustinus dicit.³⁰² homo DIVITIAS INVENISTI, REQUIEM PERDIDISTI, CUM VIGILAS (e b r e n u a g) DE HIS COGITAS, CUM DORMIS, LATRONES SOMNIAS; IN DIE SOLLICITUS, IN NOCTE PAVIDUS (f e l) [i.e. timidus]; SEMPER MENDICUS et timidus; nullus tibi probus, potentem latronem aestimas, et pauperem furem putas. O tu miser dives.
- 10 Vera timenda sunt illa verba Salvatoris, quibus divitibus avaris timorem incussit [f e l l m e t t h e t h]; dicens Lucae VI^o,³⁰³ **vae vobis divitibus**. Et certe divitibus avaris accidit sicut lupo famem patienti; dicit enim Plinius³⁰⁴ (talis magister), quod lupo quando esurit, tunc fame artatus i.e. compulsus [k e z e r e t t e t h i k], praedam invadit, et cibis multum se replet, et si videt venatorem advenire, tunc ut possit evadere, propter levificare se,
- 15 evomit cibum sumptum, sic multi qui esuriunt in paupertate, tandem per fas et nefas congregant divitias, eisdem divitiis cupidine [i.e. cupiditate] ducti, se nimium replentes, et si infirmantur et vident eis advenire mortem tamquam venatorem: tunc non misericordia ducti, sed timore coacti, evomunt ipsa temporalia per testamenta secundum illud Job: cibos **quos devoravit, evomet**.³⁰⁵ Sed discedente i.e. recedente venatore i.e. morte vel infirmitate, more canis vel lupi priora repetunt. Unde quolibet istorum dicitur II^a Petri II^o:³⁰⁶ **canis reversus ad vomitum**. Et tales quamquam in infirmitate sunt devoti et ad pauperes apparenter benigni, sed infirmitate cessante efficiuntur crudeles ut ante, et valde eis competit illud quod dicit metrista (i l l i c h o z y a):
- 20

25 Dum lupo languebat (i.e. infirmabatur) monachus esse volebat:
Sed dum convaluit lupo fuit ut ante.

Et divites debereant considerare Christi paupertatem, unde solus dicit Matth. VIII^o:³⁰⁷ **vulpes foveas habent et volucres caeli nidos: filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput suum**

³⁰¹ Boethius, *Philosophiae consolatio*, lib. 2, prosa 5: “diuitiae possidentibus persaepe nocuerunt.”

³⁰² ?

³⁰³ Lc 6,24

³⁰⁴ I could not identify the reference – it is not from the *Historia naturalis*.

³⁰⁵ Job 20,15

³⁰⁶ II Pet 2,22

³⁰⁷ Mt 8,20 (but it is quoted according to Lc 9,58)

reclinat. Et certe dominus Jhesus secundum quod homo pauper fuit in ingressu, in progressu, et in egressu. Aliquando autem iste cibus, sc. mundi prosperitas, non nocet; immo prodest, sicut cibus moderate sumptus, puta his qui habent divitias, sed non amant eas; unde Eccli XIII^o dicitur:³⁰⁸ **utilis est substantia** (h a z n a l a t u s) **cui non est peccatum in conscientia** [i.e. in anima]. Et b. Augustinus dicit:³⁰⁹ Quis [i.e. aliquis] divitias potest habere sine peccato, sed non amare sc. sine peccato. (Et tantum de primo cibo.)

Secundus cibus est doctrinae veritas. Et vocatur cibus spiritualis vel animae, nam sicut cibo corporali corpus vivit, ita doctrina vel verbo dei anima [vivit]. Ideo dixit dominus Jhesus Matth. IIII^o:³¹⁰ **non in solo pane** sc. materiali (t e s t y k e n e r e l) **vivit homo, sed in omni**
 10 **verbo, quod procedit de ore dei.** De hoc cibo dicitnr Joh. VI^o:³¹¹ **operamini non cibum qui perit, sed qui permanet in vitam aeternam, quem filius hominis dabit vobis.** Et nota quod cibus corporalis tripliciter nocet; primo si est insulsus, quia talis est insipidus [i z e t l e n] (I z e t l e n). Secundo si est crudus. Tertio si est grossus. Ita iste cibus spiritualis sc. doctrina primo non prodest, immo magis nocet sine sale discretionis. Unde apostolus ad Coloss. III^{to}
 15 dicit:³¹² **sermo vester sit semper sale conditus.** Sale i.e. discretionem, debet enim homo scrutari de talibus, quae mente penetrare [i.e. capere] potest (f o g h a y t y a), non quae fide sincere [i.e. pure] credenda sunt. Unde de talibus quae fide credenda sunt dicitur Eccli XLIII^o:³¹³ non laborate, supple: quia non comprehendetis (n e m f o g h a t y a t o k). Et b. Gregorius ait:³¹⁴ mira dei opera quae fide credenda sunt, perscrutanda rationibus [i.e. argu-
 20 mentis] non sunt. Hoc ideo dixit, ut nullus curiose i.e. vane de tam venerabili sacramento scrutetur, quia est supra humanum intellectum; propter hoc fuit praeceptum de agno paschali, qui fuit figura hujus sacramenti Exodi II^o:³¹⁵ **quidquid residuum fuerit se. de agno paschali, igne comburetis.** Quidquid enim in tam altissimo sacramento intellectu capere non possumus, debemus mittere igni i.e. spiritui sancto, qui est ignis divinus, et magister ecclesiae. Secundo
 25 cibus corporalis nocet ut dixi, si est crudus, quia ex eo generantur inflatuae (d a g a n a g h) [d a g a n a g o g]: sic doctrina vel scientia sine charitate, inducit superbiae tumorem, unde I^a ad Cor. VIII^o dicitur:³¹⁶ **scientia inflat, charitas autem aedificat.** Et ergo scientia debet coqui

