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ABSTRACT

THE CHARACTERIZATION OF THE DEVIL IN THE FRENCH MIRACLE PLAYS

BY DOLORES HOLDER WILLIAMS

Far from being a mythological character, an allegorical figure, or a comical invention of poetic whimsy, the Devil who enters from stage left during the production of the French miracle play carries to his audience of the fourteenth century the importance of centuries of tradition regarding his origin, habitat, substance, and activities as well as that of a graphic representation of a living reality, a contemporary personality. His presence is a natural element in the medieval world view and ideas on the history and destiny of man. Across the panorama of medieval society the miracles focus on a demonology pertinent to men's daily lives by precept and example. These plays, like their magnificent counterparts in stone and glass such as the cathedrals of Reims, Chartes, and Paris, attempt to inculcate the teachings of the Church by animating familiar scenes and legends.

The characterization of the Devil in the French miracle is rooted in ancient concepts nurtured in Judeo-Christian teachings which describe him as a former celestial angel of superior beauty and intellect whose pride caused him to desire equality with his Creator. His unsuccessful revolt against God resulted in expulsion from the heavenly courts of Yaweh along with a third of the angelic hosts who had aligned themselves with the rebel, Lucifer, or the Devil as he is commonly known, continues to hate his Creator and, driven by his malevolent passion, wreaks vicarious vengeance upon men as being the creation most beloved of God. The Devil's initial triumph took place in the Garden of Eden when Lucifer seduced the
first perfect pair of human beings into distrust and disobedience of God and thereby caused the Fall of Man which deprived him of fellowship with God. From these and other primordial events the Devil emerges a sinister figure in the roles of Seducer, Accuser, and ultimately Destroyer. These three roles are portrayed in the miracles by either Lucifer or his agents. The eventual fate of the evil forces is an eternity of torment in a lake of fire called enfer, and there he will be joined by human beings who persist in following the dictates of the Devil.

In the terrestrial play called Life as reflected in the miracles the mortal players regard the author of their troubles and moral failures as a subtle enemy who remains invisible most of the time and employs mental suggestion or sends one's family and friends to accomplish his temptations to do wrong. The miracles demonstrate as probably no other kind of medieval drama does that although a formidable participant in daily existence, the Devil with his wiles and aggressions cannot overwhelm the believer provided he uses the weapons which the Church offers to him.

The superhuman foe gave to medieval man a sense of eternal destiny as an active participant in the struggle to establish the Kingdom of God on earth against the perpetual opposition of the Devil.

In the examination of some forty-three miracles which span over a century and a half of dramatic endeavor by laymen, it seems apparent that in this genre of serious and edifying intent the Devil enters into the action as a singularly important personnage. There is a danger of applying modern ideas of psychology in an attempt to explain away the existence of such a creature as a personification of an evil force or deep human weakness by a superstitious and ignorant populace. However, if one takes his cue from the other personnages who crowd the boards and must deal with him, one is forced to recognize that the realist of
the Middle Ages took stock of the Devil as a powerful, though not omnipotent, contemporary who commanded a vast, sadistic, and ruse hordes of evil spirits who could play havoc with the elements and worse, trick or terrify the unwary into mortal sin. Secular history, fabliaux, chronicles, romans, as well as the popular hagiology all converge in the repertoire of the miracle to profess the reality of the spirit world and the place of man, a spirit imprisoned in flesh, vis-à-vis the subtler spirits. The characterization of the Devil in the miracle served to aid the medieval believer in his daily conflict with this very present enemy.
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CHAPTER I
THE DEVIL AS A PERSONNAGE IN THE MIRACLE PLAY

Introduction

The layman and the priest of the Middle Ages knew precisely whom to blame for the evil in the world. They were in agreement that the Devil had a monopoly on all the negative aspects of human existence from toothaches to murder. For centuries the character of such an important personage as the Devil was an absorbing study for the clergymen and the daily preoccupation of the man in the street. In France, this interest is reflected clearly in the miracle plays of the fourteenth century when one believed that the power of the Virgin Mary was the ultimate defense against the power of this force of evil. No portrait of the Devil would be complete, however, without the attending presence of his aids, the demons over whom he reigned with terrible authority.

Like their counterparts in stone and glass, the cathedrals such as those of Rheims, Chartres, Notre-Dame de Paris, the miracle plays of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were works of art dedicated to the inculcation of the Christian faith in the communicants and thereby represent the culmination of many centuries of tradition handed down through sermons and legends which ostensibly illustrated Biblical truth. At Rheims, for instance, the thirteenth century remembered the sin of Eve in the carving of stone for the cathedral as a statue of a woman showing fondness for a serpent, and henceforth preserved in a tangible medium the opinion of St Bernard in a sermon preached to his disciples
at Clairvaux to the effect that from the time of Eve woman was known to have a denatured penchant for foul things, even taking the serpent into her arms and stroking it.\footnote{1} The north porch of Chartres, also dating from the thirteenth century, depicts the motivation for an event from the Old Testament with Potiphar's wife giving ear to the advice of the Devil. The venerable legend of an ecclesiastic of the sixth century, Theophilus, is recounted in four scenes carved in the tympanum of Notre-Dame, thus fixing an edifying lesson in stone for the believer.\footnote{2} In each instance, and many others could be cited, the presence of the Devil is a harbinger of evil; persons linked with him either commit terrible sins at his persuasion or become victims of his injurious machinations. So it was in the miracle play that the Devil entered it as an integral part of culture based upon the Church's teaching concerning the human condition. Nurtured at first in the bosom of the Church, certain types of religious drama, unlike the contemporary plastic and decorative arts, began to withdraw and become independent under the aegis of the laity towards the middle of the thirteenth century, and with this change demonstrated in its portrayal of the Devil to what extent the Church had influenced the common opinion concerning the diabolical character and his activities.\footnote{3}

It is particularly fortunate that forty plays presumably from the middle to late fourteenth century and belonging to one collection are available to modern scholars for close examination.\footnote{4} This collection, entitled Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages, is contained in two manuscripts preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and is sometimes referred to as the Cange manuscripts after the name of the eighteenth century owner.\footnote{5} These ornate, bound manuscripts appear to be designed for readers rather than as scripts from which actors would work
or as an official *registruum* like that of the English guilds.⁶ The best edition—that of Gaston Paris and Ulysse Robert—divides the plays among seven volumes with the eighth volume containing a glossary of terms and the identification of proper names. This edition numbers the plays consecutively from one to forty and provides a list of the *dramatis personae* for each play. Contemporaneous to the plays in the Cange manuscript which are probably representative of the development of the genre are two other *miracles* which reflect similar feeling for the intervention of the Virgin Mary and of the role played by the Devil: *Le Chevalier qui donna sa femme au diable*, and *Une Jeune fille, laquelle se voulut abandonner a peché*.⁷ Although the former has been dated by three men from the year 1505⁸ its style is more archaic than that of the sixteenth century; Petit de Julleville reminds us that there exist only two editions of the play from the sixteenth century and not one manuscript (*Mystères*, I, 339).

There is a foretaste of things to come in the play entitled the *Miracle de Théophile* by Rutebeuf which dates from around 1261. Although this play was originally called a *jeu*, it is dubbed a *miracle* from the fourteenth century, for the format and the characterization of the Devil and divine intervention entitle it to a place beside those which followed it in the next century. In fact, the *Miracle de Théophile* may very well have been used consciously or unconsciously as a model by some of the anonymous playwrights of the fourteenth century who must have been acquainted with the play based upon such a famous legend.

In many of these plays are portrayals of the Devil. He moves into the limelight as a visible being, strutting and fretting as it were in revelatory scenes which not only gave to the spectator a lesson and a thrill similar to discovering the magician's secrets, but relieved the fear which troubled the majority of believers. The characterization of
the Devil on stage demonstrates the literalness of the popular belief in him and gives insight into the concepts which were entertained by the general public in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Among the medievalists whose interest have centered on the miracle plays there are few critics who have considered the Devil portrayed in them as having much importance to the intrigue. In addition to his overall condemnation of the Cangé plays as being of little dramatic value, Petit de Julleville relegates the demons therein to the role of buffoons similar to the blind, the halt, and the foolish (Mystères, I, 271). In this judgment Petit de Julleville appears to be thinking more about the devils in the religious drama of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries than about those of the fourteenth century. If such is his contention, he is close to the mark. Judging this personnage to be difficult to define or understand, Petit de Julleville dwells upon the ambivalent attitude of the populace towards the Devil while neglecting to analyze his character:

Ils [les diables] font rire et ils font peur. On les bafoue et on les craint. C'est l'éternel vaincu, toujours renaisissant de sa honte et de sa défaite pour recommencer contre l'homme une lutte interminable. On se venge, en le bannant, de la haine et de l'effroi réel qu'il inspire, mais on rit de lui, comme un enfant peureux, dans l'obscurité, rit des fantômes en tremblant de peur. (I, 271)

There is some truth to the "whistling in the dark" on the part of the people throughout the Middle Ages, but the sobriety with which the Devil as the enemy is generally regarded in the miracles contrasts markedly with the foregoing description which applies more nearly to the diableries of the mystères or to such liturgical pageants as the Presentatio Beatae Virginis Mariae. However, in regards to the honte alluded to in connection with the Devil, it is not one of the salient characteristics
of the *éternel vaincu* in the miracle plays of any epoch with the possible exception of Rutebeuf's *Miracle de Théophile*. Petit de Julleville has interpreted the Devil's introspections into his own fate in a Miltonic way, emphasizing, it would seem, a tragic stance not at all in keeping with the medieval concept of Satan. If one may rely upon the visual portrayals of the Last Judgment on the cathedrals such as those of Autun or Bourges as faithful representations of popular thought, it is the damned who are in misery and not the Devil who stands by as the accuser while the archangel Michael weighs the souls; nor are the demons apparently suffering while they torment their human victims.

As for the role of demons in the *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages*, Petit de Julleville notes the personal enmity of the devils towards the Virgin Mary, for she is the one who watches over the hapless victims and who, because of their faith in her, whisks them out of the clutches of the demons. He is further impressed with the apparent naïveté of the devils who, in one or two instances seem to believe that Jesus is afraid of his mother, and therefore decides in her favor or grants her requests (I, 130). In assessing the impact of the Devil and his minions on stage, it seems that Petit de Julleville exaggerates the commonplace of their appearance saying: "ils se mêlent familièrement à la vie des hommes, qui les voient apparaître sans surprise et sans terreur" (I, 129). To the contrary, as will be seen, the devils struck terror and awe in most instances, unless they appeared in human form—a favorite disguise during that epoch. The popular image of the medieval devil as a buffoon in horns, black face, and pieds fourchus appears more frequently in the miracle plays or saint plays of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries than in those of the fourteenth century and earlier.
In her very helpful survey entitled *The Medieval French Drama*, Grace Frank devotes a paragraph or two to the machinations of Salatin, the sorcerer who conjures up Satan in the *Miracle de Théophile*. Commenting upon the departures which Rutebeuf's imagination made from his sources, notably that of Gautier de Coinci, she observes that the instructions which Satan gives to Théophile, "a disciple of wickedness," might reflect what may have been Rutebeuf's personal conception of the evildoer, for Rutebeuf causes the Devil to require that Théophile refuse alms to the poor and to repel humility in others with arrogance. Miss Frank expresses admiration for the subtle role of the Devil in the semi-liturgical play of the twelfth century, the *Jeu d'Adam*. Most of her comments, however, are reserved for the saint plays of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries where she notes with Petit de Julleville the task of the devils of alleviating the dramatic monotony of the endless sufferings of the martyrs such as those of St Vincent or St Margaret. The devils of these later plays, along with the infirm, provide comic relief even to their picturesque names whose significance afforded another facet of amusement.

In her dissertation, Marguerite Stadler-Honegger sides nearly always with the devils. She devotes a sentence or two to the role of the devils in each of the plays wherein they appear throughout the *Miracles de Nôtre-Dame par personnages*. Her terse sentences usually describe the devils as either *grossiers* and *méchants* or *actifs* and *raffinés* as tempters. For example, using the edition of Paris and Robert Miss Stadler-Honegger describes the devils in the first miracle as *bons, complaisants, facilement touchés*. Whenever they are considered *vis-à-vis* the Virgin, particularly in regards to their sense of justice, they are invariably given higher marks. Some are sketched
with greater realism than others, says Miss Stadler-Honegger, citing miracles III and XIV, although it is not entirely clear what reality she has in mind, unless it be the standard of human behavior. The names of the devils are given in her study if any are used in the plays, and she notes similarities in the characterization of the devils throughout the collection (133-134). The main thrust of Miss Stadler-Honegger’s *Etude* is, however, the discernment of various esprits or minds which produced these forty plays based upon such divergent sources and capable of different effects.  

Some scholars mention the role of the Devil in connection with the stagecraft of the times. Donald C. Stuart, in a doctoral dissertation in 1910, advanced the theory that the *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages* were plays in which Hell was of no particular importance in the arrangement of the stage because during the fourteenth century one did not see Hell represented very often on the stage.  

He attempts to establish his theory by showing how unimportant the Devil is in the whole repertoire. Giving a lengthy treatment of the ten plays in which he acknowledges the presence of devils, he reasons that nine of them would not require a setting for Hell. He appears to rely upon internal evidence, in particular upon the mention of Hell in the dialogue in order to ascertain its importance, as indeed he must, for the stage directions are rare. In miracle VI Stuart says that Hell is not mentioned, but he overlooked the Devil’s hope expressed that he will be able to trap Chrysostom in a sin “Dont il pourra entre en enfer/ Presentez au roy Lucifer” (vv. 1174–1175). Stuart is quite certain that when devils carry off a soul, they exit offstage. In citing miracle XVI he says that not enough is made of Hell to warrant such a setting because the devils play the “usual role of tempters,” and do not mention Hell as they leave the stage.  

Even when as in miracle XIII the devils
do say "Alons nous en sanz demouree/ En enfer..." (vv. 348-349), they must be understood to carry their victims off stage. However, as Stuart himself asserts, "in all such plays the lines are a running commentary on the action, which would soon become unintelligible were this not the case." This position is taken up to point out the significance of the absence of lines describing action. It appears then, that Stuart is reasoning in two directions from the same evidence, for it seems that to him the "action" lines are significant unless they refer to Hell. As for the thirty other plays which do not have the Devil in a speaking part, Stuart easily concludes that where there are not devils there is no Hell represented on the stage. One trouble with the initial assertion is that Stuart has miscounted the number of plays in the Cangé group which requires the evident presence of the Devil or demons. Actually there are twelve instead of ten plays which cast the Devil or demons in speaking roles. Whereas it is not the purpose of this study to make a case for the presence of Hell on the stage, it is perhaps germane to the question of the importance of the Devil as a personnage in the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages, a question to which we shall return in subsequent chapters. Suffice it to note at this point that there has been too hasty a dismissal of the Devil as a character in the miracle genre.

Dorothy Penn takes cognizance of the work by Stuart for her dissertation concerning the staging of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages. Following the sequence of Paris and Robert she outlines the progressive complexity and numbers of playing areas needed to stage the collection, and her conclusions are based primarily upon the internal evidence to be found in the dialogues. She notes that Paradise and Hell with their appropriate inmates become less important to the human scene and that the
devils disappear entirely towards the end of the series. This appears to be true in a chronological sense provided that the Cangé manuscripts are so organized. It is well to keep in mind, however, that the influence of the Devil is often made apparent even in plays where he does not appear as a speaking character on the stage with the others.

In his book *Le Culte de la sainte Vierge et la littérature profane du moyen âge* Herbertus Ahsmann lists in order of their importance the characters which appear in the Cangé miracle plays. The first, he says, is the person who is the object of Our Lady's favor; the second rank is held by the Virgin herself, who is the author of the miracle, and in the third rank are grouped together, *Dieu, les anges, les saints, les hermites,* and last, implying the least important it may be supposed, *les diables.*

One wonders if the position of the devils in the ranks is due to Ahsmann's appreciation—or lack of it—of the importance of the devils to the plots wherein they appear, or if it is due to the relative number of times the devils appear in the entire repertoire. For the latter reason, Ahsmann may be correct; however, insofar as the devils participate openly in the intrigues at all they rank next to the victim in importance. Whereas it is true that the Virgin appears in all the plays and the Devil in only twelve, their activities are more varied than hers and they provide pivotal situations while the Virgin is stylized in her role despite an occasional lapse into undignified behavior and language which modern sensitivities find incongruous in the Queen of Heaven. Ahsmann has noted that unsaintly langage of Our Lady in some of these plays, citing for example her use of the word *charoinge* in the *Miracle du pape qui vendi le basme* (VIII) and hopes that the meaning was then less pejorative than now.

Other researchers of recent date have been fascinated by the role of the Devil in literature. Hugo Bekker has written an intriguing dissertation
entitled *The Lucifer Motif in the German and Dutch Drama of the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Diss. Abstracts Vol. 19.2). There has been considerable interest shown in the Faustian motif in literature, notable in the legend of Théophile and later cast into the French miracle.\textsuperscript{23} Despite this general interest in the characterization of the Devil very little has been done to analyze his characterization in the French vernacular miracle plays of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Although not totally ignored these characters are usually mentioned in passing in regards to their opposition to the Virgin or else used as data for proof of a theory unrelated, or vaguely so, to literary problems of a general nature.

The burden of this study will be to examine forty-three French miracles which span two centuries of development of this genre with attention to the characterization of the Devil as a personnage and to show in the course of this scrutiny the importance of his role as a reflection of common reality as accepted by the playwright and his public; to trace somewhat the demonology of the plays as to their theological, historical, and artistic heritage, and to point out the raison d'\^etre of such a creature as the Devil with his abilities, qualities, and strategems which come to light as he attacks his human victims in order to distinguish him from the clowns of the mystères and later saints' plays.

It has been surprising to note how many critics distinguish a realistic miracle play from a religious one by the absence or presence of the supernatural and in particular that of the Devil to explain certain motives or events even though the reason for such a play is to introduce the Virgin in a supernatural act of mercy. In the light of medieval logic nothing could be more natural than a confrontation between her and the Devil. There is a danger of applying modern psychology to medieval theology in order to explain the presence of the Devil in the drama as the personification of an evil
force by a superstitious and ignorant populace whereas the greatest minds among men had for centuries attested to the existence of the Devil and his fallen angels as real personalities, as creations different from man, yet no less actual or active. Indeed the Christian of the Middle Ages shared with the pagan a belief in a spirit world. Hence, the realist of the Middle Ages took stock of the Devil and made his plans accordingly, to which the miracle bears eloquent testimony. The edifying purpose of the miracle play seems most evident in the discretionary use of humor by the playwrights who chose to disarm the Devil by a careful portrayal of his powers and limitations rather than to reduce him to the unscriptural, unhistorical role of buffoon who is laughed off the stage.

The Miracle: General Considerations

A great many discussions over the classification of serious and comic plays have filled pages upon pages of print, for certain plays bearing one title or assignation in the title actually seem to belong to another type. This difficulty is particularly apparent in the comic genres of moralités, farces, and sotties. In the religious drama of the Middle Ages, however, the problems of classification seem to be less severe, particularly in the French repertoire. In the twelfth century the Latin liturgical drama played inside the church building was variously called ludi, representaciones, historiae, or representandae, and many did not bear a title. The French play on Adam and Eve was at first called a representatione, hence tying itself to the Latin liturgical drama which was concerned with both Biblical and apocryphal events (Mystères, I, 187).

In the thirteenth century the plays of Adam de la Halle and the Saint Nicolas of Jean Bodel were designated simply as jeux, the word jeu having a long life in the repertoire of religious drama since the peoples of
occidental Europe in the Middle Ages did not have in their vocabularies exact equivalents to the Latin expressions *comoedia* or *tragoedia* (*Mystères* I, 187). In the fourteenth century the miracle play flourished, and it was so called because of its special and non-liturgical content. The appellation of *mystère* seems to have been first applied to religious or liturgical drama in the fifteenth century. One encounters this term as applied to dramatic pieces for the first time in the famous letters of *patent* accorded by Charles VI in 1402 to the Confrères de la Passion.

Often a listing or bibliography of plays under the heading *mystères* includes titles of *miracles*. This apparent discrepancy is explained by the curious fortunes of two similar Latin words: *mysterium* and *ministerium*. The medieval sense of the word *mystère* as it is often spelled signified *métier* or function.24 The Latin medieval word *mysterium* was used to mean "service" or "office" or "ceremony" having been confused with *ministerium*. In the fifteenth century the word *mystère* derived from *mysterium* took on the sense of *représentation dramatique* or sometimes *scène figurée* in the course of a banquet.25 The Italian word *funzione* and the Spanish word *auto* both carry the idea of function in medieval religious drama and thereby support the unifying concept of "enactment" of the various plays such as the Passion Play (*Mystères* I, 188-189).

In the light of this understanding of the confusion of terms in the Latin one would not be amiss in classifying a play as a miracle play regardless of whether it came before or after the fourteenth century, this century commonly known as the century of the miracle play. The idea of dramatizing the intervention of the Virgin Mary in the affairs of human beings ignited the poetic imagination, which subsequently cast into dramatic form the lives of many saints with their martyrdoms and miracles. Therefore, Bodel's *Jeu de Saint Nicolas* from about 1200 and Rutebeuf's
Miracle de Théophile which dates from the mid-thirteenth century fit the category of the miracle play as does the series of fourteen scenes of the Miracles de Ste Geneviève which have been dated around the mid-fifteenth century, and which Achille Jubinal has included in a volume entitled Mystères inédits du XVIᵉ siècle. Hence, a miracle play may be culled from the ranks of the mystères in the centuries following the fourteenth.

In the type of play which we are considering, so far as the plots are concerned there are virtually no associations with Scriptural tradition; on the other hand popular legends play an important role. As Karl Young has expressed it, the miracle play or miraculum is "so peculiarly medieval in its content" that it has been given a distinctive name. Occasionally the miracles will have as centural figures Biblical characters whom the Church has canonized such as the Virgin Mary, Mary Magdalen, Lazarus, and Paul; all of whom appear in the liturgical drama as well as in later saint plays. Their roles in the miracle play differ, however, from those of the liturgical representation which was confined to their actions in Biblical biography as a rule. Hence, in the Passion Play the Virgin Mary is known as the lamenting Mother of Christ and not as the mediatrix of the miracle.

Although the miracle play is independent as a genre of the other types of religious plays and comic presentations of the Middle Ages, many traditions and contemporary movements converged to bring it into existence, not the least of which was the practice of troping the liturgical text in order to enforce its meaning and enhance its emotional appeal. Although the very beginning of the practice of embellishing the official liturgical text is hidden in the mists of the past, the tropes or extra-canonical elements inserted into the services of one sort or another are mentioned in the minutes of the various councils and in the papal decrees from the fourth
century onward. 29

When in the late tenth century three anonymous priests took on the roles of women at the sepulchre of the Christ in a brief dramatization of an old Latin trope to the Easter Introit, the medieval theatre began a new chapter in the annals of religious drama. This birth took place appropriately enough on Easter, a season of celebration of the Resurrection of the Christ for the Christians and of the general rebirth of life and hope for the human race from time immemorial. The antiphonal singing of the Quem Queritis became a dramatized moment during a service of worship and helped to impress upon the congregation the reason for it all. From that first exchange between angels and women grew a developing dramatic cycle which dealt with those Biblical events of the life of Christ. 30 The animation of the Scriptures, somewhat veiled in the Latin language for the majority of worshippers, inside the church caught the imagination of both clergy and laity so that text, costume, and musical accompaniment waxed more elaborate, employing more personnel and decorations. Out of the visit to the sepulchre mushroomed the Latin Passion Play with appendages such as the Emmaus incident in pantomime while the chorus sang from the liber responsalis.

Similarly from the Christmas season the dramatization of the visit of the Magi naturally invited further elaboration during the celebration of advent. The lectio of Christmas matins, by its introduction of the prophecies concerning the coming of Messiah provided a natural opportunity for the reader to impersonate the prophet whose utterances he read. 31 Therefore, the impersonation of familiar characters emerging from different parts of the church building while the worshippers looked on like a theater audience was an established custom long before the composed miracle play was staged.
The **miracle** was not to abandon the liturgical heritage of music nor its intent to praise God, for our earliest extant miracle play, the *Jeu de Saint Nicolas*, ends with the singing of *Te Deum laudamus*, and in each of the plays of the Cangé manuscripts a rondel is sung by the archangels who escort the Virgin. Minstrels are introduced in the stage directions of the **miracle** concerning the Roy Thierry (XXXII). In the *Miracle de la jeune fille, laquelle se voulut abandonner a péché* the celestial choir sings, and as Satan hears the song he realizes that his scheme is foiled by divine intervention. Several **miracles** in the Cangé group continue the worshipful custom of ending the play with the singing of a hymn in Latin such as the *Hic sanctus cuius Hodie*, *Te Deum laudamus*, or the popular *Ave regina celorum*. Nor was the **miracle** to ignore its edifying ancestry in the mass, for a prose sermon in the vernacular, except in **miracle** II where the sermon is in verse, appears in twenty-seven of the Cangé plays either in the prologue or within the framework of the action, and there is evidence that other plays in the same repertoire once contained sermons,31 These **miracles** given at one sitting were, in effect, services of worship rather than serial stories played out over a number of days in the manner of the liturgical cyclical dramas and **mystères**.

The practice of commemorating events in the earthly ministry of Jesus Christ at prearranged times of the year transferred easily into the practice of celebrating the festival of certain saints with dramatic presentations of miracles which they are alleged to have performed. Thus, the eve of December 6, the feast day of St Nicholas, saw the *scoliers* in monastery schools performing musical dramas in his honor and later literary societies acting in plays which they had commissioned to his memory. The *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages* were obviously composed to honor the Virgin Mary, very likely on one of her feast days such as her Nativity on September
8 or the Immaculate Conception on December 8.

Another tradition firmly entrenched in ecclesiastical celebrations were the processions into and out of the church building. Those of Holy Week, particularly that of Palm Sunday, came from the moving observances of the last days before the Crucifixion observed in the Church at Jerusalem in the fourth century.\(^{33}\) By the tenth century the West had adopted the custom of processions to the extent that widely separated communities had developed their own elaborate variations.\(^{34}\) Something of the pomp and luxury of the ecclesiastical processions found its way into some of the miracles with the use of an angelic cortège, much reduced in number for indoor productions, of the Virgin and of retainers grouped around earthly potentates such as the pope or an emperor. The costuming was generally significant, well studied for effect, and as costly as the producers could afford.

Besides the liturgical drama and processions which began to enliven the public worship of the European Christians, the legends of the lives of the saints provided further encouragement to the faithful. Indeed, as Émile Mâle has observed, "les saints étaient l'unique science de l'homme du XIII\(^{\text{e}}\) siècle."\(^{35}\) Narratives of the lives of the saints were read daily in the cloisters and monasteries, a practice observed in the convents to this day. The story of Théophile's miraculous escape from the dread consequences of the pact which he had made with the Devil served to encourage the solitary monk to keep faith with St Mary. In effect, did not Théophile belong to everyone, for his history became fixed in one of the proses sung at Mass on the feast of the Virgin Mary.\(^{36}\) Also for the illiterate faithful there were not only those legends in prose read to them in church, but the works of poets who, writing in the vernacular,
undertook to immortalize inspiring examples of faith.

A notable instance is that of Archbishop Thomas Becket of Canterbury whose violent death in 1170 at the instigation of Henry II of England aroused a certain French clerk, Guernes de Pont-Saint-Maxence to travel to England. Guernes, a wandering clerk unattached to a specific monastery, went about gathering data in a journalistic way by interviewing friends, relatives, and acquaintances of Becket and reading documents and letters pertaining to the quarrel. He then wrote a long poem in French alexandrines recounting the life of Becket and suggesting that the crime of Henry II be punished. This composition was a labor of love over which Guernes worked some six years, at the completion of which the poet read it aloud to those pilgrims who came to visit the tomb of the martyr. Guernes was not the only clerk-poet to undertake such a project concerning Becket, but his work is one of two complete poems in old French which have survived.

The legends of the lives of the saints were in the warp and woof of monastic life. About the year 1100 Raoul Tontaire was putting into verse the legends of St Benedict and St Maur while teaching versification to novices in the monastery St Benoit-sur-Loire at Fleury. Soon afterwards at the same monastery the legends of St Nicholas were put into verse, and the Fleury play-book of the late twelfth century or early thirteenth contains this same kind of verse in the St Nicholas plays. At Soissons Gautier de Coinci composed four small volumes of narrative poems in honor of the Virgin. Following the example of his hero, St Ildephonse, Gautier wrote his Miracles de Nostre Dame as a personal offering to Our Lady and he found inspiration not only in venerable legends such as that of Theophile but in personal experience as well. He records in verse a miracle which occurred in the year 1219 when a demon, incensed at Gautier's writing in praise of the Virgin, appeared to him in a dream and threatened him with
great sorrow. Sometime later Gautier had to be away from the Abbey Saint-Médard during which time thieves made off with Saint Léocarde's reliquary and a favorite statue of the Virgin. After four days of grief, however, Gautier was again joyful over the recovery of the saint's bones from the river Aisne where the thieves had discarded them. Not only did he relate this miracle but Gautier wrote three poems in honor of the event. Several of Gautier's Miracles were to provide themes for the anonymous playwrights of the dramatic Miracles of the Cangé repertoire.

With such apparent hero worship on the part of the clergy and laity in regards to their ancestors in the faith as it were, it is not surprising that miracle plays should spring up in the schools connected with the great cathedrals and monasteries. By the twelfth century a strong tradition and innovative spirit had been animating for some two hundred years the liturgical dramas towards the effective inculcation in the illiterate masses of Biblical events and truths. What more natural step than the use of legends of the saints as a means of edifying a more select group of believers, the scholars whose exercises in versification and music must be a means of spiritual as well as of intellectual growth. This formation, as will be noted presently, was to be strongly felt on the outside of the monastery school among the laymen who prayed to these saints and undertook to produce plays about them. Suffice it to say that the miracle play does not appear to have been a gradual transition from the liturgical play, for both survived side by side and fulfilled different functions in the religious life of the community. John Manly affirms in an article in Modern Philology that difference between the mystery play and the miracle play as being inherent in their origins. The liturgical drama played inside the church house and given in Latin passed on to its offspring, the so-called mystery play, Biblical background for its vernacular presentations
outside of the sanctuary. As for the miracle play, Jeanroy attests to
its less sacred birthplace:

Le miracle, au contraire, né dans les écoles
 annexées aux cathédrales ou aux monastères,
destiné à embellir les solemnités scholaires,
joué par les écoliers ou leurs maîtres, tendit
de bonne heure à réfléchir les spectateurs autant
qu'à les édifier. 40

In the **Jeu de Saint Nicolas** by the professional **trouvère** Jean Bodel,
who died in 1209, the most popular saint of the Middle Ages is seen as an
intercessor for erring mortals, a function in which he was considered
second only to the Virgin Mary herself. It is significant that this
popular legend concerning the patron of school boys should be the first
to come into the vernacular from the Latin plays of the twelfth century. 41
Jean Bodel used the story of the **Iconia Sancti Nicolai** which is preserved
in the Fleury repertoire, wherein a pagan (a Jew in the Fleury version)
entrusts his fortune to the guardianship of a statue of the saint. 42 Thieves
steal the fortune, and the Jew loses faith in the saint's power. Saint
Nicholas appears in person, however, and compels the thieves to return the
money, which results in the conversion of the Jew. Bodel handily transposes
the scene to the court of a pagan king who is attended by an excessively
respectful syneschal, a cruel jailer, and four emirs from the East. In
this play the professional skill of the trouvère is evident in the
characterization of the king and his retainer, the vivacious scenes of
low life with the three thieves who love to play dice, and the affecting
courage and faith in St Nicholas of the lone Christian named Preudon, sole
survivor of a Crusade. The richness of the heritage in liturgical tradition
as well as the innovations of the playwright are exploited happily in the
combination of pomp and beauty which one associates with the religious
processions and interiors of the cathedrals, a pagan king who surpasses the
raging Herod of the liturgical Officium Stellae,\textsuperscript{43} low comedy which was no stranger to the monastery\textsuperscript{44} and had precedence in the slapstick sequences in the Ordo Prophetarum, angel visitation, significant names of characters,\textsuperscript{45} and of course, the miracle working saint in whose honor the play is given.

Besides the fecund background provided by the Church, other fields of human knowledge or experience found their way into the repertoire of the miracle. Historical themes and characters such as the baptism of Clovis recounted by Grégoire of Tours, folk legends and romances as well as some of the chansons de geste were cast into dramatic form as a framework for the marvelous intervention of the Virgin. The poets of the fourteenth century ranged widely in reading and interest to include material from the monastery chronicles, a particularly rich source of anecdotal history concerning the Devil, and oral traditions not yet fixed in a written form. Some of the fabliaux makers, so apt to make one laugh, tried their hand also at the more serious work of writing a miracle play, and in so doing introduced, as has been noted in the case of Jean Bodel, some realistic scenes of coarse life, touches of humor, as well as the unconscious mépris of woman in their portrayal of the Virgin as well as that of human females.\textsuperscript{46} Hence a secular milieu is presented by and large with its prejudices and attitudes in which one may assist at the court of an emperor, the château of a lord, the home of a Parisian money changer, the chamber of a woman in labor, or the huddle of beggars in the street. Such a panorama as this seems to indicate a faithful laity sensitive to the problems of daily life and anxious to encourage itself in the belief that whatever the Devil might do against the man or woman involved in the common, uncloistered life, the power of God through the Virgin and other saints was effective and available protection. In the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages,
plays of extensive world view, an anonymous group of poets took up the
torch carried to them by the professional trouvères of the preceding century.

Jean Bodel and other writers such as Canon de Béthune or Adam de la
Halle whose names have survived the thirteenth century were participating
in an exciting transition of literary and artistic endeavors from the almost
exclusive patronage of the Church and its officers to that of the laity.
At any rate, the Church began to share its task of edifying the populace
through drama with the devout laity who could afford to invest in
productions to be given outside of the domain or even the jurisdiction of
the Church. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were formed
puys or literary societies composed of laymen who encouraged the adoration
of the Virgin Mary in verse and drama, a tradition which persisted and
expanded to include other saints.

The word puy signifies eminence and comes from the estrade where the
officials of the poetry contests and their assistants were seated. There
is some indication, of course, that these companies were not only concerned
with spiritual edification, and their influence upon the secular theater
came to be felt. These literary societies or puys have been called the
academies of the Middle Ages. For, the aspiring as well as the profes-
sional trouvères who entered the contests and were commissioned to write
plays brought to their works the experience and traditions of monastery
schools. The puy supplied what drama outside the Church needed most:
the actors and a stage.

It is well that a class of laymen was ready to succeed to the task
of the clergy in view of the periodic disdain of the Holy See towards
theatrical productions under the aegis of the Church. For example, in
1210 a letter from Innocent III condemns absolutely the "jeux de théâtre
et les spectacles donnés dans les églises; et pour lesquels on y introduit
des masques." In the mid-fifteenth century the Concile de Bâle condemned the Fête des Fous, and mentioned expressly the "masquarades et de jeux de théâtre" (larvales et theatrales jocos).\textsuperscript{50}

Although not all the puys concerned themselves with theatrical productions, there were enough active in this kind of endeavor to cause many of the legends of the saints to be dramatized in the vernacular. These societies, partly religious, partly literary, appear to have been the first to inherit the taste for pious plays which had hitherto been given by the clergy,\textsuperscript{51} and it is most probable that the plays of Bodel and Adam de la Halle were presented in the puys of the thirteenth century, as were most certainly the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages of the next (Mystères I, 117).\textsuperscript{52}

As has been noted in the propitious efforts of Jean Bodel in the genre of the vernacular miracle, the realism, or life on the common plane entertained the supernatural as easily as it did the base or comic aspects of daily existence; for angels, saints, devils, the Virgin Mary, Jesus, and men were to share the stage in subsequent plays of this type.\textsuperscript{53} Whereas it is true that the composers of the miracles such as Rutebeuf were in a sense confined to a certain storyline by virtue of the legend of any particular miracle already established in the popular lore, they were at greater liberty to invent surprises and to create suspense than their brethren who worked in Biblical mysteries.\textsuperscript{54} Unencumbered by strictures of the three unities imposed upon the drama of antiquity, the poet often followed his source by causing several years or a lifetime to pass within the scope of his play. He had a great deal of latitude in his choice of persons, places, and passions, which unfortunately led him into poorly motivated scenes and unprepared characters emerging late in the plot. However, drawing upon the legacy of the legends, the anonymous poets of the Miracles de Nostre-
Dame par personnages saw that there was the possibility of a different intrigue for every saint on the roster and were prompt to take advantage of it.

Among the characters which trod the stage of the miracle the Devil and his demons offered a fascinating opportunity to the poet for development, for here was an unknown quantity about which there was much speculation but little concrete knowledge although he was an integral part of the history of the human race. There were, however, precedents for the characterization of the Devil before the poets of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries took up their pens. Besides the theological concepts passed down from the early Church Fathers and filtered through medieval teachers, there was a literary and dramatic heritage as well as a contemporary development in demonology which wrought upon the creative imagination of those poets who introduced the Devil as a personnage into their miracle plays.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE


2. The first scene from left to right shows Théophile kneeling before the anthropomorphic Devil with grotesque head who clasps the hands of his new vassal in the traditional rite of the serment. The second scene shows Théophile seated and meting out the commands of the Devil, reduced in size, but present at Théophile's knee. The third episode is Théophile's repentance with the sinner kneeling before a statue of the Virgin. The last scene features the Virgin brandishing a sword over the humiliated Devil.

3. Emile Mâle makes a strong case for the total subjugation of the artistic imagination to the ordinances of the theologians: "Les artistes ne furent que les interprètes de la pensée de l'Eglise." See L'art religieux du XIIIe siècle en France, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1910), p. 455. He does admit, however, that the sculptors decorated "à leur gré" the churches with plants and animals with the "pensée confuse" that the cathedral was an abridgement of the world where all of God's creatures could enter (p. 82). On the one hand, Mâle combats the idea of total liberty chez the medieval sculptor expressed by Victor Hugo in Notre-Dame de Paris; but on the other hand he concedes that certain representations of the demons in the Last Judgment "relèvent de la fantaisie populaire" (p. 439), that the creation of bizarre gargoyles which admittedly mystified St Bernard had no theological or symbolic function, but were solely of decorative intent (p. 66).


5. The two red-bound volumes are called for at the Bibliothèque Nationale from the fond français, nos. 819 and 820. The note on the guard leaf inside each volume indicates the buyer to have been J. P. G. Châtre de Cangé, but it is not known from whom they were purchased. In 1733 the manuscripts passed into the collection of the king. The two volumes in folio are written on vellum in double columns by the same hand of which the style of script indicates the first years of the fifteenth century, probably circa 1405. Volume I contains miracles numbered from one to twenty-one, and volume II contains miracles numbered from one to eighteen. On the first page of both volumes is a Table des moralités written in a different, more recent hand. At the beginning of each play at the top of the left-hand column on the recto side of the page is a beautifully drawn miniature depicting a scene from the following miracle. The colors are rich, especially the blue, red, and gold.


8. The three men are M. Parfait, le duc de la Vallière, and M. Fournier. The evidence is a note written on a copy of the play attesting to a performance of the same year, 1505.

9. This pageant which features the horned, monstrous Lucifer in chains came into France from the Eastern Church late in the fourteenth century when the miracles in the vernacular were already an established tradition.

10. One of the Church Fathers, Origen (185-254 A.D.), advanced the idea in his treatise *De Principis* that the Devil was an apostate angel who would be saved along with his angels under the discipline of a future world. Later preachers like Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386 A.D.), differed strongly on this point, and the idea was discarded as heretical before the Middle Ages began.


12. Some devils took their names from the nomenclature of alchemy such as Aerus (acid), Arceniq (arsenic), Tossin (toxin). In Saint Antoine the Devil's wife is named Farfara and another demon, Rapalhier takes his name from a Latin root which indicates a crawling demon. See A. Jeanroy, "Observations sur le théâtre méridional au XV* siècle," *Romania*, XXIII (1894), p. 554.


14. Ibid., pp. 133, 144.

15. Grace Frank observes that Miss Stadler-Honegger merely shows that some of the plays may have been written by the same person. See *Medieval French Drama*, p. 116.


17. Ibid., p. 61

18. Ibid., p. 58.

19. Ibid., p. 62.


22. Ahsmann, pp. 133-134.

23. These studies have centered around literature of the Romantic era of the nineteenth century as well as that of more recent vintage. See Charles Déchepan, Le thème de Faust dans la littérature européenne, 4 vols. (Paris, 1954-57).

24. Métier was a development from the Latin word ministerium meaning "service" or "office" (derived from minister or servant) which in gallo-roman became metier. The French form mestier presupposes a popular Latin misterium, the result of a contraction or crossing with the word mysterium in the locations where it was a matter of the service of God or service de Dieu such as mestier Dieu. The word mistere appears often in Old French carrying the sense of office, ceremony, ministère, until the sixteenth century which seems to indicate that the two Latin words ministerium and mysterium continued to be closely associated.