³⁰⁸ Eccl 13,30

³⁰⁹ ?

³¹⁰ Mt 4,4

³¹¹ Io 6,27

³¹² Coloss 4,6

³¹³ ?

³¹⁴ ?

³¹⁵ Correctly: Exod 12,10

³¹⁶ I Cor 8,1

igne charitatis, sed diabolus vult scientiam crudam, quae mentem inflat, unde primi Reg. II^o in persona diaboli dicitur:³¹⁷ **non accipiam a te quid coctum, sed crudum** dabis mihi. Tertio cibus materialis nocet si est grossus et impurus, quia talis sanguinem consumit, et infirmitatem inducit: ita doctrina erronea humorem gratiae consumit, et infirmitatem animae adducit.

Tertius cibus est aeternae gloriae. De hoc cibo dictum fuit b. Augustino a domino, ut solus testatur in libro Confessionum: CIBUS SUM GRANDIUM i. e. magnorum, CRESCE ET MANDUCABIS ME, NEC TU MUTABIS ME IN TE SICUT CIBUM CARNIS TUAE, SED TU MUTABERIS IN ME.³¹⁸ Sicut enim cibus corporalis satiat hominem in hoc mundo, ita aeterna gloria satiat sanctos in coelo. Hanc satietatem David appetens dicebat: **satiabor cum apparuerit gloria tua** Psmo XVI^o.³¹⁹ Charissimi, istum gloriosum cibum debemus petere per orationem, quaerere per operationem sc. bonam, et gustare per devotionem. De primis duobus dicitur Isayae LV^o.³²⁰ **quaerite dominum, dum inveniri potest: invoke eum dum prope est.** De tertio dicit Psta: **gustate et videte, quoniam suavis est dominus,** Psmo XXXIII^o.³²¹ Et nota quod sicut cibus delicatum tria genera hominum abhorrent sc. mulieres gravidae (t e r h e s e k h), infirmi quos mali humores infecerunt, et qui cibus nimis se repleverunt: ita cibus aeternae voluptatis i.e. aeternae gloriae parvipendunt i.e. spernunt delicioſi, superbi, et avari, de quibus dicit Psmsta: **omnem escam abhominata est anima eorum: et appropinquaverunt usque ad portas mortis,** Psmo CVI^o.³²²

Quartus cibus est sacramentalis, qui animam nutrit et satiat. De hoc cibo dicitur in praesenti evangelio: **caro mea vere est cibus.** Sicut enim cibus materialis (vel corporalis) restaurat [i.e. renovat] deperdita: sic iste cibus beatissimus, gratiam dei per peccata deperditam recuperat. Item quemadmodum cibus corporalis corpus in vigore (e l m e b e n) conservat, sanguinem augmentat, ingenium acuit, vires ad operandum tribuit, sanitatem custodit, et somnum inducit: ita iste cibus sacramentalis. Unde tertii Reg. XVIII^o ³²³ dicitur, quod cum Elias surrexit, comedit, et bibit, et ambulavit in fortitudine cibi illius quadraginta diebus et noctibus usque ad montem (Oreb.) Spiritualiter surgit homo per bonam operationem, comedit per eucharistiae somptionem, et ambulat per bonarum operationum continuationem

³¹⁷ I Sam, 2,15

³¹⁸ Augustinus Hipponensis, *Confessionum libri tredecim*, VII, X.

³¹⁹ Ps 16,15

³²⁰ Is 55,6

³²¹ Ps 33,9

³²² Ps 105,18

³²³ ?