26. Of the Cangé repertoire the Miracle de la Nativité Nostre Seigneur Jhesu Crist (V) incorporates into its plot a legendary event which was to have taken place at the birth of Jesus. The story which concerns a midwife named Salomie whose unbelief in the virginity of Mary causes her grief was attributed to St Matthew and told in an apocryphal gospel entitled De Nativitate Mariae et Infanta Salvatoris. The poets of the fourteenth century knew it well, its having been collected in the thirteenth century by two notable compilers: Vincent de Beauvais (Miroir Historique) and Jacques de Voragine (Légende dorée). In this exceptional instance among the miracles the Virgin is both the mother of Jesus and mediator in behalf of the midwife Salomie.


29. Young, Drama, I, 179.

30. The most primitive form of this trope is in the manuscript St.Gall 484: Interrogatio: Quem queritis in sepulchro, Christole? Responsio: Iseum Nazarenum crucifixum, o caelicalae.
   Responsio: Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat. Ite nuntiate quia surrexit de Sepulchre.
   Resurrexi.

31. Young, Drama, II, chap. xxI.

32. When the sermon occurs within the play the precheur is usually identified by name in the dialogue and was played by an actor assigned to the role. Eminent persons like St Basil (XIII) or the Pope (XIV) are impersonated as the preacher which the other characters assemble to hear, and the sermon or the delivery of the speaker is often discussed.
33. Young, Drama, I, 86.

34. One of the more striking processions was that of Palm Sunday when the waving of palm branches, throwing garments in the path leading from an elevated place outside the town towards the city gates duplicated as much as possible the original entry of the Christ into Jerusalem. See Young, Drama, I, 90-94.


36. From the eleventh century this prose included the following:
   Tu mater es misericordiae
   De lacu faecis et miseriae
   Theophilum reformans gratiae.
   See Mâle, p. 307. For the full text see Ulysse Chevalier, Poésie liturgique de l'Eglise catholique en Orient (Tournai, 1894), p. 134.

37. Young, Drama, II, 131.

38. The Benedictines were most influential in the production of liturgical plays, for their monasteries inspired the famous texts of Saint Martial of Limoges, Fleury et Sens, Mont Saint-Michel, Fécamp, Compiègne, and Saint Ouen. See Frank, Medieval French Drama, p. 69. The Fleury play-book contains four miracle plays about St Nicholas.


41. The Latin lines were of four syllables and sung by the écoliers after the office of matins. The parts were probably divided between seven choristes, separated from the main choir. See Marius Septet, Le Drame Chrétien au Moyen Âge (Paris, 1808), p. 219.


43. This was a portion of the Christmas cycle portraying the visit of the Magi and usually given on January 6. The account by Saint Matthew (2: 1-16), from which the play is drawn states that the Wise-men, being warned in a dream not to return to Herod and report their having found the new-born King of the Jews, returned to their own country by another way. The medieval congregation enjoyed the moment of discomfiture when Herod learned that "he was mocked of the Wise-men" for the actor generally portrayed the wrathful king with ravings and gesticulations. (Citations from the Holy Bible are taken from the American Standard Version newly edited in 1901).

44. The "Feast of Fools" was widely celebrated around the first of January and had brought burlesque into the monastery, at least among the lower clergy whose revels included great license with the services. Later Church decrees forbade the presence of an ass. See Grace Frank, p. 43.
45. The Christian's name, Freudon, announces his character as do the names of the dice players—Cliquet (jabberer), Pinchede (dice pincher), and Rasoir (the razor). Albert Henry sees in their "sobriquets plaisants" something of their activities such as Rasoir being adept as a cut-purse, or Pinchede as an accomplished dice roller, and Cliquet as a picker of locks. See his Introduction to Le Jeu de Saint Nicolas de Jehan Bodel (Paris, 1962), p. 21.

46. Both Jean Bodel and Rutebeuf produced extant works in these two genres, the dramatic miracle and the fabliau as well as other kinds of poems common to the repertoire of the trouvère. Bodel's three dice players seem to emerge breathing from the scene of the wandering jongleur and his milieu so vividly described by Rutebeuf in his Le Dit des riaus de Greive or his La Griesche d'Yver where he says that the dice wait for the jongleur at the local tavern like enemies in ambush. As for the characterization of the Virgin, the humanizing process affected her language as well as her modus operandi in that she shares with her mortal sister some of the less desirable characteristics which are so strongly criticized in the fabliaux. Saint Mary is crafty and apparently has no sense of fair play, as will be noted in the study of the individual miracles. As Rutebeuf noted in his fabliau "La Dame qui fist trois tors entors le mostier," it is easier to deceive the Enemy, "le diable en champs arani" (vv. 3-4). See Oeuvres complètes de Rutebeuf, eds. Edmond Faral, Julia Bastin, 2 vols. (Paris, 1969).

47. Louis Petit de Julleville, Les Comédiens en France au Moyen Âge (Paris, 1885), p. 44. From here on referred to as LCMA.

48. Ibid., p. 34.


50. Petit de Julleville, LCMA, p. 34.


52. Interspersed throughout the Cange manuscripts are twenty-three lyrical pieces called serventoys in praise of the Virgin. These poems may have been the fruit of a poetical contest sponsored by the literary society which produced the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages, since these poems refer at times to the prince du puy although the name of the "dit puy" is not given.
53. In his monumental work concerning the appreciation of reality in Western culture as discernable in literature, Erich Auerbach ably points out that rigidity and narrowness were not a part of the Judeo-Christian manner of dealing with the events of the world. He says, "The hiddenness of God and finally his parousia, his incarnation in the common form of an ordinary life, these concepts--we tried to show--brought about a dynamic movement in the basic conception of life, a swing of the pendulum in the realms of morals and sociology, which went far beyond the classic-antique norm or the imitation of real life and living growth." See "Roland Against Ganelon" in Mimesis, trans. from the German by Willard Task, Doubleday Anchor Books (Garden City, New York, 1957), p. 104.

Hence, in his discussion of the liturgical play, le Jeu d'Adam, Auerbach lifts out for close study the discussion between Adam and Eve concerning her conversation with the Devil and Eve's abrupt change of tactic after she listens to the serpent's whispered advice upon how to cause Adam to taste the forbidden fruit. This episode which is an enlargement of the brief Biblical narrative of the Fall (Genesis 3:1-7), is, in Auerbach's opinion, the presentation of the sublime Christian drama of redemption in popular, immediate terms--"...it is to be a current event which could happen any time, which every listener can imagine and is familiar with; it is to strike deep roots in the mind and the emotions of any random French contemporary. Adam talks and acts in a manner any member of the audience is accustomed to from his own or his neighbor's house; things would go exactly the same way in any townman's home or on any farm where an upright but not very brilliant husband was tempted into a foolish and fateful act by his vain and ambitious wife who had been deceived by an unscrupulous swindler," Mimesis, p. 131. Continuing this thread of reasoning, we may assert that it is the "swindler" upon whom the burden of the plot resides, and that he is as real, as actual (if not more so), to the medieval man as the man and his wife in the play. The poets of the miracles accepted this concept of the Devil's existence and role in their own presentations of common, recognizable reality.

54. The legend of the sage-femme Salomie alluded to in Note 26 was altered slightly by Jacques de Voragine when he changed the name of one of the sages-femmes from Zelemi to Zebel in his Légende dorée. This change is seen in the Cangé Miracle de Nostre-Dame (V). From there several poems of the twelfth and thirteenth century and especially a mystère provençal replace the midwives altogether with an infirm woman named Anastie or Honestase. This Anastasie, born without arms miraculously grows a pair from the moment she verifies the virginity of Mary, the mother of the enfant Jesus. See Emile Mâle, L'art religieux, p. 250, who cites Paul Meyer, Romania, XIV (1885), p. 497.
CHAPTER II

THE EVOLUTION OF JUDEO-CHRISTIAN DEMONOLOGY

Part I: The Heritage

From the first century A.D. to be a Christian was to believe not only in the Trinity, but in Lucifer or Satan known popularly as the Devil or the Enemy.¹ Judging from the lengthy treatment of the Devil in the letters of the Apostles writing shortly after the ascension of Christ and from the works of the early Church Fathers of the second century on through to those of the teachers of the Middle Ages, Satan was no less real and active than one's own next door neighbor.

One may well inquire into the origins of medieval man's belief in the Devil.² Why was the average man afraid, and yet fascinated by witches? How did he explain the impure, evil thoughts which bedeviled him? Whence came the terrifying idea that winged Satan watched over his deathbed? As will be seen, these conceptions were not a fanciful creation of the Christian Church, but were ideas of long standing among some of the most learned thinkers and theologians. The beliefs which most affected the playwright of the Occident in the fourteenth century came to him from the Church whose leaders knew and considered sound in large measure the writings of the Rabbis as well as those of the Apostles.³

From Christianity's inception a good deal of Jewish demonology was naturally brought into the Christian faith and gave to medieval man's many ideas concerning demonic powers very deep roots. One notes the reliance upon former teachings throughout the works of the Christian writers. Most prominent in the medieval heritage of belief in Satan's powers was the idea of danger which is conveyed in the warning of Jesus recorded by St Luke:
But I will warn you whom ye shall fear;
Fear him, who after he hath killed hath
power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto
you, Fear him. (12: 5)

With this keynote ringing throughout the centuries any penance or pain
endured on earth or even hereafter could be faced if it were thought to
be an effective protection from that awful power for eternity.

The name Satan is a Semitic word, derived from an etymon which
means "to oppose" or "to act as an adversary," but in New Testament
literature the names Satan and Devil are used interchangeably. The Greek
word Diabolos corresponded to the Hebrew Satan. The verb diaballein
means to defame, inform against, hence the noun "calumniator" or "slanderer;"
From these names which have endured even to the present era can be surmised
what are some of the primeval attributes of this mysterious creature.
Whereas it is not feasible to trace the entire development of Jewish
concepts concerning the identity and role of Satan, there are salient
features which may be noted as having greatly influenced Christian thought
in the Middle Ages.

In the rabbinical, extra-canonical writings, two major kinds of
works dealt at length upon the character of Satan. The official Talmud
had precedence over the apocryphal, sometimes called apocalyptic, and
non-official works. The Jewish Apocrypha seem bent upon muddying the
waters in an attempt to explain various misdeeds, trials, and misfortunes
of mankind and in particular those accruing to the lives of the Patriarchs
as sketched in the Old Testament. 6

Another name for Satan in the Apocrypha is Mastema, a demon prominent
in the Book of Jubilees (ca. 135-105 B. C.). Although sometimes identified
with Satan, he is represented as the chief or prince of evil spirits which
sprang from the union of angels with earthly men (Jubilees x. 5). 7 It was
Mastema who allegedly urged the testing of Abraham in demanding Isaac as a sacrifice, and at Abraham's faithfulness he was put to shame (Jubilees xviii, 9ff). There is also reference to a class of Mastema just as a class of Satans is indicated in I Enoch. There is, then, a sense of hierarchy among evil beings created in Jewish demonology well before the Christian era. Satan is not considered a lone rebel, but rather a leader of a large number of beings similar to him but subject to him. Numerous passages in the apocalyptic literature discuss the fall of angels and the origin of demons. Most of these seem to be based upon Genesis 6:2 of the Old Testament which states that "... the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose." Of these were born the Nephilim or giants. It was generally agreed upon by the rabbis that the "sons of God" were angels.

Enoch I (ca. 170 B.C.) gives the fullest account of how these angels or "sons of God" were led by two great chiefs. Semjaza urged the angels to descend to earth and marry the daughters of men. Thereafter he taught enchantments and root cuttings. This association of demonic power and knowledge with the art of enchantment and other occult practices sifted down to medieval Christendom. Semjaza and his associate Azazel were held responsible for bloodshed and lawlessness which followed the descent of the angels. Azazel is said to have taught men to make swords, shields, and breastplates. All sin is ascribed to him (I Enoch), and the Deluge was allegedly sent because earth-dwellers had learned all the secrets of the angels and the violences of the Satans. 8

In rabbinical literature there are two major accounts of the origin of Satan. One account says that he was created on the sixth day at the same time as Eve (Beresith Rabbah xvii). This tradition connects Satan
with the Fall of man. However, the more prevalent tradition and the one
carried forward by the Church into the Middle Ages, states that Satan was
a fallen angel, identified with Sammael or the highest throne-angel, above
the Seraphim.\(^9\) Hence the responsibility for evil rests primarily upon one
celestial rebel rather than upon two or more of equal rank.

Rabbinical legend also says that the point of conflict arose over
the creation of man. Some angels vainly opposed it from the outset and
were incensed at man's being allowed to give names to God's creatures as
a sign of superiority (Beresith Rabbah xvii). Consequently the jealousy
of certain angels spawned a conspiracy against Adam. Sammael, being first
among all the angel princes, and a company of angels subject to him are
said to have visited earth and chosen the serpent as a suitable instrument
for their vengeance.\(^10\) Herein is the idea again expressed as in numerous
passages in the New Testament of Satan being a chief of a class of fallen
angels.\(^11\)

In the Martyrdom of Isaiah (ca. A. D. 1-50), references are made to
three great princes of evil, Beliar, Sammael, and Satan. It is difficult,
however, to determine the precise relationship among them, although Beliar
is the angel of lawlessness in this case.\(^12\)

In the Ascension of Isaiah appears the combined name Sammael Satan
who abides in Manasseh and who was led from God to serve Satan and his
angels. Sammael, as an Angel of Death, stands beside a dying man with
a drawn sword on the point of which trembles a drop of gall. When the
dying man catches sight of him he is startled, opens his mouth, swallows
the drop of gall, and expires (Targum of Jesus to Genesis 3: 1, T.B. Abuda
Zarah 20b).\(^13\) It is in his role of Angel of Death that Sammael caused
the death of Moses (Debarim Rabbah xi).
Satanail, the name of the chief power of evil, is found only in II Enoch, which relates how certain superior angels (Satans) under the prince Satanail revolted against God. Three of the revolters went to earth. While Satanail was imprisoned in the fifth heaven, the rest were imprisoned in the second heaven. God is represented as saying that He threw out the chief and his order of angels for the inadmissible thought of placing Satanail's throne higher than the clouds above the earth in order to equal God's rank. Satanail is doomed to fly in the air continuously above the bottomless. This idea is also found in the New Testament and represents the most prevalent belief among the Jews. This version was adopted by the most influential of the Christian teachers.

In the Book of Wisdom (11. 24), there is a famous passage which states: "By the envy of the devil death entered into the world, and they that belong to his realm experience it." Some authorities believe it refers to the murder of Abel. This interpretation seems to find support in the New Testament by St John since he attributes Cain's act to the prompting of Satan (I John 3: 12).

There are several passages in rabbinical literature which foreshadow the final destruction of Satan. There is also the implication that Satan will be overthrown by the Messiah (Yalkut Jesaj 359). One account tells of a resurrection at which time Gabriel will fight and prevail against Leviathan (T. B. Baba Bathra 75a). These echo the famous prediction of God made to the serpent in Genesis wherein the "seed" (Jesus) of the woman shall one day bruise the serpent's head at great cost to Himself (3: 15). In the New Testament St John's great vision (Revelation 20: 10) encompassed the end of the world as we know it and the final punishment of Satan and his angels. This idea survived and was strengthened so that to the
medieval Christian this final victory over the Enemy was an event to anticipate with relish. Emile Mâle observes that “Le jugement dernier, tel que le XIII\textsuperscript{è} siècle l’entend, est un grand drame qui se divise très exactement en cinq actes.”\textsuperscript{18}

The patriarch Naphtali is represented as assuring his sons that if they do good the Devil will flee from them (Testament of Naphtali vii. 4). Saint James, the brother of Jesus, affirmed the same thing in the New Testament (James 4: 7). The Devil makes the evildoer his own peculiar instrument (Naphtali viii. 6), and the Spirit of hatred is said to work with Satan (Testament of God iv. 7, v. 2). The inference is more than clear that Satan hates God and God’s special creation—Man.

The death of a man shows whether he was righteous or unrighteous when he meets the angels of the Lord and of Satan (Testament of Asher vi. 4). In the Bible this idea is amply demonstrated in the case of the Archangel Michael who contended with the Devil over the body of Moses (Jude 9), and in the instance when Jesus told Peter that Satan had desired him to sift him like wheat (Luke 22: 31). The Church readily accepted this idea, and it appears in some of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages. Hence, from these glimpses of Jewish thought concerning the Devil can be discerned a three-fold description of Satan as a Seducer, an Accuser, and a Destroyer. He is the chief of evil spirits or demons and is the bitter enemy of God and man.

These three major roles assigned to the Devil as well as his position in the hierarchy of the spirit world transferred from Jewish beliefs into the concepts of Christian demonology. From the teachings of Jesus among principally Jewish people which leaned heavily upon the Hebrew Scriptures and the teachings of St Paul among principally Gentile people which issued from both Hebrew Scriptures and the teachings of Jesus concerning the Devil,
the Apostolic Fathers of the second century had a wealth of material from which to draw their own conclusions. During the period of approximately A.D. 97-160 the early Christian literature reflected the great interest of the Apostolic Fathers in the person and work of the Devil, among whom the most notable are Ignatius, Polycarp, and Barnabas.

Ignatius, who was to become a central personnage in one of the Miracles under consideration seems to have referred frequently to Satan as either "the prince of this world" or "the Devil." Hence, in the second century he kept alive the terminology and many of the ideas of St Paul. When Christians meet together, he says, the power of Satan is cast down, and refers to the ill odor of the teaching of the prince of this world, an idea reflected in the priests' chronicles of the Middle Ages. Ignatius asserts also that the kingdom of Satan was pulled down when God appeared in the likeness of man, meaning Jesus Christ. He mentions "envy of the Devil" already alluded to in this study from the Book of Wisdom (11. 24), and he labels his own sufferings the "cruel tortures of the Devil."19

The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians (ca. A.D. 150) echoes the assertion of St John that whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the Cross denies the resurrection and the judgment and is of the Devil or the Anti-Christ.20 In the Letter at Smyrna to the Church at Philomelium (ca. 155) is found an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp and other Christians. It asserts that the tortures endured by the martyrs are designed by the Devil to bring them to denial. The Epistle of Barnabas (ca. 100) refers to Satan as the "Evil One," "The Active One," and, most peculiarly, "The Black One." Christians must offer resistance in order that the Black One may not enter them, for the Black One's way is crooked and full of curse.21 This title was literally applied to the Devil in
the literature and art of the Christian Church.\textsuperscript{22}

An elaborate demonology similar to that of the Jewish apocalyptic works abounds in the \textit{Shepherd of Hermes} (ca. 140-154): moral evils have an embodying demon; for example, slander is a restless demon, anger an evil spirit. This practice of assigning a demon for each sin found its way into the teaching of the medieval clerics and was often reflected in the morality plays.

There is an obvious citation from Revelation 12: 9 in the \textit{Fragments of Papias} which Andrea of Caesarea in his \textit{Apocalypsin} used in sermon number twelve, referring to Satan or the Devil as the "great dragon" or the "old serpent" who was cast down to the earth with his angels.\textsuperscript{23} Hence the imagery of the Old Testament depicting Satan as a monster such as in Isaiah's prophecy (27: 1) which concerns the Day of the Lord and his triumph over leviathan, the swift serpent, continued in Christian literature. In the light of such borrowings during this crucial period, it is easy to appreciate how strongly were interlocked the Christian links in the chain of demonology with those Jewish ones already forged before the advent of the Christ.

The learned Justin Martyr (114-165) has in several works left a philosophy of history in which Satan plays a dominant role. He follows Jewish apocalyptic literature in his opinions concerning the origin of demons, in that they are the offspring of the fallen angels who transgressed God's commandments. These fallen angels yielded to the fascination of women, an idea which seems to have lain at the root of the subsequent antifeminine interpretations by the Church of the Pauline Epistles of the New Testament.\textsuperscript{24}

Justin refers to Satan variously as the prince of evil spirits, the
Serpent, Satan, and the Devil. He clearly identifies the Devil with the serpent in the Garden of Eden or with the demonic power working through it. Having deceived the first pair, the "misanthropic demon" will one day be punished forever by fire. Further, demons subdued the human race to themselves by means of magical writings, teaching men to offer sacrifices of incense and libations. Poets and mythologists erroneously attributed these works of fallen angels and their progeny to God. Thus, says Justin, arose the horror of idolatry (Second Apology V). Hence the activities of Satan and his demons are varied and have left an indelible mark on the human family. Heathen mythology is an inspiration of the demons. They have misled men even after Christ's advent by putting up magicians such as Simon Magus and Menander to deceive. Heretics and false doctrine are obviously the work of the Devil, for they led pagans to imitate Christian rites such as baptism, asserts Justin. They are responsible for the persecution of Christians and they operate in dreams and terrify men into believing that they are gods assuming names they like. However, such enthraling power can be broken. Jesus is called by Justin "the Great Exorcist," and in his name Christians still cast out devils. According to Justin, Christians are more successful than Jewish exorcists, but he does not deny the power of the latter.

Thus it is in the thought of Justin that one discerns a sharp development in the movement of human thought which linked the Christian teaching concerning Satan with former conceptions, thereby making the Devil responsible for every kind of evil in the world. From the works of Justin Martyr there flowed an unbroken stream of demonology similar to this source, but augmented from time to time by important teachers.

Falling right in line with Justin Martyr concerning the origin of demons and Satan's fall are Tatian (d. ca. 170) and Theophilus of
Antioch (d. ca. 188). In his brief Address to the Greeks Tatian elaborates upon the spiritual versus the physical appearance. Spirit, he says, is finer in form than matter, and the bodies of demons are not seen, except by persons who are indwelt and fortified by the Spirit of God. This gift was to be much esteemed later by monks in the medieval convents. As robbers capture persons and hold them for ransom, so demons invade bodies and produce a sense of their presence in dreams. They produce physical sickness as well as moral and spiritual conditions, contends Tatian. They work by means of roots, sinews, and bones, but do not partake of flesh and do not die easily. Usually invisible and inaudible, these demons are overcome by faith in God and by asceticism. Those who would conquer demons should repudiate matter; but what thoroughly mystifies Tatian is the ability of Satan and his demons to take on material forms and make themselves both seen and heard.

Satan is a ruling prince, according to Theophilus, and demons are his followers. These followers are angels who fell into disobedience by an abuse of free will. Theophilus asserts the presence of demons in the air because they no longer are able to rise to heavenly things. They and the souls of giants, which are demons, wander about the world and perform actions similar to the nature they have received and to the appetites, physical and moral, which they have excessively indulged. Again he echoes Tatian in reference to Satan as the "prince of Matter."

Probably one of the most influential of the Apostolic Fathers was Tertullian (155-230) whose teaching exerted great authority until the nineteenth century. In his seven works there is a preoccupation with the idea of demons. He, too, regards Satan as the chief of demons fallen by an act of free will, although at first Satan was a good creation
of God. In his treatise against Marcion he calls the Devil a lying Archangel. Tertullian refers often to the "sacred books," probably meaning the Jewish apocalyptic works, for he relied upon them as authorities for his own speculations. He believed them to have been published before the Deluge, although he realized that they were not admitted to the Jewish canon and thereby not considered by others as sacred books. He seemed bent upon justifying his own reliance upon them as source material on the Devil among other things. Tertullian continues that every spirit, both angel and demon, possesses wings and that spirits are endowed with amazing swiftness, which allows them to be everywhere at once. Thus they have a semblance of divinity, for they know so quickly that they can give intimations of the future. The habitat of demons is near the stars, which helps them forecast weather. They also have access to both the body and soul of man. Although intangible and invisible, demons may be detected by the effects of their actions similar to that of the wind.

Tertullian expended much effort towards exposing the folly of idol worship, for he believed that the idolator is a fellow-worker of unclean spirits. Tertullian also denounced all kinds of images and statues dedicated to gods or to the memory of the dead. He would have been scandalized by medieval Church buildings, for he believed that demons took up their abode in the images of the dead; the Roman Capitol was to him a temple of demons. Therefore Christians must avoid places tenanted by such multitudes of diabolical spirits.

Persecution was thought to be the Devil's work, but Tertullian held firmly to the belief that the Devil would work only by the appointment of God. Satan was but an agent and went only so far as God permitted. Among their multitudinous activities demons could breathe into a soul and rouse
up its corruptions into furious passions and excesses. Likewise they put an invisible poison into the breeze which blighted apples and grain still in flower or in the bud and even at maturity. Similarly in men they caused diseases and pretended to cure merely by withdrawing the hurtful influence. An evil spirit supposedly shadowed every individual of the human race from birth. Tertullian taught that demons were a prime cause of heresy, sending heretics to seduce those who did not keep the faith as taught by the Church.\textsuperscript{36} However, demons were most active agents in necromancy. It was with their aid that sorcerers call forth ghosts and make what seem like souls of men appear. In the same way goats and tables are made to divine or answer riddles or questions.\textsuperscript{37} Hence all magical arts, incantations, familiar spirits, philtres, love-potions, and dreams are the stock-in-trade of demons.

Christians can, he affirms, undo the work of Satan by the exorcism of demons. He goes so far as to suggest that those who cannot exorcise demons are not genuine Christians. Exorcism is achieved by uttering the name of Christ and reciting the woes with which the demons are threatened at the coming of Christ the Judge, accompanied by a touch and breath blown over the possessed by the exorciser.\textsuperscript{38}

Origen (ca. 185-254) has left perhaps the most elaborate writings on demonology of any of the early teachers of the Church, and he is not unknown to some of the poets of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages. In the preface to his famous treatise De Principiis, he points out that the Church has always taught the existence of demons, but has not explained with sufficient clarity what or how they exist. Origen wished to distinguish clearly between the usage of the word demon in pagan and Christian thought. Whereas pagans believed in good and evil demons, Christians applied the name only to those beings who fell away from God. They were not demons
originally.\textsuperscript{39} He does not, however, trace the origin of demons to the unlawful intercourse of angels and the daughters of men, and thereby rejects one of the Jewish concepts already mentioned.\textsuperscript{40}

As for the fall of Lucifer, Origen cites Isaiah 14: 12ff (as applying to Satan), and he cites the words of Jesus in Luke 10: 18 as referring to his fall.\textsuperscript{41} Because he was cast down into this world exercising power over any who acknowledged his sway, Satan is called the "prince of this world" by Jesus himself.\textsuperscript{42} Satan is called "the adversary" because he was first among those happy ones to fall from the blessedness of heaven and to lose his wings. Satan and his angels made a lucid choice and fell through vanity.\textsuperscript{43}

Origen reinforces the belief that all creatures once belonged to God. Some angels still do, but others belong to Satan. Just as there is a hierarchy among the celestial angels, says Origen, so is there one among the fallen angels with Beelzebub as the chief of demons. There are distinctions between "principalities," "powers," "rulers of the darkness of this world," "spirits of wickedness," "malignant spirits," and "unclean spirits."\textsuperscript{44} Position and rank are determined by conduct and progress in wickedness, so that it is possible for a demon to change rank, work up or down the chain of command. A demon is not stratified by some inherent quality or propensity. Fallen angels and demons are one and the same, according to Origen.\textsuperscript{45}

Demons run riot in pagan countries, says Origen, and they haunt the dense part of bodies and frequent unclean places. They enter bodies of animals and stir them up to do their bidding, and certain noxious types of animals, such as serpents, foxes, and wolves, are more amenable to demonic influence. Hence each species of demon possesses an affinity with a certain species of animal.\textsuperscript{46} Origen further affirms that demons are not
bodiless, although their bodies differ from that of man and are not
normally visible to the human eye. In his *Exhortation to the Martyrs*
Origen says that demons need nourishment from the smoke of sacrifices—
blood and incense—in order to remain in the heavy atmosphere which
surrounds the earth and that those who provide these things aid demons and
partake of sin.\textsuperscript{47}

Origen advanced the notion that there are two ways in which demons
operate upon the lives of men. Those victims completely possessed by demonic
powers are captive without understanding or feeling; they are insane like
those said to have been cured by Jesus. Some people are possessed from
birth, a situation which crops up in the *Miracle de Robert le Diable*
(XXXIII) of the Cangé group. Sloth and neglect, says Origen, also allow
evil spirits to rush into the mind. The second way in which demons operate
is through suggestion by provoking thoughts in the minds of men.\textsuperscript{48}

The Devil and his demons are said to stir up princes to persecute
Christians in an attempt to destroy Christianity. These sinister spirits
inculcate the "wisdom of this world." Physical calamities such as plagues
or barrenness as well as climatic catastrophies may be laid at the door of
the Devil.\textsuperscript{49} Origen agrees with his brethren as to the connection between
magic and demonic power. He is also in agreement as to the possibility
of exorcism, and gives certain formulae used by the Jews in their war
against demons, two of which are "God of Israel," and "the God of the
Hebrews"—to be pronounced exactly and in the original language, for the
mystical power is lost in translation.\textsuperscript{50} Of course the name of Jesus is
the Christian formula, and His followers will always prevail using His
name. Citing the accounts in the New Testament of Jesus’ power over
devils, Origen contends that such power does His name possess that even
evil men can invoke it.\textsuperscript{51}
Probably his most daring speculation was that in spite of the depths of wickedness the Devil and his angels may be saved under the discipline of a future world. This teaching was branded heretical, and the Church successfully squelched it for many centuries. Jerome (340–420) for one strongly opposed the suggestion that the Devil will recover his former character and position.

From the third to the eighth century one notices a materializing of the Devil as the beliefs of the pagans are reviewed and not always rejected. A stable religious and political system was in the making, and the masterminds of this new civilization were above all strong. Throughout the furious controversies which divided the Christians into such sects as the Arians or the Monophysites, strange opinions were cherished in secret. The Church kept its sway and orthodoxy fairly well intact less by active persecution than by wise toleration or actual encouragement of certain innovations.\(^52\) Hence the cult of the Blessed Virgin and of the Saints, the reverence for relics, the worship of pictures and crosses seemed to satisfy the desire of many for the indulgence in superstition and for the desire for the marvelous.\(^53\) In keeping with the desire for order in the governing of the faithful the Church entertained speculations and finally the establishment of a celestial hierarchy and its opposite by inference, a hierarchy under the wily Satan. From this spiritual hierarchy was deduced an ecclesiastical one which placed the laity and the catechumens on the lowest rung of the ladder.

Eusebius (264–340), the famous bishop of Caesarea, is called the "father of ecclesiastical history," and in his treatises, *Preparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*, he reviews various pagan philosophies and religions, showing how in some sense they prepared for the coming of Christianity.\(^54\) He cites Plutarch to show that demons are
subject to death. Citing Porphyry concerning the rulers of the wicked
demons who are Saropis and Hecate and bringing in Scriptural teachings
by saying that Beelzebub is the prince of demons, Eusebius echoes Origen
in the belief that demons dwell above the earth and underground, haunting
the heavy cloudy atmosphere as well as graves and monuments of the dead
or in loathsome and impure matter; they are everywhere in houses and in
bodies.\textsuperscript{55} He also follows Origen in the differentiation of demons as evil
spirits, principalities and the like, but he agrees with Porphyry regarding
the invisibility of demons. Their forms are moulded in various shapes to
express the character of their spirits and are not clothed in a solid
body, for the worst of them can change form. Again he reinforces the
idea that demons delight in bloodshed and gore and in the fumes of incense
and vapors arising out of the earth. They also like certain kinds of food
and—disgusting thought—sit close to our bodies while we eat. Eusebius
says little about exorcism, but believes deliverance from demons can be
affected by preaching the Gospel, chastity, and pure disposition.\textsuperscript{56}

From Cyril of Jerusalem (315–386) on the one hand and Ambrose of Milan
(340–397) on the other rings out the message of warning against the Devil,
the great adversary of man. Cyril says that the Devil is called "Satan"
because of this and "Devil" because of his disposition to slander.\textsuperscript{57} From
Satan comes every kind of evil from fornication to divisions among the
people of God. Cyril anticipates the time when the Anti-Christ comes and
martyrs will have to do battle with Satan in his own person. Ambrose points
out that Satan causes ailments in the limbs and sickness. Both teachers
assume the general practice of exorcism.\textsuperscript{58}

Chrysostom or "The Golden-Mouth" (347–407) preached eloquently in
Constantinople concerning the Devil. His concepts generally echo those
of his immediate predecessors concerning the identity, substance, habitat,
form, powers, and activities of Satan and his demons. However, he asserts that they do not exercise complete tyranny over men, although Satan corrupts man through deceit. The providence of God prevails even to the demoniacs so that demonical operations are limited, and the Church is triumphant because of the advent of the Holy Spirit. There is a kind of energetic exuberance for the fight which reminds one of St Paul, whom Chrysostom obviously admired for his power over the Devil. Chrysostom also emphasizes the value of the Devil's activities in the development of human character. To eliminate the Devil would rob man of his chance to win crowns.\(^{59}\) For Chrysostom, victory over the Devil was an absorbing and exciting event on all accounts, from exorcism which could be affected by fasting to the miraculous healing of diseases caused by the Devil. Chrysostom cites the fact that St Peter's shadow was sufficient to expel diseases and that even the bones of the saints have power to expel demons.

Three greatly influential men, St Jerome, St Augustine, and Gregory the Great, followed one another and crystallized the beliefs propagated by the Church concerning Satan. Saint Jerome (340-420), perhaps the most learned of the Latin Fathers, shows Satan to be an enemy of God and man throughout his writings. His demonology is to be found primarily in his accounts of the lives of certain saints.\(^{60}\) Despite his caution against invention and his apparent consciousness of the tendency of some monks to exaggerate, he relates many anecdotes in which demons have made themselves felt, seen, and heard by men. He discusses St Anthony's vision in the desert of a creature who was half horse, half man, and thus a centaur, according to the poets. Saint Jerome confesses that he is unable to decide whether the Devil took this shape to terrify the saint or whether the desert actually engenders such a creature. He contributed greatly to
the permanence of the belief that Satan and the demons under his control are able to assume grotesque forms and manifest themselves to the eyes and ears of men. These "powers of darkness" which range the skies receive their orders and their particular offices from the Devil and not from God, says Jerome. They govern the world in the same way a civil government functions through its hierarchy.61

Saint Jerome echoes St Peter's designation of the Devil as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour.62 In the struggle between the flesh and the spirit it is Satan who besieges the body. In his letter to the young woman Eustochium who had recently taken the vow of chastity, after having described his own self torture in order to subdue the thoughts of fornication, Jerome wonders how much more difficult it might be for a maiden reared amidst the good things of the world. Thus does he counsel Eustochium to flee wine as a poison, for wine is the foremost weapon of the Devil against the young. Neither avarice nor pride wield half the power of wine. Wine and youth are double fuel to sensuality. Jerome cites Job as saying of the Devil that "his strength is in his loins, and his force is in the navel of his belly;" which is one way of designating the "uncomely" part of man and woman, wherefore, says the saint, the Devil's strength against man is in the loins and his power against woman in the navel. Whereupon Jerome brings to mind sordid events surrounding the lives of Samson, David, Solomon, and Tamar in support of this thesis.

Being convinced of the reality of demonic possession, Saint Jerome was equally confident in the power of Christians to cast them out. He recommends prayer and a word of command in the name of Christ for effective exorcism.63 Hence, the oft cited St Jerome was not guilty of underestimating the Enemy, for he warned against not only the snares laid for man in his fleshly appetites and natural desires but insisted upon the possibility
of visible and audible manifestations of the Devil and his minions to the hurt of God's children. His materialistic concepts were to flourish in later centuries.

In many respects the most influential writer of the time was St Augustine (354-430) who fixed the beliefs of the Church concerning man's relationship to God for a thousand years. Giving a lengthy treatment to the doctrine of the Devil and demons, he generally bases his concepts on those of previous writers by asserting that demons must never be considered good and evil as the Platonists did, for demons are thoroughly evil. He refers frequently to the demons dwelling in the air, a view common among the Greeks. Basing his doctrine upon Ephesians 2: 2, St Augustine denounces, as did his predecessors, the wicked practice of sacrificing to false gods or demons and to the Devil, who is inhabiting the dark heaven nearest the earth as one in prison. He believes that infants are subject to the assaults of unclean spirits, although no one can be possessed except by guile.

Saint Augustine could not believe that God's holy angels could have fallen by the means suggested in Genesis 6; rather, he prefers to think that the passage refers to the sons of Seth who formed connections with the daughters of Cain. As for the faculties of sight and hearing, admittedly demons have ones superior to those of man; nevertheless the latter surpasses them on the total scale of creatures because of his capacity to respond to the promptings of God. Man can be changed from a vile or useless creation to a noble, profitable human being if he will allow his soul to be filled with the presence of God and his life to be directed according to divine dictates. Therefore, man surpasses both animals and demons in virtue, which is a higher test.
It is just this void in the soul of a sinner that allows demons to operate frequently by suggesting unclean thoughts and by influencing dreams. Saint Augustine acknowledges the general rumor, too well verified by the experience of men that it would be imprudent to deny it, that sylvans and fauns commonly called *incubi* often made wicked assaults upon women to satisfy their lusts upon them. Certain devils called "Duses" by the Greeks are constantly attempting with success this impurity.

Saint Augustine supports the opinion that demons are intimately associated with magic. Magicians are able to accomplish marvels with the aid of demons, but God limits their power. Saint Augustine condemns the illicit art of necromancy as a criminal tampering with the unseen world. Those who practice these black arts are the slaves of the deceitful rites of demons, and those who seek divination by the aid of demons may find out some things about the past and future, but these people are often deceived by false angels whom God has subjected to the lowest part of the world. Saint Augustine observes that many people seeking to return to God, but ignorant of the true way, long for curious visions and have by correspondence of heart drawn unto themselves the dark princes of the air. The general rule of the Church, even in the case of children, is that exorcism is achieved by the sacrifice of Christ and the power of God's Holy Spirit. Saint Augustine affirms from his own knowledge that divine power is often manifested at the tombs of saints and martyrs, and thereby supports the belief of St Jerome on this point.

Gregory the Great (540-604) identifies Satan with the appellations of the Old Testament such as "the Dragon," "Leviathan," and "Behemoth." These names for the various devils were to appear often in the medieval *miracle*. Originally Satan was the chief of all the angels created by God,
affirms Gregory, and drawing many angels with him became apostate by
his own free will. Of course Gregory takes literally the allusions to
Satan in the Prologue to Job, and he waxes eloquent concerning the Anti-
christ who will specifically manifest Satan, but at the end of the world
will be destroyed by fire.\textsuperscript{72} Gregory affirms strongly that neither the
Devil nor his demons can repent. Gregory would have men know that the
activities of malign spirits are innumerable and that they influence the
minds of men waking or sleeping, often troubling the saints by dreams.
Satan's activities are not confined to the mental and spiritual world, but
he controls material things such as the elements in order to stir the air
with storms.\textsuperscript{73} The Devil is aware of his limitations and realizes that
all his powers are ultimately under the control of God, and likewise should
the believer understand this.\textsuperscript{74}

With Gregory the Great and John of Damascus a great many popular
tenets of the Church concerning the Devil, whether or not given official
sanction, merged and flowed on into the medieval scholastic system of
philosophy that was to be taught in the universities. From about the
fourth century, the idea of a hierarchy among the celestial angels
interested the teachers of the Church, who by extension of this principle
imagined a similar order existing among the demons who were, after all,
former angels. It appears that during the first century of the Christian
Church in particular, the writers of the Gospels and other influential
elders such as St Peter and St Paul, or Jude made but passing reference
to the possible types of demons, their main objective being to warn the
believers against the power of wiles of the Devil and to exhort Jew and
Gentile alike to recognize their plight as victims of the Enemy.\textsuperscript{75} They
urged, rather, the need for an unwavering faith in Jesus Christ, whose
return they expected shortly, whereas later writers began to enlarge in
extensive speculations upon scattered canonical and apocryphal hints concerning the Enemy and the spiritual creatures who were allied with him. They began to delve into the "private lives" of the fallen angels and seemed especially interested in the probable effects of their fall upon their intelligence and form. As has been noted, a good deal of controversy had arisen over the initial sin of the angels of God, its nature and motive. Orthodoxy denied the dualistic interpretation of evil, stating clearly that all creatures were good at first and that evil was a later, secondary attitude found among a third of the heavenly host. 76

Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) was among those interested in spiritual hierarchy, and he proposed nine denominations of angels as being those of angels, archangels, virtues, dominations, principalities, powers, thrones, cherubim, and seraphim in ascending order (Catechêse 23, Myst. 5). 77 Jean Chrysostom proposed the same list but gave "thrones" a different place in the hierarchy. The Apostolic Constitution gives a list which includes eternal armies: angels, archangels, thrones, dominations, principalities, powers, virtues, eternal armies, cherubim, and seraphim in ascending order. 78 Gregory the Great (Homilia) presented the same nine orders as those of St Ambrose: seraphim, cherubim, dominations, thrones, principalities, poten-tates (powers), virtues, archangels, and angels in descending order.