usque ad montem) dei Oreb, i. e. usque ad regnum caelorum. Sed charissimi, sicut cibus materialis uni est proficiuus et alteri nocivus: sic iste, cibus eucharistiae, digne sumentibus proficit, indigne autem sumentibus mors est. Unde b. Gregorius in prosa (i. e. in sequentia) hodierna dicit:³²⁴ MORS EST MALIS; VITA BONIS. Est enim sicut amigdalum, quo homines
 5 vivunt, et vulpes moriuntur; et sicut flos apibus est mel, araneis autem venenum, unde apostolus in hodierna epistola dicit: **qui manducat et bibit indigne, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit**, prima ad Cor. XI^o.³²⁵ Judas enim sumsit indigne et mox introivit [in eum] Satanas, Joh. XIII^o,³²⁶ et dampnatus est. Et ergo qui vult sumere hoc venerabile sacramentum, primo debet esse mundus a peccatis, et hoc potest fieri per contritionem, confessionem, et satis-
 10 factionem. Secundo debet esse devotus per mentis elevationem. Alium enim cibum sumit homo per appetitionem [i.e. per desiderium] istum autem [debet] sumere per devotionem. Tertio debet esse purus etiam corporaliter, quia corporalis pollutio procurat mentis vagationem (e l o z l a s t h), propter haec bene dixit apostolus I^a ad Cor. XI^o.³²⁷ **probet autem se ipsum homo: et sic de pane illo edat, et de calice bibat.**

15 Quaeritur utrum omnes christiani obligantur ad istius sacramenti manducationem? Respondetur primo quod aliqui obligantur solum ad credendum et amandum, sicut illi qui [sunt] in servitute paganorum (i n s e g b e n), et hoc sufficit eis ad salutem; secundum enim b. Jeronymum:³²⁸ ad impossibile nemo obligatur. Secundo aliqui non solum ad credendum et amandum, sed etiam ad venerandum obligantur. Quilibet enim christianus non impeditus
 20 tenetur ad minus in diebus dominicis, et praecipuis i.e. colendis festivitibus, secundum praeceptum ecclesiae missam audire; dicitur enim de Constitutione dist. prima:³²⁹ MISSAS DIE DOMINICA SAECULARIBUS (p a r a z t o k) [i.e. laicis] TOTAS AUDIRE SPECIALI ORDINE PRAECIPIMUS, ITA UT ANTE BENEDICTIONEM SACERDOTIS EGREDI POPULUS NON PRAESUMAT. Consimiliter est intelligendum de aliis festivitibus solemnibus etc. Attende quantum valet
 25 etiam temporaliter auditio missae: legitur, quod [erant] tres juvenes (latrones) satis malitiosi, transeuntes per quamdam viam ad latrocinia exercendum. Tunc de coelo facta est vox dicens: percutite primum, ne amplius ambulet in terra, et mox fulminatus est (m e g h i t e m e n); et iterum dixit: percutite secundum, et illico secundus fulmine percussus expiravit. Tunc tertio vox insonuit dicens: percutite et tertium. Statim clamor daemonis auditus est sic: non possum,

³²⁴ Correctly: St. Thomas, *Lauda Sion* – S. Thomas Aquinatis, “De Officium Festo Corporis,” 581f.

³²⁵ I Cor 11,29

³²⁶ Io 13,27

³²⁷ I Cor 11,28

³²⁸ I could not identify the reference, though It also exists as a simple proverb in many European languages.

quia dum sacra communio fiebat i.e. missa celebrabatur, interfuit. Vide ergo quantum valet missae auditio contra daemonis potestatem. Tertio dico quod aliqui non solum obligantur ad credendum, amandum et venerandum (i.e. audiendum) hoc divinissimum sacramentum, sed etiam ad sumendum. Sed an quotidie? Dico, quod prius christiani quotidie solebant
 5 communicare, quia erant devotiores (quam nunc). Tandem non qualibet die, sed solum diebus dominicis, et postea tepescente charitate, solum ter in anno, sc. in festo nativitat, resurrectionis, et pentecostes, et secundum alios in festo assumptionis virginis gloriosae. Sed quia (jam) charitas refriguit, et iniquitas praevaluit tenentur homines sub praecepto cessante legitimo impedimento tempore paschae communicare, ut patet extra De poenitentiis et
 10 remissionibus capitulo.³³⁰ Omnis utriusque sexus etc. B. Augustinus dicit.³³¹ QUOTIDIE COMMUNIONEM EUCHARISTIAE RECIPERE [accipere] NEC LAUDO, NEC VITUPERO, OMNIBUS TANTUM DIEBUS DOMINICIS COMMUNICANDUM HORTOR. Ita faciebat s. Alexius, sicut habetur in ejus legenda. Quarto aliqui non solum tenentur ad credendum, amandum, venerandum et sumendum, sed etiam ad conficiendum i.e. ad consecrandum (a l d a n i), sicut sacerdotes, unde
 15 in prosa missae hodiernae dicitur: sacrificium istud instituit solis presbyteris, quibus sic congruit ut sumant et dent ceteris. Ille venerabilis Beda de celebratione missae dicit.³³² Sacerdos sine mortali peccato existens, si non celebrat, habens copiam celebrandi, privat quantum in eo est, totam trinitatem gloria, angelos in coelesti patria magna laetitia, privat homines in terra laborantes beneficio et gratia, animas in purgatorio existentes patrocinio i. e. auxilio, et venia.
 20 Hoc enim sacramentum offertur pro his tribus, sc. pro beatis in patria, in laetitia, pro animabus in purgatorio existentibus, in liberationis munditiam, et pro hominibus viantibus in veniam. Ideo hostia in missa in tres partes dividitur.