There was not, however, a systematic treatise concerning the celestial hierarchy until towards the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century when a body of writings appeared in Greek whose author made the impossible claim to be Dionysius the Areopagite who was converted under the preaching of St Paul in Athens (Acts 17: 34). Although the identity of Dionysius is still a moot point in ecclesiastical history there is no doubt about the influence of the corpus dionysiaca upon subsequent thinkers
and writers. 79 Whereas earlier Fathers of the Church such as Origen and St Jerome had already speculated upon the celestial hierarchy, nothing in the way of a fixed schema resulted until the dionysian works appeared. It fell to this neo-Platonic Christian philosopher to design two hierarchies, celestial and terrestrial, under God in the Trinity. Between God and man is a ninefold celestial hierarchy whose members endeavor to raise man to God by three stages—purification, illumination, and perfection. 80 The nine orders of the celestial hierarchy are divided into three triads according to their physical and spiritual proximity to God himself. The first or superior hierarchy is composed of the seraphim, the cherubim, and thrones, who receive the light of God directly and who transmit the revelation of God's holy pronouncements to the next rank. 81 Below these three orders resides the middle triad which consists of dominations, virtues, and powers, who receive the illumination of God through the intermediary of the superior triad. 82 In the lowest triad are principalities, archangels, and angels, of which the last are the messengers to the human world and are better known to men. 83

From these orders of good spirits fell certain ones who revolted through the abuse of their free will against the divine Light, which they either wished to ignore or surpass, thus refusing to participate in the celestial hierarchy according to their assigned capacities, and in so doing became blind on the one hand or frustrated by their unhealthy pride on the other. 84 Therefore demons were not created evil, and they have not always been so; neither are they totally deprived of all good, for they still possess existence, life, and intelligence. 85 They are called bad, however, because of the weakening of their natural activity or function: "Le mal qui est en eux, c'est une déviation, un abandon des biens qui leur conviennent, un insuccès, une imperfection, une défaillance, un affaiblisse-
ment de la puissance qui conservait leur perfection, un faux-pas et une chute."86 What other evil is there in demons? Dionysius answers that there are irrational wrath, unintelligent cupidity, and enterprising imagination.87 Demons are evil, not in conforming to an evil nature so designed, but in so far as they do not conform to their original nature and have deprived themselves of their initial state of being. Because of their desire for this privation the desire itself is evil.88 Dionysius builds his argument on part of Jude 6 of the New Testament where it says, "And angels that kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Therefore if demons are perverted it is because they have abandoned the right and power of their divine gifts.89

Hence, it is with no great surprise that in perusing the great book of Sentences by Peter Lombard, the scholar of the late twelfth century should find in the second book, which devotes much consideration to angels, the following lesson with an incorrect but honest citation of Dionysius as the source.90

Post praedicta superest cognoscere de
ordinibus Angelorum qui scriptura tradat.
Quae in pluribus locis novem esse ordines
Angelorum promulgat, scilicet, Angelos,
Archangeli, Principatus, Potestates, Virtutes,
Dominationes, Thrones, Cherubin, et Seraphin,
Et inveniuntur istis ordinibus tria terna esse,
et in singulis tres ordines, ut Trinitatis
similitudo in eis insinuetur impressa. Unde
Dionysius tres ordines Angelorum esse tradit,
ternos in singulis ponens. Sunt enim tres
superiores, tres inferiores, tres medi,
Dominationes, Principatus, Potestates: Inferiores,
Virtutes, Archangeli, Angeli?91

With such a formidable array of authorities emphasizing the power and activities of the Devil, the teachers of the Middle Ages could hardly ignore the doctrine in their attempts to reconcile faith and reason.
Satan was taken seriously by St Anselm, St Bernard, Peter Lombard, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, to name only the scholastic giants of the time.

In his dialogue De Casu Diaboli St Anselm (1033-1109) deals in a subtly profound way with the possible motives which could have led a former good angel of God to assume an attitude of hostility towards Him, and the question still haunts Christian theology today. If will and power are gifts of God, how then did Satan lose the gifts? Saint Anselm says that Satan did not continue to exercise his will in the right direction. Evidently the gifts were always there or available but were not appropriated to their intended end. Justice, says St Anselm, is willing what one ought, and injustice is willing what one should not. Satan's basic desire to be like God became sin by his willing excessively something beyond what he had received—that is, exceeding justice; he wished to become like God beyond what God wanted him to be. In his pondering of the sin of the Devil St Anselm veers close to the reasoning of Dionysius. Hence, the constant preaching of humility is salient among the medieval teachers. One must avoid the sin of Satan, the original sin of pride, suavely explained by St Anselm as an excess of a basically good desire, that of being like God.

In his treatise Cur Deus Homo St Anselm rejects Origen's idea of the ultimate salvation of the Devil; he also rejects the explanation that the death of Christ was a ransom paid to the Devil, although this view was supported by former Church Fathers and is reflected in a few of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages. Saint Anselm himself substituted a more reasonable theory that Christ's death satisfied the claims of divine justice which demands its due before a pardon can be given to sinful mankind.

Among the textbooks used from the late twelfth century onward few exerted the influence of the Libri Quattuor Sententiarum of Peter Lombard
(1100-1160). This theological manual earned for Lombard the title "Master of Sentences." As one would expect of one of the first doctors of theology of the University of Paris and later bishop of Paris (1159), Lombard's work deals profoundly with every phase of belief in good angels and demons. Using the reference in Isaiah 14; 12 Peter says angels were created in the higher empyrean heaven, but were cast down for pride. He says that Lucifer, already in the empyrean, resolved to go higher still, to scale the height of God and attain equality with God. All angels were created good, but not righteous; for righteousness is attained only by the free exercise of the will. Those angels who turned to God in love were illumined and became righteous, and those who turned away in envy or hate were blinded and became unrighteous. Demons who are both spiritual and wicked draw near to mortals in the turbulent air. Lombard carries forward the idea that there are orders among evil angels as among good ones and that so long as the world endures there will be hierarchies. There are major and minor superintendencies with some demons set over a province, others over a man, others over a vice such as the spirit of pride or the spirit of luxury. Lombard thinks it possible that some demons remain in the infernal regions and take turns tormenting the souls of the wicked. Using the descent of Christ into Hell to bring forth the justified, Lombard emphasized the doom of the sinner; for if the righteous descended thither, how much more the unrighteous. He affirms that at the Last Judgment Satan and his demons will be cast into eternal fire.

Saint Bernard (1090-1153) along with St Augustine becomes one of the Church authorities most often quoted in the sermons of the Miracles de Notre-Dame par personnages. Although more scriptural than St Anselm in his treatment on the subject of Satan, he is not entirely free from speculations. His teachings are contained in scattered references through-
out his works. Satan and his angels fell, says St Bernard, because of pride, and the fall left many vacant places in heaven which will be filled by God with the redeemed souls of men.97

Most of the work of Albertus Magnus (1205-1280) consists of discussing the Sentences of Lombard. He says that when angels fell is uncertain, but that, being created good, they fell into sin of their own free will.

Saint Thomas Aquinas (1227-1274) left works which are today the most authoritative compendium of Christian Theology in the Roman Catholic Church. In the Summa Theologica he discusses eruditely every phase of demonology, seeking to give an answer to every question. While treating on the subject of the sin of the angels St Thomas was at some pains to reconcile a passage in Ezekiel with the hierarchy set up by Dionysius as he attempted to ascertain the order of angels to which Lucifer formerly belonged.98 He seems to waver as to whether or not Lucifer could have been a Cherub or a Seraph.99 He follows Dionysius' interpretation in his reasoning that Lucifer must have been a Cherub because the word Cherubim means an abundant knowledge and may exist beside mortal sin whereas the word Seraphim which means a brilliant flame and presupposes ardent love for God could not possibly apply to a creature that sins.100 Saint Thomas also concludes that the rest of the angels which fell with Lucifer were of inferior rank, but were not coerced because they felt that in aligning themselves with the Devil, in placing themselves under his command, they might conquer and attain their ultimate happiness in one stroke. It was, for them, a simple transfer of allegiance, since they were already under the superior angel in the celestial hierarchy. Hence, as a superior angel Lucifer increased his responsibility as an instigator of rebellion and retained his leadership in wickedness: "Et ideo factus est etiam in malitia major."101 It is in this manner that St Thomas reproduces the principal
ideas of Dionysius, Lombard, and Albertus Magnus as well as other predecessors.

It was during the fourth Council of Lateran, which convened on St Martin's Day in 1215, that the doctrine of the Western Church was formally established. 102 Innocent III caused seventy canons, prepared by himself, to be read before the assembled prelates who accepted them. The first canon concerns the doctrine of the Trinity and declares that God made all things—even the demons who were originally good, fell into sin, and led man astray. 103

Thus in an unbroken chain of teaching the Church etched upon the consciousness of its adherents the towering figure of Satan, an angel and prince of demons having come from the Courts of Yahweh of the Old Testament. A fallen angel, he emerges from rabbinical writings in darker hues to be elaborated upon by the various sects of the early Christian Church in the regions bordering the Mediterranean Sea. The great teachers and philosophers of the Roman Church, learned in pagan and Christian literature, made permanent contributions to the conception of Satan. This supernatural figure whose existence and activities were revealed by God in both the Old and New Testaments materialized increasingly in Church doctrine from the second century. As the Church evangelized and brought under its sway pagans of high and low degree, the superstitions, folkloric and otherwise, of the new regions accepted the Devil as the chief power or instigator of witchcraft, so that despite the schism between the Byzantine Church and the Roman Papacy, 104 beliefs, practices, and heresies concerning Satan knew no boundaries. The manichean dualism, which suggests that two opposing powers or beings of equal strength are engaged in a cosmic struggle for supremacy, grew under various guises within the Church and thus added to the prestige of the Devil. Hence, in the early Middle Ages almost the
entire world believed itself subject to the power of Satan or the Devil as portrayed by Judeo-Christian tradition.

Part 2: Medieval Man's Attitude Towards the Devil

The Devil of the layman of the Middle Ages was similar to the one who haunted the monk. This was probably due to the monastic movement which included orders of lay-brothers, who with the staffs of menials and other servants, went in and out of the monasteries carrying with them stories about the activities of the Devil and his demons. On the other hand, the ecclesiastical chroniclers report sightings and devil possession which allegedly occurred outside the confines of the monastery, but were brought to the specific attention of the local clergy, usually for exorcism, so that the flow of information was not in one direction. Amazingly, throughout Europe, identical phenomena were reported, particularly in the realm of demonic appearances and witchcraft. This was probably due largely to the uniformity of Christian teaching on the subject of the demonic power and the use of a common catechism.105

The average man was, of course, little concerned with the origin of the Devil or the ecclesiastical explanations for his activities. He picked up enough scraps of information, particularly of the more sensational kind, to put him on the alert against possible, even probable attack from the Enemy. Hence, whatever protection was offered by the Church, coupled with superstitious customs, was seized upon by the believer. Much of the information concerning the Devil of the layman as well as that of the monk of the Middle Ages is preserved in the chronicles of such monasteries as Heisterbach, Cluny, and St Denis. Since much of the popular lore was purely verbal one must rely upon the written forms which have survived the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as faithful examples of the kind of
thinking prevalent among the masses. From the evidence of the *fabliaux* and songs which exist in writing one may conclude that in these popular entertainments the allusions to the Devil are not numerous nor fraught with metaphysical implications. Satan's function in the daily vicissitudes, ironies, and funny incidents which comprise the content of most of these tales and songs is either assumed or ignored, for the Devil is seldom mentioned except in an oath or ejaculation. Indeed, the *fabliaux* are the kind of story one might imagine being told among the medieval devils for a good laugh at the expense of the human race. As Joseph Bédier has ably pointed out the *fabliaux* exclude religion and the supernatural, for their end is to make people laugh rather than cause them to think seriously.  

That the Devil materialized frequently is commonplace in medieval demonology. The famous work *Salimbene's Chronicle* (1221-1281) has the story of a Friar to whom the Devil came habitually in the forms of Saints Francis, Anthony, Claire, Agnes, and Mary.  

He was reported as disguising as the Christ Himself or taking on animal forms.  

Scriptural allusions to the Devil, particularly in the New Testament warranted the belief that men actually saw and heard demons. The accounts of the temptation in the wilderness of Jesus by the Devil were a touchstone for the concept, for the divine sanction seems to have been given herein for it.  

It is a psychological truism that people often see what they believe it is possible to see and that mental vision may be mistaken for a visible and tangible reality. The lonely life of a monk and his meager diet creating physical weakness greatly favored the fashioning of such mental illusions.

The monks blamed the Devil and his demons for headaches, indigestion, flatulence, melancholy, fever, and accidents. Demons were believed to creep into teeth and cause them to ache. They swarmed under garments with the bodily semblance and blood-thirsty appetite of fleas. The *Vita*
S. Romualdi by Petrus Daminnus is a vivid narrative of the conflict between the saint and demons in various cells wherein he sought refuge from the world. It is told that the saint lent his cell to one of his disciples for whom demons made it a night to remember. The poor disciple was thrown to the floor and left half dead. Seeing that the demons had failed to fright him, the Devil adopted the form of a foul, hairy creature and rushed madly upon him threatening death. Nothing daunted, the disciple called upon Christ for help. Whereupon the Devil struck the wall of the cell with such violence that heavy boards were split. Hence it was known that the Destroyer would stop at nothing to subdue his victims.

Such violent incidents as these invite skepticism in the mind of the modern Christian; however, it would be imprudent to suppose that all the events which were recorded by the chroniclers were fiction or invented romances in order to scare monks and laymen into obedience to the Church. There has been, perhaps, too much emphasis by some historians laid upon the avowed falsehood of some of the stories designed for the edification of the devout, for the chronicles of the monks were not compiled as works of the imagination any more than those case studies so carefully recorded by those engaged in present day psychical research. That which most distinguishes the medieval and the modern chronicler of para-normal phenomena is the basic assumption or theological orientation of the investigators, and this difference must be appreciated in order to accept the Devil as a character in the miracles as the medieval spectator perceived him.

One such careful chronicler, Pierre le Vénérable, friend of St Bernard, who was abbot and reformer of the Cluny Monastery of the twelfth century, provides a rich source on visible demons. In the following story one may appreciate the frequency with which demons visited monasteries as well as
the versatility which they exhibit in their forms and the care with which these occurrences were often researched. This occurrence also demonstrates what activities were considered typical among demons, such as their penchant for comparing notes on their several evil projects.

It is told by Pierre that a lay-brother, a carpenter, rested at night in a place somewhat removed from the rest. As was customary in the monks' dormitories, the place was lighted by a lamp. The lay-brother saw a monstrous vulture whose wings and feet were scarcely able to bear the load of his great body and who labored towards the amazed brother and stood near his bed. What is more, two demons in human form spoke with the vulture, who was obviously a demon himself, asking what his business was there. They wondered if he could do any work in the place. The vulture replied that he could not, for he was thrust out by the protection of the cross, by the sprinkling of holy water, and by the muttering of psalms. He reports that he has labored hard all night consuming his strength in vain, wherefore he had come to this spot baffled and weary. Then he asked what the other two had been doing. They answered that they had come from Châlons where they had made one of Geoffrey of Donzy's knights fall into adultery with his host's wife. Next they had been successful in a certain monastery where they had caused the master of the school to fornicate with one of the boys. Then abruptly the demons upbraided the sluggard for not cutting off the foot of the monk who was sprawled in a disorderly fashion beyond his bedclothes. The monk realized that they were referring to him when one of the demons seized the axe from under the bed, swung it up to smite off the offending foot. Hastily the monk withdrew his foot, and the demon's stroke fell harmlessly upon the end of the bed, whereupon the evil spirits vanished. The next morning the brother related the vision to Father Hugh, who in turn sent to Châlons and to
Tournus to verify what the two demons had reported. Searching narrowly, Father Hugh found that these ministers of lies which the lay-brother had overheard in the night had told the truth concerning the knight and the school master.

Pierre disarms the objection that inasmuch as evil spirits surpass all human cunning in the subtlety of their malice, being nimble from no bodily weight and sagacious by long experience, how is it that they betray their wicked designs and deeds to men's ears? He answers that by God's hidden disposition they are often marvelously and incomprehensively caught in their own false wiles, that they are sometimes compelled to serve that human salvation which is always contrary to their desire.\textsuperscript{112}

Similarly Christina von Stommeln wrote to her friend Peter of Sweden in 1272 to tell how the Devil inhibited her prayers by coming in the likeness of a spider as large as an egg. and flying in her face and molesting her. Already he has set boils on her fingers, she affirms.\textsuperscript{113}

Etienne de Bourbon (b. 1195), a distinguished mission preacher among the early Friars, preached against the superstition that attributes divine honors to the demons or to any other creature. Such superstitions were found to be rampant among the ality. In a case at Lyons Etienne discovered that St Guinefort, to whom the women had taken their children, was in reality a greyhound which had saved the life of his master's infant, but was erroneously killed by the said master. Upon discovering his mistake, the master had put the dog's carcass into a well, heaped up stones, and planted a tree as a memorial. The country folk, hearing of the dog's heroism, flocked to the place and honored the dog as a martyr by praying to him. All this, says Bourbon, was at the instigation of the Devil who had deluded them: \textit{seducti a diabalo et ludificati ibi pluries, ut per hoc homines in errorem adducerat.}\textsuperscript{114} Women with sickly infants resorted to the place
in an attempt to persuade the demons to take back the weak children and return the sound and healthy ones which have been spirited away. An old crone from a nearby village accompanied the mothers in order to lead them in the rite. Bourbon had the bones of the dog exhumed and burned, and he persuaded the lords of the country to issue an edict threatening the confiscation and public sale of property against any who should resort to the same place.\textsuperscript{115}

If the country folk were seduced by the Devil into bizarre forms of idolatry, they were no more gullible than some of their brethren in the Church. The clergy were not above consulting necromancers and dabblers in magic. Returning to Étienne de Bourbon, we find that while he was a student in Paris a certain noted thief entered the hostel where the students resided while they were at Vespers. One of the students who had lost the volumes of law books hastened to the wizards, of whom many failed him. At last, however, one of them adjured his demons and, holding a sword, bade the young scholar gaze upon the blade. After seeing many things there, he saw in a succession of visions how his books were stolen by one of his comrades, a cousin thought to be the most upright of the group. The boy openly accused his cousin. Later, the thief stole again, was caught, and confessed the theft of the books. With this story Étienne cautions that demons may not be trusted, for they will slander a good man, break the bonds of charity between kinsfolk, and bring the man who believes in them to eternal perdition.\textsuperscript{116} Étienne makes a good résumé here of the salient characteristics of the Devil's operations among men, all of which are realized in the dramatized miracles.

Despite the repeated warnings of the Church Fathers, laymen and clergymen alike could not be kept from venturing into the dominion of the Devil—magic. From the \textit{Grandes Chroniques de St. Denis} comes the
narrative of an abbey of the Cistercian Order which in 1323 was robbed of a fabulous sum. It was believed that certain devils gave information if summoned by rather involved rites, and the priests of the abbey were not above exploiting the possibility of finding the thief in this way. A former provost of the Chateau-London was contracted to find the thieves through a sorcerer. A large chest with holes was made and a black cat was placed therein with three days' food, the food being bread steeped in chrism (consecrated oils and holy water). Unfortunately some shepherds' dogs discovered the cat, and a large inquisition ensued which traced the matter back to the provost. During the inquisition into the cat's unseemly burial it was discovered that among the known masters of the art of sorcery the rite was common; that is, the cat was to have been flayed and from its hide three thongs were to be made, stretched to their fullest extent, and knotted together. With this length of cat's hide a circle would be transcribed, and in the center would be placed a man who had eaten of the same food which was fed to the cat. The man within the circle would call upon a devil named Beric, who would come instantly and answer all questions.
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The importance of demonology to the training of monks is amply demonstrated in the works of Caesarius of Heisterbach (1220-1235) who wrote The Dialogue of Miracles in twelve books, of which book five is devoted entirely to demons. He teaches the importance of confession with anecdotes about the Devil's ability to reveal all unconfessed sins through a medium, but once a sin is confessed it is blotted from the memory of the Devil. However, if one confesses with the entention of sinning again, then Satan's knowledge is in no wise reduced. Herein is shown the importance of confession as a protection against Satan the Accuser.

In the fourth book Caesarius explores the possibilities of trouble from the Devil as a subtle tempter. The tool of pride, one of the Seven
Deadly Sins, preoccupies the good teacher because it is this sin that lies at the heart of a devilish nature, is easily concealed behind apparent acts of benevolence, and can overtake the victim without an overt act of Satan. Caesarius relates a mild instance of pride among the clerks who sang in the choir only to discover that instead of their voices ascending as an acceptable gift to God the Devil was collecting their voices in a sack. A certain clerk who observed this phenomenon told his self-congratulating brethren about his vision, and they stood rebuked. In connection with this insidious aspect of the Devil's work, the famous preacher Berthold von Ratisbon (b. 1220) assured his auditors: "...didst thou see but once a single devil as he is; then wouldst thou surely never commit one sin again; that itself is one of their snares the worse of all that they have, that they deal so stealthily with us..."\(^{119}\)

The Devil is also clever at deterring those who have made a vow either to God or to one of the saints. Caesarius strenuously warns the novice that one must not fail to make good any promises or pilgrimmages no matter how inconvenient, for as long as one follows the siren's song of delay one's soul is in constant jeopardy. He illustrates this dangerous procrastination in relating at length the nearly fatal negligence of a certain knight named Mengoz, who was spectacularly rescued by a friend from the literal clutches of a demon that had grabbed him by a foot and was dragging him face downward along the pavement.\(^{120}\)

The touch of the Devil was considered to be lethal by many. Caesarius of Heisterbach reports that a woman died when her hand was pressed by the Devil, who was in the guise of a serving man whom she knew. She had ordered him to leave her, and straightway lay down, but within a few days she succumbed to a weakness of heart.\(^{121}\) Caesarius assures the novice that the nature of demons is so baleful and poisonous that men are injured
at the sight of them. He says that a lay-brother named Albero fell sick
at the sight of a demon and remained so for eight days. Often the sight
of the Prince of Darkness causes pain thereafter in human nature when a
man looks at a fire which is a source of light.

The debilitating effect of the Devil's presence is demonstrated by
the anecdote told by Caesarius about two young men exercising their
horses near a stream after sunset on the eve of St John Baptist. They
saw a woman in a linen robe, and thinking that she might be practicing
magic as some do on that particular night, the men crossed the stream to
arrest her. The woman gathered up her robe and fled. The men pursued her
at a full gallop and exhausted their horses in chasing the fugitive who
eluded them like a shadow. They came to the abrupt realization that it
was a demon, and both made the sign of the cross. The woman vanished,
but from that hour on both men and horses suffered a state of languor.\textsuperscript{122}
It is not surprising, then, that strangers were often eyed askance and
avoided by the country folk and burghers. The touch of a stranger or,
worse yet, that of one familiar might be the fatal touch of the Devil.\textsuperscript{123}

Devil possession continued to be reported in much the same frequency
as it appears in the New Testament. Caesarius again provides a wealth of
anecdotal material concerning this, all of which tends to caution one
against uttering such curses as "May the Devil take you," or "Go to the
Devil." Near Aix during a mass at St Saviour's Mount, for example, a
woman possessed of a devil was brought in. The priest read over her the
gospel for Ascension Day (Mark 16: 17) and placed his hand on her head.
She uttered a lamentable cry which terrified everyone. The priest adjured
the devil to leave the woman, to which it replied that it was not yet the
will of the Most High. When asked how he entered, the devil did not reply,
nor did he allow the woman to answer. Caesarius says that later the woman
confessed that her husband had said to her in anger, "Go to the Devil." At moment she felt him enter through an ear. In the *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages* such rash speech and pacts with Satan on the part of parents and husbands is dramatized to show the power of Satan when he is invoked against a relative.

A certain abbess of St-Armand at Rouen reported by letter on a strange case of a woman from the village of Lissy occurring in 1107. Beset by the Devil with various fantastic and malignant cogitations which caused her to lose her mind and set herself to suicide by either hanging or drowning, she forgot in her deadly melancholy God and the Christian faith. However, the abbess reports a miracle occurred when the demoniac was brought to her church, even though the woman refused to make the sign of the cross and used her diabolical cunning to elude the appointed guards. Feigning weariness, she lulled her watchers into sleep, after which she crept away and hanged herself from a pillar. When her lifeless corpse was found, it was brought down to the church pavement, whereupon three sisters went to beseech the archdeacon with tears for advice while the others prayed over the body. The archdeacon returned with the sisters and found that breath struggled for revival in the woman's breast. She remained speechless for a day and a night and was so strong that four men could scarcely hold her. At dawn of the second day, however, her first words were: "Holy Lady, loving Mother of God, Mary, be thou my help!" The abbess concluded that the woman lived on in the praise of Christ the Savior. The narrative of the abbess reflects the typical belief of the populace that suicides were directly instigated by the Devil, whose role as a Destroyer was literal. It is little wonder, then, that suicides were denied Christian burial in consecrated plots.

Satan the Destroyer was known to contend for a man's soul even after death. Caesarius of Heisterbach was told by an aged Benedictine monk of
such a confrontation between demons and holy angels. A certain rich usurer who held in pledge the treasuries of several churches was stricken by mortal illness. The avaricious man began to think upon the burden of usury, the torments of hell, and the difficulty of repentance. He sent for the Benedictine abbot, saying that if the abbot would undertake to save his souls he would put all his property into his hands. The abbot conferred with the bishop, who asked for a portion of the usurer's wealth in return for absolution; and a deal was struck. The monks removed the usurer's money first, and then rushed the dying man in the last carriage to the monastery for the last rites. However, as soon as the carriage entered the gates of the monastery the usurer died. In the church as relays of monks sang around the bier during the night, four foul spirits appeared and took up a position on the left of the coffin. All were terrified and fled except for the aged monk who saw to his amazement an equal number of angels placing themselves to the right of the bier. The leader of the demons broke out into a psalm of David (36), "My heart showeth me the wickedness... this is fulfilled in this man." Another continued the theme, and a third chimed in on "The words of his mouth are unrighteous and full of deceit..." to which the fourth added his verse of condemnation. Altogether they claimed the man because of his guilt. The angels answered by continuing the psalm, each repeating a line or so in succession beginning with "Thy mercy, O Lord reacheth..." Finally the angels in chorus claimed the soul of the deceased because "God is just and the Scripture cannot be broken." At this the devils were stricken dumb, and the heavenly messengers took up the soul of the contrite sinner.¹²⁵

Probably of all the doctrines propounded concerning the Devil the rite of exorcism held strongest sway. Following the example of Jesus the "Great Exorciser," as Justin Martyr dubbed him, the Church held out
hope for deliverance from even so terrible a thing as devil possession.

Hugues de Saint Victor (d. 1141), a French philosopher and theologian of
the first half of the twelfth century, put down the formulas and teachings
of the rite in which he strongly believed. In his *De Sacramentis Fidei
Christianae* Hugues de Satin Victor devotes an entire chapter to the rite,
explaining that exorcists are those who invoke the name of the Lord Jesus
over the *catechumens* or the *energumens*, that is, those who have an unclean
spirit, that he may leave them. Rightly, therefore, the exorcism follows
the catechizing in order that the hostile power may be driven away from
the catechized or newly instructed in the faith.

The formal rite of exorcism, according to Hugues, begins with the
*energumens* receiving the sign of the cross on the forehead, breast, eyes,
nosstrils, ears, and mouth in order to protect the senses of the body by
which all sacraments are fulfilled and all devices of the Devil are
frustrated. Then salt which has been blessed is placed in the mouth to
season it with wisdom so that it may be free from the foulness of iniquity.
The subject then breaths out (*exaufflato*) to symbolize the renunciation of
the works of the Devil, that the evil spirit be driven out by the good
spirit. Next, the ears and nostrils are touched with saliva so that by
supernatural wisdom the ears may be opened to hear the word of God and the
nostrils quickened to discern the odor of life and death. This is the
sacrament of opening as in accordance with *Mark 7: 34*. The priest then
baptizes the candidate. Of course this rite was most fully carried out
in the perfecting of a novice who was not possessed of a devil.

On the authority of Origen and Tertullian, however, even the simplest
of the faithful were sometimes able to cast out demons, for a prayer of
conjuration was all that was needed, seeing that demons are unable to resist
the power of Christ's grace. Even after the institution of an order of
exorcists, exorcism was not forbidden to the laity.\textsuperscript{127}

The chief elements used in the blessing of persons or places were salt, oil, and water, and these were first exorcized formally to rid them of any demonic taint which they might harbor. After such purification these elements were in turn used for personal blessings or the consecrating of places such as churches and objects like church bells and altars. The Holy Water was a mixture of exorcized water and exorcized salt. In the prayer of blessing God was besought to endow the elements with the supernatural power of protecting those who used them with faith against the attacks of the Devil.\textsuperscript{130}

It was not a casual matter to approach a demoniac, however, for the Devil was a potent enemy to anyone harboring secret sin. Those hidden sins debilitated the potential exorcisor. Caesarius of Heisterbach records that a demon once vowed that he had no fear of a virgin monk because of the monk's pride, much to the surprise of the prior who had hoped to see his protégé do a wonder in exorcism.\textsuperscript{131}

The average medieval man used simple protections in the everyday struggle against the unseen enemy. The sign of the cross or a quick muttering of an invocation of Jesus or the Virgin Mary sufficed to make him more secure in moments of surprise and uncertainty. The recitation of a psalm would throw up a barricade around the traveler. If one were in danger of succumbing to a temptation, he might make a special trip to the local church and there pray before the shrine of his favorite saint or ask for the assistance of a priest. In the thirteenth century the practice of going on pilgrimage in honor of a saint made the carrying or the wearing on a string of a protective medal, often of lead, indispensable against Satanic assaults of one kind or another. Certain saints were invoked against the demon who caused various illnesses such as St Geneviève
against fever or St Blaise against a sore throat. Saint Apolline was supposed to chase tooth ache and St Hubert had special power against rabbis. 132

It was also in the thirteenth century that belief in the Virgin Mary's personal enmity towards Satan and her general indulgence for repentant sinners, whatever their crimes, was irrevocably established. 133 Often her power over the Devil was unleashed after the desperate cry of a backslidden believer whose past life had been devoted to her. She reserved the right, however, to upbraid her protégés before confronting the Devil and disarming him. Scholars have expressed amazement at some of the unregal behavior of the Queen of Heaven in the dramatized miracles of the fourteenth century, but there were precedents for her tendency to chide, to use common vocabulary, and to adopt a cavalier manner with the Devil bordering on that of a fishmonger. 134

Jacques de Vitry, an ardent preacher of the Crusades and elected Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1239, left a notable story of the Virgin's intervention in the scandal caused when a virtuous matron and a certain monk, who was treasurer of his monastery, were unduly beset by a jealous devil and agreed to run away together. 135 The woman stole from her husband and the monk from the monastery. At Matins the monks found the empty chest, while at home the husband discovered his loss and set out after the couple. The two were apprehended, brought back, and cast into a dungeon. Then coming to his senses, the monk called upon the Virgin Mary, whom he had served since childhood, and the matron followed suite. Finally the wrathful Virgin appeared, saying that she might obtain from her Son remission for the sin, but that it was doubtful as to what she could do about the scandal, for the name of the monk was a stench in the nostrils of the people, and all monks had suffered thereby. Entreated yet further, the Virgin consented to
intervene and summoned before her the demons who under the Devil's
directions had instigated the sin. The Virgin enjoined them to end the
scandal, which they did after some earnest reflection. The demons brought
the monk and the money back to the monastery and repaired the chest; like-
wise the lady to her chamber and the money in its chest under lock and key.
Upon discovering the lady at home, the monk at his prayers, and the money
returned, the husband and the monks were stunned and hastened to the prison
where they found what appeared to be the monk and the lady still in chains.
Actually one demon had assumed the form of the lady and another demon that
of the monk. The whole city gathered at the prison to witness the miracle.
Then one of the demons said in the hearing of all, "Let us depart now, for
we have deluded them long enough and given cause for evil thought enough
concerning religious folk." This legend became very popular in the Middle
Ages, and various other versions were circulated.¹³⁶

Hence, despite modern readings which tend to appreciate such stories
with a grain of salt, it cannot be safely stated that these tales were not
believed by the majority of the medieval Catholic world. A lone tale-
bearer might not have been believed, but often one or several witnesses
corroborated the accounts. Names, dates, places are liberally supplied
as ironclad facts. Just such an account is given in the Grandes Chroniques
de St Denis involving Adam, a lay-brother of Vaux-Cernay of the Order of
Citeaux, who with a servant set out before daybreak on Saturday before
Christmas in 1303 to meet his abbot at the Grange named Croches hard by
Chevreuse. During the course of the trip the Devil appeared in various
shapes, culminating in a classic confrontation involving the best of the
lore of demonology as handed down through the centuries.¹³⁷

With this "cloud of witnesses" one may venture into the artistic works
of the French of the Middle Ages well prepared for the wonders which one
will see, especially upon the stage. There is no need for sophisticated transpositions of abstract thought concerning evil into concrete, palpable forms. This had been done these many centuries. The playwright who dramatized a miracle and cast the Devil as one of his characters had a fairly certain faith in the existence of his character, and took liberties, of course, with the facts of lore concerning the Devil in much the same way he did with those facts surrounding Saint Alexis or Clovis, for example. The Devil actually furnished for the medieval poet a richer history, more precedents in his characterizations, more events, for his characterization than did any other of the more conventional historical persons that he might choose to portray.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO, PART 1

1. Whereas it is true that there was not a catechism of the doctrine of the Trinity formulated during the first century, there are among the writers of the New Testament several who witnessed to the belief in the triune God, of whom Jesus was the bodily manifestation according to St Paul (Colossians 2: 8-9). The apostle St Matthew quotes Jesus in the famous Great Commission as attesting to the three persons of the Godhead: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: ..." (28:19).

Saint John, the Beloved Disciple, backs up St Matthew's witness in his record of the Farewell Discourse of Jesus to the Twelve in which He promised not to leave them desolate, "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." (John 14:26). At several different intervals throughout this discourse Jesus describes the person and work of the Holy Spirit so that it was not a chance remark or a vague idea which gave birth to the Christian concept of the Trinity.

Saint Luke takes up the theme in his letter to Theophilus in which he describes the actual coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost to the group in Jerusalem with its phenomena of the sound of rushing wind, cloven tongues of fire, and the speaking by the apostles in strange tongues. (Acts 1: 4-5).

In his own letters of instruction to the believers St John disseminated on the authority of Jesus himself and personal experience at Pentecost a reverence for the Holy Spirit as the third Person of the Godhead (I John 5: 5-8). Indeed, the apostle Paul was accompanied on some of his missionary journeys by St Luke, preached the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a necessary experience to a believer's relationship with God. Saint Luke reports that when St Paul came to Ephesus he asked the Christians whom he found there if they had received the Holy Spirit when they believed. They answered in the negative, never having even heard of the existence of the Holy Spirit, although they had been baptized with water according to John's baptism (John the Baptist). Saint Luke relates further that St Paul baptized these men "in the name of the Lord Jesus," and that the Holy Spirit visited with results similar to those of Pentecost in Jerusalem (Acts 19: 3-4). In his epistles to the churches St Paul insists upon the Person of the Holy Spirit as the one who continues the work of Jesus Christ through believers, of which his letters to Corinth are typical (I Cor. 12: 3-4; II Cor. 1: 21-22). Therefore, during the infancy of the Christian Church wherever the apostles, and in particular St Paul, preached the doctrine of the Trinity was planted.

2. The word: "Devil" means the personification of supreme evil, the foe of the Christian God. When used in the plural, however, "devils" are synonymous with demons or fiends or evil spirits, malignant beings of superhuman power, fallen angels, so that the Devil or Beelzebub becomes the "prince of devils" as in Matthew 12: 24. In this study when the Devil is considered theologically as the supreme embodiment of evil, the word is capitalized; a person signs a pact with the Devil. On the other hand, a witch may work with a demon or a minor devil: a person is accused of receiving a devil's mark. The possessing agent in demonic possession is also presumed to be one of the representatives of Satan. Here the devil has not been capitalized.
3. For example, the Church finally rejected rabbinical conjecture that the first sin of the angels was marriage with human women.


6. Evidently the same curiosity about the persons mentioned in Holy Writ motivated certain believers, Jewish and Christian, to fill in details which are left out of the canonical narrative.


8. Ibid., p. 19.

9. Ibid., p. 11.

10. The serpent had hands, feet, and the gift of speech, and resembled a camel. Sammael took possession of the serpent and affected the Fall of Man. For this Sammael and his aids were cast out of heaven and the feet of the serpent were cut off (Bereshith Rabbah XIX). In the New Testament there are references made to Satan as the "old serpent" or "primal serpent." Saint Paul used such an epithet in writing to the Corinthians (II Cor. 11: 3) as did St John in the Apocalypse (Rev. 20: 2).

11. Saint Paul referred to him thus in his letter to the Ephesians (2: 2), "... wherein ye once walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the powers of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience; ..." See also Eph. 6: 12. Saint Peter echoes the same idea (II Peter 2: 4).

12. Langton, *Portrait*, p. 17. This is an attempt to combine traditions.

13. In the Hebrew idiom, expression like "son of ___" denotes persons possessing the quality indicated. It is this idiom where the term Bellar is associated with the words like "man, son, daughter," or "children" in the Old Testament. See *Portrait* by Langton, p. 17.


15. A capital passage which identifies Satan as the serpent and chief of the fallen angels is found in Revelation 12: 9 where St John writes: "And the great dragon was cast down, the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world; he was cast down to earth, and his angels were cast down with him." See also Jude 6.

16. Another tradition also recorded in II Enoch states that the Devil is the evil spirit of the lower places, a fugitive from heaven. Langton says the meaning here is probably that of lower celestial spheres and not subterranean regions. However, Satan's intelligence and understanding of righteous and sinful things remained intact. He understood his condemnation, and therefore conceived an attack upon Eve, but did not touch Adam. The mystery play, *Jeu d'Adam* (ca. 1146), has Satan trying unsuccessfully to seduce Adam twice before approaching Eve.


20. This assertion is in I John 2:22 which reads: "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the anti-christ, even he that denieth the Father and the Son."


22. An interesting example of the oriental view of the Devil and the color black associated with him appears in a Bible of St Grégoire de Nazianze now conserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, in which several miniatures include Satan. This Bible is but a copy of an earlier manuscript dating from the sixth century and hence reproduces an early artistic conception of Satan as an anthropomorphic creature with a well proportioned head and expressive face resembling the well known Molière as Scapin. In the Temptation of Job Satan with the familiar traits of claw-like hands and feet does nevertheless wear a black nimbus, a vestige of his former glory. See Jacques Levron, Le Diable dans l'Art (Paris, 1935), pp. 16-17. At the end of this chapter one of the harrowing ordeals of a lay-brother is recorded which again introduces the Devil as the Black One.

23. Langton, Portrait, p. 46. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, was supposed to have heard the apostle St John preach, and afterwards undertook to write Explanations of the Words of Jesus, of which only fragments have survived from the first half of the second century.

24. Even in the first century the three unforgivable sins after baptism were apostasy, homicide, and fornication. Early in the third century, Pope Callistus issued a mitigating edict allowing adulterers and fornicators one regeneration by penance. See F. J. Foakes Jackson, An Introduction to the History of Christianity (New York, 1928), p. 198.

25. Langton, Portrait, p. 46.

26. loc. cit.

27. Langton, Portrait, p. 47.

28. loc. cit.


31. Langton, Portrait, p. 49.

33. Langton, Portrait, p. 49.

34. Ibid., p. 50.

35. loc. cit.

36. loc. cit. Another teacher much concerned over the Devil’s part in heresy was Clement of Alexandria (d. ca. A.D. 220). His main objective as a Christian teacher was to break the bondage of tyrannizing demons. Clement makes reference to the Devil couched in Biblical terms, and his main interest centers around the activities of Satan as an influence of men. He denounced ancient poets like the Thracian Orpheus, who possessed a spirit of artful sorcery and enticed men to worship idols. The gods of the heathen were once men, he asserts, who died and were raised to honor by fable and time. Rightly, therefore, do men call them "shades" of demons. Clement asks how shades and demons can be reckoned gods, being in reality impure spirits. They are acknowledged to be of an earthly, watery nature, sinking downwards by their own weight, flitting about graves and tombs, appearing dimly, being but phantoms. He assesses pagan idolatry with the words from Psalms 96: 5, "For all the gods of the peoples are idols..." See Langton, Portrait, pp. 51-52.