Secundo dixi quod veritatem hujus sacramenti vel fidem de hoc sacramento quo ad mutationem probat vel juvat similitudo naturae: nam videmus quod actione naturae grana
 25 convertuntur in gramina (f i w e) [i.e. in herbas], nucleus parvus in magnam arborem, poligrana in pisces, ligna in lapides, cinis in vitrum, et terra in aurem et cetera. Si enim natura creata potest unam speciem mutare in aliam, a fortiori, creator omnium rerum potest substantiam panis mutare in corpus suum et vinum in sanguinem. Hoc patet per illam regulam topicam: si illud quod videtur minus in esse, inest ergo et majus. Item in Ibernica lacus est, cui

³²⁹ De Const., D. I, C. LXIV, in *Decretum*, 1312.

³³⁰ It is again (as above in the Maundy Thursday sermon) a reference to the so called *Liber extra* which I could not consult; the ultimate source is: *Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis*, 67f.

³³¹ cf. Gennadius Massiliensis, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus liber*, Patrologia Latina 58, col. 994.

³³² ?

si palum (k a r o t h) homo in fixerit, pars in aqua existens vertetur in ferrum, et pars quae aquae eminet (v i z f e l w l), mutatur in lapidem. Item fons est in Scitia [Scithya], cui si quid inmergitur, et aliquantulum ibi tenetur, in lapidem commutatur [inmutatur], quod Fridericus imperator probare volens, misit chirothecam suam sigillatam per nuncium illuc, qui unam
5 partem inmergens, in durum lapidem versa fuit, alia parte illaesa permanente. Item philosophus in Metaphysica dicit:³³³ quod est quidam lacus, in quem panis projectus statim in lapidem mutatur. Item natura panem comestum in carnem, et vinum sumptum in sanguinem convertit. Tertio dixi, quod veritatem hujus sacramenti probat, vel fidem nostram juvat de hoc sacramento explanatio figurae. Primo igitur figura fuit in oblatione [oblatio] Melchisedek, qui
10 fuit rex Salem (i.e. Jerusalem) et sacerdos, [offerens] panem et vinum Genes. XIII^o, per hoc significans hoc divinissimum sacramentum novae legis, sub specie panis et vini institutum. Secunda figura fuit immolatio agni paschalis. Immolabatur enim ille agnus pro salute populi judaici, et certe ille agnus significabat hoc sacramentum quod quotidie offertur pro salute hominum. Tertia figura fuit manna datum populo israhelico in deserto, per quod ipse populus
15 satiabatur: ita isto venerabili sacramento anima satiatur. Et sicut manna bonis erat dulce, malis vero amarum [amara], et in nauseam i.e. vomitum vertebatur: sic istud divinissimum sacramentum bonis est ad meritum, malis vero ad supplicium. Unde b. GREGORIUS dicit: SUMUNT BONI, SUMUNT MALI, SORTE TAMEN INAEQUALI, VITA BONIS, MORS EST MALIS.³³⁴ Quarta
figura fuit ipse panis propositionis, de quo habetur primi Reg. XXI^o.³³⁵ Sicut enim ille panis
20 non dabatur nisi continentibus i.e. mundis, et non ab alio ministrabatur nisi a sacerdote: sic istud venerabile sacramentum, solum a sacerdote ministratur, et continentibus a peccato datur.

Quarto³³⁶ dixi quod fidem de isto sacramento possumus juvare miraculorum ostensione.³³⁷ Primum miraculum accidit b. Gregorii propter cujusdam faeminae haesitationem [i.e. dubitationem], cui b. Gregorius dabat communionem (i.e. hostiam). Unde
25 legitur quod matrona quaedam ipsi b. Gregorio singulis diebus dominicis panes offerebat [i.e. dabat vel portabat], qui cum post missarum solemnia corpus domini sibi (sc. mulieri) offerret et diceret: corpus domini nostri Jhesu Christi custodiat te in vitam aeternam: at illa subrisit (m u s u l u l a). Ille continuo dextram ab ejus ore retrahens, partem illam dominici corporis super altare deposuit, postmodum coram populo matronam interrogavit: quam ob causam

³³³ ?

³³⁴ Aquinas, *Lauda Sion* as above.

³³⁵ I Sam 21,6

³³⁶ Correctly: "Tertio."

³³⁷ For these miracles see above 2.3.

ridere praesumpserit? At illa: Quia panem materiale[m] quem propriis manibus feceram, tu corpus dominicum appellabas. Tunc b. Gregorius se in oratione prostravit, et surgens, particulam illam panis ad instar digiti carnem factam reperit, et sic matronam ad fidem reduxit. Oravit iterum, et carnem illam in panem conversam vidit, et matronae sumendam
 5 tradidit. Secundum miraculum est de quadam muliere, quae de consilio cujusdam pythonissae (n e z e) [n e z e w] hostiam in quodam alveolo apum, ut apes remanerent, reposuit. Tandem veniens ad alveolum reperit ibi beatam virginem suum filium in brachiis bajulantem, (et tunc mulier hoc videns, ivit festinanter ad sacerdotem. Et hic cum veniret cum processione, recipiens corpus dominicum cum reverentia portabat.) Tertium miraculum est de quodam
 10 Judaeo, qui deridens christianos dicebat: quod christiani panem, pro deo colerent, qui cum christianis quinta feria magna ivit ad ecclesiam, ubi christiani communicabant, et vidit cuilibet christiano unum puerum [pulchrum] dari per sacerdotem, et sic conversus, vitam in bono finivit. Quartum miraculum in regno nostro accidit cuidam sacerdoti, qui facta consecratione haesitabat, an ibi esset verum corpus Christi. Statim hostia ad visum pro medietate in carnem
 15 versa fuit, quae nunc est Jaurini (g e r e t h). Similiter accidit cuidam sacerdoti de sanguine.

Quarto possumus probare hanc mutationem verissima ratione. Sic nam fuit mutatio accidentis sine substantia vel subjecto, sicut aquis amaris per Eliseum in dulcedine conversis, remanente nihilominus substantia aquae, ut habetur quarti Reg. II^o.³³⁸ Item fuit mutatio substantiae in aliam substantiam unacum accidentibus, sicut fuit de aqua conversa in vinum
 20 Joh. II^o,³³⁹ et quia dei perfecta sunt opera, Deutro. XXXII^o.³⁴⁰ ergo et ista, mutatio debuit fieri, sc. substantiae sine accidentibus, quam nos firmissime credimus in peccaminum remissionem, gratiae donationem, et gloriae expectationem [i.e. collationem], quae nobis per merita virginis Mariae donare dignetur dominus Jhesus, in secula seculorum benedictus Amen.

³³⁸ II Reg 2,21

³³⁹ Io 2,1f

³⁴⁰ Deut 32,4

Selected Bibliography

Sources

- Aurelius Augustinus. *Sermones*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne. Patrologia Latina 38. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1861.
- Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum Commentariis glossatorum*. Ed. Antonio García y García. Documenta Iuris Canonici, series A: Corpus Glossatorum 2. Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1981.
- Gottschalcus Hollen. *Sermonum opus exquisitissimum ... super epistolas dominicarum per anni circulum*. Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1520. (ÖNB 20. CC. 113)
- Henricus Herphius. *Sermones fratris Henrici Herp ... de tempore et sanctis*. . Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1509. (ÖNB 18. G. 22)
- Jacobus de Voragine. *Legenda aurea*, ed. Giovanni Paolo Maggioni. Firenze: Sismel, 1998.
- Jacobus de Voragine. *Sermones aurei et pulcherrimi etc.* Paris: Regnault, 1533. (MTA Ant. 12)
- Jean Gobi. *La Scala Coeli*, ed. Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu. Paris: Édition du CNRS, 1991.
- Joannes a Capistrano. *XLIV sermones Vratislaviae habiti a. D. MCCCCCLIII*, ed. Eugen Jacob. Johannes von Capistrano, part 2: Die auf der Königlichen und Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Breslau befindlichen handschriftlichen Aufzeichnungen von Reden und Traktaten Capistrans 3. Wroclaw: Trewendt & Granier's Verlag, 1911.
- Joannes Herolt. *Sermones Discipuli de tempore et de sanctis cum exemplorum promptuario*. Venice: Sessae, 1584. (ÖNB 18.R.14)
- Missale Paulinorum*. Venice, 1514. (OSZK RMK III. 196)
- Missale Quinqueecclesiense*. Venice, 1499 (OSZK Inc. 989.)
- Missale secundum morem et consuetudinem fratrum praedicatorum Ordinis S. Dominici*. Venice, 1497. (OSZK Inc. 1198.)
- Oliverius Maillardus. *Sermones de adventu, quadragesimales, dominicales et de peccati stipendio et gratie premio etc.* Strasbourg: Knobloch, 1506 (ÖNB 19. F. 43)
- Osvaldus de Laskó. *Sermones Dominicales perutiles*. Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1516. (MTA RM III 81a)
- [Paratus]. *Sermones parati de tempore et de sanctis*. Hagenau: Henricus Gran, 1513. (ÖNB 32. F. 36)

- Pelbartus de Temesvár. *Pomerium sermonum de Sanctis*. Rouen, 1521. (MTA RM III 104)
- Peregrinus de Opole. *Sermones de tempore et de sanctis*, ed. Richard Tatarzynski. Studia "Przeglądu Tomistycznego" 1. Warsaw: Institutum Thomisticum, 1997.
- Robertus Caraccioli (Roberto da Lecce). *Sermones*. Lyon: Johann Clyn, 1502. (ÖNB 19.H.41)
- Rusconi, Roberto, ed. *Predicazione e vita religiosa nella società italiana da Carlo Magno alla controriforma*. Torino: Loescher Editore, 1981.
- Sermones dominicales*, ed. Áron Szilády. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1910.
- Thomas Aquinatis. *Summa Theologiae*. 5 vols. Madrid: La Editorial Catolica, 1958.
- _____. "De Officium Festo Corporis." In *Opera omnia*, ed. Roberto Busa, vol. 6. Stuttgart: Friedrich Fromman, 1980.
- Vincent Ferrer. *Sancti Vincenti Ferreri Opera seu sermones de tempore et sanctis cum tractatu de vita spirituali*. 2 vols. Augsburg: Joannis Strötter, 1729. (ÖNB 21.P.13)