37. Langton, Portrait, p. 50.

38. Ibid., pp. 49-50.

39. Ibid., pp. 52-53

40. Ibid., p. 53.

41. The passage begins, "How are thou fallen from heaven, O day-star, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, that didst lay low the nations! And thou saidst in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; and I will sit upon the mount of congregation, in the uttermost parts of the north;..." (Isaiah 14: 12-13). The passage in Luke reads, "And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

42. Saint John records such a reference three times in the Farewell Discourse. See John 12: 31; 14: 30; and 16: 11.

43. Langton, Portrait, p. 52.

44. These alleged orders of fallen angels were taken in part from the letter by St Paul to the Ephesians (6: 12), where he says, "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places."
45. Langton, Portrait, p. 53.

46. Origen thinks Moses used this as a basis for designating unclean animals.

47. Among the ruling Princes of Time are the Celestial Orders with Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones, Dominions, Virtues, Powers, Principalities, Archangels, and Angels. These designations were based primarily upon Jewish apocryphal writings such as Enoch I.


49. Ibid., p. 53.

50. The word Sabaoth means "powerful," but if translated into "Lord of Armies" or "Almighty" it accomplishes nothing. Langton, Portrait, pp. 54-55.

51. Langton, Portrait, p. 54.

52. The African bishop Cyprian (200-258) encouraged orthodoxy in his teachings concerning the Devil, and he attributed the fall of Satan to jealousy over the creation of man in the image of God. Hence, one must beware of the destructive and devilish attitudes of jealousy and envy, and Satan must be recognized as the "ensnaring adversary" whose work is to wound God's servants with lies. However, the machinations of the enemy are limited by God, and the Advent of Christ spelled the everlasting doom of the Devil. Although the waters of baptism may effectively nullify the effects of the Devil's malignity, Cyprian advocates more violent methods such as startling threats and heavy blows which can drive the demons howling from their victims. These methods were to be employed by many an abbot in the monasteries of the Middle Ages. The obvious question arises for the modern mind as to which of the two were actually yelling, the victim or the demon. See Langton, Portrait, pp. 55-56.

53. Jackson, p. 185.

54. Langton, Portrait, p. 56.

55. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

56. Ibid., p. 58.

57. loc. cit.


59. loc. cit.

60. The Vitae Patrum commonly ascribed to St Jerome in the Middle Ages contains material ranging from trustworthy descriptions to evidently legendary matter.

62. "Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." (I Peter 5: 8).

63. Langton, Portrait, p. 61.

64. See Note 11 of this chapter for the quotation.


66. Ibid., p. 63.

67. Ibid., p. 62.

68. This argument is in Book viii of De Divinatione Daemonum.


70. loc. cit.

71. Ibid., p. 62.

72. John of Demascus (d. ca. A. D. 754) reinforced (in the Eastern Church) ideas similar to those of Gregory the Great, particularly concerning the doom prepared for all demons and the Devil. He believed the Devil to have been created a good creature, but did not sustain the brightness and honor originally bestowed upon him. See Portrait, p. 64. Another notable teacher of Western Christendom often cited by medieval teachers is Isidore of Seville (560-636), who also proposed a ninefold hierarchy of celestial spirits. See his Etymologiarum, II, Books viii, ix.

73. Apparently the Church Fathers took a hint from the incident recorded in the New Testament (Matt. 8: 23-27; Mark 4: 37-41; Luke 8: 22-25) where Jesus rebuked the storm on the Sea of Galilee, and his disciples marveled and asked themselves just who he was that he commanded even the winds and the waters to obey him.

74. Langton, Portrait, p. 64.

75. Notable references are I Peter 5: 8, Ephesians 6: 11-13, and Jude 5-9.

76. In the passage in Revelation 12: 3-10 Saint John's vision of the red dragon whose tail "draweth the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth..." (v. 4) is so interpreted.


78. loc. cit.

79. Among those who kept alive the mystical ideas of Dionysius the Areopagite were Jean Scot Eriguène at the court of Charles the Bald, Fulbert (d. 1028) the founder of the School of Chartres, Abelard (1079-1142), Hughes of Saint-Victor, and St Thomas Aquinas. See Oeuvres complètes du Pseudo-Denys L'Aréopagite, Introduction by Maurice de Gandillac (Paris, 1943), pp. 49-55.


85. Occasionally the representation of angels and demons took on physical forms similar to those in the writings of St Jerome. In a letter addressed to a monk, Dionysius relates the vision of Carpos who saw Jesus in heaven surrounded by angels in human form and from an abyss in the earth serpents who crawled and slithered around the feet of two men pulling them over the edge. Epître VIII (1100A) in *Oeuvres complètes*, p. 349.

86. *Les Noms Divins*, chap. IV, 23 (725C) in *Oeuvres complètes*, p. 119.


88. *Les Noms Divins*, chap. IV, 23 (725C) in *Oeuvres complètes*, p. 120.


90. This particular division of the heavenly hosts is more nearly like that of Gregory the Great in that Virtues are placed with Angels and Archangels in his hierarchy whereas Dionysius gives Principalities with Angels and Archangels.


93. Jackson, p. 175.


95. Using the Descent into Hell by Christ to bring forth the justified, Lombard emphasizes the doom of the sinner; for if the righteous descended thither, how much more the unrighteous. He affirms that the Last Judgment will see Satan and his devils cast into eternal fire. By this time the descente aux limbes or the Harrowing of Hell as we know it was a cherished Easter tradition that when Christ died he visited the very midst of hell and brought out those righteous souls who were in Purgatory awaiting the promised deliverer, the Messiah. The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, circa second century, which was supposed to have been written by two men who arose the day Christ died, relates how Jesus came to their rescue. This grandiose account was to become dogma and is today part of the Apostles' Creed.
96. Lombard's reliance upon his predecessors is notable in his reference to Isidore of Seville concerning the powers of perception possessed by demons and to St Augustine upon the subject of the relation of demons to magic. See Portrait, p. 68.

97. Langton, Portrait, p. 67. Reference is to sermons xxii, xxvii.

98. "Thou was the anointed cherub that covereth: and I set thee, so that thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; ..." (Ezekiel 28: 14).


100. Ibid., p. 336.

101. Ibid., Question 67, Art. 8, pp. 337-341.

102. Besides the condemnation of the Waldensians and Albigensians, the Council made annual confession and communion obligatory and passed several decrees on marriage, and set up a hierarchy among the patriarchs in Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

103. Jackson, p. 194.

104. The discord which resulted finally in the separation of the Eastern and Western Catholics into two separate churches in the ninth century was discernable in the canons of the Council of Constantinople in 381. The third canon of this Council decreed that the bishop of Constantinople was second in honor only to the bishop of Rome, for Constantinople is the new Rome. The importance of the emperor of Byzantium in ecclesiastical matters was also to become a bone of contention.

Part 2

105. Langton, Portrait, p. 68.

106. Bédier objects to the inclusion of the récits miraculeux, Martin Hapart and Vilain qui donna son ame au diable, in the collection of fabliaux published by Messrs. Montaiglon and Haynaud, and he also rejects the Cour de Paradis and the Courtois d'Arras as designated by G. Paris saying:

Dans ces pièces, l'intention pieuse des poètes est évidente; ils seraient fort scandalisés de retrouver leurs édifiants poèmes en compagnie des Braies au cordelier, et reclamerait de préférence le voisinage du Miracle de Théophile et de la Vie Sainte Elysabel.


107. Politics notwithstanding, the Inquisitors of Joan of Arc had some precedent for their skepticism concerning the saints which she vowed had visited her.
108. Langton, Portrait, p. 74. The romanesque cathedral at Saulieu in Burgundy boasts a capital depicting the temptation of Jesus wherein the Devil's body has a human form, but his head is like that of a wolf. Also from the twelfth century survive the sculptures at Vezelay and Autun which show the Devil as a lion and a basilisk, the latter a legendary creature, part serpent, part bird, that could kill by its glance.


110. Langton, Portrait, p. 73.

111. Ibid., p. 75.


113. The Devil had more than once come to Christina in the form of Peter and other spiritual friends seeking to dissuade her from mortifications and special devotions. See Coulton, Life, p. 145. This particular feat of the Devil is exploited in the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages, wherein to inhibit a believer in his fulfillment of a religious vow is choice deversion of the Enemy.


115. loc. cit.


117. This inquisition was held in Paris, the result of which was the condemnation of Jehan Prevost and Jehan Persant "a être ars et punis par feu." So detestable was the crime of magic that Jehan Prevost's bones were ground to powder, and Jehan Persant was burned with the cat hung from his neck. The others involved were an abbot, an apostate monk, and other regular chanonnes who were publicly disgraced and placed "en chartre perpetuellement." See Les Grandes chroniques de France, selon que elles sont conservées en l'Eglise Saint-Denis en France, ed. Paulin Paris, 6 vols. (Paris, 1837), V, 269-273.


119. For Bertholde's sermon on Woman's Dress see Coulton, Life, p. 631.

120. Caesarius, Dialogue, V, p. 375.

121. Ibid., p. 361.

122. Ibid., pp. 360-361.
123. Ibid., chap. xi. The shadow of fear and the ready use of the sign of the cross are not merely romantic trappings or residual mannerisms of a former time as often seen in modern films propped to have Catholic leanings. Dr. Bertie Acker, a Spanish professor, relates an upsetting incident that took place one beautiful morning in Cali, Columbia in 1964. As Dr. Acker and her daughter, aged ten, were approaching the crowded open air market, motherly pride in her daughter’s golden hair surged in her as she noted the halo effect of the sunshine catching the highlights. A young, well-dressed woman emerged from the dark-haired crowd, her head bowed as if in meditation, and came towards Mrs. Acker and her daughter, who by then reached the market stalls. The daughter stepped from the shadow of a booth into the sunlight just as the woman looked up. Evidently startled by what she may have thought to be an apparition, the woman recoiled, crossed herself, and hurried away muttering rapidly in unintelligible syllables.


126. Apparently the priests tried to copy Jesus’ procedure in this passage: “And looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, ‘Ephphathat, that is Be Opened.’” This passage refers to the healing of a deaf man who also had a speech impediment.


128. Ibid., p. 209.

129. Ibid., p. 206.

130. Ibid., p. 211.


132. By the thirteenth century the practice of going on pilgrimage in honor of a saint made the carrying or wearing on a string of protective medals, often of lead, indispensable against Satanic assaults of one kind or another. Certain saints were invoked against the demon who caused sickness, such as St. Geneviève against fever or St. Blaise against a sore throat. Saint Apolline was supposed to chase toothache, and St. Hubert had special power against rabies. See Emile Mâle, L’Art religieux, p. 316.

133. Under the aegis of the local bishop the artists of the gothic church dedicated more space to the Queen of Heaven than did the former architects of the romanesque church. Emile Mâle has noted that in the thirteenth century either legend or history of the Virgin was carved over the portals of all the cathedrals, even those dedicated to some other saint, such as Saint-Etienne of Bourges, Sens, and Maux, and Saint-Jean of Lyons. L’Art religieux, p. 274.

134. Such behavior and speech are in the records of the monasteries concerning events taking place among the people.
135. Etienne de Bourbon also relates this story in his Anecdotes, Item 519, pp. 448-449. This miracle was versified by Rutebeuf at the commission of a certain Benoît. See Le Sacristan et la femme au chevalier in Œuvres complètes de Rutebeuf, eds. Faral and Bastin, 2 vols. (Paris, 1969), II, 214-234.


137. While riding and saying his prayers in lieu of matins and the hours, the monk saw a great tree covered with hoarfrost in the road approaching hastily. The horse began to tremble in terror, and the hair on the head of the servant stood on end. As the travelers passed by, they realized that they were near the Devil because of the hideous stench of corruption which issued forth. Presently the Devil appeared on horseback in apparently human form, but said nothing as he followed close behind Adam. At last Adam adjured the spectre to leave in the name of the Virgin, and it vanished. For his third appearance the Devil seemed to be a man of great stature, yet having a small, slender neck. Adam tried to smite the figure with his little sword, only to find his strokes passing, as it were, into a cloth hanging in the air. The next appearance was a medium sized black man such as a black monk of St Benedict with two large eyes gleaming like two copper cauldrons. Adam, extremely vexed, tried to smite the figure with his sword, but his own cowl fell over his eyes and he lost his stroke. The Devil came a fifth time as a strange beast with the ears of an ass. The servant then suggested what he had heard by way of protection, and Adam complied.

The monk drew a circle on the ground with the sign of the cross within and all around, and thus protected inside this circle, the servant and horse awaited the outcome of the confrontation to follow. At first Adam reviled and spit into the Devil's face, whereupon the Devil's ears turned to horns. The lay-brother tried to cut off one of the horns, but his sword leaped back as though having struck marble. The servant cried out to his master to make upon himself the sign of the cross, and Adam did so immediately. Then suddenly the Devil went into the shape of a great rolling barrel going towards the town of Molières. By then dawn had broken and the travelers hastened to the Grange to relate the experience. The evidence remained with the horse which the monk had ridden, whose former gentleness had been changed within a few hours into extreme nervousness as if demented. The lay-brother's frock carried such a stench that he had to get rid of it. The servant, of course, witnessed to the truth of the story. See Coulton, Life, p. 157. See also Les Grandes Chroniques de France selon que elles sont conservées en l’Église de Saint-Denis en France, ed. Paulin Paris, 6 vols. (Paris, 1837), V, 157-161.
CHAPTER III

THE DRAMATIC HERITAGE OF DEMONOLOGY

Having outlined the evolution of Judeo-Christian demonology and the attitudes of medieval laymen towards the Devil, we may now examine the dramatic heritage of demonology also fostered by the Church, but in a more immediate, less theoretical and dogmatic fashion. In this perusal one finds a diverting twist in history’s plot in regards to the attitude of the Church towards the Devil and towards the drama, this attitude being in the fourth century, vehemently negative towards both. At this time the Church was denouncing the theater as a work of the Devil. Chrysostom, the Bouche d’Or, thundered from Constantinople his denunciation of not only the theater, but also of the Hippodrome, the Feast of Calends, wedding celebrations, popular songs, and local festivals; in short, any entertainment which contained traces of pagan religion. It appears that the eloquent Chrysostom unconsciously created some sort of drama in the church by his denunciation of the Satanic corruptions of the stage, which aroused great opposition among his auditors, who, being apt to interrupt the sermons, changed from a congregation of worshippers to a howling mob.¹

The reactions of those Byzantine converts may not be wondered at, for Chrysostom advocated the eradication from the minds of the people of songs of childhood, lullabies, and work songs, for therein were entrenched the old mythologies. It seems that Chrysostom found the competition with theatrical entertainment maddening and dangerous to faith. He inadvertently touched off equally exciting events or confrontations in church, his sermons producing a “happening” as might be said in the current parlance of today.

In the illustration of the danger of pagan or devilish culture as
foressen by the early Church Fathers, there is a Byzantine legend which was passed on after the time of Chrysostom in which a painter, attempting to portray Christ, painted instead Zeus with a great head of hair. The hand which had thus degraded the Savior was accursed and was subsequently shriveled. The afflicted artist appealed to the patriarch, Gennadius, who prayed successfully for the restoration of the hand. It is said that during the night, while Gennadius prayed in the altar-place, he had a vision in which demons (as were then designated all pagan gods) cried out that they would yield to him, but that after his death they would rule the Church. Had these demons been asked by the astonished Gennadius just how they would conquer the Church, they should have probably answered by means of the stage.  

One can easily imagine the reaction of the crusading Chrysostom could he have been shifted to the fourteenth century in France, where he would have heard himself referred to as Saint Jehan Crisotomes or the "Boche d'Or." At this time he might have witnessed one of history's puckish ironies. Ushered into a large hall by the devout members of a literary society, termed then a puy, Chrysostom would have adjusted his eyes upon an elevated platform or stage of approximately forty feet across upon which were distributed a curious assortment of little structures which seems to represent houses or chapels, perhaps a hermitage. Some of these structures are beautifully draped with tapestries. A sermon would have opened the proceedings with quotations from the venerable Saint Jerome. "Ah yes," we can hear Chrysostom sigh, "my contemporary Jerome. He outlived me some thirteen years... The sermon can hardly be said to arouse one's emotions. It is doubtless very devotional and all that, but really most dull. This congregation is quite docile." Scarcely has the brief and placid sermon been brought to a close, than what should appear upon the elevated platform where the preacher had stood before the saint's
unsuspecting gaze but a young man answering to the name Jehan Crisostome. In a matter of moments this "other" Chrysostom becomes a priest, and what’s this, the king’s daughter attempts to seduce the servant of God! He does not yield, of course. In a twinkling the innocent man is banished like a medieval Joseph. Moving once again into the mind of Chrysostom the theater-goer, we may perceive him start at the memory of the persecutions which he had suffered at the hands of the Empress Eudoxie.

But miracle of miracles, from the higher scaffolding on the left of the viewer descend two angelic beings and the Virgin Mary, who obviously intend to comfort the exile. Can this be a theater with saints and angels playing their parts? Then from the right emerging from behind prison grates, as it were, comes the very Author of all pagan entertainments, the ancient Enemy of the Church. However, before our hypothetical spectator can rise to his feet to voice the objections which he feels almost too strongly to articulate, his double turns to confront the taunts and threats of the unmistakable Devil. Crossing himself hastily, the fascinated saint might be heard to whisper the words of Job, "Surely the thing which I greatly feared is come upon me ..."  

To those looking on during the performance of the miracle play in honor of the Virgin Mary and featuring the life of Chrysostom the appearance of the Devil in a theatrical piece was not uncommon. The medieval spectator by this time was perhaps startled by the suddenness of his appearance, but not surprised that he appeared, for at this time when the miracle play was at its zenith, the Devil and his demons were frequently cast as personages in stage productions. The articles of faith such as the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Birth of Christ, the Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Last Judgment as well as many of the champions of the faith so lavishly depicted in stone and glass for all eyes to see had come down
to eye level and begun to move and talk and thus portray themselves again in flesh and blood.

What Chrysostom could not have understood is the role of his Church in the resurrection of the once despised form of entertainment. Having successfully chased off the boards *le théâtre comique* and the nearly forgotten tragedies of the Greeks and Romans, the Catholic Church, during the reign of Charlemagne, turned itself to refurbishing and reforming its own liturgy. As Petit de Julleville has succinctly stated: "Sous les Carolingien il n'existe plus de théâtre en France. . ."6

It was for Marius Sepet to perceive that the drama, particularly the *mystère* of the Middle Ages, was born *au sein de l'office* and answered the needs of the Catholic culture as did the tragedy or the comedy of the ancient Greeks and Romans.7 He says further:

Drame veut dire action: histoire, morale, ou dogme mis en action. Or la liturgie catholique étant la mise en action des dogmes chrétiens et de leur histoire, cette liturgie est nécessairement dramatique, aujourd'hui comme au moyen âge, mais au moyen âge elle l'était plus qu'aujourd'hui.8

The Church moved slowly, however, in the direction suggested by Tertullian in the second century, who doubtless envisioned a rivalry of potent attraction in the Church.9 It is evident that probably at no other time in man's thinking was the Devil more a part of everyday life and therefore became a natural dramatic character when the Church began to stage certain aspects of the faith and lore of Christianity. Hence the drama of the Middle Ages points up this preoccupation with the Devil by its varied and frequent inclusion of the theme. It was in the Roman Catholic Religion that the common Frenchman acquired many of his ideas about the nature of Satan and his minions, although many types of celebrations of religious ideas came from the Eastern Church, as we have noted.10
In 1194 an ordo was celebrated at Regensburg which concerned the angels and the fall of Lucifer as well as the creation, the fall of man, and the prophets.\textsuperscript{11}

One of the most exciting inspirations for liturgical treatment of the Devil is in the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus. In complete form this narrative is composed of two parts: Acta Pilati and the Descensus Christi ad Inferos, each of which was probably written independently of the other\textsuperscript{12}

It is the older part, the Descensus, assigned to either the second or third century A. D. which purported to be an eyewitness account from Hell itself and became the theme of so many artists who translated almost literally in church windows the release of the just from the gueule d'enfer.\textsuperscript{13}

The priests read in Latin to the congregation the dramatic account of Christ's descent into Hades in the interval between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, of his breaking down the gates and binding Satan, and of his releasing the souls of the patriarchs from long imprisonment. This gospel also cites the well-known triumphant Psalm 24: \textit{Tolle portas, principes, vestras, et elevamini, portae aeternales, et introbit rex gloriae.} "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory will come in." This is the command which Jesus is alleged to have made at the doors of Hell, in reply to which the prince of Tartar gives the command to lock the doors. Again the command is given to open the gates in the words of the Psalm but the text is altered to read \textit{portae infernales} instead of \textit{portae aeternales}. This apparently small change of one word tended to underline the triumphal situation of Christ over death and hell in implying something prophetic in the Old Testament text. The tendency of St Paul and St Peter to use Old Testament passages in their explanations of the work of Jesus as the Messiah was followed, but with error, by the writer of this apocryphal work.
The theme of the Harrowing of Hell was early used in processions on Palm Sunday and at the dedication of churches. For the former, priests bearing a cross led worshippers either to the city gates or to the doors of the church. Using the cross to knock, the priest, using the words of Psalm 24 would recite the apostrophy to the gates and upon the opening of the doors or gates, as the case may be, the final line of the passage would be repeated: *et introibit rex gloriae*. Thus laymen had the sensation of being part of the heavenly hosts breaking down the gates of hell. The latter of these ceremonies included a personage hidden within the church to represent or symbolize Satan, whose eventual expulsion from the building directly reflects the story of the Harrowing of Hell as narrated in the *Descensus*. The surviving liturgical texts that embody this theme are later than those of the vernacular plays, but this does not necessarily represent the original order of the development.

There is a *canticum triumphale* which was frequently used in the Easter procession. It may have been composed under the influence of a sermon on the theme of the Harrowing of Hell attributed often to Saint Augustine. However, it was an independent liturgical composition available for any festal ceremony. Its most conspicuous use was in the *Elevatio*. Thus devils were not strangers to the sanctuary, because on numerous occasions they were cast as major and minor characters in liturgical plays on various themes.

Although no liturgical Christmas play survives in French which combines the *Prophetæ* with scenes involving the shepherds, Magi, Herod, and the Innocents, Germany has preserved the Benediktbeuern manuscript which gives an elaborate version of this combination. The scene with the shepherds introduces at the same time as the angel the presence of *Diabolus*. After each speech of the angel, the Devil interposes himself in an attempt to
corrupt the listeners with false doctrine. Karl Young has pointed out the similarity in the role of this devil with that of the one who besets Mary Magdalen in the Passion Play from the same monastery of Benediktbeuren. He has further observed that in later vernacular plays in Germany this same situation is used as having a human being alternately solicited by good and evil agents. Among the personnages in the play are to be found St Augustine, the figure of Diabolus, a Boy Bishop, and a humorous Archisynagogus. There are also scenes showing the Annunciation and the visit to Elizabeth.

From the abbey Saint Martial at Limoges, renowned for its school of music and fine library, came the excellent liturgical drama entitled the Sponsus, which interprets the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins recorded in the Gospel according to St Matthew. Devils appear at the most poignant moment of the play to lead away the five Foolish Virgins, upon whom the gates of Heaven have been forever closed. As these unworthy ones, the Fatuæ, beat in vain upon the barriers, demons approach as the agents of doom to enforce upon the congregation the horror of being found unprepared for the Last Judgment and the Marriage Supper of the Bridegroom (Christ) and his Bride (the Church). Throughout the play a recurring verse, intoned by the Fatuæ of Dolentias, chaïtivas, trop i avem trop it avet dormit! is taken up by other characters as Dolentias, chaïtivas trop i avet dormit! This motif gathers the intensity of a death knell when it finally announces the approach of the devils.

The anonymous author of the Jeu d'Adam left to subsequent lay dramatists a rich legacy in his characterization of the Devil. The comic element introduced with Balaam's ass and the diableries after the Fall "was the first solvent which tended to loosen the tie with the Church ceremony." Apart from these old conventions the dramatist has skillfully
embroidered the brief account of the Fall of Man in Genesis by enlarging
the temptation scenes to include Adam as well as Eve.

Marius Sepet has beautifully reconstructed the setting and the
dignified manner in which the Tempter par excellence makes his way from
the citadel of hell to the edge of paradise. It is an arresting scene
which begins with the scampering band of demons who have jumped out of
the "gueule de l'enfer" situated to the right of the spectator, and
spread themselves quickly like a net of evil all around the set, forming,
as it were, a background for the ensuing action.

Adam et le diable jouent au plus fin,
comme deux vrais Normands qu'ils sont,—car
ce drame est écrit en dialecte normand,—et
quoique également désireux, l'un de révéler,
l'autre d'apprendre ce plus grand bien auquel
l'homme pourrait atteindre, ils ne se font pas
moins prier, l'un pour parler, l'autre pour
prêter l'oreille.22

In the terse exchange the Devil finds himself frustrated in his first
attempt to induce Adam to eat of the fruit, despite the promise: Ti oll
serrunt sempres overt. Angrily the Devil stomps off, saying to Adam that
he is a fool. Interest is aroused by the delay of the climax, for the
Devil's task is not so easy after all in this familiar story of Satan's
successful trap.

After a brief consultation with his aids the Tempter returns to Adam
saying:

Adam, que fais? Changeras tun sens?
Es tu encore en fol porpense?
Jol te quidai dire l'autr'er,
Deus t'a fait ci sun provender,
Ci t'ad mis por mangier cest fruit.
As tu donc autre deduit?
(vv. 173-178)

In an attempt to make Adam discontented with his lot the Devil insinuates
that God has slighted him in making him a gardener. The Devil then baits
the ageless trap with the very desire which spelled his own downfall: "You will be God." At this audacious suggestion Adam explodes, ordering the Devil away and calling him, among other things, a faithless traitor.

The obviously disappointed Devil drags his tail back to the doors of hell, which open to reveal a council of demons looking on. The prince of demons holds yet another animated colloquium with his cohorts at the mouth of hell and decides to make another attack on paradise. This time he is all charm, and as he speaks to Eve he employs a honeyed tone. Again, the dramatist creates a scene in which all the wiles of the Devil are deployed in order to win the confidence of the first woman. The Devil assures the skeptical woman that he has her profit and honor at heart, to which Eve replies sagely that it is for God to give her. In the face of such evident distrust, the Devil moves smoothly on to the subject of secrets which he will tell her, provided that she can keep them to herself. What woman will deny her ability to do so?

Celeras mei?

Eve

Oïl, par fei.

Diabolus

Iert descouvert.

Eve

Nenil par mei.

Diabolus

Or me mettraï en ta creance,
Ne voil de tei altre fiance.

Eve

Bien te poez creire a ma parole. (vv. 215-219)
Having deftly placed Eve in the position of his confidante, the Devil proceeds to criticize her husband, who is, in his terms, a foolish man. Even sidesteps the Devil’s attack upon Adam’s common sense with her own observations that Adam is perhaps rigid but honest. The Devil counters that Adam is ignorant, servile as a serf because he does not look out after his own interests. The tactics of the Devil demonstrate the most modern sense of psychology. Urging the young wife to think for herself, the Devil resorts to a kind of galantry in the flattery of her feminine charms and superiority to her husband. He clucks over how ill-matched she and Adam are. She is tender, but Adam is hard and obdurate; Eve, however, is the smarter of the two. The suppleness of the Devil’s discourse is worthy of a courtly knight:

Tu es fieblette et tendre chose
E es plus fresche que n’est rose;
Tu es plus blanche que cristal,
Que neif que chiet sor glace en val;
Mal ouple em fist li criator;
Tu es trop tendre et il trop dur;
Mais ne porquant tu es plus sage,
En grant sens as mis tun corrage.
Por ço fait bon traire a tei.

(vv. 227-235)

Criticism of the Creator in line 231 is cleverly slipped into the flattering speech. Hence, when the subject of the fruit is finally introduced, Eve is the more ready to believe that a God who would give her an inferior husband might also withhold something good, as the Devil suggests. Eve betrays that she is weakening in the question: Quel savor a ? The Devil replies: Celestial. He then describes how her lot will be changed from one of subservience to one of authority which her beauty and knowledge will command. At this point Eve is anxious to have it. She looks for a long moment and observes: Je me fait bien sol le veuir. Seeing that she is already convinced, the Devil urges her to remember the
wonderful consequences of eating the fruit and suggests her course of action. In a priceless irony he promises to her a change of heart, which is, technically speaking, too true. For when Satan leaves the scene to Adam and Eve, his influence is still fatally potent through the cooperation of the serpent whose whispered message into the woman's ear insures the doom of the man.

The Biblical curse pronounced by God (Genesis 3: 17-18), upon the earth that thorns and thistles would spring up, is interpreted in the play as being carried out by the Devil himself. While Adam and Eve rest from their labors, the Devil sows the thistles in their garden plot and then absents himself before they awaken. This enactment echoes the teachings of Justin Martyr and Tertullian.

The hierarchy implied by the difference in the deportment between Satan the Arch-Tempter and the other demons in the play is well made by Sepet. For later, when the Devil comes with three or four other devils carrying the manacles of iron and chains with which to bind Adam and Eve, it seems that his role is more nearly that of supervisor. The stage directions are explicit in their instructions to the devils. Some devils are to push, others to pull the reticent pair towards hell. Another group, nearer the destination, comes dancing out to meet the entourage. Some point out the gaping mouth of hell to Adam and Eve, while others surround them in a horrendous celebration. Great billows of smoke issue forth, and the noise of pots and pans being beaten mixes with the cries of hilarity over the catch. Once the couple is received inside the inferno, devils run about all over the stage, while others remain inside to continue the din and ostensibly the tortures.

The role of the Devil and his demons in the use of hell as a temporary Purgatory for the just, such as Abel and the Patriarchs which are
represented later in this *ordo* as being led off to the same inferno as were Adam and Eve has little official theological support. This idea seems to have been a popular extension on the concept of hell in the Last Judgment, in which Satan and his demons play the part of tormentors of the human beings damned to eternal coexistence with them. The fine distinction between the treatment of the just and of the culpable is suggested in the rubric which directs the devils to be more gentle with Abel than with Cain.23

Having lingered somewhat over the irresistible characterizations in this play may help to demonstrate the high level of achievement already evidenced in the dramatization of devils in a religious play of the twelfth century. It is a formidable, if unique, standard of excellence to which the poets of the vernacular miracle plays scarcely attained. It is worth noting, however, that in conceding to the usages of the times in regards to the casting of devils the anonymous authors of the *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages* no less than the nameless master of the *Jeu d'Adam*, showed personal insight into the problem of temptation and also into the methods of attack used by the Enemy.

Although the Devil had been a frequent member of the cast in religious drama, it appears that Rutebeuf in his *Miracle de Théophile* introduced for the first time the Virgin Mary to the stage in France; for no extant liturgical play up until this time had dealt with her life or with her battle against Satan in Théophile's behalf. She fulfills that extraordinarily sympathetic role of intercessor for erring mortals, the advocate for desperate cases. Following the trend in mariology, the play is a portentous introduction of the Devil as the loser in an endless struggle with her for human souls. The Devil cowers and excuses himself during the confrontation with St Mary almost like a naughty child.
The howling Lucifer in chains made for a humorous scene in the spectacle *The Presentation of the Virgin Mary in the Temple*, a ceremony to be observed November 21. Philippe de Mezières brought this liturgical drama of the Eastern Church to Avignon in either 1372 or 1385. Lucifer appears with twenty-one other characters as the familiar monster of the Middle Ages with horns, menacing teeth, grimace, and chains which bind him to the archangel Michael, who, according to directions, is armed and brandishes a sword.

The instructions for this elaborate *ordo* give exact details as to costume, order of procession to the church from the chapter house where the participants dressed, as well as dimensions for the two platforms or stages erected inside the church itself. After the little girl representing Mary has mounted the steps alone and the lights and entourage have been arranged before her, the *Laudes Mariae* begin. Nine angels make each in turn an obeisance, utter a verse of praise, and descend by the east steps to the pavement between the stage and the door of the choir. Anna, Joachim, and Ecclesia do likewise one at a time. Synagoga in tearful lament is pushed town the west steps of the stage by Gabriel and Raphael. She drops her banner and the tables of the Old Law and rushes crying from the church, *fugiet plorando*. After the laughter of the people has subsided Michael ascends the platform leading the howling, reticent Lucifer. Michael delivers his verse of praise and then makes Lucifer humble himself to become Mary's footstool: *Et tune Michael Luciferum sic ligatum et ululantem sub pedibus Mariae ponet*. Then Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael together throw Lucifer down the west steps to the ground.

As Young suggests, had an enthusiast such as Philippe de Mezières promoted this *ordo* a century or so earlier, it may have become a generally
adopted play in the Western Church during the formative years of the religious drama. However, owing to the lateness of the arrival of the Presentatio, the vernacular drama of the fourteenth century had already developed the theme of the Virgin Mary placing her heel, as it were, on the neck of Lucifer, and that outside of the auspices of the Church.

Contemporary to the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages is a Passion play based upon the poem called the Passion des Jongleurs written at the beginning of the thirteenth century. In this play, called La Passion du Palatinus, the theme of the Harrowing of Hell is resurrected. While the saints are rejoicing over the promise of a coming Messiah, Satan and Enfer quarrel over how best to defend themselves against the coming Christ. Satan is angry at the apparent laziness of Enfer and cites his own many accomplishments during the earthly life of Christ. Enfer counters with the question as to whether or not this Jesus is the same who brought Lazarus back to life. After an affirmative answer Enfer becomes extremely frightened, but it does not deter him from calling his supposed colleague names and indulging in "picturesque curses." The transposition of the serious narrative of the Descensus into a scene of comic interest to the spectator over the anxiety of the devils in this Passion becomes something of a model for later Passion plays and for religious drama in general in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. One notes also an attempt at delineation of character between the inmates of hell which will be further developed in the miracles of the fourteenth century.

When we move into the fifteenth century repertoire we note a change in emphasis in the plays concerning the saints; and this change brings with it a certain amount of difference in the characterization of the Devil in the plays concerning the saints. Although humorous elements were generously provided for in other types of plays, the miracle play
maintained a certain sobriety up through the fourteenth century. The Bibliothèque St. Geneviève has, among other types of plays, the *Vie de Monseigneur S. Fiacre*, a miracle play which has the unparalleled distinction of being interrupted approximately one third from the end by a farce. This rather inept use of comic relief is a hint of the not altogether happy changes which were taking place in the miracle play.

Accompanying the *Vie* is a group of fourteen scenes from the life of St. Genevieve. This play, a product of the fifteenth century, includes some of the same ideas and characterizations as the miracle plays of the fourteenth century, and seems to be a kind of bridge between the two types of miracle plays. Although the Virgin does intervene a time or so, her role as well as that of the devils who appear in three different episodes represent something of a general departure from their counterparts in the earlier *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages*. For instance, these later devils are not content to tempt or to spy or merely to haggle over a soul, but resort to a more direct violence. In the ninth scene the devils drown an unbaptized child. The stage directions are explicit as to how the devils are to sneak up behind the child and throw him into a pit of water or a well.

Whereas it is evident that this miracle play demonstrates skill superior to that of the early miracle plays in handling repartee between Satan and the angels, the ghoulish humor of the devils is apt to produce an involuntary shiver in the spine of the modern reader and would probably not have been tolerated by the *puy* which gave the *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages* in the fourteenth century. For, having thrown the four-year-old child into the well *doulcement*, Leviathan breaks out into laughter shouting, "il boit, il boit!" Satan also exults that the child will belong
to them, whatever he weighs.

The shifting of the serious dramatic tradition from the *puys* to the *confréries* may have been a decisive factor not only in the differences in the characterization of the Devil, but also in the importance of the Virgin as their chief antagonist. At any rate, the Miracles de Ste. Geneviève, boasting fifty-six characters, seems to embody many of the former concepts of demonic behavior as well as those popular in the contemporary *spectacula*.

Indeed, three times at least each year the societies of the Grande and Petite Basches gave public entertainments in the form of masquerades, processions, and comic pieces usually designed to lampoon the weaknesses of the men involved in the profession of law. The satirical spirit, virtually unknown to the *miracles*, began to infiltrate the saint plays such as the *Vie de S. Louis* given by the Confrérie de la Passion in 1472. Potentially a historical play, its emphasis upon the role of the devils as well as the wonders worked posthumously by the saint betray its hagiographical sources and might be classified as a miracle play. The devils include in their ranks one Pentagruel, also known in the *Actes des Apôtres* before Rabelais seized upon the name. The demons make topical remarks which seem to convey a satirical intent by the author.

It appears that except for the *puys*, as the ones at Amiens and at Dieppe, the custom of performing plays in the *puys* tended to disappear in the fifteenth century. In their place the *confréries* emerged as a strong branch from the same tree. They sprang up in a hundred places other than Paris, the home of the famous Confrérie de la Passion et Resurrection, which had a permanent charter and home in the early fifteenth century. It has been suggested, incidentally, that the Miracles de Ste. Geneviève were designed to serve as a repertory to the Confrérie in Paris. In most places the *confrérie* was a temporary association contracted for the
presentation of a miracle or mystère in a kind of civic endeavor. The participating merchants and artisans shared together the expenses of furnishing the theater, the actors, costumes, sets, perhaps even a new text by a likely poet. It behoove them to please the public, whom they invited to their productions.

In passing beyond the era of the devout puy and the miracles of that epoch to that of the confrérie we have observed briefly a change in the predominate characteristics of the Devil and noted the choices made in demonology in the plays contemporary to and succeeding the miracles of the fourteenth century. For, the miracle chose to remain somewhere between the stylized black faced, horned creature of the first liturgical dramas and the rowdy, physically nimble demons who scamper about the stage or literally engage in tug-of-war with the angels over a child's soul, as they do in the Miracles de Ste Geneviève. In resisting the current of satire and buffoonery offered by the Passion du Palatinus and the pieces of the Basoches and Confréries the poets of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages show, rather, a sensitivity to the main purpose of the Devil in the world of men without abandoning altogether a sense of humor in the portrayal of the Devil's minions. This strong dramatic heritage in demonology reflects faithfully much of the personal or grass roots kind of belief in the Devil and his agents, as well as the dogma propagated by the Church. Within this climate of belief, thus created theologically and artistically, the Devil's part in the plays to be studied next may be more adequately understood.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE


2. Ibid., p. 15.

3. The popular hypothesis of the frères Parfait that the theater stage for the mystères consisted of five or six levels has been discredited in favor of the one major level as a basic stage with occasional elevated sets to designate a particular locale such as paradise. The décor simultané used in the twelfth century for productions outside the church was apparently still in use when Rutebeuf created Théophile presumably for the puy d’Arras. In keeping with the medieval penchant for hierarchy and order, heaven doubtless stood as a draped elevated set at stage right and the Devil’s lair, probably a prison-like structure with iron bars at the windows, was placed at extreme left. The bishop and his clerks would probably have their mansions or sets next to that of heaven, and Salatin the sorcerer would be stationed nearer Satan’s mansion in order to produce an aesthetic symmetry in good and evil surrounding the protagonist. See Grace Frank, The Medieval French Drama (Oxford, 1954), p. 111.

Judging from the playing conditions known to exist for the late contemporaries of the anonymous puy which gave the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages, the indoor stage was de rigueur for the theatrical efforts of both the Confrérie de la Passion et Résurrection and puy s in and around Paris. At the time (1402) that Charles VI issued the lettres patentes to the Confrérie, the group was already installed at the Church of the Trinity. Apparently the religious order which owned the premises including an hôtel (originally built, according to tradition, in 1100 to receive poor travelers) rented out the main hall on the ground floor of the hostel to the Confrères. Assuming their stage and hall to be typical of such lay groups involved in theatrical productions, it is safe to envision a similar staged used by the puy in question, whose miracles required on the average of about six different sets. See Dorothy Penn, The Staging of the "Miracles de Nostre-Dame par Personnages" of MS Cange (New York, 1933), p. 18.

4. Although Stuart and Penn are opposed to the idea that the classic décor simultané with heaven at stage right and hell at stage left persisted in the staging of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages, the internal evidence of at least twelve of these plays would lead one to believe the opposite. It may be true, as Penn asserts, that the gaping mouth of hell was not yet developed for the stage; there is no reason to suppose that the prison concept with smoke billowing from the iron grates and noise issuing from within was banished from these productions. Since the Jeu d’Adam of the twelfth century had such a well defined stage setting for its diableries and the Miracle de Théophile of the thirteenth had a full complement of sound effects and setting for hell, it hardly seems feasible that the fourteenth century abandoned the ideas for staging of such successful plays. The fourteenth century welcomed many elaborate mechanical devices which had been tried in public presentations with flying angels and life-like animals, so that the action of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame offered interest in the way of theatrical effects and properties. If indeed the mansion of heaven were retained as an elevated set, draped richly, with a hidden
4. (cont'd) staircase at the rear to allow angels and St Mary to ascend and descend, it is reasonable to assume that the setting of hell, be it *goule d'enfer* as conceived by the artists of the time or prison with bars, was also retained and perfected as a counterbalance, at least in those plays where the Devil figures as a visible and audible *personnage*.


10. The processions of Holy Week and the Presentation of Mary already mentioned are two notable celebrations which came into France from the Eastern Church.

11. Frank, p. 18. Medieval liturgists explained the symbolism of the mass as a static drama with the bishop standing in the place of Jesus, Karl Young discusses some of these ideas in *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1933), I, 149.


13. This work, which has survived in the Greek and which is thought to be that of a converted Jew, passed into the Latin tradition quite early, for it appears that Grégoire de Tours (538-594), who did not know Greek, was familiar with it. In writing about the death and resurrection of Jesus he mentions that the apostle James had vowed not to eat until he should see the risen Christ. He then remarks that on the third day the Lord returned after having vanquished the king of Tartarus and showed himself to James. See *Histoire des Francs*, trans. Robert Latouche (Paris, 1963), Livre I, cap. xxii, p. 50. In the same book (cap. xxi), Grégoire's description of the rescue of Joseph of Arimathaea from prison echoes the narrative in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*.


15. Frank, pp. 29-30.


18. It has been suggested that for the medieval audience of less sophistication than the ancient Greeks the use of two personnages debating on either side of the protagonist was a device necessary to enact the struggle taking place within the mind of the protagonist. This idea may be justifiable in some cases, but it appears to nullify somewhat the reality
18. (cont'd) of the Devil as a creature involved in man's destiny and is not supportable in the light of the world view implied by the Christian religion of the Middle Ages.

19. This liturgical play entitled Bridgroom is taken from the passage in Matthew 25: 1-13. The manuscript for the Sponsus dated from the late eleventh century boasts a considerable number of French verses.

20. The text, which is clearly neumed for singing, is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, ms. Lat. 1139. A résumé of the discussion concerning the date of the Sponsus may be found in the Introduction to an edition by L.-P. Thomas, Paris, 1951.


23. The idea of Purgatory is ostensively underlined in the whole ordo by the fact that all the prophets, even Abel as well as Cain who murdered him, are led off ad infernum by the demons to await their deliverance through the Messiah. As early as the second century Saint Irenaeus proposed that a kind of purging fire or other woeful was in store for the just persons who were at death harboring faults. Saint Augustine and others through the centuries wrestled with the idea, rather vague as a rule, as to just what kind of suffering one must endure after death in order to be purged of small sins—vential, not mortal ones. Some vowed that the fire was metaphorical because a disembodied soul can hardly be expected to feel a real flame. As the Middle Ages neared its zenith, the idea of real fire as a temporary punishment ridding the soul of all unholy taint was widely accepted. Hence, the prayers for the dead to speed them into paradise, for few could, like St Paul or the thief on the cross, be sure of passing directly into paradise from this life. It seemed to follow, then, that all pre-Messianic believers, no matter how righteous (Enoch and Elijah who did not die excepted) were assigned to hell, or rather, a special temporary hell called Purgatory and designed only for the purification of the righteous, that is, the penitent. The unrighteous were thought by some to await the Last Judgment in another part of hell with no hope of escaping eternal perdition with the Devil and his angels, for whom hell was originally designed. The Last Judgment as depicted in carvings which adorned churches of the thirteenth century and earlier has no Purgatory, for the weighing of the souls by St Michael spelled either eternal bliss or eternal torment.

24. The Latin title is Presentatio Beatae Virginis Mariae in Templo. The text of this repreaesentatio figurata is reproduced in Young's two-volume work, The Drama of the Medieval Church, II, 227-242.

25. Frank, p. 64.

26. Anna and Joachim are the parents of the Virgin Mary as set forth in the apocryphal gospel De Nativitate Marieae et Infantia Salvatoris. Ecclesia represents the Church of the New Covenant which has superseded the religion of the Old Testament represented by Synagoga. Synagoga is generally represented in artistic representations as blindfolded to
26. (cont'd) symbolize the Jewish race, which refused to recognize Jesus as the promised Messiah.

27. Young, Drama, I, 242-244.

28. Ibid., p. 244.

29. Frank, p. 127.

30. loc. cit.

31. A very probable influence upon the change in tenor in the mystères of the fifteenth century was the popular theater of the Basoche, which, if tradition is correct, was contemporaneous to the puy which gave the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages. This tradition, held among the societies engaged in play making, was that in 1303 the clerks of the Parlement of Paris were united in a mutual society for protection, a trade union of sorts. The association was also given to self amusement. It is said that Philippe le Bel gave to this union or society the title of the Kingdom of the Basoche, a name derived from the Greek word for the house of justice or basilica. Comprised of clerks serving procurators, advocates, registrars, and counsellors, there were officials under a king and by-laws which governed the men of this vast organization and assumed some sort of sovereignty over another society called the Basoche du Châtelet. The members of the smaller Basoche were clerks employed by the notaries, commissioners, procurators, and registrars of the Châtelet, and they claimed to antedate the grande Basoche under Philippe le Hardi in the year 1278. A third corporation of clerks for the procurators of the Department of Accounts called themselves the Empire de Galilée. It was as old as the Basoche, but its traditions and history are obscure.

These groups were obliged by statute to give an annual revue or montre at the end of June or early July. They also assembled during the Fête des Rois. The procession in July was a king of masquerade with clerks grouped around their several captains and costumed according to their dictates. The clerks of the Châtelet held their revue or montre at Mardi Gras.

The Basochiens early introduced comic pieces into their entertainments, writing and acting in their own works. They played before the king and enjoyed great popular success with their satiric and comic repertoire. They were invited by local civic government to provide entertainment at official ceremonies and princely entrances. See Petit de Julleville, LCMA, pp. 88-92.

32. Petit de Julleville, LCMA, p. 52.

33. Ibid., p. 9.

34. Frank, p. 146.

CHAPTER IV
ENTER THE DEVIL

Part 1: From Arras to Paris

On the local level the Church attempted to control the efforts of the laity to edify itself, even though the production of vernacular drama such as the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par Personnages was not carried on inside the church. However, alongside the confrérie pieuses and the puys a large number of sociétés joyeuses began to flourish in towns throughout France. These comic counterparts of serious religious drama have been termed hérités of the Fête des Fous, long celebrated inside the churches by the lower clergy during the Christmas season and other times. They owe also thereby their genesis to the Church, howbeit inadvertently. The entertainment afforded by the sociétés joyeuses consisted of farces and satires which ridiculed the weaknesses of the man in the street as well as those of the Establishment, be it ecclesiastical or civil. Such high spirited competition for the more serious confrérie made its mark upon the tone of its offerings as well as causing it to be included in the periodic censures. On June 3, 1398, for example, the Provost of Paris forbade the performances of farces or the lives of saints in Paris, St Maur, and other nearby towns without express authorization in the obvious hope of censoring the offerings of the various companies of play-makers.¹

There is no trace of severe or prolonged punishment for violating such ordinances as that of the Provost. Among the principal powers of censure, the Bishop, the Parlement, the King, and the Provost, the duties were poorly defined or regulated. For instance, the edict of 1398 just alluded to was successfully appealed by the Confrérie de la Passion which
received from Charles VI on December 4, 1402, a charter or lettre patente according in perpetuity the privilege of playing "quelque Misterre que ce soi, soit de la dicte Passion, et Résurrection, ou autre quelconque tant de saïnts comme de saïntes." As Samuel Carrington has pointed out, the wording of the lettres patentes indicates that the interdiction of June 1398 would not have been issued, had the king been present. Therefore, it appears that the Provost had taken the initiative in censoring theatrical activities in the king's name. With the monarch's apparent taste for religious plays, evidenced as far back as 1390, when he awarded forty écu d'or to the clerks of the Sainte-Chapelle for their production of the mystery play of the Resurrection, it is not surprising that a fairly tolerant policy of censorship prevailed, especially in regards to religious drama.

At the time of this four-years-feud between the Provost of Paris and the Confrérie de la Passion, the devout puy which sponsored the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par Personnages had already established in evident tranquility the annual tradition of presenting for the edification of their members a special play to commemorate one or two of the annual feast days of the Virgin Mary. As noted already in chapter one of this study, the reverent framework of these dramas imposed a certain restraint upon the potential humor which the introduction of the Devil had suggested to other groups who were casting actors to portray him. The characterization of the Devil in these miracles no less than that of the Virgin and other personnages of supernatural powers was the result of a venerable heritage in demonology—folk, theological, and dramatic—and was not designed primarily to amuse or to cause laughter any more than were the gargoyles and symbolic monsters which adorned the gothic churches. The characterization of the Devil in the Miracles de Nostre-Dame reflects a more sober approach
to life and religion.

In examining the Cange collection one is impressed by the omnipresence of the Devil in thirty-eight of the forty plays. Although the Devil appears as a member of the cast in only twelve of the pieces, his character and influence are strongly attested to and felt in all but two of the remaining plays of the group. In two contemporary plays, *Le Mystère du Chevalier qui donna sa femme au diable* and the *Miracle de la jeune fille, laquelle se vouloit abandonner a péché*, the Devil also appears as an important, visible character. For the medieval believer the enormity of the crimes committed in the *Miracles* underlined the power of the Evil One and, of course, rendered more glorious the mercy and deliverance of Our Lady and her Son.

Granted that the Devil's appearances become rarer as the plays of the Cange collection advance towards the end of the series as numbered by G. Paris and U. Robert, the fact of his reality as a supernatural person is assumed. It is through the dialogue of the other characters in the plays such as *Robert le Diable* (XXXIII) that one discerns the important role which Satan plays in their lives. Subsequent French playwrights such as Molière, who kept his Tartuffe in the wings until Act III, realized the value of the portraiture of an unseen villain through the testimony of his victims and detractors. However, the Devil's power is somewhat tempered by his foibles, many of which are very human, such as the tendency to boast—too soon. It appears that the medieval man could not envision an utterly different kind of being from himself, be he divine or malign, for in the Devil's flawed nature there lies a curse, as it were, of fallibility and certain limitations in power common to those of his victim—Man. In a sense, the Devil could not be perfectly evil, for as the Church Fathers taught, in falling from grace the Devil has impaired
his otherwise perfect faculties.

Probably one of the oldest ideas connected with the character of the Devil, and certainly one of the most enduring to be reflected in the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages is that of a written pact between man and Satan. It was generally accepted that witches and magicians were in frequent communication with the Devil and were considered his slaves. In fact, in 1350, in Carcassonne and Toulouse the Inquisition had burned six hundred persons as heretics for practicing the new sorcery,6 Even the ordinary man could, if desperate enough, find a means to contact the Devil and to make a pact. Such a meeting as this generally took place on the initiative of the human being as opposed to the more usual situations in which the Devil makes the advances.

Hence, early in the history of the vernacular miracle play Rutebeuf casts into dramatic form the venerable legend of Theophilus, who signed away his soul to the Devil in return for temporal power and prestige. In the Miracle de Théophile the poet enlarges upon the anonymous magician or génie mentioned in Gautier de Coinci's earlier version in verse of the legend. The magician is named Salatins, and his character seems to convey the wily mentality often associated with the Devil, whereas Sathanz himself enters as a disgruntled evil genie. Apparently ignorant of the conversation between Théophile and Salatins, the Devil reluctantly responds to the incantation uttered by the magician only to complain of being overworked: Molt me travaillles (v. 171). In a rare display of humor the Devil comments wryly that whoever tutored Salatins in the incantation had done a good job. In taking leave of Salatins the Devil says that he doesn't want to be bothered for several months either in Latin or Hebrew.

Having been apprised of Théophile's desire to place his fate into
the Devil's care, Sathanz shows a certain businesslike astuteness. He fixes conditions for the rendez-vous with Théophile in a terse way which seems to indicate that he has been at this for some time. Théophile is to come alone to a nearby valley on foot, "sanz compagnie et sans cheval;" and he must never call upon Jesus, the Son of St Mary for help. (This latter restriction underlines the power of the name Jesus as a protection against Satanic powers). The Devil has, however, learned to impose such conditions through the very human process called experience. Sathanz also requires a contract written legibly and sealed because men have formerly tricked him when he took their word as their bond. According to the legend, the Devil has evidently been gulled in the past, and this admission on his part seems to humanize him somewhat more:

Quar maintes genz m'en ont sorpris  
Por ce que lor lettres n'en pris;  
Por ce les vueil avoir bein dites. (vv. 252-254)

Sathanz promises to raise Théophile from his lowly, persecuted estate to that of Bishop and sole head of his monastery as well as to that of seigneur. In a feudal society of such rigid castes this was indeed a dizzying climb up the scale. Théophile is cautious until Sathanz makes his promise of aid: "Je t'aiderai outre reson" (v. 241).

The Devil's masterstroke is his underscoring of the wrong done to Théophile by the Bishop by asking Théophile what he wishes to ask of Sathanz that he could not request of his superiors. This simple question is reminiscent of the Jesus dealt with several supplicants? Sathanz thus invites Théophile to state exactly what he wants. In such a stance the Devil implies that he has limitless power and can perform anything requested of him. Once the frightened Théophile has rendered the contract and given his hand, the Devil's attitude softens towards his new disciple. His
cordial address to Théophile is now "biaus douz amis." He then proceeds to lay down some guide lines for the future deportment of his new vassal. In something of the style of an irascible suzerain Sathanz instructs Théophile to turn away from the poor and to adopt the proudest manner possible. Above all, he must never bow himself before anyone, but must repay humility with haughtiness. The spiritual virtues such as sweetness, humility, pity, charity, friendliness, fasting, and penitence give Sathanz a stomach ache. He elaborates upon his aversion to the Christian way of life, saying that giving alms and praying annoy him; loving God and living a chaste life are like a serpent and a viper eating at his entrails, "cuer el ventre." This latter aspect of the Devil's character becomes a commonplace in the subsequent miracle plays. It must have thrilled the spectators to think that each little act of piety caused acute physical suffering to the Enemy of their souls.

Having run the gamut of poses from complaining servant to overbearing feudal lord, to conciliatory suzerain, the Devil finds himself completely discomfited at the intervention of the Virgin on Théophile's behalf. Stripped of all dignity, like a naughty child confronted with the wrath of a human mother, Sathanz is self-excusing and anxious to avoid her. The Virgin does not need an incantation to summon him, for she orders him to give up the pact made by Théophile, and he does so, protesting but obedient. Cowering before the angry Virgin, the Devil explains the terms of the pact and attempts to justify his action with the truth—that Théophile came to him, not he to Théophile. It makes no difference to Our Lady, who dismisses the Devil with the inelegant promise: "Et je te foulèrai la pance." Again the reference to inflicting physical pain upon the Devil seems to underline the medieval penchant for corporal punishment. By exposing the Devil's vulnerable side the poet brought him down to human dimensions.
Curiously enough the Devil does not assume the role of tempter in this play. Théophile's despair over his fruitless self-denial and subsequent ill treatment at the hands of his bishop might be inferred as having been inspired by Satan. However, the monologue where Théophile weighs the pros and cons, balancing a soul in flames or eternal darkness with the present misery and possible return to riches and honor does not seem to reflect Satan's influence at this point. This, coupled with Sathanz's apparent ignorance of Théophile's conversation with Salatins, makes Théophile's resentment of God for having allowed him to be so mistreated seem to fall into a category of natural human reaction, although theologically his discontent would be interpreted as yielding to Satanic influence. In fact, Théophile's frame of mind is so desperate that he is ready to do anything to regain his former station: "Il n'est chose que je n'en face" (v. 80). He has already contemplated suicide by drowning or hanging (v. 21) and rejects God before he seeks out Salatins.

Théophile addresses Salatins, a known agent of the occult, as "Salatins frere," and accordingly the magician responds to the tale of woe with apparent sympathy. Salatins recognizes immediately the change in Théophile's personality and his hitherto cheerful mien and with diabolical calculation agrees with the discouraged monk that it is a hard thing to fall upon the charity of another, and it is too much to have to endure hard words and abusive language. His suggestion to Théophile that the Devil be given a chance hardly constitutes a subtle temptation, for Théophile knows too well Salatins' connections. The magician, though mortal, seems to be a potent extension of demonical powers, for his authority over Sathanz is acknowledged by him. In attempting to establish rapport with Sathanz the magician speaks to the yet invisible Devil. He asks twice if Sathanz is listening, thereby enhancing the feeling of
portent among the spectators. Receiving no answer, Salatins forces the
Devil to appear with the following incantation, a potpourri of Greek,
Hebrew, and Aramaic words.

Bagahi laca bachahe
Lamac cahi achahe
Karrelyos
Lamac Lamac bachalyos
Cabahagi sabalyos
Baryolas
Lagozatha caby9las
Samahac et famyolas
Harrahya.

The tension created by such a scene is evident. Many of the
spectators had heard of conjuring, believed in it, and now were afforded
a daring facsimile of such an illicit meeting with the Devil. Sathanz'
entrance could hardly be more affectively arranged. The roar of a canon
with the accompanying smoke and burst of flame provided the Devil with a
flamboyant screen from which to emerge.\(^{10}\) Instead of the awesome, grim,
and gravely superior presence one might expect, there appears a tardy,
grumbling elf whom Salatins takes the liberty of scolding for being late.
It is the magician who fully appreciates the triumph of their new trick
or geu novel, and he expects Sathanz to be just as thrilled as he that one
of their former enemies, a monk, has come to their side. The enlargement
of Salatins' character in the play, even his name, seem to be a personal
addition of Rutebeuf's. The poet was content to allow Sathanz a somewhat
perfunctory if faintly droll function in the transaction of the pact.\(^{11}\)

In the anonymous play Mystère du Chevalier qui donna sa femme au
diable of the next century the Devil becomes devious while taking the
initiative as the tempter; he contrives to make a pact with one mortal
in order to acquire the soul and body of another. Hence, the Devil is
more interesting as a character in this play than in Rutebeuf's earlier
effort. In this miracle play of ten characters, Le Dyable emerges as
an able manipulator of two powerful weapons, pride and despair. With
the rich and prodigal chevalier already under his sway, the Devil
pursues a more difficult pray, the chevalier's wife, for she is the
virtuous antithesis of her husband. His pride is a blinding intoxicant,
evident as he exults:

Il n'y a, en tout ce pays,
Plus riche homme que je suis,
Je vis sans soucy;
De vilains dis fy;
De gens suis garnys;
Tant que jen vouddray
De biens suis garny.
Je puis mettre au ny
Ceux que je vouddray.

(vv. 6-14)

The chevalier betrays in the last two lines a dangerous kind of
pride in his power over others. The possibility of destroying whom
he would has an obvious fascination which robs him of the charm of a
generous, good-time spender and makes him a potentially sinister agent
of the Devil's heinous designs. However, the playwright has wisely kept
the Devil in the background until all the human players have demonstrated
their characters. The piety of the wife is thrown into relief against
the knight's attitude in her kind remonstrance:

Mon doulx amy, je vous diray,
Se des biens avez largement,
Merciez Dieu devotement,
Car sachez veritablement
Que sa grace les vous envoye.

(vv. 14-19)

While the two écuyers, Amaury and Anthenor, flatter the knight into
greater follies, the devoted wife invokes the protection of the Virgin
for her husband's soul. The two companions prove to be his evil angels,
as it were, encouraging the chevalier into a false sense of security in
earthly wealth, in their own plot to relieve their benefactor of his gold.
Athenor

Je saiy tout ce qu'il faut faire;
Baver, flater et bien mentir
Font souvent les flateurs venir
En grant bruyt, es court de seigneurs.

(vv. 122-125)

The intrigue has the stamp of the Devil on it, particularly when
the chevalier asks his wife what is on her mind, and she tells him that
she disapproves of his style of life and attitude. His reaction is very
rude, for he calls her a nag and tells her to hold her tongue. He then
calls for Amaury, preferring the company of a squire to that of his
beautiful and loving wife. Were the Devil never to set foot on the stage,
there would still be no doubt in the mind of the spectator that here was
a fool blinded indeed by the Evil One.

It is at this point, however, that the master puppeteer, the mover
behind the evil scenes just depicted steps forward. The Dyable has seen
all, of course. He hates the wife of the knight because she invokes so
often the name of his arch enemy, Mary. In a revelatory monologue he
unveils for the spectators his intention to obtain both the knight and
his wife, using the husband as his agent.

Si je puis venir au dessus
De ce chevalier, par mon art,
Je le tîneray de sa part,
En despit de sa faulce femme,
Qui ainsi chascun jour reclame
Celle Marie, qui tant nous fait
De despit et noz gens retraict
Par sa tres orde baverie,
Par mon barat et trichezire
Les auray tous deux, se je puis.

(vv. 290-299)

With a subtle twist of vocabulary the Devil heightens his speech to
irony by promising to use his well-known "prudence" in finding a way
to reduce the inflated chevalier to despair.
On sait bien que caustellu suis
Assez pour trouver la manière
De la faire en quelque manière
Coeur en voye de desesperance.
Or, avant, il faut que m'avance
D'aller faire mon entreprise.

(vv. 300-305)

However, for all her sweetness and apparent gentleness the
châtelaine is nobody's fool. She is fully aware of the Devil's power
over her husband and of the ever present danger to herself. In a portion
of her long prayer of supplication to the Virgin she sets up an opposing
force to the stated project of Satan, although clearly she has not overheard
it:

Tu as tant fait vers Dieu pour les humains,
Que de peril tu az engarde maintz
Et delivrey d'enfer, Douce Marie,
Si tu supplie, oy mes pleurs et mes plains;
Garde mon ame qu'elle ne soit perie.

(vv. 339-343)

Hell was no fairy-tale place to this devout woman, and her supplication
reminds every spectator of his own potential fall and of the way to
protect oneself against this fall. One feels the tentacles of evil
closing around the valiant wife whose prayers include her foolish
husband:

Oy-moi, dame, si te vient a plaisir;
Pour mon mary humblement te supplie,
Car je voy bien que son sens fort varie;

(vv. 345-347)

During the disastrous dice game in which the knight loses everything
one sees an apparent master stroke of the Devil's "prudence" although one
does not see the Evil One in attendance. After the game, however, Satan
lies in wait for the bankrupt knight who comes lamenting his folly. The
Devil comments that things are going as planned and annuyt, he expects
to have "luy et sa femme" in his clutches. Hence the ensuing scenes
between the knight and his wife are seen to be closely monitored by the
Devil.
The knight invites death to plant his dart into him so that he will not have to confront his wife. Death will not oblige him, of course, since the wife is the prime target of Satan, and he needs the husband alive awhile longer in order to acquire her. Therefore the Devil lurks around the edges of the action calling the wife by names such as la faulse gloutte, when she offers comfort and advises the knight to pray. These imprecautions who how frustrated is the Devil because the wife holds steadily to her faith despite misfortune. He vows, however, to snap up the knight and his lady nonetheless.

Maintenant est temps que m'avance
De conduyre mon entre prise,
Le chevalier chascun despise
Pour ce que tout est despenu,
Mais que mes mots ayt entendu,
Il sera mien, point je n'en doute
E si auray la faulse gloutte
Sa femme, qui sert à Marie.

(vv. 644-651)

Deftly the Evil One moves in at the point where the knight is most vulnerable. Destitute and thereby abandoned by his erstwhile friends, and having crowned his foolishness by abandoning in turn his wife's comfort and good advice, the unsuspecting knight keeps a rendez-vous with the Devil.

The fairly long scene in which the Devil successfully extracts a pact written in blood from the knight shows the Devil to be unrecognized by his victim, at least at first. One may infer here that a disguise, probably that of a lord, may have been adopted for the moment by Satan, for the chevalier assures the stranger that all the goods which he must have in his home country "Ou tu es trop puissant seigneur" will not restore the despairing knight to his former estate. Even when the Devil assures the man that he has all power to make him rich, the knight does not guess his identity. The boast made by the Devil in this scene is
reminiscent of that used during the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness, and which was not denied by the Christ:

\[
\begin{align*}
J'ay en moy le gouvernement \\
Du monde; sache vrayement \\
Que puis ung povre homme enricher,^{12} \\
\text{(vv. 696-698)}
\end{align*}
\]

The Devil is quite straightforward in his request for a written agreement, and he does so early in the conversation:

\[
\begin{align*}
De ton sang lettre me feras \\
Et de ta main tu l'escriras, \\
Puis apres tu seras pourveu. \\
\text{(vv. 723-725)}
\end{align*}
\]

Satan shows good psychological insight, for this was a capital moment to introduce the bizarre request. The prospect of salvation from ignominy is an overpowering idea, and desperation clutches at a straw. With his victim so willing to be saved from penury, the Devil boldly tells his supreme lie about the chevalier's wife. The Devil's slander of a pure woman is a recurring theme among the miracles, and this instance has been carefully prepared by the Devil. He capitalizes upon the hard attitude he has fostered in the knight towards his wife, and now he hands over justification to the careless husband. Like a sympathizing old friend the Devil says that he has known this terrible scandal all along and thereby opens the door to the double jeopardy:

\[
\begin{align*}
Saches que ton faict ay cognu; \\
Ta propre femme t'a deceu; \\
Pour tant la doys abandonner. \\
\text{(vv. 729-731)}
\end{align*}
\]

Even though the chevalier admits that he has seen nothing amiss with his wife, the rich stranger's suggestion that she be given to him meets no strong resistance. The Devil has gauged accurately the shallowness of the knight's character, his love of the pleasures money can buy in particular. The knight requires a large monetary recompense for his wife. Briefly then, without evidence or proof of infidelity the chevalier
sells his wife to the Devil, thereby reducing her to her lowest position as legal chattel. All that the stranger asks of the knight in return for riches is that his will be done. The knight is curious about the stranger's identity, but the Devil says that he will never reveal it and repeats his offer. The chevalier jumps to the conclusion that he is talking to Death, whom he has summoned earlier, and agrees to the terms. The Devil allows the chevalier to believe the ironically accurate but mistaken identity to be so and says that is enough for the deal. Then Satan shifts from the subject of his identity to refocus attention on the knights situation.

Now comes the "fine print" of the pact and interestingly, the renunciation of the faith as the first condition of the pact causes the knight to balk:

\[
\text{Adea, ainsi ne m'auras pas,} \\
\text{Je m'adviseray sur ce cas;} \\
\text{La cause requiert qu'on y vise.}
\]

(vv. 756-758)

Satan answers such haggling with the prospect of poverty and the alternative of liberty through independent wealth. Here the Devil is supremely successful in directing the thinking of the chevalier into the opinion that he can free himself from bondage to poverty and its stigma, when in reality the man is about to place himself under a more stifling bondage. Thus the chevalier ruminates:

\[
\text{De regnier la Trinité} \\
\text{C'est ung dur point et detestable;} \\
\text{Mais d'estre mis en liberté} \\
\text{Cela m'est au cœur agreable.}
\]

(vv. 767-770)

The ruse of the dishonest businessman who rushes a client to a decision because the bargain "cannot wait" is successful again for Satan as he gives the impression that he is about to pass on.
Satan does, however, push too hard in telling the chevalier that he must also renounce the Virgin Mary. His haste to rid himself of the possible threat of the Virgin nearly costs him the whole agreement. For the first time since the play began the chevalier shows a sign of faith and the strength to uphold it. No matter how the Devil presses, the chevalier remains obstinate:

*Laissons en pax ceste matière;  
Pour mort ne le feroys jamais.*

(vv. 785-786)

The Devil yields on this point, for he has gained two souls, and the chances seem good that the Virgin may not be called in, at least not by the chevalier. Since the lady will not be apprised of her fate until it is too late, the plan is almost certain to succeed. That the Devil included Mary in his requirements attests to his fear of her power and his hatred for her and her *dévots*. Once the pact is signed, the Devil takes it and summarizes their agreement, pointing out their next place of meeting and enjoining the knight not to forget his end of the bargain, once he has again been *remis en honneur*.

Immediately after the chevalier goes his joyful way, the Devil indulges in an activity common among the diabolical characters of the *Miracles*—he gloats. In a brief monologue obviously given for the benefit of the spectators *le Diable* exults over the pact and anticipates the happy day, seven years hence, when he shall actually possess the wife whose fate is sealed in writing. All eyes in the theatre must have been fascinated by the cursed paper whereon the blood of the knight had not only damned his own soul but that also of his innocent wife. The pact was an effective property, impressing upon the audience the bonds or *liens* of Satan so often alluded to by the priests. In this brief scene of triumph the invisible and subtle power of Satan is concretized, concentrated in a piece
of paper visible to all in attendance.

Just as Eve in the *Jeu d'Adam* becomes the agent of Satan, so the
chevalier becomes his active agent during the absence of the Evil One
from the scene. One senses that wherever the knight happens to be,
satanic influence is bound to be felt. The chevalier rebukes cruelly
his wife when she remonstrates with him that his words are careless:

\[
\text{Taisez-vous, de par tous les dyables,
Qu'il n'ayt hutin entre nous deux,
S'il faut que j'entre en mon courroux,
Le dyable vous chantera messe.}
\]

(vv. 950-953)

With this impudence he silences his wife and turns towards his former
companions, whom he forgives for the sake of resuming his debauched life.
At this point the poet demonstrates an instance of the Devil's utilization
of a good act or attitude for an evil end. Since forgiveness is not
generally regarded as an evil act, in this instance of reinstating his
former cronies it is a negative act because of the chevalier's motive.

The time for the rendez-vous comes, and the Devil appears as the
harbinger of doom. In his monologue he appears to feel secure in
regard to the improbability of the intervention of the Virgin, although
she is still on his mind as a potential danger:

\[
\text{Il me convient avoir regard
Au terme que ce chevalier
S'est voulu à moy obliger}
\]
\[
\text{Et me livrer icy sa femme,
Je l'auray en corps et en ame,}
\]
\[
\text{L'eussent juré Dieu et les saints,}
\]
\[
\text{Car il m'a escript de ses mains}
\]
\[
\text{La lettre sellée de son signe.}
\]
\[
\text{Tantost fauldra que m'enchemine}
\]
\[
\text{Pour l'aller attendre au lieu dit,}
\]
\[
\text{Il est mien, sans nul contredit,}
\]
\[
\text{Jamais il n'en peult eschapper,}
\]
\[
\text{Marie ne me pourra tromper}
\]
\[
\text{Que ne l'aye, maulgré son visage.}
\]

(vv. 1012-1025)
One notes the hint of bravado in the last two lines, for Satan knows full well that he cannot look at the Virgin directly in the eye.

The chevalier, on the other hand, seems less anxious to meet the stranger again. Even in his self condemnation over having done such a thing to his wife, he uses an interjection so often associated with the Devil, so that his speech has taken on a demonic flavor:

    O haro! suis-je bien infame
    De l'avoir en ce point lyée
    Et envers le dyable obligée?

(vv. 1049-1051)

During the seven years he enjoyed his ill-gained wealth he has had time to reflect somewhat upon the former rendez-vous and to surmise the identity of the stranger to whom he sold his wife. His remorse is shortlived as he plots to explain to his wife why they must take a mysterious trip into the woods without retinue from the castle. Not realizing that his own fate is inextricably linked with that of his wife, he replies rather glibly to his wife's malaise over the possibility of being attacked by brigands.

    Ne vous en vuelvez point doubter;
    Homme ne vous fera nul mal.
    Devulle vousfault pour ce val
    Affin que mal si ne vous voyez.

(vv. 1109-1112)

Knowing that his wife has in mind danger from strange men, he answers her with the diabolical assurances one has come to expect--truth twisted so as to lie. She does not suspect that the only man who plans evil for her is her husband, and doubtless he has the Devil in mind when he reassures her about the danger from men.

The wife's own piety is something over which the Devil has no control. The châtelaine commits herself to the protection of God and the Virgin, whereas the Devil goes doggedly ahead with his plan, reminding all that
he has a written pact and that the couple cannot revoke it. The
intercessory prayer of the wife, meanwhile, has set in motion a scene
in heaven of which the Devil knows nothing. The Virgin advocate pleads
before her Son for the salvation not only of the châtélaine but of
her husband as well. As if the Devil's own actions were not enough
evidence, the Virgin goes to great lengths to remind her Son of just
how wicked the Devil is.14

Or est-elle en grant soucy
Pour ce que le faulx Sathanas
Tient son mary tout en ses las,
Et tant que luy a fait promettre
Et de son sang faire une lettre
Que sa femme luy livreroit,
Si te prie, filz, pour bon droit,
Que la femme soit garantie,
Et pour le chevalier te prie
Que du dyable delivré soit,
Car Sathan très fort le deçoit
Par ses abus dyaboliques
Et par ses fallaces obliques,
Dont son amer est en grant danger.

(vv. 1197-1210)

Satan, the knight, and his wife proceed to the woods, ignorant of
the heavenly council in which Jesus outlines a plan for delivering both
the husband and wife from the terms of the pact. The Virgin will take
the wife's place, while the lady shall be made to sleep kneeling at the
altar of the woodland chapel.

Au faulx Satan vous osterez
La lettre qu'il tient en sa main,
Et le chevalier tout à plain
Delivrerez, aussi la dame.

(vv. 1257-1260)

The disappointed Satan affords an unending source of pleasure
to the medieval spectator. As is often the case, the moment of truth
is preceded by a premature triumph by Satan, who gloats over his
expectations. However, he recognizes immediately his arch enemy as she
emerges veiled from the chapel and approaches on the arm of the chevalier,
who at this point thinks he is escorting his wife. Because of the written pact, Satan intends to stand his ground, although he is not certain as to how to confront the Virgin:

Bien sçay qu'elle me fera meschef;
Mais, au fort, je viendrai à chef
Du chevalier car il est mien
Par ceste lettre que je tien.
Harol ne sçay que faire doze.

(vv. 1302-1306)

Discretion being the better part, he approaches the chevalier instead of addressing himself to the Virgin. The irony of the situation lies in the fact that the Devil accuses the chevalier of treason of which he is inadvertently innocent!

With her identity revealed, the Virgin takes over the scene and banishes forever the Devil to his prison for having laid claim to the lady in question.

Ha, faulx Sathan, venue je suis
Pour celle que livrée t'avoit.
Tu sçeus bien que tu n'as nul droit
Sur elle, qui est ma servante.
Va-t'en en la prison puante
A toujours, sans jamais partir. 15

(vv. 1323-1328)

A marked contrast in the dénouement between the Devil and the Virgin in the present play and that of Rutebeuf's Théophile is easily discerned. Whereas Rutebeuf's devil returned the pact and quickly retreated, the devil harassing the chevalier's wife stands firm according to the terms of the pact. His attitude is typical of most of the legalistic devils who populate later medieval drama. 16 He appeals to the Virgin's nonexistant sense of the legality of a signed contract, but he does not appear to cower and offer it as an excuse:
D'icy ne me vouill departir
Tant que le chevalier j'auray:
Car par raison je monstreray
Qu'il est mien; en voycy la lettre
De ses mains; jamais ne peut estre
Il en escript le libell,

(vv. 1329-1334)

The Devil's manners and obviously fine appearance during the first encounter had lulled the knight of shallow character into a false sense of security on his own account, so that only when the Devil claims him in the presence of the Virgin does he realize the enormity of the danger he has courted. The panicky chevalier immediately addresses the _digne pucelle_ in a plea for protection. The Virgin invokes the authority of her Son to enforce her command that the pact be renounced.

Faulx Satan, tu seras vaincu,
Car par malice tu l'as fait.
Baille-moy la lettre; de fait
Le chevalier nul ma n'aura;
De tes mains delivré sera,
Et sa femme pareillement;
Mon filz l'a dit par jugement
Qui congoit assez tes abus.

(vv. 1353-1358)

Gabriel steps into a familiar role as assistant to the Virgin and adversary of the Devil by advising Satan to hand over the pact. Saint Mary, impatient with the quarrel, interrupts the argument, and the Devil then acknowledges his defeat. His capitulation includes the usual accusation that she is destroying hell, thus echoing the famous sermons by St Bernard to that effect. In his speech of concession it is also revealed that this creature _rusé_ is not Lucifer, the chief of the fallen angels, for this devil is afraid to report to hell. As the powerful representative of hell he was for all practical purposes _the Devil_. In his defeat his real position in the demonic hierarchy is exposed, for he must report to Lucifer and receive a beating and other torments.

He decides to go elsewhere first in search of a substitute trophy:
Haro! de dueil le cueur ne fault,
J'ay perdu ma possession,
Et tout par ton abusion.
Marie, tu destruis enfer.
Hari ! que dira Lucifer
Quant il saura ceste nouvelle?
Bien say que pas ne l'aura belle;
Batu seray et tourmenté.
Je m'en voys d'ung aultre costé.
Faire tout qu'auray aultre proye;
Je ne puis arrester en voys;
Maintenant il s'en fault fouy.

(vv. 1371–1382)

Evidently the medieval man took great pleasure in the idea of
punishment being meted out in hell to the agents of evil who failed to
seduce a mortal, for there are several other Miracles which feature this
idea. For the medieval Christian, the reward and punishment concept
applied both to believers and to demons, each receiving his due according
to his works. At any rate, not only could the steadfast believer inflict
physical pain upon his tempters, but he could also anticipate the
beatings and tortures which awaited the demons when they reported to
headquarters.

There may be something to the idea that the apparent interest in
trial scenes between Mary and the devils before Christ the Judge was due
to the influence of the great jurisconsulte Barthole, who composed a procès
of Satan against Mary before the tribunal of her Son entitled Processus
Satanae contra Virginem, coram judice Jesu. From this era of Philippe
le Bel (1268–1314) and onward there was a decided taste for the subtleties
of law on the stage, even to the point of trickery. In the fourteenth
century Barthole's work was imitated in Franco-Normand, probably by Jean
de Justice, Chanson de Bayeux, in a poem entitled L'Advocacie Notre-
Dame ou la Marie plaidant contre le diable. In this poem Satan claims
the human race for himself, while the Virgin defends it with tears and
wins her cause.
Part 2: Seducer, Accuser, Destroyer

The first play of the Cangé collection of miracles combines the situation of a pact signed with the Devil and the arbitration of Jesus when the Virgin intervenes to retrieve it. Entitled Miracle de l’Enfant donné au Diable, this drama spans some fifteen years; Beelzebub and Lucifer join forces to secure their prey, the soul of a child carelessly dedicated to them by his mother before his conception. In this play the Devil and his lieutenant take a greater part in the action than that observed in the preceding examples as they initially lay a snare for a childless couple who have recently vowed themselves to chastity in honor of St Mary.

Lucifer, called le Premier Dyable in the stage directions, begins the insidious intrigue by enunciating his hatred for the Virgin:

Belzabus, trop est esmarie
La pensée de celle femme,
Mère Dieu, qui si nous diffame
Qu’ame ne nous peut demourer.

(vv. 64-67)

Hence the plot which they are about to hatch will involve mortals in an attempt to outwit and wreak vengeance upon the Virgin. There is no better way to achieve vengeance than to cause one of her adherents to break a vow, and that of chastity especially rankles the devils. In keeping with the medieval taboo on physical lovemaking in marriage for other than the purpose of procreation the two devils wish to perpetuate the pleasure enjoyed by this pair who have, quite foolishly to the modern mind, made such a vow to the Virgin. Beelzebub places their project within the framework of avenging a wrong done to them, and in a sense the two mortals are pawns in a high level contest between Lucifer and the Virgin.
In order to cause the breach of the vow to be irreparable
Beelzebub reveals another power, that of causing a child to be conceived.
Lucifer pledges his aid in such a coup, for he desires the souls of both
the man and wife. While indulging in a typical boasting session Beelzebub
vows not to rest until all the task is accomplished. Hence, the devils
strike at a moment when all seems tranquil between the couple. Although
the wife is the one who suggests the vow of chastity, the husband agrees,
and they return home from the chapel in harmony of spirit. Lucifer glides
into the scene and asks the provocative question: "Ceste besongne
est bonne et crasse; ne voiz tu comme elle se fait?" The audience is
asking itself just that question, for each one of the spectators is
curious as to how the Devil is going to break down the resolve of the pair.

As might be expected, the husband regrets the vow, an evidence to
the medieval spectators of the success which the devils are having.
Despite the wife's remonstrance, the husband is determined. The wife, in
turn, thinks that the Devil has gotten into her husband, and as if to
confirm this, he becomes incensed.

La Dame

Sire, moulant bon gré vous saray
Se vous m'en voulez deporter.
Pour Dieu, allez vous confesser
Pour l'ennemi qui vous atise.
Le Seigneur

A! dyables! y a il maistrise?
Ce sera fait vueillez ou non.

(vv. 180-185)

This couple are not just ignorant, violent vilains, but people of rank who, under the Devil's malign influence, have lost control. The wife rashly gives the fruit of her womb to the Devil as a deterrent to the advances of her husband, for her frantic efforts to keep her vow cause her to play into the hands of Lucifer:

Vous estes un homes sans raison
Quant ainsi estes eschaufez.
Et je donneray aus maufez
Le fruit, se de vous je conçoys.