Secondary literature

- Aichinger, Robert. Die Eucharistiepredigten Johannes Taulers: Kontext und Deutung. M.A. diss. Katholisch-theologische Fakultät der Universität Wien, 1993.
- Amos, Thomas L., Eugene A. Greene, and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, eds. *De ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1989.
- Aston, Margaret. "Corpus Christi and Corpus Regni: Heresy and the Peasant's Revolt," *Past and Present* 143 (1994): 3-47.
- Bárcezi, Ildikó. Ars compilandi – a szövegformálás középkori technikája: Forráshasználat, hivatkozási gyakorlat és tematikus szerkezet a későközépkori prédikációirodalomban Laskai Osvát életműve alapján (Ars compilandi – the medieval technique of word processing: Application of sources, practice of references, and thematic structure in late medieval preaching literature on the basis of the works of Osvaldus de Laskó). Ph. D. diss. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1993.
- Bataillon, Louis-Jacques. *La prédication au XIII^e siècle en France et Italie*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1993.
- _____. "Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons." *Leeds Studies in English* n. s., 11 (1980): 19-35 (= *La prédication au XIII^e siècle en France et Italie*, ch. 1. Aldershot: Variorum, 1993).
- _____. "Les instruments de travail des prédicateurs au XIII^e siècle." In *Culture et travail des prédicateurs dans l'Occident médiéval*, 197-209. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1981 (= *La prédication au XIII^e siècle en France et Italie*, ch. 4. Aldershot: Variorum, 1993).
- _____. "De la lectio à la predicatio: Commentaires bibliques et sermons au XIII^e siècle." *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 70 (1986): 559-574. (= *La prédication au XIII^e siècle en France et Italie*, ch. 5. Aldershot: Variorum, 1993).

- _____. "Similitudines et exempla dans le sermons du XIII^e siècle." In *The Bible and the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, eds. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood, 191-205. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985 (= *La prédication au XIII^e siècle en France et Italie*, ch. 10. Aldershot: Variorum, 1993).
- Bell, Rudolph M. *Holy Anorexia*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Bériou, Nicole. *L'avènement des maîtres de la Parole: La prédication à Paris au XIII^e siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1998.
- _____. *La prédication de Ranulphe de la Houblonnière: Sermons aux clercs et aux simples gens à Paris au XIII^e siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1987.
- Bériou, Nicole, and David L. D'Avray, eds. *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons: Essays on Marriage, Death, History and Sanctity*. Florence: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1994.
- Boesch Gajano, Sofia. *La santità*. Rome and Bari: Laterza, 1999.
- Bossy, John. "The Mass as a Social Institution 1200-1700." *Past and Present* 100 (1983): 29-61.
- Brémond, Claude, Jacques Le Goff, and Jean-Claude Schmitt. *L'exemplum*. Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 40. Turnhout: Brepols, 1996.
- Browe, Peter. *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter*. Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1933.
- _____. *Die Eucharistischen Wunder des Mittelalters*. Breslau: Müller & Seifert, 1938.
- _____. *Die häufige Kommunion im Mittelalter*. Münster: Regensbergische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938.
- _____. *Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter*. Münster: Regensbergische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940.
- _____. "Die Entstehung der Sakramentsandachten." *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 7 (1927): 83-103.
- _____. "Die Abendmahlsprobe im Mittelalter." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 48 (1928): 107-143.
- _____. "Die Kommunion in der Pfarrkirche." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 53 (1929): 477-516.
- _____. "Die Elevation in der Messe." *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1929): 20-66.
- _____. "Die scholastische Theorie der eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 110 (1929): 305-332.
- _____. "Die Eucharistie als Zaubermittel im Mittelalter." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 20 (1930): 134-154.
- _____. "Die Nüchternheit vor der Messe und Kommunion im Mittelalter." *Ephemerides liturgicae* 45 (1931): 383-391.
- _____. "Zum Kommunionempfang des Mittelalters." *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 12 (1932): 161-177.