(vv. 186-189)

The husband is not so insensible as to take her words lightly, for he says that he will not concede to her giving away their child to Satan and warns her that she will regret her words more than she can imagine. The discord is sharp between the pair as the wife attempts to shift all blame not only for having broken their vow, but for having sworn to give her baby to the Devil, should there be one. The ghosts of the Garden of Eden are present in this situation somewhat analogous to that of Adam and Eve, who also laid the blame for their own shortcomings upon another. It is not long, however, before their mutual anger gives way to mutual fear, so that the husband admits his part in the guilt and joins his wife in another trip to the chapel to beg pardon of the Virgin.

This sudden turn of the plot causes Beelzebub and Satan to be at a greater advantage than they had hoped at the outset. Apparently to them a careless word is binding, and the Devil will collect, if possible. Lucifer and Beelzebub revel over their triumph, despite the fact that the lady calms down enough to pray to the Virgin for protection against them and the husband repents for having broken the original vow.
Nevertheless the husband holds his wife responsible for her rashness.

The devils remain close to their prey for fear they will somehow escape. Lucifer cannot help boasting of what else he will do to the couple, but he is also aware of the possibility, remote though it may be, of being foiled:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tantost de si pr\'es les suivons} \\
\text{Qu'\'il ne nous pourront eschapper.} \\
\text{Tu les me verras rehapper} \\
\text{D'un autre tour, s'on ne me noye.}
\end{align*}
\]

(\text{vv. 236-239})

As the time for her delivery approaches, the wife, feeling the precious life inside of her, is moved to appeal again to the Virgin for protection against the enemy. In this prayer she acknowledges her own guilt, but blames Satan and not her husband, as formerly, for being so rash, and she repents of the anger which made her vow so wickedly.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vierge puissant, veuillez garder} \\
\text{Le fruit que je sens dedans moy} \\
\text{Du Satan, que m'en aie ennuy,} \\
\text{Que je li donnay comme folle.}
\end{align*}
\]

(\text{vv. 248-251})

The husband is sorry for having broken the vow and asks the Virgin to invoke the power of "le vray roy puissant" who can save the child so that the "anemis n'aît pouvoir a li."

Lucifer moves in to secure his victim just as the wife, weak from her labor, has sent the midwife in search of her husband, because she desires that her son be baptized immediately. The air fairly crackles with tension as the undisguised prince of the devils confronts the solitary mother:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vous en avez trop tost parl\'e,} \\
\text{Dame: est enfer cy est miens.} \\
\text{Il ne sera ja crestiens;} \\
\text{Je l'emporteray tout delivr\'e.}
\end{align*}
\]

(\text{vv. 306-309})

As if the undisguised Devil were not enough to frighten the lone woman
into insensibility, the situation of having an unbaptized infant at
his mercy would complete the job. The maternal instinct rouses the lady
into a desperate bid for time, and she asks for seven years of deferment,
since this child is her only son. The Devil seems unusually susceptible
to a bargain, but he exacts from her a pact, an agreement not to baptize
the child. Lucifer has dealt cleverly again, capitalizing upon the
mother's intense possessiveness and her momentary panic, which made her
forget the power of the sign of the cross or the invocation of the name
of Jesus. The didactic impact of the scene must have been great,
particularly when followed by the wife's explanation of the situation to
her husband.\(^{21}\) One can appreciate her fear that Lucifer would strangle
the baby at any moment.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sire, il l'eust ysmel le pas} \\
\text{Estrangle tout certainemment,} \\
\text{Se ne li eusse convenant} \\
\text{Que ja par non n'iert baptizier.} \\
\text{S'eust esté moulant grant pechiez,} \\
\text{S'ansemment l'eusse perdu;} \\
\text{Mais je li ay couvent eu} \\
\text{Que set ans respit m'en donroit} \\
\text{Que je baptizé ne seroit.}
\end{align*}
\]

(vv. 348-356)

The Virgin fights back at the urgent request of the couple: she
appears to them and assures them that their son will know four times more
in seven years than any other child. The tender aftermath of his
heavenly visitation lies in contrast to the previous antagonistic
scenes between the pair and with Lucifer. The husband asks what the
child will be named, since "Nous ne l'osons crestitennier, Pour avoir le
nom de bapteseme." The mother replies simply, "biau filz."

Promptly at the end of the seven years Beelzebub comes to claim
the child according to the verbal pact made with Lucifer. The woman
recognizes him, just as she had Lucifer, and she haggles for another
eight years, saying that she will make a covenant with Lucifer that he may
have his way and which she will not retract. She is successful with Beelzebub, who returns empty handed to his chief. There is a difference of opinion between the two devils, for Lucifer believes that the proverbial bird in hand is definitely preferable, and he correctly considers that any delay endangers the possibility of acquiring the child. Beelzebub's case for leniency appears weak indeed. Lucifer is, however, persuaded to concede, provided there is a written pact, signed and sealed. In the presence of the mother Lucifer affixes his seal into the wax, and in a crisp businessman's manner Beelzebub hurries the process along, mentioning their many other projects to tend:

\[\text{C'est escript; tenez. Alons mant,}
\text{Car nous avons ailleurs a faire,}
\text{Tenez la cire, que je n'erre:}
\text{Seelez, puis si en yrons.}
\]

(\text{vv. 570-573})

As in the case of the chevalier's wife, the son of this pair is an innocent victim of a relative's folly. Satan's hold is, however, resisted when the parents send for the precocious son of fourteen, hoping that by arming him with the facts he will find a way to save himself from the clutches of the Devil.\(^{22}\) As the father relates the story to the son of why he was reared in a nearby town and never baptized, the blame is placed squarely upon the shoulder of the Devil.\(^{23}\) The father also has an explanation for the seeming leniency of Beelzebub towards the mother's second plea for an extension of time; evidently the Virgin influenced the mind of the devil, for the father credits her with Beelzebub's decision to give the child eight more years:

\[\text{Celle qui est fontaine et puis}
\text{De grace et de misericorde,}
\text{Qui percheurs a Dieu racord,}
\text{Refist puis tant que li Sathans}
\text{Te donna de respit huit ans.}
\]

(\text{vv. 718-722})
The youth decides without hesitation to go to Rome and consult the Pope. The latter, however, seems unable to handle the case personally, but he grants the pontifical blessing requested by the boy, and sends him to his own confessor, a hermit. The resources of the Church are fairly exhausted, as three hermits in succession are unable to give sufficient succor. The last year of reprieve has slipped away, save one day, and Beelzebub has tracked down his victim. The youth, like a hunted animal at bay, throws to heaven a desperate cry for help. The verb in line 1216 suggests a mite about to be scopped up on the tongue of a frog, or a small chick under the threatening claws of a swooping hawk:

Glorieuse vierge, humblement
Vous requier, se c'est vostre grez,
Qu'n c'est jour d'ui me delivrez
De l'ennemi qui cy me chace.
Se vous n'y mettez vostre grace,
Vierge, et de moy n'avez pité,
Il m'ara ja tantost hapé,
Car plus n'ay respit nuit ne jour.

(vv. 1210-1217)

Not allowing Beelzebub to make the collection by himself, Lucifer fears the Virgin's power even though he bluffs the youth by saying that she cannot rightfully take him away from them. The impatience of Lucifer is evident, for he wastes few words. Beelzebub, on the other hand, naively believes that if put to the test, Jesus would rule in their favor.

Premier Dyable (Lucifer)

Elle ne te petu retolir
De nous, s'elle ne veult tort faire,
Avant! faisons lui assez haire;
Ne nous feroit pas tort son filz.

Second Dyable (Beelzebub)

Ce ne feroit mon, j'en suis fis;
Se sur lui nous en vouliions mettre,
Et il s'en voulsist entremettre,
Tout a plain le nous renderoit.

(vv. 1224-1231)
As both Lucifer and Beelzebub are about to lead the youth away, both the boy and the hermit in turn implore the Virgin once again. In this eleventh hour she comes and imperiously addresses the devils, stopping them in their tracks: "Maufé de male denomme, / Retournez; n'alez en avant." Despite the Virgin's authoritative address, Lucifer and Beelzebub do not quake as does the devil in Théophile. The hope to slip out with their prey by reminding Our Lady of their rights to their victim. She, however, is not deterred by the fast talking Beelzebub, whom she tells to go spread his net elsewhere because he has failed to take this prize.

Lucifer intervenes and proposes to lay the case before Jesus, "le vray juge," saying that if He judges against them, they will leave the boy to Mary. Our Lady agrees, but in the meanwhile she will keep the boy next to her to prevent any trickery. As the assemblage comes before Him, Dieu greets his mother, who says that she has rescued a boy from the clutches of "cilz dyables." Somewhat similar to the scenes of the Old Testament when Solomon sat as arbitor of his subject's quarrels, the trial proceeds informally, with Lucifer making his complaint against the Judge's mother. One wonders if the irony of this situation was lost upon the medieval writers and spectstors, for it is repeated in subsequent miracles. The devils actually think that they have a case, and so it appears to the mortals involved. It seems to appeal to the medieval sense of humor to fin the Devil so gullible. Disregarding his own unscrupulous dealings, Lucifer boldly asks "le vray juge" for justice.

Premier Dyable

Faite nous droit, sire, en amour,
Se vous voulez, de ceste dame,
Qui nous tolt chascun an mainte ame,
Ce nous semble, par son effort,
Ne nous laissiez par faire tort,
Où el nous a cestuy osté,
C'on nous a, quinze ans a, donné,
Et si le nous veult retoirt.

(vv. 1286-1293)

The Judge wants to know precisely who gave away the child. The two devils, like two eager plaintiffs at a hearing, are anxious to tell their side. They have been lenient, they say, with the mother of the boy.

Second Dyable

Sire, la mère sans douter
Le nous donna, et si savez
Qu'il fu en peché engendrez
Contre foy et contre raison.

Premier Dyable

Veuillez entendre ma raison,
Vray juge: encore y a plus,
Tant de foiz que la suis venuz,
La dame respit me prioit,
Ne de rien se contredisoit
Le don qu'elle nous avoit fait;
Ains dist que sans noise et sans plaist,
S'encor huit ans avoit respit,
Que bien vouloit sans contredit
Que son filz nous fust tous delivre.

(vv. 1298-1311)

Our Lady speaks up to say that the youth belongs to her and to Dieu because the mother did not have within her anything to give away when she made the "gift." The Judge promises justice: "Vous et au diable doit feray." At that Lucifer hastens to bring out the pact as the decisive exhibit for the plaintiff.

Seeming to ignore momentarily the Judge, St Mary disparages the value of the sealed pact. It is this scene which Stadler-Honegger says shows the Virgin in a poor light, in that she makes fun of justice, for when Our Lady asks to see the paper, the devils trustingly hand it over to her, only to see her crumple it into tiny pieces. She seems concerned, as any human mother might, that her Son will be deceived by Lucifer,
whereas it appears that she is the more rusée in this transaction.

It may be just such behavior as this which caused Stadler-Honegger to declare herself the Devil's advocate in her study.25 The devils do seem to demonstrate more good faith and dignity in their deportment at this moment than St Mary, who destroys the evidence.26

The by-play between Mary and Lucifer being unimportant to Him, the Christ renders a verdict based upon law:

Sathan, je vous dy et par droit
Que la femme n'a que donner
A chose qu'elle ait a garder
Sanz le vouloir de son seigneur,
Cist dons est de nulle valour,
Quant son père ne l'ottria.

(vv. 1368-1373)

The devils are ungracious losers, even though they asked for and receive a judgment according to law. They reaffirm their enmity against God and make what appears to be a naïve comparison between the relationship of the Christ and Mary with their own in terms of who has authority. They blame Jesus' judgment against them on Mary, surmising that He is afraid of a beating from his mother, should he decide counter to her will (vv. 1376-1387).27

The captious devils who insist upon a trial reflect the current high interest in court proceedings, the drama of the courtroom having captured the imagination of the populace. The great popularity of the poem L'Advocacie mentioned earlier seems to attest to this climate of interest. Certainly the tribunals of the Inquisition of the South of France were not held in a closet, although the miracles make no direct comment upon this actualité, just as they make but perhaps one passing reference to the invasion of the English. The influence of the Baschiens, whose lighter offerings consisted of mock trials and the lampooning of the men at law, seems apparent in the behavior of the devils in the court
scenes of the miracles. Therefore, in a somewhat oblique way edifying miracle plays of the late fourteenth century followed the popular taste of the day in the presentation of the Devil at work, as in the play just discussed.

The three miracles examined thus far represent something like one hundred fifty years of dramatic effort in this particular type of religious play. Certainly there is variety in the characterization of the Devil, despite a few stylized conceptions of Satan, insofar as his appearance and behavior are concerned. From the Sathanz of Théophile to the Dyable of Le Chevalier the change is striking, for the reluctance of the first cedes to the aggression of the second. One notes the summoned servant of the former versus the independent initiator of the latter; the matter-of-fact and overbearing opposes the rusé, boasting conniver. It seems that it was the character of the sorcerer which most interested the poet of Théophile and therefore led him to neglect the more sinister aspects of the Devil's character. Hence the recognized, undisguised quasi-buffoon of the first miracle takes on a deeper character in the latter, who comes at first incognito. Rutebeuf's devil seems almost disinterested, appearing but three times onstage, whereas the later devil appears several times in order to observe closely the knight and his lady. The pair work diligently in the Enfant Donné au Diable and thus follow the example set in the Chevalier, although no chronology is implied. Both Lucifer and Beelzebub are recognized by their victims when confronted by them, and deal directly, allowing leeway in time, as a creditor might. Their so-called leniency smacks more of the cat playing with its captive mouse. They are implacable at the last, and Lucifer's potential for violence adds another dimension to the demonical character onstage.28

The danger involved in dealing with Lucifer comes through mightily in the
scenes with the mother and child, in the pope's evident fright and the son's desperate flight.

Rutebeuf's devil hardly seems worthy of the rank of Prince of Evil. He takes a step backward in depth of characterization from Satan in the earlier semi-liturgical play le Jeu d'Adam. As has been noted, Salatin's the magician appears to embody more of the Satanic drive and skill in seducing a mortal. Since the terms of "Satan" and "Devil" are interchanged by medieval poets, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not the Chief of Devils is being alluded to, unless he is named Lucifer. On these occasions, as noted in the first miracle play of the Cange group, clearly Lucifer is the Prince of Evil and Beelzebub is his lieutenant. An illustration of this hierarchy occurs when he urges Beelzebub not to hesitate in his project if he would have the good will or "amour" of Lucifer: "Amis doulx, or ne t'en fain pas, / Se tu veulx acquerre m'amour" (vv. 79-80).

Two other devils take their case before the "vray juge" in the third play of the Cange collection, entitled Miracle de l'evsque que l'arceldacre murtrit. This time Behemot as the Premier Dyable and Sathan as the Second Dyable have what appears to be an airtight case, since they hold the soul of a murderer. Their antagonist will inevitably be Our Lady, whose appearance is prepared in the sermon which opens the play. The anonymous preacher finishes by citing from St Bernard, who calls her the arch enemy of hell:

   Et encore dit saint Bernard que c'est celle qui a le ciel remplit, enfer vouidi, la ruine de paradis restoré et eux chetis pecheurs attendans mercy vie pardurablo, qu'ilz avoient perdu, donné. Laquelle vie pardurable nous offroit ille qui est Deus benedictus in secula seculorum. Amen.
The anonymous poets of the miracles introduce a serious trial
twice within the first three plays of the Cangé group and thus indicate
that the predilection for tribunals in stage plays is not apparently
confined to those members of the Basochiens, the large and the small
societies, which were by vifte of their membership apt to stage mock
court trials with burlesqued plaidoyers. In this play of intrigue and
murder in high ecclesiastical places the injustice which seems to go
unchecked on earth comes at last before "le vray juge" in paradise, and
the culprit receives his just reward, to the immense satisfaction of the
Devil.

A certain archdeacon who wishes to supplant the present évêque
d'Alemaigne struggles within himself as a kind of ecclesiastical Macbeth;
he contemplates the murder which he is planning for the middle of the
night, because the habit of the bishop Jehan Compa negligence to rise in the
night in order to pray is well known to him. In his monologue the
archdeacon airs his resentment and his jealousy of Jehan, and at the
same time he demonstrates a confused state of mind, almost as if his train
of thought were imposed upon him from the outside. The Devil has not yet
appeared onstage, but the soliloquoy of the archdeacon bears the telltale
marks of Satanic influence, about which one learns more at a later time:

Certes or ne sçay que je face;
Car penser ne met a meschief
Tel que n'en puis venir a chief,
Quant de moy évéque on ne fist.

Hélas! je pense en vérité
Que, se par mort finé estoit,
Que de moy évéque on feroit;
Car je n'y say homme vivant
En ce pais si souffisant,
Bien aroit lors mon cuer grant joye.
Certes tout maintenant vouloye
Que de mort soubite moreuse,
Mais qu'a évéque on m'esleust.
Si le feray je, se je puis,
Briefment que, se la voie true,
Sa vie li acourceray,
Par quoy a cel honneur venroy
A quoy je tens.

(vv. 90-93; 106-119)

The archdeacon's plot appears the more despicable in the light of the opening scenes of the play in which the good bishop Jehan has articulated his wariness of the Devil and has shown that he realizes that his elevated position would make his fall a dreadful one. The first clerk reminds Jehan that his very prudence makes the bishop a prime target of Satan, and both priests understand the necessity of vigilance against the tireless efforts of the Devil to ensnare them (vv, 58-61).

Allowing the audience to receive the shock of the audacious usurpation before unveiling to them the cause of it, the playwright has kept the Devil out of sight until after the murder. Two devils, Behemot and Sathan, meet casually to compare notes on their latest forays. As is their wont, Behemot asks his companion what he has done, because he himself has a pet project to unveil. The urge to boast is a salient characteristic of conversations between demons, and Sathan says in a typical colloquialism that what he has done lately is not worth a stalk of straw. Behemot is delighted to name his latest coup—murder—and points out the prelate, the erstwhile archdeacon, now bishop, and in a proprietary tone says, "Il est mien," just as if he had acquired a new horse. The only unfortunate fact in his reckoning is that the victim of the murder was beyond the pale of the devilish wiles, being of too saintly a character; unable to seduce, the devil destroyed. The typically casual proprietorship of mortal affairs is reflected in this first dialogue between Behemot and Sathan, thus animating the Biblical statement that the Devil is the Prince of this world.30

To reiterate a point of theology, or more precisely demonology,
Behemot states that his greatest joy in the situation is not so much in the destruction of mortals per se, but in the fact of thwarting the Virgin by so doing: "le mort a pris dame Maroye." Our Lady is so upset that her servant was murdered that she goes straight to her Son to get things righted. This should prove great sport, for Behemot is sure that the soul of the murderer-bishop is theirs. It appears that in her wrath Mary is going to damn the soul of the usurper and thereby play right into the hands of her enemy. She commissions a chevalier, to whom she appears in a vision, to avenge the death of Jehan. Thus armed with the truth the chevalier confronts the jovial bishop and reveals to all just how the former bishop was murdered.

Enter the devils, approaching harbingers of doom. Their progress is somewhat reminiscent of that in the old Sponsus, where the devils appear from different parts of the church to lead away the five Fatuæ. The bishop recognizes the devils immediately, for they have come undisguised; the usurper knows his fate.

_Helas! helas! je suis dampez,
Puis que la vierge m’est contraire,
Qui aus autres est debonnaire.
Las! que pourray je devenir?
Je voy les ennemis venir,
Qui en enfer m'emporteront,
Ne Dieu n'ara de moy mercy.
Je ne puis plus demourer cy
Mourir me fault._

(vv. 954-963)

The villains's lament does not move either of his adversaries, and it is Satan who is prompt to claim everything; he does not want to hear anything more from the victim. Since their right to the soul and body is clear, Satan plans a quick delivery to hell. At this point, Behemot disagrees and decides to get Jesus' verdict on their claim. Satan is more wary of the Virgin and, understandably, he would prefer to whisk the
victim off without more ado; but since this is Behemot's project, he
concedes to his decision. Behemot proves a true prophet this time, for
in light of past experience, such as in the first of the Cangos miracles,
which involved a trial or arbitration scene, Satan has cause for anxiety.
Mary does plead for the archdeacon's soul on the grounds that he killed
her servant, although she does concede that the archdeacon's body must
necessarily be taken by the devils.31 Asking him what he thinks, Dieu
dresses the soul of the murderer. The soul replies that it is Jesus
who must judge him a sinner according to His will. Impatiently Satan
interrupts; with more finesse Behemot asks the "vray juge" what He wills,
not telling Him what to do (vv. 1000-1003).

In pronouncing the sentence, the Christ tries to let Mary down
easily by explaining to her tenderly on what Scripture he bases his
judgment. The scene is amusing in that Jesus wonders if his mother knows
the particular passage He is using. It is obviously a text that the
devils would know, but upon which they had not based their claim.

Ma douce mère, entendez ça:
La sentence est en l'esçripture
Escripte contre lui trop dure;
Je ne sçay se vous la savez;
DIRE la vueil, or entendez:
"Qui de glaive ferra autry
A glaive ira le corps de lui,"
Puis qu'il est ainsi qu'il a mort,
Dame, vostre serjant a tort,
Il fault qu'il muire, ce me semble,
Et en ame et en corps ensemble.

(vv. 1004-1014)

This verdict in favor of the devils' claim is unusual in the miracles.
Their chances of receiving a favorable judgment are rare, for usually the
guilty repent before they die.

The poets were generally apt to portray the Devil as a trickster
attempting to acquire souls to which he had no claim. This play is a
notable exception in that the death of the culprit took him totally by surprise, and he had not repented, but was in *plein délit*. There are several cases among the Cañas miracles in which the Devil might have with more acumen been able to acquire a favorable verdict, had he appealed the case to the Celestial Court; however, in these intrigues the intervention of the Virgin seems to be enough to settle the argument.\textsuperscript{32} A crucial factor in the salvation of a guilty soul is repentence before death, and in the case of the innocent invoking the protection of Mary. There is no recourse left to the Devil if his victim repents before he slips into Eternity.

The Devil is captious in these plays, and he will pounce upon any error on the part of a mortal which renders either his soul or body fodder for the flames and torments of hell. Of course, the greatest triumph is to get both soul and body eternally. In the case of the archdeacon Behemot's victory is complete, for God himself orders the devils away with the body. The devils rush off with the archdeacon's soul and they intend to hunt up the body as soon as they deliver what they have.

In their delight Behemot and Sathan indulge in what today would be called appropriately enough "black humor." Typically they enjoy speculating upon the probable reactions of their victim to hell; being as hard as iron, the archdeacon will be able to test the heat. None of the characters questions the literalness of the flames. Sathan brings in a wheelbarrow to haul away their catch, making a great deal of raucous noise as a kind of triumphal herald of joy while Behemot indulges in a crude joke about taking an altar along to make the right setting for the archdeacon. With this busy scene of loading up the wheelbarrow and exchange of *plaisanteries* the devils drive home to the spectators the ghoulish fate of the unconfessed sinner. The medieval man might laugh
at the jokes, but at the same time he would feel relief that it was not he who was the butt of Satanic humor.

The terse pronouncement of doom by Dieu (vv. 1020-1023) was not meant to amuse, and the ensuing repartee of the devils (vv. 1024-1085) introduces the use of humor as an irony peculiarly medieval. The implied comparison between their abode and that of a cloister contributes to the levity as a kind of aside against monastic life. In the latter scene the devils behave in the manner most often attributed to them. They are buffoons, but their play is brief. They are not brought on gratuitously to amuse or startle, as will be some of the devils of the longer mystères and outdoor pageants to be produced towards the end of the fourteenth century and afterwards. Their comments are limited to the buisness at hand, as is their action, that of carrying away soul and body of their victim in one of their rare victories. The inside jokes are really funny only to them, for the audience is used to laughing when Satan gets thrown down the stairs or outmaneuvered by the intended victim, or trounced by the Virgin Mary. The personalities of the devils are defined rather well in that Behemoth is the more skillful and suave of the two. Satan is more impatient, more nervous about the outcome of the trial and interrupts when he should keep still.

In the Miracle (XXXVI) concerning Pierre le Changeur the devils which Stadler-Honegger judges to be "de nouveau de braves et justes diables qui rappellent ceux des premiers Miracles. . ." again find themselves before the "vray juge" (v. 432) for the arbitration between them and the Virgin's claim; the hassle is over the soul of Pierre. The pair of devils named Sathan and Vehemot, a variation on Behemoth, oppose three angels besides Mary, and they are all summoned by the Lord.

The rich merchant Pierre has lived most of his life demonstrating
the very Satanic attitudes of pride and hostility towards the poor. No one has ever heard of his giving alms to the poor, and his conduct is reminiscent of that of Théophile, although he resembles more closely a miser like Ebenezer Scrooge. Two beggars waiting in the sunshine for high mass to dismiss make a bet that if one can get alms from Pierre, the other will buy wine for them both. The talemelier delivers a loaf of bread to the door of Pierre, and Didier takes this moment to ask alms. Pierre throws the loaf at Didier's head, shouting that he hopes that it will split the beggar's scull. This contempt of the poor stamps Pierre with the Devil's brand for all those looking on.

No sooner has the beggar run off with the bread than Pierre falls ill and sends for a beguine or nursing nun. The devils gather around the dying Pierre, who recognizes them. Blunt man that he is, he asks their business, and they tell him the usual; they have come for his soul. Angels come, however, to the bedside of the sleeping Pierre, whose vision of this scene is what the spectators are also observing. Disputing the rights of the devils, the angels state that Pierre is not yet dead and that his sweating and sleep are a sign of his recuperation.

In his familiar role of the Accuser, Satan takes over the argument with telling exactness:

Sy arons, qui droit nous fera;
Car tout est de mal entechiez
Et tant a fait de grands pechiez
Qu'il n'est rien qu'il ait desservi
Qu'estre du feu d'enfer servi
Sanz finement.

(vv. 408-413)

Gabriel is sent to find out the reason for the quarrel and to summon the contestants before God; both angels and devils obey immediately. As the Accuser, Satan recites before God the sins of Pierre who from infancy, it seems, was a glutton, a drunkard, and a shameless, disrespectful cheat,
particularly with other people's money. By virtue of his job as a money changer at the city gates, his position was akin to that of the despised publicans of the New Testament. Not only that, but Pierre was also a homebreaker, a seducer, a beater of women, a creature worthy to be hanged.

Vehemot chimes in to confirm all that his colleague has charged and more; he mentions the avarice and lack of charity of which the beggars in the first scene have already complained. Warming to his subject, Vehemot throws out the challenge to find any good thing done or said by Pierre le Changeur. This very impassioned speech before the Judge displays vividly for the spectators the skill of the Accuser. However, the fallibility of the devils is also apparent for he overstates his case in the last four verses, thus placing his cause in jeopardy (vv. 458-471).

It is the Virgin's turn to testify, but all that she can ferret out of Pierre's record is the anecdote of the bread, which the Troisième Ange relates dubiously. Grasping at a straw Mary pleads for mercy for Pierre saying that the bread tossed at the beggar was the sign of a possibility that Pierre might repent if given a chance. The motive for Pierre's action is glossed over; the important thing, she says, is that he did one good thing in giving bread to a beggar. This case is indeed weak, but Mary is pleading for a man's life, for another chance, and this is very consistent with the medieval idea of the mercy of God to those who are still alive. Pierre was not yet dead, and we are given to understand that he is having a deathbed vision.

The devils are, of course, disappointed that the decision goes against them. They criticize the judgment. Protesting that they always lose in a hearing before God when Mary takes the defense, these devils echo the sentiments of others in previous plays in assuming that the Son
fears the disapproval of his mother and therefore decides against them.

The retreat of the defeated enemies bodes no good for others. In their exit lines they discuss their next victim, reminding the spectators that Satan never rests in his evil machinations against men. True to their raison d'être, they turn immediately to one of their favorite projects, that of getting two birds with one stone. Vehemot already has in mind a possibility:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Je soc\^e en la rue du Plastre} \\
\text{Un biau visage femenin} \\
\text{Que trop convoite un turpulin.} \\
\text{Alons y, et si faison tatant} \\
\text{Que l'un soit l'autre combatant} \\
\text{Et puis qu'il s'en voisent ensemble,} \\
\text{Ainsi a un cop; se me semble,} \\
\text{Deux en arons.}
\end{align*}
\] (vv. 594–601)

Leaving Pierre to his penitence and new life of generosity, the two evil cronies embark upon the interesting seduction of a woman by a heretic, thereby hoping to gain two mortals in the place of one recently lost; in this manner the enemy salves his wounds. A belle femme provides a great opportunity to Satan for corruption, and if she be innocent and proof against his wiles, the Enemy will attempt to destroy her.

Apparently the Devil was seen to be a particular enemy to feminine innocence and purity. As in the case of the chevalier's wife and similarly to those of women of vowed chastity, Satan was unmerciful in his assault. In Miracle XII the vicious nature of the Devil flashes out again, when, unable to tempt a virtuous woman, he plots to have her malign and killed. The victim for whom the miracle is named, La Marquise de la Gaudine, finds herself betrayed by the uncle into whose care her husband the marquis had entrusted her and whom she trusted. 34

A tender, religious, dependent kind of woman, as shown in her prayer to the Virgin and her adieux to her husband, she has in common with the
chevalier's wife a great wariness where the Devil is concerned. Herein lies her great strength and invincible purity despite her apparently yielding nature. She prays for the marquis that he will be proof against Satan's wiles.

Gardez que son suer ne varie
Le faulx Sathenaz deputaire
Et m'ottroiez tel chose faire
Que mostre sauvement y soit.

(vv. 222-225)

In this case one devil works alone and when he sees the marquise at prayer he suffers physical pain; he is also incensed at the Virgin Mary for her protection of the faithful wife (vv. 204-211), both notable complaints common to other demons. It is in recognition of his hitherto unsuccessful attacks upon the soul of the marquise that the devil plans a deeper game involving the uncle of the marquis.

For the benefit of the audience Satan plots aloud to cause the uncle to spend the night at the castle of the marquise, thus throwing temptation he hopes, in the way of both. If she proves to be invulnerable, Satan's alternate plan is to put directly into the uncle's head the idea of framing the marquise in revenge, a time honored strategem of the Enemy. It is understood, then, that the author of at least part of the ensuing scenes between the niece and her uncle is Satan. The niece rebuffs the uncle's unseemly advances, and he surmises that she will tell her husband about his conduct. To prevent this the uncle takes the dwarf, Calot, into his scheme as his subagent. The latter is to sneak into the bed of the marquise as soon as she falls asleep and stay there until the uncle sounds an alarm. The dwarf is reluctant to do this, fearing the displeasure of his mistress. The uncle assures him that he will take the responsibility and, in addition, promises wealth as a reward. Personifying a demon because of his size and evil function, the dwarf slips into the good
woman's bed as planned. The uncle sounds the alarm which calls several of the chevaliers and retainers to the marquise's chamber. Before either the dwarf or the marquise has time to collect his wits, the uncle kills Calot on the spot and accuses the marquise of adultery. The men believe the circumstantial evidence and confine the marquise in prison until her husband returns.

Although very reluctant to believe the story, so many witnesses convince the marquis that his wife is guilty, and he asks several different people what he should do with her. He finally condemns the marquise to be burned at the stake. The plot goes forward as planned until Our Lady raises up a defender. The marquise is championed by a knight, is exonerated, and released from prison moments before her scheduled demise. The artist's conception of this scene is even more dramatic, for the miniature which accompanies this miracle shows the marquise bound and already in the charette when the knight appears on the horizon. At any rate, the uncle is forced at dagger's point to confess his crime. With the truth out, the devil does not dare return to this field of action, and he must content himself with the dwarf as his sole and unexpected booty.

Hence, in this drama, the Devil makes his plans in the presence of the audience, but he suffers ultimate defeat in private. Instead of closely surveying or actively participating in the intrigue he initiates an evil idea in a mortal's mind, then allows the natural result to be worked out in the human system of moral justice. His plan was well conceived and his assessment of the characters and situation as well as of the probable outcome was accurate. The unforeseen Deus ex machina in the person of the knight sent by the Virgin into the locality at the eleventh hour ruined for the execrable demon an otherwise simple and
effective plot to corrupt and destroy.

The Devil is designated simply as L’Ennemi in the Miracle de Théodore (XVIII of the Cange collection), which is probably based upon the legend in Jacque de Voragine’s Légende dorée or Legenda aurea, as it was then known. The enemie’s role as a personnage is briefer in the dramatization than in the narrative form of the legend, but his influence is felt throughout the crisscross of dubious relationships. Again the situation of a husband going away, this time to war for his lord, for an indefinite period of time opens a possibility for the enemy’s plan. The wife, Théodore, is “belle et bonne ensemble” like the Marquise de la Gaudine, but Théodore’s adversary is more skillful in finding a chink in her armor.

A secret admirer reveals himself to Théodore, who at first rebuffs him properly; his promise of dresses and jewels avail him nothing. In despair he seeks out Margot de Mulent, called La Maquerelle, to use as his emissary. Théodore is again adamant in her refusal until Margot suggests that God can see clearly in the daylight, but sees nothing at night "pour l’obscurité." At first incredulous, Théodore is nevertheless intrigued, and she grants a rendez-vous to the amant, who takes her out to supper. Théodore exacts a promise of secrecy from her admirer, who in their brief conversation promises to return “plus a loisir.” So far the enemy has not appeared to acknowledge his hand in the plot, but to faithful watching the foregoing scenes, the devil’s handiwork is easily recognizable in the deception of Margot and the capitulation of Théodore.

The turning point which draws the enemy into the open is the sermon preached by Guillaume Rousée, at which Théodore suffers acutely in her conscience. Her husband’s unexpected return complicates the matter.
After the confused wife raves briefly, her uncomprehending husband leaves to dine with a friend, and she rushes to the abbess for an opinion. In a naïve scene with the Bible opened to find proof of God's omniscience, Théodore gives way to a poignant despair. The abbess counsels Théodore to seek the aid of the Virgin. A sage opinion is offered by Suer Ysabel, who fears for Théodore's soul, saying that a heart so downcast will be put into despair by the subtle enemy. She echoes the Church Fathers concerning this powerful weapon of Satan against the human mind.

A tels cuers ainsi esmaiez
Vient a la foiz li enemis,
Et sachiez que plusieurs a mis
En desespoir; trop est soubil.
Jo vous dis bien c'est grant peril
De tel dueil faire.

(vv. 384-389)

The desperate Théodore does embark upon an extravagant penance, and it is at this point that the play becomes a strong support for the doctrine of penance. In the garden of the abbey, while the abbess and Ysabel prepare supper, Théodore gives up her role as a woman, cutting off her hair in one of the moving scenes of the miracle repertoire. Although she blames the enemy for her sin, she hopes to foil him by living her life as an itinerant monk, leaving husband and all former comforts and joys forever. Théodore is truly sorry, and her subsequent penance is heroic, pitched against the crushing discouragements prepared for her by the enemy. She tells God her naive plan to hide from the enemy by way of a disguise.

Sire, si le t'amenderay:
Dès maintenant commenceray.
Vezla mes tresses jus copèges;
Plus ne seront de moy portées.
Ma propre robe aussi lairay
Et robe d'homme vestiray
Pour aler amal le pais,
Li enemis s'est envais
Contre moy et m'a fait pechier,
Mais voir je le pense trichier.
Puis que comme homme suis vestue,
Aler m'en vueil sanz attendue:
Hostel et meubles, je vous lais;

(vv. 415-427)

Once she has become a monk, the enemy comes into the open and plots to afflict Théodore in a similar fashion to that which he used on Théophile. The devil hopes that abuse from her superiors or mistreatment will cause her to deny her crucifix as it did the venerable Théophile. The enemy's use of irony in expressing the threat "Par mes vertus c'on doit bien craindre" recalls the "prudence" of which he boasts in the Miracle du Chevalier Qui Donna sa Femme au Diable. Her novitiate taught her well how to resist the devil, for Théodore wisely shows the proper way to deal with the enemy. She fears, as does everyone else, the touch of the Devil, but at the sign of the cross he is obliged to leave.

Théodore

Beau dire Dieux, peres et filz,
Gardez moy de cest ennemi
Qu'il n'aie de riens pouvoir sur moy.
Je te conjur, faux Sathanaz,
Tantost en sus de ci t'en vaz
Sanz moy touchier.

L'Ennemi

Haro! ne la puis approuchier;
Le signe a fait qui tant me nuit.
Je te feray ains qu'il soit nuit
Assez contraire.

(vv. 668-677)

Sathanaz follows up his threat when Théodore is sent on an errand by her abbot and must spend the night in a hostel: the daughter of the host comes to mind as a possible agent. Except for the seriousness of Théodore, the ensuing scenes at the inn seem to come right out of a conte à rire.

Sathanaz must by an indirect method inflict the promised adversity upon Théodore. The daughter of the host makes advances to Théodore, whom
she believes to be a monk. Rejected and scolded by the friar, the daughter gives herself later that night to the valet. Finding herself with child she runs to her aunt for succor; in the meantime Théodore has completed her errand and returned to her pious duties in the monastery. The aunt wants to know whose child it is, and as one might expect, the girl lies, accusing Frère Théodore. The lie, which causes an innocent woman to suffer again, forms the pivot in this bizarre plot. The aunt reveals to the father the whereabouts of his daughter, the birth of a grandson, and the alleged father at the same time. Incensed at the betrayal, the father swears not to swallow another morsel of food until his daughter is avenged. He calls for the infant and presents it to the abbot, who cannot believe the accusation against one of his monks. Instead of revealing the impossibility of her having sired the child, Théodore merely pleads for mercy as if she were a friar at fault. She accepts banishment and care of the infant as just punishment for her infidelity to her husband.

The Devil ruminates aloud over the chain of events, noting that Théodore’s great virtue of patience is difficult to unseat. He sees that another effort is necessary to follow the blow to Théodore’s reputation as a friar. He decides upon perhaps one of his most ingenious plans, that of using a human disguise. In the guise of a brother-in-law he will attempt to dissuade Théodore from her penance. His choice of disguise appears to be particularly wise, for he must appear to find Théodore by chance and have enough kinship to her that his appeal concerning her home and loved ones will ring authentically. He also counts upon the strength of the witness of a third party, someone other than her husband, in persuading her to return to her pining spouse. He could not have come as effectively in the guise of her husband, although
this is the case in the legend, because Théodore has already glimpsed, even exchanged greetings with her husband once, observed his grief, and yet remained firm in her resolve.\(^{36}\)

The enemy feigns to believe that Théodore hesitates to return for fear that her husband will reproach her, and assures her that all will be forgiven. Hence, in the guise of her beau-frère, the tempter is able to approach Théodore directly and try to cause her to regret her self-imposed exile. Truth, or better, half-truth in the mouth of a loved one or a friend is a powerful influence. Since it was a time honored belief, supported by preaching, that the Devil and some of his demons assumed human form at times, one could not be absolutely certain that people were actually who they appear to be. The spectators must have mentally urged their heroine to be careful. In this instance, however, Théodore accepts in good faith the Devil's story and explains to her supposed brother-in-law why she cannot return to her husband: "Du pechié que fis contre li/Vueil je faire la penitance" (vv. 1136-37). In the midst of her explanation she breaks into prayer to the doulx Jhesu and asks anew forgiveness for her sin.

Coming to herself, Théodore turns to her "brother-in-law" to resume the conversation, but he is no longer there. Then it is that Théodore realizes that she has been talking to the enemy; by invoking the name of Jesus she has inadvertently exorcized the devil. Here dramatized again is the simple but effective method of setting the devil to flight which had become by this time a commonplace in the daily life of medieval man as he confronted the Power of Darkness at every turn, in people and places, strange and familiar. One hears the sudden terror in the voice of Théodore as she perceives the truth:
Sire, en vostre garde me met,
Egar! sainte Marie, ou est
Celui qui parloit ci a moy?
Qu'est il devenuz? He je voy
Que c'est l'ennemi qui me veult
Honnir et decefoir, s'il peut,
Mais ainsi ne m'ara il mie.

(vv. 1143-1149)

This time the Devil accepts defeat and does not reappear, thus demonstrating for the spectators of the play the familiar advice of St James (4: 7): "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you."

Théodore receives a visit from the Virgin, who attempts to assuage the heartache of the years. Yet another seven years remain of her penance, but Théodore's triumphant death in her former abbey with angels, the Virgin, and Jesus coming for her, and her posthumous vindication attest to the power of penance over the snares of the enemy, whether he attack as tempter, accuser, or destroyer.