- _____. "Die Kommunionvorbereitung im Mittelalter." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 56 (1932): 375-415.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Holy Feast, Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.
- _____. "Women Mystics and Eucharistic Devotion in the Thirteenth Century." In *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*, 119-150. New York: Zone, 1991.
- Camporesi, Piero. "The Consecrated Host: A Wondrous Excess." In *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, ed. Michael Feher, vol. 1, 220-237. New York: Zone Books, 1989.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Bollingen Series 36. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Dal pulpito alla navata: La predicazione nella sua recezione da parte degli ascoltatori (secc. XIII-XV)*. Medioevo e Rinascimento 3. Firenze: Olschki, 1989.
- Dalla penitenza all'ascolto delle confessioni: il ruolo dei frati mendicanti*. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1996.
- D'Avray, David. L. *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Douglas, Mary. "The Eucharist: Its Continuity with the Bread Sacrifice of Leviticus." *Modern Theology* 15 (1999): 209-224.
- Jean Dunbabin. *A Hound of God: Pierre de la Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Erdő, Péter. *Az egyházi jog forrásai: történeti bevezetés* (The Sources of ecclesiastical law: Historical introduction). Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1998.
- Faire Croire: Modalités de la diffusion et de la réception des messages religieux du XII^e au XV^e siècle*. Collection de l'École française de Rome 51. Rome: École française de Rome, 1981.
- Gurevich, Aron. *Medieval Popular Culture: Problems of Belief and Perception*. Trans. János M. Bak and Paul A. Hollingsworth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Hamesse, Jacqueline, Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Debra L. Stoudt, and Anne T. Thayer, ed. *Medieval Sermons and Society: Cloister, City, University*. Louvain: Fédération Internationale des Instituts D'Études Médiévales, 1998.
- _____, and Xavier Hermand, eds. *De l'homélie au sermon: Histoire de la prédication médiévale*. Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1993.
- Hanska, Jussi. "And the Rich Man Also Died; and He Was Buried in Hell:" *The Social Ethos in Mendicant Sermons*. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1997.
- Henisch, Bridget Ann. *Fast and Feast: Food in Medieval Society*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976.
- Hughes, Andrew. *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to their Organization and Terminology*. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

- Hundersmarck, Lawrence F. "Preaching the Passion: Late Medieval 'Lives of Christ' as Sermon Vehicles." In *De ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, eds. Thomas L. Amos, Eugene A. Greene, and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 147-168. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1989.
- Jacquart, Danielle and Claude Thomasset. *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*. Trans. Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.
- Kaminsky, Howard. *A History of the Hussite Revolution*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.
- Katona, Lajos. "Temesvári Pelbárt 'Stellarium'-a és a 'Scala coeli' " (The 'Stellarium' of Pelbartus de Temesvar and the 'Scala coeli'). *Irodalomtudományi közlemények* (1900): 158-164.
- Kerényi, Karl. *Der göttliche Arzt: Studien Über Asklepios und seine Kultstätten*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1948.
- Klaniczay, Tibor. "Megoldott és megoldatlan kérdések az első magyar egyetem körül" (Solved and unsolved problems concerning the first Hungarian university). In *Hagyományok ébresztése*, 136-165. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1976.
- Lambert, Malcolm. *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992[1977].
- Le Goff, Jacques. *La civilisation de l'Occident médiéval*. Paris: Arthaud, 1984.
- Longère, Jean. *La prédication médiévale*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1983.
- Luszczki, Lucianus. *De sermonibus S. Ioannis a Capistrano: Studium historico criticum*. Studia Antoniana 16. Rome: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1961.
- Macy, Gary. *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians c.1080-c.1220*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Dogma of Transubstantiation in the Middle Ages." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 11-41.
- Madas Edit. "Az Érdy-kódex perikóparendszer és Guillelmus Parisiensis posztilláskönyve" (The pericope system of the Érdy Codex and the book of *postillae* of Guillelmus Parisiensis). *Magyar Könyvszemle* 100 (1984): 99-105.
- _____. A középkori magyarországi prédikáció-irodalom forrásai (XII-XIV. század) (The sources of medieval preaching literature in Hungary from the twelfth until the fourteenth century). Ph. D. diss. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1992.
- _____. "A Legenda aurea a középkori Magyarországon" (The Legenda aurea in medieval Hungary). *Magyar Könyvszemle* 108 (1992): 93-99.
- _____. "A Dominican Sermon Collection." *Budapest Review of Books* 6 (1996): 415-419.
- Makdisi, George, Dominique Sourdél, and Janine Sourdél-Thomine, eds. *Prédication et propagande au Moyen Âge : Islam, Byzance, Occident*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1983.
- Martin, Hervé. *Le métier de prédicateur en France septentrionale à la fin du Moyen Âge (1350-1520)*. Paris: Cerf, 1988.