The Devil attempts to corrupt a young virgin through her commendable concern for her parents in the play dedicated to the tres digné Nativité of Our Lady and entitled Une Jeune Fille laquelle se voulut habandonner a peché pour nourrir son Pere et sa Mere en leur extreme pauvreté. The enemy is no respecter of persons when it comes to laying snares, for the girl is the sole offspring of a couple who have fallen upon hard times. While the family is in the chapel pleading to Our Lady for deliverance, Sathan calls upon his devils in hell to bring him help and advice, so that his victims will not escape. Hence, two types of invocations are being voiced at the same time. Evidently there has been some negligence and miscalculation regarding this family on the part of Sathan. The implication appears to be that Sathan may have designed the financial ruin of the couple in hopes of ensnaring them. He has plunged them into despair, a hopeful climate to the legions
of hell, but the family clings to a straw in the opening moments of the play. This tenacity on the part of his victims and the reticence of his cohorts to enter into his labors have caused Sathan to fear defeat, an unusual state of mind for most demons so early in a miracle play:

Dyables ouvrez denfer la bonde
Sailliez de labyme profonde
Venez ung pour me resjoyr.
Chacun de vous preigne sa fonde
Pour garder quon ne me confonde
Affin meulx de noz droitz jouyr

Trop a langourir
Sans me secourir
Icy me laissez
Vueillez acourir
Je suis au mourir
Que ne secourez
Trop vous demourez
Que vous ne venez
Je suis esperdu
Tres mal labourez.

Although there are no indications in the manuscript that visible demons rush to his side, it is not long before Sathan has found two human agents—a prostitute and a thief. Not only are the larron and Tost Versée to be a part of the elaborate scheme, but also the lord of a castle who is preparing to go hunting in his woods (where Sathan is lurking), in the company of his retainers, among whom is his most trusted servant Petit Bon.

Meanwhile Sathan's weapon of despair has gripped the parents, and they utter loud lamentations similar to those of Job, such as longing for death and regretting their birth. They place their daughter in a terrible quandry, for she fears that they will lose both body and soul. She attempts to rally their faith and to warn them against despair. The mother moans, "O mort viens a coup me saisir," and the father echoes the sentiment for himself. The daughter implores the Virgin for aid only to be answered by the Devil in person. He could hardly be considered the "answer to a maiden's prayer," and the irony of his appearance at this
moment is well calculated.

Il faut bien que je luy responde
Et que prou moy en je luy treuve
Ung coup recevuer de ma fonde
Present la mettray es espreuve.

She seems to jump immediately to the conclusion that the devil proposes that she steal. She says, "Il est contrainte que je preuve/ De remedier en ce pas." To this Sathan replies with the familiar adage: "Necessite la loy repreuve." The maiden replies, "Jarronnesse ne feray pas." The Devil does not have theft in mind, and therefore cleverly breaks down the girl's resolve to keep herself from dishonor by playing upon her sense of helplessness in regard to her parents' misery. His ready comments are brief, but suggestive enough that the girl's defenses become less strong with each exchange. She is young, says the tempter, will always have plenty to eat, be honored by great men, even welcomed by clergymen. Hence, the hungry girl becomes swept along by these prospects of plenty, then remembers momentarily her resolve, only to be intrigued again by the insistent pictures of comfort and food depicted by Sathan. The possibilities are unlimited; he takes the maiden's imaginations of a comfortable life up to the very court of the king, at which portal the girl's mind boggles. Skillfully Sathan substitutes conquests more nearly attainable, spiraling downward to the less grandiose idea of seducing the local young men for her livelihood. At any rate Sathan promises to lead the maiden step by step, because she needs guidance along this line.

Thus dubiously inspired to action, the girl announces her decision to seek service outside her home. A commiserating neighbor lady approves the plan, provided that the girl keep the honor of God by heeding only good advice. Sathan haunts the scene and interjects an insinuation to the daughter, evidently not heard by the neighbor. The sympathizing lady
apprises the girl's parents of their daughter's desire to seek a
situation for their sake. They warn their daughter against sin and
committing her to the care of the Virgin Mary, let her log, although
she has no prospects of a position at that time.

Alone for the first time, the maiden, herself weak from hunger,
faints. When she revives, her anguish is renewed over the idea of
betraying her honor. Sathan is quick to brace her faltering resolve, and
he urges her to lift up her countenance. The maidenly downcast regard will
never do. Tost Versee then accosts the girl and attempts to reinforce
Sathan's arguments in favor of assuming this new "profession." The girl
says that she would rather beg. Sathan calls aside Tost Versee and chides
her for her lack of tact. Thus admonished by Sathan, Tost Versee tries
again, but to no avail. The maiden takes leave of Tost Versee, saying
that she is not asking for advice. Sathan, however, mumbles that he is
not yet finished with that girl, and he vows that he will not leave her
alone until she succumbs. Having failed with direct confrontation and
arguments and with the indirect persuasion of a human agent, Sathan's
patience has worn thin.

The maiden seeks refuge from such as Tost Versee in the woods in the
hope of meeting a kind passer-by who will help her. At this moment a liely
agent of Sathan's ilk appears in the person of a larron. He hears the
girl praying to the Virgin and follows the sound. Likewise a merchant
passing through the woods hears her. The larron sees the merchant arrive
and decides to see what advantage he can take. The girl's desperation is
apparent in her artless address to the merchant, as is also her lack of
experience or inclination for the "oldest profession":

\[\begin{align*}
& \text{Las vous voyez de quoy} \\
& \text{Faictes de moy vostre plaisir} \\
& \text{Et ung peu vueillez secourir} \\
& \text{Ma necessite si tres grande.}
\end{align*}\]
Fortunately the merchant is a man of honor who wishes to help the maiden. He questions her closely to discern if she is an abandoned woman, and being satisfied by her answers, he goes aside to ruminate. Although he considers taking advantage of the girl and wonders momentarily if she is sincere, the merchant follows his conscience and gives her his signet ring of gold with the usual fatherly advice. Sathan, however, has not been idle, for he has come to share the stage with the larron in order to tempt the merchant into violating the maiden; he mocks the man's sense of decency.

Incensed over the merchant's indecision, Sathan then calls his demons with another colorful invocation:

Dyables a pied et a cheval
Sur tigres lyons et lyepars
Accourez cy de toutes pars
Aultremont je pers cest proye
Tres volentiers je me turoye
Sil estoit possible de faire
Ce marchant icy mest contraire
Pour parfaire mon entreprise.

Commenting upon how suave is her approach, the larron then gives his base opinion of the girl. When the merchant takes leave of the maiden, Sathan, ranting, returns to the stage. His discourse is a kind of play on the word outrage, all of which sounds like a sputtering rage of Herod in the liturgical play Officium Stellae.37

Je suis totalement transfis
Transfis de dueil et desplaisance
Desplaisance navre a oultrance
Oulfrageusement oultraige
Doutraige de tout enragé
Rage me rent sec et ethique
Quant cautelle dyabolique
Est mise en ce point au neant.

This brief moment of enjoyment at the Devil's expense is short-lived, for the next thing to happen is not at all good for the heroine. The thief accosts her and begins to say abusive things. Sathan comes to his
senses and leaps into the act by prompting the thief to take the girl right then; the girl tells the stranger to back off, but he grabs for her. While the girl struggles against the thief, the lord of the castle arrives with his retinue to stop the fracas. The tongue of the thief does Sathan proud, for he quickly accuses the maiden of stealing the signet ring from him. The chastellain has the girl searched, and upon finding the merchant's ring he believes her to be guilty as charged.

Nothing the girl can say moves the lord, who thinks that her appeals to the Virgin are a pose. Sathan observes this unexpected turn of events as a chance to even the score with Our Lady. Stripped of his suave exterior, he now emerges the destroyer; he means to have the innocent girl maligned and executed, since he cannot seduce her. He will use the cloak of justice to mete out injustice, just as in the case of the case of the Marquise de la Gaudine.

Therefore, at the house of the provost who is sleeping, the lord insists upon immediate trial, and with his rank he can obtain it. He is the first to speak and accuses the girl on hearsay, and the larron backs his accusation as the injured party. At first the provost thinks that he will exact a fine, but the lord holds out for severe punishment. The maiden is finally allowed to speak. In response to her truthful account of the incident, the thief feigns injured, shocked piety. Questioned closely by the provost, the girl admits that her intention was to sell her favors to support her parents and adds that God mercifully prevented her from doing so. Her story is not believed, and the provost sentences her to be hanged. The executioner is summoned, and the maiden commends her soul to the safe keeping of the Virgin.

Sathan enters again to observe that everything is going as desired. He takes the credit for the girl's fate: "Par le moyen de ma poursuite."
His only apprehension is the possible intervention of Mary, but he believes that he can unite both soul and body of the maiden en enfer. The executioner and his helper stall the proceedings by questioning the provost's officer as to what kind of job they have to do. They do not come in haste, nor do they show sensitivity in addressing witticisms to each other as they prepare for the hanging. Our Lady finally responds to the maiden's frequent appeals by speaking to God on the girl's behalf. Her request is promptly granted, and the angels sing joyeusement in praise of the Trinity and the holy birth of the Virgin. The maiden, however, is ignorant of this intercession, for the Virgin does not visit her, nor does any other heavenly messenger.

At the sound of the angels' song, Sathan panics. He hears his doom in a celestial melody which the spectators might not hear. His appeal to the devils in hell in indeed frantic, and his discourse changes in rhythm from lines of eight syllables to lines of five syllables to denote the urgency of his plea. Without the aid promptly rendered by his cronies, Mary is going to ruin the whole scheme. There is an evident love of torture in the Devil's warning that she who was to have been hung up, stretched on the infernal gibbet in the grip of irons, is going to be lost to them:

Se de vous ne suis visite
Diabes denfer tout est perdu
Jay ouy voix qui ont chanté
Ung chant dont suis tout esperdu
Que fusse perdu
Et tout estendu
Au gibet denfer
A griffes de fer
Venez a moy fort entendu
Tout mon brouet est respondu
Par Marie je lentens bien
Je suis de tous point confondu
Se par vous nay aultre moyen.
This is the devil's last word from the stage, for the means of salvation
does appear in the person of the merchant, who recognizes the maiden's
voice raised in prayer to the Virgin. At this point the dénouement begins,
to the maiden's salvation, the chastellain's chagrin, the larron's
discomfiture and execution on the gibbet, and Sathan's crashing defeat.

After much bantering between the executioner and his varlet, the
terrified thief, who has begged and received forgiveness from the maiden,
is forced to mount the scaffold, from which he cries out to the Virgin
for protection against—of all persons—the Devil. Reaching the summit
of the scaffold, the larron evidently touches the hear of heaven by
praying the the name of the Virgin's immaculate conception or saincte
nativité. The larron's last words of appeal to Jesus end with the
dedication of his soul, pronounced in Latin, a certain sign of his having
been snatched from the clutches of Satan at the brink of death. The girl
is moved to pray for the sinner's soul, and the merchant, who has stayed
to witness the hanging, comments that the thief had a très belle fin.

In this, perhaps the latest chronologically of the miracles under
consideration in this study, the devil assumes several attitudes. A
complex personality, he is a suave tempter and yet, in the face of defeat
or jeopardy, he panics and calls for assistance at three different moments
in the play. He coaches his agent, Tost Verse, in the art of persuasion,
being an able critic as the "father of lies" should be, of her
tactless use of words. His viciousness leaps out when he meets unexpected
resistance, and he proves to be a merciless destroyer. He mocks the
merchant's sensitivity to the girl's plight, thrusting jibes at him
where it seems to hurt the male ago most, his virility. The devil
suggests that the girl will mock him later, and he further twists the idea
of manhood to be synonymous with unchecked sexual appetite: "Ce nest pas
monstre quon soit homme." As is typical of the devil in the miracles, he leaves the scene of impending defeat as soon as he perceives that there is no remedy.

The *Miracle de la Mère du Pape* (XVI of the Cangé group) might be considered the Devil's most ambitious project in the use of pride among persons of high rank. In his pursuit of the mother of the pope, he proves to be as tenacious and wily as one could imagine him to be. This play demonstrates similar characteristics to that of the *Miracle de Théodore* already discussed, in that the enemy has an initial success with the lady by causing her to fall into sin, but he must contend with a most severe penance and great determination to make amends, so that he must resort to human disguises and monstrous lies in several futile attempts to reclaim his victim.

Unlike Théodore, the pope's mother does not take a lover in her husband's absence, but she does fall into another insidious sin, that of overweening pride. She basks in the reflected glory of her sons, two of whom are cardinals and the third the pope himself. Her conceit causes her to think herself more blessed and meritorious than the Virgin Mary, and she gives voice to her sinful thought. Her conscience, however, being quickened during a sermon which she attends near the beginning of the play, she confesses several times, before the pope's dispenser of penance and her two sons. Nowhere is there in the books a just penance for her sin. Finally brought before the pope himself, she again rehearses her sin of pride. The pope metes out a pilgrimage of ten years in honor of saints Katherine and John, during which she must spend no more than one night in any one town. The mother accepts this with humility, whereas the first cardinal remonstrates with the pope for such a bitter penance. The pope, true to his duty as the savior of souls, replies with
the classic medieval formula:

Plus li sera au corps grevable,
Miex sera de son pechié quitte,
Et miex acquerra grant meritte
S'en grê le porte.

(vv. 698-701)

Although the Devil has not yet stepped out before the spectators, no one is deceived as to his part in the mother's sin. The latter realizes that she had been the dupe of the Devil, and therefore before setting out on her arduous journey, she prays to the Virgin for protection against the further wiles of the enemy.

Glorieuse vierge Marie,
Ne souffrez que mon cuer varie,
Royne des cieulx et du monde,
Sathan en qui tout mal habonde
Par ses fausses ilusions
Mais de ses griefs temptacions
Me jettes hors.

(vv. 851-857)

The violence of the devil's disappointment at this turn of events erupts after the pope's mother has departed. In fact, the second dyable, called Beleal, is shocked at his colleague's behavior:

Et qu'as tu? que touz ceulz d'enfer
Te rompent l'eschaignon du col!
Voirement es tu dyable fol
Et enragie.

(vv. 864-867)

There follows a common routine between the two devils who exchange notes on the progress of their projects against the human race. Beleal offers to hear the complaint of the first devil, called Sathan, who rants over his failure to secure the pope's mother. He dreads having to return to Lucifer and report this inadequacy on his part, for he knows that he will be punished. In desperation he begs the aid of Beleal.

The sermon concerning the evil of pride is reiterated by having Sathan recount how he led the pope's mother into this sin. He evidences some pride in his accomplishment, despite the pain he suffers at the moment.
Beleal shows some apparent sympathy by eagerly offering to undertake the job of tempting the woman in place of Sathan. His clever idea is to cause the woman to renege on her vow by making her content with her intentions to do penance, so that she will curtail it.

Disguising himself as a human being, perhaps a fellow pilgrim, Beleal stops his intended victim with flattering recognition in an attempt to appeal to her former vanity. He uses the vousvoiement in respect for her station, an important change of custom for the devils, who consistently tutoient everyone except God. The weary lady does not recognize the devil, addresses him as "biaux amis," and asks him how he recognizes her. Beleal recites the woman's illustrious sons as he tries to use the truth as a snare: "vous veez que je no mens pas" (v. 925). At such a statement one must be alert, for the lie is certain to follow it. The devil speaks about home and one's duty to home and family, reminding the woman that formerly she had honor; he then slips into a lie about the pope's having rescinded the penance (vv. 928–940).

For reasons similar to those used in Guillaume du desert (IX), Beleal contrasts the comfort and security of her former life (vv. 939–940) with the present weariness and suffering of the pilgrim's life (vv. 934–935). The devil also casts doubts about her ability to endure the deprivations, were she allowed to do so by her sons; at least he attempts to stir up anxiety over this possibility. He then directs the lady's thinking towards the future, holding out a prospect of hard labor into her old age. He also suggests the problem of her property, which must be handled without delay,
thereby taking precedence over her present concern. The devil seeks to impose upon the woman's thinking his own priorities, those of the temporal before eternal, secular before sacred, and physical before spiritual. Playing the part of a well-meaning fellow mortal, Beleal proffers the suggestion that if the pope's mother persists in neglecting her business affairs, she will have not only the prescribed ten years of hardship, but beyond that, no end to poverty, should her property be lost, as it is likely to be. He invites her to come with him and to forsake her penance, for he will guarantee her safety:

Se ne veult que plus travaillez,
Car il doubt que ne failliez
Par viellece ou par impotence,
Voire, ou que par impacience
Vos biens faiz ne soient perdu
Si que n'y art plus attendu
Mais venez vous ent sansz delay
Avec moy; je vous conduiray
A sauvegde.

(vv. 941-949)

Like Théodore, the mother of the pope wisely prays before replying; she is fatigued and knows her weakness and the limits of her wisdom. Therefore she sagely turns to the "vray Dieu" who "es sage sur touz les sages," and "qui seul cognois les courages..." The woman does not, however, invoke the name of Jesus at this time. She also asks Beleal for a token of the truth of his message. Caught off guard in his lies, Beleal tries to redirect the conversation back towards filial love which the pope bears for his mother and her high station, which she ought to reclaim. Beleal reiterates the idea that the pope regrets his too severe, thoughtless sentence. Since the pope's brothers were against the severity of the penance at the outset, the devil's argument is plausible (vv. 974-977).

His suave discourse almost overshelsms the vagabond, whose strength of purpose wains. She calls upon heaven, the Virgin in particular, for
guidance and closes in the name of the Trinity: "In nomine patris et
fili et spiritus sancti." In that instant Beal's apparent success
becomes a rout, for he flees before the powerful invocation:

Haro! n'oseray maiscuan
Ne jamais retourner vers elle,
Elle a gangnie sa querelle
Et moy vaincu.

(vv. 1006-1009)

Turning to confront her fellow pilgrim, the woman sees no trace of
her fellow traveler. Like Théodore, she surmises correctly that the "man"
with whom she has been conversing is the enemy and realizes that she has
inadvertantly exorcised him. Again she makes the sign of the cross as
further insurance against harm. Then follows the inevitable prayer of
thanksgiving to the "bons Jhesus" whom she did not see "en corps," but
who was, nevertheless, close at hand:

Sire, je te lo et gracy
Tant com je puis et te mercy,
Quant de ceste temptacion
N'a pas la dominacion
Sathan, ains a este vaincu
Par la puissance et la vertu
Du signe de la croix que fis.

(vv. 1024-1030)

Since the mother of the pope did not hear the devil's vow never to come
near her again, she deliberately makes the sign of the cross in whose
power against the Enemy she has complete trust. For her, Beal was the
Devil with all the malignant power in the world.

Both devils have failed miserably; they discuss the situation while
indulging in the typical slander reserved for the intended victims who
successfully elude their pitfalls. Sathan is anxious to know how Beal
fared and betrays his ruthlessness in his desperation over the pope's
mother. He approves that Beal use any means to achieve his end (v. 1038).
Beal relates how he spoke to no avail: "G'y ay perdu tout mon langage."
The anathema of the cross chased him from the victim, so that his intentions were totally frustrated. Sathan accepts the inevitable in regards to the pope's mother, but he cannot abandon the family. His resourcefulness comes to the fore as he broods over the situation. His inspiration to get to the pope and his brothers takes Beleal and the audience as well, it may be imagined, by surprise. He has hit upon another way to make the mother of the pope suffer through her sons. He will not divulge all his plan even to Beleal, but promises him that he is going to take on all three brothers at once: "Ilz seront touz troys assailliz" (v. 1061). Beleal naturally insists upon some details, and Sathan reveals that he too will don the disguise of a human being and call upon the pope in person. If he can deceive the pope, then his brothers, the cardinals, will the more easily be deceived. The temerity of the plan causes Beleal to caution Sathan to use a gentle and courteous manner before the pope: "fay bien devant eulx le doux." Sathan assures Beleal that while he was on the fruitless mission to the pope's mother he, Sathan, was pondering his dilemma.

The intrigue of the first devil against the pope thus begins to pique the curiosity of all observers as he alludes to a mensonge that he is hatching, but the exact content is not divulged for some time. We see him gain admittance to the pope, hear his humble preface and his protestations that the advice he offers is for the pope's good, then the announcement of his bringing bad news. The pope and the spectators are, by this time, bursting with curiosity as to just what terrible thing the messenger is going to tell. Of course the audience wonders how great a lie will be told. The disguise works perfectly on the pope, who grants an audience without so much as knowing the messenger's name. In a kindly way the pontif assures repeatedly the "timid" stranger that he will not be
punished for bad news.

Sathan slithers into the lie in such a diffident manner that all the pope's filial attachment leaps to the fore:

Premier Dyable

Je ne le dy pour desdis,
Saint père, et y prenez bien garde,
Mais le mechien que je regarde
Qui sur vostre mere est cheu
À ce me fait estre meu
Que le vous die.  

(vv. 1132-1137)

Sathan hopes to disarm the pope by saying that he is not slandering the mother (v. 1132). To the initiated, however, this is an alert to the very thing which the devils disclaims. The alleged misfortune that has fallen upon the pope's mother is a vague phrase calculated to stir up concern, and it does.

Finally Sathan, as a supposed eye witness, tells the lie to an excited son who just happens to be also the pope. To the horrified ears of the poor man and the spectators the devil tells such a stupendous lie that it was bound to have incensed those in the audience who knew it for what it was. Great sympathy is elicited for both mother and son as the victims of this monstrous attack:

Vous l'avez mis en tel berelle
Qu'elle a plus pechi que qu'onces mais,
Et soiez certain que jamais
Son pechi ne delaissera,
Mais pis qu'elle n'a fait fera:
Si est mechiie de telle dame,
Et je vous di bien qu'a vostre ame
En convenra estroittement
Respondre au jour du jugement:
J'en sui touz fiz. 

(vv. 1140-1149)

Sathan lays blame on the pope for the sinful condition of the mother, whom he vows to be lost. Without protesting the accusation the pope asks for specifics.
Stepping into the limelight, Sathan turns in a masterpiece of subtlety and pacing. Using the Bible as the starting point for his discourse, he adds to the aura of disinterested charity which he has created for his mission. The oblique angle by which he approaches the accusation of the pope's mother is a model of strategy, for his choice of Biblical example hints at the gravity of sin of which the pope's mother is allegedly guilty. The coincidence of the mother's name, Marie, is worthy of note:

Quant la suer Marthe pour amende
Vint aux piez Jhesu Crist plourer
Et les encroir et li oor,
Communément on la nommoit
Pour les pechiez que faiz avoit
La pecheresse et non Marie;
Et toutevoie ne dit mie
L'escripture ne qa ne la
Que quant Dieu tout li pardonna
Que penitance li chargast
Nulle, fors qu'elle se gardast
De rencehoir en son peche;

(vv. 1152-1163)

Hence the devil ably points out the clemence of Jesus in regard to the sins, in particular the devil-possession of Mary the sister of Martha (vv. 1160-62), whose sole duty thereafter was to sin no more. One can hardly ignore the justice of Sathan's observations on penance or the cleverness of his criticism of the penance imposed by the pope on his mother, destined as it was to convince the pope of his mother's recent fall from grace. Seeming to be concerned about the justice of the case, the devil deftly prepares a reception for the lie; focusing attention upon the pope's lack of charity in comparison with that of Jesus, he blames the pope for the mother's apostasy, which has yet to be proved. Sathan tacitly disparages the initial sin of pride committed by the mother by juxtaposing it with the sins of Mary, who was delivered from seven devils:
Et s'avoit elle tant pechié
Que pour ses pechez vilz et ors
Elle avoit set dyables ou corps,
Et vous avez a votre mère
Chargié penance si amère
Qu'elle ne l'a peu porter;

(vv. 1164-1169)

Sathan describes at some length the situation of the poor woman
who went to the Holy Land to see the sepulchre of Chrstit but was made
a prisoner by a pagan ruler of the region and subsequently denied the
faith. She now lives, he continues, in great ease and luxury and has
become a byword among those who hate Christianity. The vision of the
mother reigning in state as a pagan seems a great deal to believe, and
the pope can hardly accept the apparently earnest story of the messenger.
When asked how he knows this woman to be the pope's mother, Sathan
embroiders on the lie, frabricating an incident to support the allegation
and he feigns shock and reluctance to relate what he has heard (vv. 1206).

Chier sire, je le sco par tant
Que je mesmes vien du pays;
Et sachiez mout suy esbahys
C'un paian de moy se moque
Une foiz et me dist: "Vez la
La mère du pape aux chrestiens.
Il pert bien qu'ilz ne valent riens
Ne leur loy, quant l'a delaissie
Pour estre a la loy adresse
Que nous tenons."

(vv. 1204-1213)

Thus the accuser charges the mother of the pope while seeming to excuse
her by blaming the pope:

Si di que s'el s'est pervertie,
C'est par votre dure justice
Et que cause estes de son vice:
Gardez vous y.

(vv. 1196-1199)

Sathan, however, paints the mother too black, and the son suspects the
story to be false in the light of his training at his mother's knee and
all he knows of her character. His heart revolts a the dreadful tale,
and he demonstrates the power of the faithful against the wiles of the Devil, just as his mother had done inadvertently during her encounter with the Evil One. He wisely test the authenticity of this messenger by invoking the Trinity.

In dismissing the messenger, whom he knows to be a devil or "espirit mauvais," the pope is cautious about being touched or approached. On this account he is as afraid of that deathly touch as any peasant or fabled saint. He orders this devil back to hell where he can never again tempt man or woman (vv. 1220-1229). Thus unmasked and disarmed, the enemy is powerless against the invocation of the Trinity. He confesses painfully to his identity and assumes his usual use of the tutoiement in addressing the pope before making his doleful exit:

    Las! tu m'as chargé si grief somme
    Quant fault que je te die voir:
    L'ennemy sui, qui decevoir
    Toy et tes deux frères cuideïe,
    Mais je n'en sui pas a deux doye:
    Dolent vois.

    (vv. 1230-1235)

The pope immediately alerts the cardinals as to the visitor's identity. Everyone makes the sign of the cross and prays to the "vray Dieux" and the "doulce Vierge" for protection. The pope admits to his great fear as he listened to the enemy's discourse. The brothers then echo their mother's prayer of thanksgiving to "Jhesu Crist" after her encounter with Beleal, and the vow to pray for their mother's safe keeping if she still lives. The spectators may breathe relief, for they know that the victory is already won by the mother. Although both devils are not proof against the sign of the cross or the invocation of the Trinity, they strike terror in the souls of the very highest rank in Christendom. In confronting the power of the Evil One, personified or represented in this one malignant creature, even the Vicar of Christ shrinks in his
finiteness, his small human power apart from the power of God. Here is 
dramatized the struggle against that which is not flesh and blood 
(Ephesians 6:12).

The grandiose schemes of the devils Satan and Beelzebub coupled with 
their temerity seem to negate the rather sweeping dismissal of the 
_Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages_ by Petit de Julleville, who 
disparages their dramatic worth by judging them as having no dramatic 
techniques, no forceful plot, nor real characters who live. In this 
miracle, if in none of the others, the devil runs an interesting 
intrigue with two big scenes of encounter in which both Satan and Beelzebub 
show histrionic gifts. Satan as a desperate tempter seems very much 
alive and gives impetus to the events by his tireless machinations and 
all-consuming desire to recapture the mother of the pope and to ensnare 
her sons.

If the enemy dared to seduce the pope, he would not hesitate to 
tempt hermits, respected as they were for their renunciation of the world 
and celestial preoccupations. In the ninth miracle concerning Guillaume 
du desert it appears that, so long as other agents or Guillaume himself 
as le duc d'Aquitaine are acting against the best interest of the Church, 
the devils are not obliged to participate actively in a direct manner. 
When it becomes apparent, however, that Guillaume has repented and that 
neither his squire nor the knight can dissuade him from the life of a 
hermit, Satan and Beelzebub find it necessary to confront the converted 
nobleman. There is also the display of violence, even murder on the part 
of the demons, which is rare in the miracles of this period.

In the play Guillaume is also called the comte d'Aquitaine, and his 
reputation as an enemy of Pope Innocent is formidable. Saint Bernard, 
the great reformer and abbot of Clairvaux, calls upon Guillaume the duke
in behalf of the Bishop of Poitiers, whom Guillaume has ousted from 
his land. Guillaume seems very contrite over his mistreatment of the 
bishop and is much impressed by the gentle conduct of St Bernard 
(vv. 505-508). He also wonders what possessed him to be so unjust against 
the clergy; he does not realize that the devil has been using him against 
the Church.

\begin{quote}
A quoy pensole je?
Je ne scaay, douz Dieux, mais bien voy
Que j'ay pechi\^e en ton sergent.
\end{quote}

(vv. 512-514)

When he decides to seek counsel as to how he might "ma vie amender," 
Guillaume finds himself much in the same situation as the newly converted 
Saul of Tarsus, whose sincerity was doubted by the believers in Jesus, 
including Ananias, who first visited him at God's command (Acts 9: 13). 
The first hermit reacts to Guillaume's repentance in the light of the 
duke's former reputation, for the religious community recognizes the 
Devil's hand in Guillaume's former deeds. Despite his protestations, 
Guillaume is sent to another hermit. The angel Michael comes to 
forewarn this hermit of Guillaume's arrival and to leave the selection of 
penance to the discretion of the hermit. The second hermit seems even 
more spiteful against Guillaume than the first, and he heaps on the duke 
humiliations such as a hair shirt and a pilgrimage to the pope on foot 
without shoes. One senses that the hermit expects the pope to be harsh 
in his retribution, hardly a charitable or Christ-like attitude towards 
the penitent.

Guillaume comes to present himself to Innocent II, who does not want 
to see the pilgrim, but two cardinals persuade him to have compassion upon 
his former enemy. By this time Guillaume knows whom to blame for his sins 
and does so as he asks the pope for mercy and release from Satan's bonds:
Ha! saint père, vueillez entendre
A moy pecheur que deceu
A Sathanz; bien m'est mescheu.
Deslie moy de ses liens.
Saint père de tous chrestiens,
J'ay ou ciel et encontre toy
Pechie: sire, vueillez de moy
Avoir mercy.

(vv. 755-762)

Once again the victim uses the image of "liens" of Satan so dear to the medieval sermons of the day. Guillaume sees the Devil as an enslaver whose deceptions ensnare with subtle cords which bind and keep him prisoner or slave to sin. Tho pope, in turn, sends Guillaume to the patriarch in Jerusalem, before whom the penitent again recites his sins. The patriarch readily absolves Guillaume and cautions him to say often his *paternoster*, to flee the honors of the world, even to stay in Jerusalem with him. Guillaume brings down the ire of the Devil and gives pleasure to the patriarch when he settles near Jerusalem as a hermit.

Still remaining in the background, the Devil allows the knight and squire who were close to Guillaume in his former life to tempt him away from his hermitage. There are two such attempts made by these friends, the second of which causes Guillaume to falter in his resolve. The chevalier naturally appeals to the sense of justice which every ruler should possess. His description of the situation at home is studded with specific outrages against the helpless, which the former duke can scarcely hear without pain—orphans and widows destitute, virgins molested, and churches pillaged. All these abuses provide a legitimate reason for returning in power to Poitiers. Hardly could a devil's advocate possess more innocence, more feeling, or more reason in his appeal. Another twist of the knife is the realization that many of the ills suffered by the Church at present had been inaugurated under Guillaume before his
conversion. By returning, Guillaume could perhaps reverse more effectively the trend which he himself had started and which his penance so soon begun has denied him time and power to rectify completely. It is no wonder that the hermit cries, "Vray Dieux, je ne puis cy duer," and goes to the island of Rhodes.

The hermit's persistence brings the suffering Beelzebub into the open complaining about his stomach:

Sathan, j'ay tout le ventre plain
De dueil, et te diray pour quoy.
Nous avons perdu, bien le voy,
Guillaume le duc d'Acquittaine,
Il m'a tant donne haire et paigne,
Et si ne le puis aтрapper
A ce que le puisse happer
En un pecie.

(vv. 1135-1142)

The only relief for his acute pain is to trap, happer, the hermit in a sin. Sathan has thought of a good plan, that of using human form to approach Guillaume; he will masquerade as the hermit's father. Beelzebub admires the cleverness of Sathan:

Haro! com bons sont tes conseulz:
Pour nient n'es pu pas advocat.

(vv. 1151-1152)

Hence, disguised as the old father, Sathan tries to awaken the sense of filial duty very strong in the heart of medieval noblemen. To him there could scarcely be anything more commanding than the sight of the aging father who enters like a broken King Lear.

Guillaume, biau filz chier,
Le cuer pour toy de dueil ne fent,
Tu scez bien je n'ay plus d'enfant
Et je ne fais mais qu'en veillir,
Biau filz, pour me terre tenir
Te pri que t'en viengnes arriere,
Ne refuses pas ma priere;
Tu as bien tant a Dieu servi
Que paradis as desservi
Et que sa gloire t'est deus;
Si te pri que sanz attendue
Ne veuilles plus cy demourer,
Mais avec moy sans sejourner
Filz, t'en retournes,

(vv. 1155-1168)

Sathan uses similar arguments to those which were advanced to the
mother of the pope and to Théodore, that enough penance has already been
done to more than expiate the sin and that loved ones at home need their
presence. Guillaume cannot raise his eyes, but apparently bends low with
his forehead to the ground. Beelzebub, less subtle than Sathan in this
instance and also less patient, suggest beating the hermit in order to
get a response. Evidently Sathan is just as exasperated by the apparent
lack of success of his strategem and agrees to the suggestion. He
commands Beelzebub to throw the hermit onto his face and he, Sathan, will
take over the beating himself.

Avant a la terre l'adente:
Fiers de la, je ferray de ça.
Ha! ha! bouf! nif! Tien; pren cela,
C'est a estraine.

(vv. 1173-1176)

The two devils stoop to violence like common thugs; Beelzebub in
particular demonstrates what predators the devils are when he suggests
that they take what little living the hermit has, as if they needed his
poor provisions. This scene enacts before the laymen a devilish trait
well-known in the annals of the monastery, namely that Satan is a spiteful,
violent tormentor as well as a subtle tempter; unable to seduce the hermit,
the devils beat him to death.44

Immediately following the diabolical assault on Guillaume, Our Lady
asks permission to succor the dying hermit. She personally anoints his
wounds, although he does not recognize her. Shortly thereafter Guillaume
dies in the arms of Albert, a neophyte who wishes to become a hermit.
Another joins Albert as a companion, thereby augmenting the ranks of the
sanctified with two in the place of one. Sathan could destroy the body, but not the soul nor the influence of a godly life, for Guillaume's example inspired the living after his death.

As for the dramatic interest in this play, Stadler-Honegger has suggested that it lies only in the second part:

Le seul intérêt dramatique sera la vie de pénitance de Guillaume, combat incessant, livré aux forces obscures du mal et de la nature. Cette évolution est assez pathétiquement dessinée, une fois même le héros chancelle (v. 1060) et sans l'aide de Dieu il ne parviendrait pas à poursuivre le chemin étroit sur lequel il s'est engagé.

It seems scarcely necessary to suggest that that which makes interesting dramatically the vie de pénitance is the series of obstacles placed before the hermit. These obstacles are not, as Stadler-Honegger asserts, "forces obscures du mal et de la nature," but are palpable beings, human and superhuman, who tempt Guillaume with such legitimate concerns as his civic responsibility and filial duty. To the medieval milieu there was hardly anything vague or incomprehensible about the temptation or the tempters: had they been so, the hermit would not have felt obliged to leave Jerusalem for a more remote hermitage. The Devil is shown as employing the same or similar strategems countless times in varying situations. Throughout the miracles the Devil, faithful to his role as destroyer of the human race, frequently causes the incorruptible dévot to be accused and executed by men, but he rarely commits murder with his own hands.46

The Miracle VI of the Cangé manuscript has already been alluded to as the ironic showpiece of Satan's confrontation with St Jean Chrysostome, the "Golden Mouth." Known as an eloquent speaker in his day, he is referred to in the play by the Devil as a larron and papelart. These appellations are a measure of the hatred which the Devil harbors
against the saint for his effectiveness against evil. Sathanaz, as 
Jehan calls him later, does not appear on the scene until the child 
Jehan has become a man and a priest at the court of the king.

In a situation similar to that of Joseph accused falsely by 
Potophar's wife, poor Jehan finds his chastity tested by the king's 
daughter. Like Joseph, the young priest resists the "wiles of the Devil," 
and in anger the king's daughter turns to kiss a chevalier and promises 
him more favors, while the priest thanks the Virgin that he was able to 
withstand the advances of the girl. Sathanaz has not finished with the 
priest, however, for months later the queen recognizes the telltale signs 
of pregnancy in her daughter. The girl tells her mother that Jehan is 
the father of the baby. The queen wastes no time in informing the king, 
who believes his daughter's version rather than Jehan's protestation of 
nobility. He angrily banishes the latter to the desert and the mercy of 
wild beasts. Led away by two chevaliers and then abandoned, Jehan cries 
to the Virgin, who comes in person to comfort him. As she and her 
companions Michael and Gabriel return to paradise, Jehan burst out in 
praise and thanksgiving for her concern and also promises to write a book 
of her praises.

Until this moment the Devil has not appeared in person, but his 
recognizable plot to corrupt and destroy Jehan has gone awry in the 
hands of his mortal agents. Therefore, he decides to work directly 
without disguise. As an enemy of the Virgin he cannot tolerate the creation 
of a volume made in her honor.47 Hence he confronts the saint as a 
terrorist for which his appearance alone well equips him. Indeed if the 
miniatures which accompany the Cang6 group are a true indication of the 
costume used in the productions of these miracles, the Devil was a black, 
hairy, apelike creature with large gorilla head and red eyes, enough to
frighten a lone man in the wilderness. The enraged Sathanaz throws away the hermit's ink supply and threatens violence from the wild animals, should Jehan pursue his devotion (vv. 703-712).

Jehan, however, is not ignorant, nor is he intimidated into submission. Although startled by the sudden appearance of this devil, he reacts quickly with an effective defiance—the invocation of the Trinity:

Ha! ennemi Dieu, Sathanaz!
Je te conjur de Dieu le père,
De Dieu le fils et de sa mère,
Et de toute la trinité,
Que tu, beste d'iniquité,
De ci t'en voyses. (vv. 713-718)

The devil does not leave graciously, but he does leave:

Pour nient en Marie t'envoises,
Car se je maintenant m'en vois,
Si revendray j'une autre foiz
Toy honte faire. (vv. 719-722)

The parting threat is not an idle one, for Sathanaz acts upon his words, although Jehan's fortunes soon turn for the better. The devil comports himself much as a prototype of the villain of the modern melodrama. The spectators are treated to an active see-saw conflict between good and evil. Meanwhile, his ink supply overturned, Jehan continues to write for the Virgin, using his saliva, faute de mieux. Back at the palace, however, the king's daughter has had labor pains for over a year but cannot deliver her baby. The mystified queen finally voices her suspicion that there is unconfessed sin involved, whereupon the daughter confesses her lie about Jehan. The king sends for the exile and greets him on his knees with apology; Jehan raises him up and asks to be taken to the daughter. She asks only for death, since she has wronged him, but the saint prays for her, and a son is born. The precocious infant points out his father among those standing by as the chevalier, or the first knight
of the king. The king is amazed and wants to baptize the child immediately. Jehan performs this favor and goes home for the night with the king's promise of the bishopric of the town.

Meanwhile Anthure, the widowed mother of Jehan, who at the beginning of the play confers upon her mother her property and son in order to go on a long, indefinite pilgrimage, is sent home again by the angel Gabriel. The mother of Anthure does not recognize her, but treats her with courtesy. Michael comes by night to forewarn Anthure of her son's impending fall, but also tells her that God will avenge him. This is the first hint in some time that the devil has been at work, regardless of the appearance of things. Anthure still fears the power of Sathanaz, and so awakening from her dream she prays for protection (vv. 1055-1060).

The devil returns to the stage to ruminate over what to him is an unforeseen change of fortune for Jehan. He must think of a project to discredit the reinstated exile, since he cannot corrupt or frighten him. At the same time he seems to be at a momentary loss as to how to cause suffering to Jehan. His tactics will have to entail more than throwing out ink or the use of menacing words:

Haro! haro! grant despit ay
De ce larron Jehan, sanz doubte,
Qui si ensus de lui me boute
Que je ne say tant a lui tendre
Qu'en aucun mal le puisse prendre.
Je ne sçay pas quel art je truisse
Comment annuy faire li puisse;
Ne le pourray j'a mechief mettre?

(vv. 1157-1164)

As the devil paces around thinking aloud, the idea comes to him to forge Jehan's handwriting in a letter maligning the king. He thinks that in this way he may trap Jehan into the sin of anger and thus present him to the king of hell—Lucifer (vv. 1165-1175).

Sathanaz writes out the letter and throws it into the king's room,
and like a halloween prankster, disappears to watch from hiding the proceedings. The king, of course, jumps to the conclusions expected and has Jehan's hand severed from the wrist. Our Lady comes, however, to restore the hand which had written her praises and thus vindicates her protégé. After such a marked sign of the Virgin's favor the devil does not again take the field. His assessment of the king's temper was quite accurate, and had the plot to descredit Jehan gone along without any celestial interference, Jehan could have been permanently exiled and minus a hand. As in the case against Théodore, the protective instincts of a father naturally favor his believing his daughter rather than the accused priest. A father's misplaced trust was an easy tool against the devil's victim. Both the innkeeper's daughter and the king's daughter were vulnerable to Satanic use by their unchaste behavior in the first place, for each attempted to seduce a priest. The disparity in rank makes no difference to the devil, and it appears that sex, especially illicit sex, was considered a favorite wedge used by Satan in the lives of the people, regardless of their social status.