- _____. "Les procédés didactiques en usage dans la prédication en France du Nord au XV^e siècle." In *La religion populaire*, 65-75. Colloques internationaux du C.N.R.S. 576. Paris: Éditions du C.N.R.S., 1979.
- Megivern, James J. *Concomitance and Communion: A Study in Eucharistic Theory and Practice*. Studia Friburgensia, new ser. 33. Fribourg and New York: The University of Fribourg Press and Herder Book Center, 1963.
- Menache, Sophia. *The Vox Dei: Communication in the Middle Ages*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Mészöly, Gedeon. "Jegyzetek a 'Sermones Dominicales' szótárához" (Notes on the glossary of the 'Sermones Dominicales'). *Magyar Nyelv* 6 (1910): 401-406.
- Michaud-Quentin, Pierre. "Les méthodes de la pastorale du XIII^e au XV^e siècle." In *Methoden in Wissenschaft und Kunst des Mittelalters*, ed. Albert Zimmermann, 76-91. Miscellanea Mediaevalia 7. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.
- Montanari, Massimo. *Éhség és bőség: A táplálkozás európai kultúrtörténete* (Hunger and abundance: A cultural history of eating in Europe), trans. Katalin Kövendy. Budapest: Atlantisz, 1996.
- Morée, Peter C. A. *Preaching in Fourteenth-Century Bohemia: The Life and ideas of Milicius de Chremsir (+1374) and His Significance in the Historiography of Bohemia*. Slavkov: Eman, 1999.
- Moser, Dietz-Rüdiger. "Fastnacht und Fronleichnam als Gegenfeste: Festgestaltung und Festbrauch im liturgischen Kontext." In *Feste und Feiern im Mittelalter*, eds. Detlef Altenburg, Jörg Jarnut and Hans-Hugo Steinhoff, 359-376. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1991.
- Park, Katharine. "Medicine and Society in Medieval Europe, 500-1500." In *Medicine and Society: Historical Essays*, ed. Andrew Wear, 59-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Parkes, Malcolm Beckwith. "The Influence of the Conceptes of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book." In *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, eds. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson, 115-141. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300). The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of the Doctrine*, vol. 3. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Pellegrini, Letizia. *I manoscritti dei predicatori: I domenicani dell'Italia mediana e i codici della loro predicazione (secc. XIII-XV)*. Dissertationes historicae 26. Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1999.
- _____. "Indici per predicare: Le tavole nei manoscritti di sermoni fra XIII e XV secolo." In *Fabula in tabula: Una storia degli indici dal manoscritto al testo elettronico*, ed. Claudio Leonardi, Marcello Morelli, and Francesco Santi, 135-143. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1995.
- Siegfried Ringler, " 'Die Bienenkirche' ('Die Hostie im Bienenstock')," in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, vol 1 (1977), 859-862.

- Roberto Rusconi. "De la prédication à la confession: transmission et contrôle de modèles de comportement au XIII^e siècle." In *Faire Croire: Modalités de la diffusion et de la réception des messages religieux du XII^e au XV^e siècle*, 67-85. Collection de l'École française de Rome 51. Rome: École française de Rome, 1981.
- Rouse, Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse. "Statim invenire: Schools Preachers and New Attitudes to the Page." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, eds. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable and Carol D. Lanham, 201-225. Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 1982.
- Rubin, Miri. *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- _____. "Whose Eucharist? Eucharistic Identity as Historical Subject." *Modern Theology* 15 (1999): 197-208.
- Sallay, Dóra. *The Eucharistic Man of Sorrows: Evolution, Function, and Interpretation*. M.A. Thesis. Budapest: The Central European University, 1999.
- Schipperges, Heinrich. *Die Kranken im Mittelalter*. München: C. H. Beck, 1993.
- _____. *Der Garten der Gesundheit: Medizin im Mittelalter*. Zürich: Artemis, 1985.
- Schlette, Heinz Robert. *Die Lehre von der geistlichen Kommunion bei Bonaventura, Albert dem Großen und Thomas von Aquin*. Münchener Theologische Studien, Systematische Abteilung 17. München: Max Hueber, 1959.
- Schneyer, Johannes Baptist. *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150-1350*. 11 Vols. Münster: Aschendorff, 1969-1995.
- Tarnai, Andor. "A magyar nyelvet írni kezdik": *Irodalmi gondolkodás a középkori magyarországon* ('Hungarian begins to be written': Theories of literature in medieval Hungary). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984.
- _____. "A budapest-németújvári 'Sermones dominicales' " (The 'Sermones Dominicales' of Budapest and Németújvár). *Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* 87 (1983): 23-31.
- Taylor, Larissa. *Soldiers of Christ: Preaching in Late Medieval and Reformation France*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Tubach, Frederic C. *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales*. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science, 1981.
- Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969.
- Tüskés, Gábor and Éva Knapp. "A szent vér tisztelete Magyarországon" (The veneration of the holy blood in Hungary). In *Művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok a magyar középkorról*, ed. Erik Fügedi, 76-116. Budapest: Gondolat, 1986.
- Westfeling, Uwe, ed. *Die Messe Gregors des Grossen: Vision, Kunst Realität*. Exhibition catalogue. Cologne: Schnütgen Museum, 1982.
- Zafarana, Zelina. "La predicazione ai laici dal secolo XIII al XV." *Studi medievali* 24 (1983): 265-275.

Ziegler, Joseph. "Medical Similes in Religious Discourse: The Case of Giovanni di San Gimignano OP (ca. 1260 - ca. 1333)." *Science in Context* 8 (1995): 103-131.

Zolnai, Gyula. "A Budapesti és Németújvári Glosszák" (The glosses of Budapest and Németújvár). *Magyar Nyelvőr* 39 (1910): 460-474.