The Devil tests the resistance against the carnal desire for a woman in a certain hermit of Jerusalem in the *Miracle de Saint Jehan le Paulu, Hermite* (XXX). Unlike Jean Chrysostome, the archbishop of Constantinople, this hermit falls into one of Satan's oldest snares, and, having done so, is further pushed into murder by the apparent necessity of covering his first sin. In this miracle Satan appears early in the plot, goaded into action by the renewed devotion of Jehan, who had heard along with the spectators a sermon on the theme "Ecce quam pulcra es, amica mea; ecce tu pulcra; oculi tui columbarum" in praise of the Virgin. Inspired by the superlatives used in describing Our Lady, Jehan vows to wear his hairshirt and live only on roots and barley bread. The nemy is bold
enough to try to move in with this hermit who invokes the name of God and Mary so frequently. The enemy plans to shed his ghoulish appearance and present himself as a pious young man and offer his services as a servant to the hermit. Herein he raises suspense in the hearts of the spectators, who begin to wonder if Jehan will detect the counterfeit dévot (vv. 51-56). This somewhat extreme gesture is the result of past failures, for apparently Jehan is neither proud nor presumptuous (vv. 41-42).

During the devil’s soliloquy he surveys his victim and surmises aloud that he must change his tactics from what they have been. He has tried unsuccessfully to tempt the hermit away from strict observance of dietary restrictions and, having failed in the minor areas of sin, he must embark upon a major operation:

Haro! ne sçay comment je brasse
Que cel hermite la degoive
Si que de moy ne s’aperçoive
En li n’a orgueil ne bouffois;
Je l’ay tempté par maintes foys
De largement mangier et boire,
De luxure et de vaine gloire;
Mais plus li fais temptacion,
Plus se met en devocion;
Ainsi ne le puis attrapper
Ny en fait de pechié happer,
Mais pour ce ne le lairay pas,

.......

(vv. 39-50)

In this scene the spectators have been allowed to see into the devil’s mind and at once to rejoice and to fear: rejoice for Jehan’s past triumphs over the enemy’s wiles and fear for the future treachery to be performed against Jehan. The hermit, however, is not unaware of Satan’s presence, for he prays specifically for grace to withstand the surprise attacks of the Devil.

Presently the devils returns to the stage as a good looking young man with a face to inspire confidence (v. 97). This provides a tense scene
for the audience who must see their hero being taken in by the enemy.
The bargain between the two seems quite reasonable on the surface, for
the young man wishes only to serve God and the hermit and expects no
remuneration. Jehan exacts from him loyalty, peace, and love. The new
prospective disciple promises to obey:

Sire, s'avec vous fas demour,
Je feray ce que me direz,
Si que je croy que vous serez
Content de moy et m'arez chier.
Nullui n'ay apris a trichier,
Je vous promet.

(vv. 87-92)

What admirable truth in line 91, for no one did indeed teach the enemy
to deceive. He is the "Father of Liar." As the conversation
progresses, one is impressed by the discretion of the enemy in disguise.
He comes from a "bon lieu" from the looks of him, the bon lieu being
heaven or paradise in the minds of the spectators. The irony of the
statement lies in the fact that, having once been a celestial angel,
this fallen one once knew the delights of heaven. Somehow beauty of
countenance was believed to go hand in hand with beauty of soul; such is
often reiterated in the homilies concerning the Virgin similar to the one
which begins the play. Jehan's loneliness creeps out into his invitation
to the "disciple" to tell about himself, his family, and his birthplace.

With the greatest of apparent candor the enemy sidesteps many
commitment about his birthplace, implying a painful estrangement from that
bon lieu. The remainder of the conversation maintains a high level of
irony, as the two men use the same vocabulary, but with different
significance. This interview is a highlight in the Devil's career
among the miracles, for he tells the truth about himself in such a way
as to incite compassion in Jehan. Particularly humorous is his real name,
Huet, meaning a loud cry; and to that name he replies when thus "invoked."
L'Ennemi

Sire, pour vérité tenez,
Combien que ci me soie traiz,
Que je sui de bon lieu estraiz;
Et a tant vous souffise, sire,
Que je ne vous en puis plus dire
   Ne me diray.

Jehan

Donques, amis, je n'en tairay,
Mais que sanz plus sache ton nom:
Je croy n'es murtrier ne larron
   Pour le celer.

L'Ennemi

C'est voirs; ou ne me seult appeller
Huet, et a ce nom respons.

Jehan

Huet, tien, pren me cest cruche
Et si nous vez de l'iaue guerre
A la fontaine, Or fai bonne erre:
   Point n'en avons.

L'Ennemi

Biau père, assez tost en arons
   A grant foison.

Jehan

Or vaz et sanz demouroison
   Trop longue faire.

L'Ennemi

Ne doubtez que tost ne reparie,
   Biau père, cy.

(vv. 101-124)

This last little promise of Huet to return promptly must surely have been calculated to send shivers of dread through the spectator.

While the devil or Huet, as he is called, is busy ingratiating himself, the second plot begins to unfold towards a convergence with the first. In order to forget the grief caused by the recent death of the
queen the king and his retainers decide to hunt and then dine. The
ing's daughter reluctantly accompanies the chase, but gets lost in the
forest. Back at the sylvan hut of Jehan an interesting observation made
by Jehan is the pride which he detects in the demeanor of his eager and
obedient disciple, whom he admonishes to put off the orgueil which mars
Christian character. This is another touch of irony deftly inserted by
the playwright. Having thus offered this gentle advice, Jehan goes off
to pray, leaving his disciple alone at the hut, ostensibly to ponder his
"Christian character."

Night draws on, and the lonely girl prays to Our Lady for protection.
A moment later she spies a lighted house and calls out for shelter. Huet
greets her, feigning nervousness about opening to a stranger in the dark,
but warming to the girl's obvious plight (vv. 425-440). The hermit is
embarrassed to offer only bread to eat, only one bed, and that stuffed
with foin. Huet urges the hermit to give the lady shelter, which is all
she requires. Jehan consents, and Huet courteously makes the damsel
welcome as he takes her from her horse. When Jehan comes apologizing
for the poor accommodations, he recognizes in her a lady of rank, but not
that she is the king's daughter. She promises to reward him for his
hospitality, the hermit graciously invites her to sit and partake of
their fare, which Huet goes to prepare. The latter knows very well who
she is, but he keeps the knowledge to himself until later.

Huet returns and questions the girl as to why she is alone in the
forest, a liberty that probably would not be allowed to an ordinary
valet. Jehan betrays quite a bit of dependence on his servant in this
scene. The girl is too tired for conversation, and Jehan tells Huet to
prepare the bed for their visitor. The opportunist, Huet, hatches a scheme
right then, for there is no indication in the opening speeches that the
enemy had in mind a specific sin when he decided to become a valet to Jehan. Often circumstances play an important part in the commission of sins, and this devil is prompt to take advantage of this gratuitous occasion. The very fact that there is a woman in the hut troubles the hermit. After the exhausted girl has gone to rest Jehan confides his moral fears into the ears of his valet. For one thing, he finds that he is terribly sleepy and yet cannot go to his bed because of the woman occupying it. It is obvious that he could sleep on the floor, as does his valet, or even keep a vigil in prayer, as might have been done otherwise.

The subtlety of the enemy emerges as he scorns the temptation in order to lead Jehan into false pride in his strength. Jehan knows full well why his bed seems especially appealing this night and why heavy fatigue has made him prefer his bed to the floor or pallet, to which by this time he should be accustomed. Although this would be a perfect night to pray, Jehan listens to the advice he really wants to hear. The enemy's task is easy with such complicity:

Est nature en vous si grant dame?
Hart! bien vous en garderez.
Mais tant vous dy je, fols serez
Se pour doube de tel delit
Vous ne gissez en vostre lit,
Puis qu'aviez de repos besoin;
Si vous couchiez d'elle au plus loing
Que pourrez, et clinez les yeux
Et vous endormez: c'est le miex
Que puissez faire.

(vv. 585-594)

There is little indication that the old hermit actually does violate his young guest. What matters to the enemy is that Jehan has been tempted and with the circumstantial evidence so easily arranged, Huet can accuse the hermit in such a way as to place him under the damning guidance of
At the very least Jehan has yielded to the temptation of luxury. Huet is determined to use this instance of weakness to make the hermit believe himself guilty and thereby drive a wedge between Jehan and his conscience. He plans to present this hermit to the roy Lucifer, and therefore plays a deeper game than mere unchastity. Thus the enemy outlines his plot for the sake of the audience, while the trusting old man goes to his bed.

Asses tost yray, père chier,
Ne vous soussiez point de moy.
Puis que son cuer en doute voy,
Je ne tien point qu'il soit si ferme
Que je ne li face en brief terme
Perdre tous les biens d'onces fist.
Ce qu'en ay veu me souffist;
Tempter le boys par tel deacroy
Qu'a Lucifer nostre grant roy
Sera acquis, se je na fail;
Sa sainteté ne vaulra un ail,
Se puis, bien bref.

(vv. 601-612)

The hermit rises in the night for a drink of water and, throwing on a cote sans plus, he walks right into the waiting trap, for Huet is also awake. The devil is an adept accuser, and the ensuing scene shows him assuming command of the situation:

Vous aves bien fait vos degoiz,
Père ennuit de celle pucelle.
Osté li avez la plus belle
Chose qu'elle en son corps eust
Et dont miex priser se deust:
C'est pucelage.

(vv. 619-624)

Jehan is aghast at first and tells Huet that he is crazy to say such a thing. The enemy persists, however, saying that the hermit will be torn limb from limb for such an act. The incredulous hermit wonders how his valet knows that, and Huet reveals the identity of their guest. In a deft move to rush the hermit headlong into murder, he offers counsel as to how they can avoid detection. He successfully breezes over the
unlikelihood of guilt, or at least the lack of proof, and causes Jehan to panic at the consequences. The latter thereupon seeks his advice and promises to do all that Huet suggests. This is precisely what the devil intended to hear, and he takes over completely:

Et vez oy que je vous conseil;  
Tandis qu'elle en ce lit se dort,  
Alez la ferrer si qu'a mort  
De tous points le corps mettez  
Et en ce puis la le jetsez;  
Par ce point delivre en assez,  
Que jamais parler n'en orrez  
Ne po ne grant.  

(vv. 645-653)

The suggestion is hardly out of the enemy's mouth, than Jehan stabs the girl in a frenzy of fear and thus ignobly perpetrates a murder to save himself from retribution. Although the enemy stands aside while the hermit kills, he nevertheless is willing to help Jehan carry the body to a nearby pit and dump it in. This accomplished, the valet turns upon his master and accuses him again, this time revealing his true identity with cruel mockery to the hermit, whom he abandons on the spot:

Or vous tien je pris en mes laz,  
Murtier, mauvais, non pas hermites,  
Mais luxurieux yporites;  
Joyez m'en vois.  

(vv. 665-668)

This abrupt exit must certainly leave spectators stunned as well as the poor hermit. Of all the possible ways the devil could have ruined Jehan such as secretly sending a message to the king or merely gliding out of the picture to leave the hermit in doubt as to his whereabouts, or even staying on awhile to needle the man's conscience, perhaps drive him mad, Huet chose a typically demonic style of departure with a note of triumph and irresistible bravado.

The devil, however, rejoices prematurely, for having enticed the hermit into a heinous crime, he believes that despair will overtake the
victim. Having been so intent upon tempting Jehan, the enemy failed to
discern the strength of the man's faith in the mercy of God. Instead of
following the example of Judas, the betrayer of Jesus, and giving up to
the inevitable remorse, like that of Peter who denied Jesus, Jehan
repents from the depths of his soul and in prayer to the Virgin he cites
the devil as the cause of his downfall (v. 678). 55

Jehan's sincere repentance for having been deluded by the devil is
reflected in the great self-imposed penance he undertakes. He will burn
house and robe, refrain from meat, speak to no human being, take up
residence in a tree, and go about on hands and knees like a four-footed
animal. For seven years Jehan lives alone in the wilds becoming le pauvre,
the hairy one, and praying for forgiveness. His prayers are heard at last,
and God sends St Mary and St John, Michael and Gabriel to visit the
penitent. Once beguiled, however, Jehan is wary of the visitation, for
he realizes too bitterly that the devil may come as an angel of light.
Therefore, instead of replying to God for protection just in case this
apparition is not from heaven (vv. 876-880). Then turning to Our Lady
and her retinue he welcomes the visitors cautiously:

Se vous estes de la Dieu part,
Bien vegnez; se n'en estes mie,
De Jhesus le filz de Marie
Vous conjur que plus ne parlez
A moy, mais tost vous en alez
De cy endroit.

(vv. 882-887)

The Virgin remains, thus proving her identity, and promises Jehan that
soon he will be more blessed than he ever dreamed.

In the complicated denouement Jehan is restored to favor, and the
king's daughter is brought back alive from the pit, where evidently the
Virgin had been keeping her company these seven years. For all his skill
and art, the devil must return to hell empty handed. Once again the
enemy did not adequately assess the power of faith in the hermit's life of devotion; all Jehan's years of piety and successful battle against Satan's wiles were not to be lost for the sake of one terrible fall. The devil had hoped that Jehan's pride in his spiritual strength and splendid past would cause him to despair over such an abysmal sin as murder. The devil gravely miscalculated and wasted a quite ingenious scheme on his intended victim. It may be that the devil's cruel abandonment of the hermit cost him the man's prized soul, for, left to himself, without human succor, Jehan had to lean upon God or die in shame. The devil, not comprehending the life of the spirit and the power of God and being virtually dead spiritually, errs again as the one who triumphs prematurely.

Satan and another demon rush to capture the soul and body of an emperor in *Miracle XXV*, being the obvious agent of the Devil throughout the intrigue, works his own destruction while the enemy remains pretty much in the background. Incensed over the teaching of his son by the converted Chaton, the emperor imprisons not only the tutor, but his own son and a classmate. The pagan emperor's obvious scorn of the Virgin birth marks him immediately as a dangerous man, a diabolical agent as he questions St Valentine about the new religion. Such a blasphemous attitude towards the holy "Mother of God" could only be inspired by her enemy the Devil. Saint Valentine has come to Rome at Chaton's request in order to heal his son. After this miracle, Chaton, his son, and other escliers decide to become Christian. The emperor decides, however, to put an end to this new movement at court.

During the inquisition, St Valentine stands his ground, and those jailed are brought in and threatened with death unless they recant. The emperor commands that the prisoners be beheaded and their bodies
left to be devoured by wild beasts. Saint Valentine sustains his
disciples against the attack of the serpent (v. 999) with promises of
eternal life in paradise as chosen martyrs (vv. 996-1005). In proof of
the words of St Valentine, the song of the angels wafts down upon the
ears of the emperor as Mary and angels gather the souls of the martyrs.

Then comes the moment of decision. Saint Valentine presses the
emperor for a change of heart, saying that if the emperor will but
renounce his idols, which are full of devils,\(^56\) all of his own suffering
will be as nothing. The emperor refuses, preferring to remain a pagan
and thus, in the opinion of the Christians, give himself to Satanic
slavery. The emperor takes the rather incongruous tack of accusing the
saint of being "plain de l'anemi" (v. l111), and gives the order to have
him beaten until his body is covered with blood before he is again jailed.
Such persecution was considered an earmark of devilish influence; although
the Devil is not seen at this time. In the spirit of St Paul, however,
St Valentine tries to convert the sergent and the jailer. The first
sergent tattles to the emperor, who in wrath orders Valentine to death,
seeing that the zeal of the saint has not abated.

To the faithful this decree was the roar of the Devil. With the
sang-froid of a Nero the emperor has the table set for his meal and the
saint brought in for his execution at the same time. What the cruel
ruler does not realize is that as St Valentine kneels and commits his
soul to God, two devils are approaching to claim their own. A bone gets
caught in the emperor's throat and chokes off his air (vv. 1258-1261).

Premier Dyable

\[\text{Avant tost, nous deux par accord,}
Sathan, prêrons c'est emperière,
Il a tant fait ça en arrière
Qu'il est nostre par droit acquis,
J'ay assez de ses faiz enquis;}\]
Il faut qu'en enfer le livrons,
Si que nous en delivrons:
  Emportons l'en.
  
(vv. 1262-1269)

Without ceremony and without intervention from the Virgin the two devils quickly carry the emperor's remains and soul to his everlasting torment. Just as scavengers clear the land of dead and decaying carcasses, so these two scavengers from hell rid the earth of a dead, morally decayed mortal. They work swiftly, efficiently, and one feels justice is done by these evil creatures.

They are, however, not quite finished with their work. It is at the death of the jolier who beheads the saint that one perceives the frightening aspect of these undisguised devils, for even a pagan readily recognizes them and is terrified. Michael and Gabriel descend for the soul of St Valentine as soon as his head rolls and thereby present a foil to the dark presence of the devils. His axe poised, the jailer talks to the martyr all the while. His job accomplished, he then perceives what may be a host of demons (v. 1328), two of which at least are the ones who carried away the emperor a few moments ago. The shock and the horror of so prompt a demise is reflected in the jailer's despairing cry to Mohammed:

D'ainsi comme es a genouillons
Ne quier que te liées jamais,
Ne plus n'attenderay hui mais,
Tu as assez ton Dieu prié,
Et si m'as assez detrié
Estens le col, besse la teste,
Et pleureux, se veulx, ou faiz feste,
Tu ne m'en feras ja engaine;
De moy as eu la colée,
Je veueil en sauf mettre m'espée.
Mahon, las! on me suis je mis?
Entour de moy ne voy qu'enemis
Hideux qui, sans moy deporter,
M'ont ja saisi pour emporter
  En grief tourment.
  
(vv. 1316-1331)
As the devils gather their second prize of the day, that of the executioner, they indulge in a little humor. The idea of a new residence for their victim seems to amuse them. They discuss casually their booty, the *deuxième dyable* remarking that he really cannot tell whether or not this fellow is a layman or a clergyman, but he does not really care. The main thing is to make a hasty retreat with their spoils, lest some interference arrive (vv. 1332-1341).

When the son of the emperor comes in with his knight to care for the body of his father, he is mystified as to what has happened to the corpse. He witnessed the "fin honeuse et amère," of the emperor, but he is at a loss as to what became of his father. The knight says that he believes that they have been invaded by unknown magic. The spectators may smile knowingly to themselves, for this so-called magic is none other than the work of the Devil. Hence, the pagans are left to cope with the mystery, unable to recognize what is so readily discernible to Christians.

The characterization of the Devil is not extensive here, for the two evil personages appear on stage merely to reap the reward of their work behind the scenes. They have successfully inured the heart of the emperor to the claims of Christianity and made him their agent. How they managed this is left to the imagination, but his pagan background was a good wedge into his soul. They are unable to retain their hold on Chaton and his son, nor could they frighten through the emperor the devout St Valentine. The triumph of evil lay in their having damned the emperor and his executioner and destroyed, for this life at any rate, the lives of St Valentine and his formerly pagan converts. Their victory was incomplete because of the steadfast faith of the saint and his disciples, whose souls went to paradise as blessed martyrs. Neither devil is the Prince of demons or Lucifer, but they are partially successful henchmen.
In the play entitled *Miracle de l'empereur Julien* (XIII) two devils called Sathan and Belial are active participants in the downfall of Julien the Apostate. It is not until after the emperor Julien has displayed his stiff-necked pride before his seneschal (Libanius), knights, and even St Basil, that the devils appear to reveal their interest in the proceedings. Saint Basil presents bread as a gift to his emperor at the occasion of the campaign against Persia. Julien disdains the gift, made of barley, and takes umbrage at the good intentions of the priests. At St Basil's protestation, Julien bursts into a tirade against Christians saying that he will kill them in Persia and will even do harm to the image of Mary. With this last declaration Julien is marked as one of Satan's disciples, for the Devil's hatred of Mary is no secret.

With such a beginning it is little wonder that Belial skips for joy about the stage—somewhat to the surprise of Sathan, who hazards a guess that his colleague has set fire to Les Halles. Thus begins their discussion of the projects, as might be expected of two human rivals in mischief. Belial's pride is very apparent as he contemplates the imminent dishonor to the Virgin:

```
Jean de faire un fait royal.
Scez tu comment, Sathan amis?
J'ai un contens si tressant mis
Entre Basille et l'empereur,
De qui je sui piece seigneur,
Qu'il a juré a ce Basille
Qu'il destruirait toute sa ville,
Laquelle est Cesarine nommée,
On Narole est tant honnourse,
Et de Marie ardra l'image,
Dont a po Basille n'enrage
Est ce bien fait?
```

(vv. 314-325)

Not to be eclipsed by his colleague's apparent triumph, Sathan, or the Premier Dyable, shares his latest project, that of causing a monk to visit
the wife of a laborer. Each is, he exults, full of la culaine rage or lust. Although his scheme is less grandiose than that of Belial, Sathan foresees some amusement in causing the discomfiture of the monk in a rather violent manner. The slapstick type of action which he plots reminds one of the Farce du Cuvier and the fate of Jehan's domineering wife who falls into the laundry tub. Sathan's brutal sense of fun rears its ugly head as he relishes the pouring of lye onto the back of the erring monk.

Si que je pense a empechier
Si leur tridal et leurs ambiaux
Que le moine, en lieu de drapiaux
A laver, dedans un cuvier
Sera bouté, mon ami cher,
Et si ara, qui qu'en estrive,
Sur son dos de chaude lessive
Jetté plain de chraudon.

(vv. 336-343)

In this bit of dubious comic relief Sathan invites the admiration of Belial, whose more grim work has been done with Julien. Here is one more monk taken for a fool, and Belial is appropriately amused, but he is anxious to report his progress to headquarters en enfer and to receive the welcome of a conquering hero. Their fiendish glee is premature, however, for the Virgin's ire over the impending attack upon a city devoted to her is such that only the death of Julien will appease her. She calls forth St Mercury to kill the attacking emperor with un coup de lance. The latter leaps to her command and pledges to thrust the soul and body of Julien sans pitié into hell. Hence the premature death of Julien thwarts the plot of Belial to cause a great battle against Caesarea, with the carnage and ruin he envisions.

The First Devil hunts up the Second to tell him that bad piece of news. Evidently the latter has sought a quiet place away from the din of enfer, for he seems to have been hunted by the other a good while. The Second Devil is quite agitated. His colleague is not happy at being
interrupted, thinking that his cohort is in trouble with his peers, and wants him to arbitrate a quarrel. He suspects that his fellow devil may be indulging in mockery. He soon learns, however, the seriousness of the message and recognizes the handiwork of the Virgin Mary. Without Julien the battle will not go forward.

The two schemers almost reluctantly pull out their wheelbarrow in order to collect their paltry booty. After all, what was the soul and body of one mortal who has been theirs for a long time compared to the possibility of bringing a whole city under their sway through their agent Julien and even perhaps trapping St Basil (v. 669) while deceiving the people? As they lift the corpse into their barrow they decide to make the best of it (v. 685) and celebrate this uncontested victim, even though he falls short of their ambitious schemes (vv. 675-686).

This is the last view of the dyables in the play, but their presence is emphasized again at least twice in the vision of Libanius, the emperor's seneschal. When the others come to awaken him and to report the death of Julien, Libanius knows already the fate of his late master. He apostrophizes the defunct ruler and acknowledges the role of the Virgin Mary in the ruler's demise. Libanius guesses the emperor's fate to be eternal torment by li dyables. This marks a turning point in the life of the seneschal:

\[
\text{Las! je voy bien que tu fus nez,} \\
\text{Emperère, de mauvaise heure} \\
\text{Or te queurent li dyables seure,} \\
\text{Qui tourmentent ton corps et t'aimé.} \\
\text{Ce t'ont fait Basile et la dame} \\
\text{Qui mère Dieu est appelée} \\
\text{Et des cretien honnorée.} \\
\text{(vv. 735-742)}
\]

In the meantime St Basil addresses the people of the beleaguered city to announce the fate of Julien. He reiterates the horrible end of the late
emperor at the mercy of the Enemy, so that whereas the devils are not in plain view, their probable treatment of their victim is well in mind. His description of Julien's last horrible scream is particularly vivid:

En mourant fist un bruit lors,
Si tresorrible et si hideux,
Qu'encore en suiz tout paureux,
Tantost apres des ennemis
Fu corps et ame en enfer mis.

(vv. 869-873)

After his conversion Libanius relates to St Basil his own vision which is a recapitulation of all that the saint has himself recounted. Evidently the horror of the death of the apostate is such that it must be emphasized, particularly the screams emitted by the wounded emperor as he saw his tormentors approaching:

Et quant vint au glaive retraire,
Julien commenga a braire;
Mais si orrible fu ce bruit,
C'onques homme ne fist si lait.
Puis vi les ennemis d'enfer
Qui, apres le grant cop du fer,
Emportarent est ame et corps.

(vv. 980-986)

Somehow in the retelling of the death of the apostate Julien the grisly spectre of the approaching devils increases or is enhanced. This presents something of a contrast to what the spectator actually saw the initial pair of devils do. Their almost reluctant attitude towards their victim was evidently not conveyed to Julien, who was obviously terror-stricken by all accounts. The spectator misses the actual moment of death and therefore first sees the emperor's demise from the point of view of the devils who collected his body and not of those who closed in on his soul at the moment of death,59 for although the Deuxiesme Dyable speaks of taking "le corps et l'ame Julien," they are obviously not on the scene when Julien gave up the ghost (vv. 665-667). Sathan and Belial were too certain of their success and failed to supervise properly the plot which
was so cleverly launched through Julien. Evidently the hosts of Evil backed up the work of Belial by assising at the unforeseen death of the emperor. In this page of history is a capital demonstration of the medieval world view, for between the lines of actual fact is the underlying truth of spiritual forces or beings at work bringing about the evident events. For the medieval Christians the significance of the life of one Julien, Roman emperor (A.D. 361-363), nephew of Constantine, is that he became the dupe of the Devil, turned his back upon God, and died a pagan in a campaign against, not the Persians, but against the Virgin and her disciple St Basil, a Church Father.

In sending the converted Libanius into hermitage, the burghers pray God’s protection for him against the Devil. Among the bourgeois it was a truism that the Devil buffetts saints and hermits, and this is reflected in the brief prayer of the Deuxiesme Bourgeois:

*Amen! et du Satan contraire\nPar qui li bon vont empeschié\nLe gart, si que jamais peschié\nEn li ne sente!*

(vv. 1213-1216)

Perhaps unique in the miracles under consideration is the use of the Devil as an agent of God for punishment. The Church Fathers had continually stressed the limitations which God places upon the activities of Satan, but they had not dealt at great length upon the servitude of the Devil to the express purposes of God. However, there was tacit if not explicit belief that Lucifer's authority over his agents was always subject to God's sovereignty in the final analysis. In the Miracle de un Prevost Que Nostre Dame Delivra (XIV), the Devil's character is deployed like a multicolored fan in most of its nuances. He is ironic, sadistic, buffoon, rusé, disguised, naive, particularly the Premier Dyable who seems unaware of the futility of his task, since he is commissioned by Gabriel to
place the provost in torment.

From the beginning Dieu sets up the limits of the Devil's power to inflict pain. He must lead the provost Etienne to purgatory, but the soul may not be separated from the body. Gabriel is quite precise in relaying the conditions to Satan:

Sathan, sans nul délaiement,
Pay en'en purgatoire soit mis
Le provost Estienne et pugnis
Sanz li du tout a mort destruire,
Car Dieu ne veult mie qu'il muire,
Mais qu'il sente qu'est purgatoire,
Cecy te mande Dieu de gloire.
Vas, si le fais.

(vv. 400-407)

The Devil seems to relish his commission, recognizing that good people have been wronted by the provost. He seems to discount the fact that the arrangement is temporary. He then rushes off to find one of his cronies, Veheemot, and proceeds to upbraid him for his lack of initiative, paucity of ideas, and wonders what could be wrong with him. It appears that Veheemot (a variant on Behemot) has reason to be despondent and in need of solitude. Evidently the din in hell even gets on the nerves of the demons at times, particularly when a cherished project is in danger of failing. One of Veheemot's victims, the archdeacon of Milan, whom he himself has placed in purgatory, is about to be released. It seems that the erring archdeacon had made a great act of contrition towards the end of his life and thereby won the protection of God. Veheemot can hardly take pleasure in the pain and torment which the archdeacon now suffers, for he anticipates the imminent departure of the penitent (vv. 433-444).

Veheemot does seem to take heart, however, from the idea of tormenting the archdeacon's brother, Estienne the provost. He appears shortsighted in his enthusiasm in view of the fact that Estienne's residence in purgatory is also temporary. At any rate, he spies the intended victim
and he is ready to pursue. There is at this point a lively discussion as to how the pair will snatch their prey. Sathan favors jumping him, but Vehemot desurs because they might injure the man and have to carry him like a burden or cadaver (v. 460), about the neck. They certainly do not want to have to work that hard for a victim who is not a real corpse and a doomed soul. He believes that a more prudent way would be to lead the provost to purgatory as one might a fool or deranged person.

Delighted that Vehemot is getting into the spirit of the thing, Sathan continues the jollity by suggesting where to place the provost. He observes that the lowest part of purgatory is where Estienne built his great house when he took three houses from St Lorens. Vehemot exults over the fire in which they will roast Estienne for having taken away a garden from St Agnes.

Il le nous convient mettre ou fons
De purgatoire; au dire voir,
La sera son maistre manoir'
Un grant temps. Il y maçonna
Dès que les troys maison osta
A Lorentin.

Second Dyable

Tu dis voir, et pour le jardin
Agnesot il aura un feu
Ou nuit et jour ardra. Hareu!
Com je suis aise.

(vv. 466-475)

Notable in this repartee is the literalness of the fire which the Devils inflict upon their victims and the familiar diminutives, Lorentin and Agnesot, they employ in designating revered saints. Such verbal license enhanced the diabolical portrait of the demons and had its shock effect which could surprise the spectator into smiling at the audacity of such creatures; for they could say things with impunity, being already damned, which the faithful could not and dared not utter. Such naughty humor seems to have been expected from the Devil's minions to whom nothing
was sacred. This humor provided comic relief, vicarious rebellion, as well as character delineation to the Devil.

The brothers meet in purgatory. The archdeacon complains about the heat, but realizes its purpose. Estienné cannot, however, imagine what his brother did to deserve it; the archdeacon frankly admits that it was avarice. The provost then asks if there is hope of deliverance, to which query the archdeacon is optimistic, saying that the pope is pleading his cause.60 Sathan nudges Estienné on through the gates of purgatory, affirming that the archdeacon will be led to paradise the next morning.

Having safely deposited their new victim, Sathan and Vehemot discuss casually the torture which they will inflict. With sadistic relish they pretend to have a guest to whom they will show the "delights" of his new home or "manor." The appellation "mon ami doux" (v. 532) has an eerie ring. Sathan wonders coyly if they will not be too tired after such a tour to do ill to their guest. It is Vehemot's considered opinion that, if anything, they will gather momentum and pass to more vile places and torments, and he, for one, is more anxious than Sathan to begin.

The "humor" of the situation is understandably lost upon Estienné, who laments the day he was born. He reckons that the service which he tried to render to St Prit is of no avail to him now. His opinion is incorrect, fortunately, for St Prit gets permission to reclaim Estienné. With St Agnes and St Lorenz, he approaches the gates of purgatory to affect a rescue. Saint Prit as spokesman demands that his servient be brought out. The devils attempt to stall by pretending not to know who the servient is and by claiming that possession is nine-tenths of the law or to that effect:

Quel servient est ce que queres?
Cens n'a il rien qui soit vostre.
Tout ce qui y est si est nostre
Et de droiture. (vv. 852-865)
Saint Agnes moves up to the gate of hell to upbraid the devils who have taken Estienne so abruptly, meaning perhaps that he was hustled off in the prime of life without warning. She seems to be unaware that God commissioned him to torment Estienne in the first place. The devils reply to her scolding with raillery. They mock the errand of the saints with sophistry, pointing out the unseemly action of such as they to come hunting in hell for a man who has usurped three benefices and who has turned good into bad. Sathan addresses first St Lorens (v. 888) and then St Agnes (v. 890), reminding each of his personal grievance towards Estienne; it is a clever strategy to make the saints feel ridiculous over their claim. Sawan demonstrates that he is his own worthy advocate as he is an able prosecutor of the provost:

Haro! vestes vaisseau vassalages,
Que si vaisse gents que vous estes,
Venez querre en nostre maison
Un homme, c'est grant desraison,
Qui e'emblé onques ne fina,
Qui toujours l'autrui rapina,
N'onques ne se mist en deport
Qu'il ne feist d'un droit un tort;
A vous meismes osta il, sire,
Trois maisons, se voir voulez dire,
Dame, et a vous vostre jardin.
Comment est il si vostre affin
Com vous le faites?

(vv. 880-892)

To the average man who believes in the maxim "eye-for-an-eye" in meting out justice, the question which Sathan poses is rhetorical: "Comment est il si vostre affin/ Com vous le faites?" Because they are saints, however, the emissaries recognize the Devil's guile for what it is. Saint Prist takes charge and in God's name orders that the devils stand back while he retrieves Estienne. Hence the ugly creatures are dismissed from their own abode, not to reappear in the play.

Estienne describes vividly the atmosphere of purgatory from which he
has been rescued:

Las! qui est ce qui de ce val
Meschant, chetif, lait et hideux,
Ruunt, orribile et tenebreux
Me veult oster?

(vv. 910-913)

Even though the Devil has departed from view, his presence is not discounted. The provost is placed back on Earth, it appears, and is given a new chance to amend his life. When he requests an audience with the pope, the Holy See is thrown into a state of confusion and dismay, for the "annemi" may well have taken on the appearance of the provost whom they believe to be dead. "Est-il en vie revenu?" (v. 1091) echoes in the hearts of all who await his appearing; the first sergeant seems to be the only one convinced that Estienne is really alive. In anticipation of this visit by what most surely is a devil in disguise the cardinal prompts the pope to use the sign of the cross. The chaplain also has a defense ready peradventure the visitor turns out to be a devil posing as Estienne:

Ce conseil est bon, ou est un;
Et je vous diray que feray
L'iaue benoite prestes aray
Si qu'aizin que mal ne nous face
Je li jetteray sur la face
Dès qu'il verra.

(vv. 1105-1110)

Estienne realizes how upset the pope and his retinue are when he acknowledges the sign of the cross and the holy water thrown in his face, for he does not flinch but rather blesses the cross and the holy water and offers to tell his story. The pope, yet uneasy despite the precautions just taken, replies that God will "te conjur" if Estienne has evil designs. The provost, however, tells his story at length, and as a seal of proof Jesus, Mary, and angels descend to speak to the pope who accepts this apparition as being truly divine and not further diablerie.
Thus the Devil performed a specific task at the direct command of God. The central idea of this dramatization was to show the providence of God even in the life of an unjust man who had done but one thing in honor of St Prist. Although not stressed in preaching as a rule, God’s sovereignty over even the Prince of Demons to the extent that He could commission Lucifer’s own minions was accepted without question unless one were of the manichean persuasion. The poet showed for the edification of the viewers how greatly the Devil was limited in his persecution and vengeance. The greater liberties allowed the devils here in their levity is probably due to the fact that their victims were not to be eternally lost, but were the butt of demonic amusement for their soul’s good and always under the supervision of the Almighty. Instead of begrudging the time and effort expended upon one of their victims, the provost, the devils relish the job of torturing in spite of the good end to which it is directed, that of saving the soul at the expense of the flesh. This seems to suggest the gratuitousness of the demonic pleasure in inflicting pain. The devils seem to cling naively, even doggedly to the hope that God will forget their victim and leave him eternally to their mercies. Vehemot, at first desolate over the loss of his own archdeacon, does not fail to revive in spirits at the opportunity to do the same for the archdeacon’s brother, Estienne.
Part 3: The Devil as Personnage

In surveying these fifteen plays, of which twelve belong to the Cange manuscript, one may regard the characterization of the Devil as a reflection of combined theological, historical, and superstitious beliefs of the time. It is rare that Lucifer, that Arch-Fiend, that fallen Morning Star, appears himself, but his guiding authority and influence is assumed by his agents, the dyables who represent him in the human world. Miracle VI concerning Jehan Crisotomos shows him being referred to as li roy Lucifer (v. 1175), and he takes the leadership when he and Beelzabub, a high ranking subordinate, work together unsuccessfully to secure the souls of both parents and child in the first miracle. It is Lucifer who usually metes out the punishment to the other devils who fail to conclude successfully their projects. The devils fear such reprisals and try to avoid returning to hell without a trophy, as in Miracle XXXVI where, failing to wrest away the soul of Pierre le Changeur from the angels, they plan to get, if possible, as many as four more souls instead before reporting to headquarters.

The poets do not trouble themselves much over the demonic hierarchy so elaborately established by certain Church Fathers and teachers. Of the six varieties of devils proposed by Michaelus Psellus,⁶¹ the second kind, the aerial ones, who dwell around us and may become visible to man, and the third class or terrestrial variety are obviously the ones involved in the plots of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages. The invocation made by the demon in La Jeune Fille suggests that this poet was aware or took notice of the different kinds of demons thought to be operating in the world.

When one devil works alone, he may generally be called merely the
Devil, the Enemy, or Satan, though his identity with Lucifer is not absolutely verifiable. It appears that the appellation of Satan is almost the same as devil, not referring to Lucifer, the king of devils, but to any one of the horde which happens to be working mischief in a particular miracle. There appears to be no consistency of character throughout the plays for those personnages of any one name like Beelzebub for example. Even the association of the title "lord of flies" is lost in the miracles, and the idea of chaos also associated with this name applies equally as well to the demon Beleal or Leviathan, since they all work towards creating havoc in the lives of the people. Hence, the name of any particular devil will not necessarily differentiate him from the others, as the poets, in the popular spirit of their peers, seem to choose commonly known names at random simply as a matter of designating a particular personnage as a devil. Similarly one pagan ruler was about the same as another in the miracles. A notable exception to this tendency among the devils is the case of Huet in the Miracle de Jehan le Paulu (XXX).

At any rate, the salient motivation of the Devil's existence throughout the miracles is his hatred for the Virgin, such as is expressed specifically in Miracle de Théophile, Le Chevalier qui donna sa femme au diable, L'Enfant donné au diable (I), La Marquise de la Gaudine (XII), Saint Valentin (XXV), and Pierre le Changeur (XXXVI), and tacitly so in the others. There is an evident respect for Jesus, the Son of Mary, as the vrai juge, for his arbitration is sought or relied upon with one notable victory for the devil, Beleal (in III concerning the archdeacon). In two other trials (Miracles I, XXXVI) the Devil loses both the infant pledged to him and Pierre le Changeur. The odds are not good in this sampling with one in three causes won for the Enemy through arbitration. However, since according to the medieval viewpoint Satan should not have
any souls by virtue of the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ, the Devil has done too well.

In his three-fold function as Tempter, Accuser, and Destroyer, the Devil appears to be versatile in his approach, and yet too often he is over confident, once he has set in motion a likely chain of events. In his role as tempter he apparently has more success when he deals directly with his victim rather than using a human agent. In *La Jeune Fille* he is able to pry the girl away from home and plant the idea of selling her favors when he talks to her directly, but when he sends Tost Versée to lead her into the life of sin, the girl is repelled by the tactless approach of the prostituée. The two evil companions of the profligate chevalier successfully do the Devil's work in leading him further astray. It is, however, the Devil himself, using his most clever disguise, that another human being, who talks the knight into a pact, signed sealed. The two former friends of Guillaume d'Aquitaine (IX) innocently plead a good cause but in effect play into the Devil's hands by attempting to persuade Guillaume to abandon his penance. This favorite kind of temptation among the demons is not left only to human agents, for the Devil comes in the human guise of Guillaume's father. Where the Devil is concerned, to make a vow to God is like challenging him to a contest, and mortals of high resolve must beware.

The Devil plays a deep game in his temptation of Théodore. He has a rare success in the use of a human agent in the initial seduction of Théodore. During her husband's absence she falls under the sway of the combined enticements of an ardent admirer and his female accomplice. The Devil's facile sophistry is transmitted by Margot, thereby demonstrating the danger of placing too much confidence in another's opinion in matters of moral decision. But the lover and Margot appear to be unaware
of the diabolical import of their actions. The Devil's later attempts to dissuade Théodore from her penance are inspired, if one may so term any diabolical action. His use of the innkeeper's daughter as a snare to Théodore may have appeared ridiculous at first, considering the attraction of the licentious and spiteful girl for the disguised Théodore as an impossible situation at the outset. Rather than tempt her, the Devil persecutes Théodore through the lies of his unsuspecting agent, the innkeeper's daughter. Failing to achieve the capitulation which he expects, the Devil uses human disguise and a direct approach as a final strategem. Although he deceives Théodore as to his identity and purpose, her habit of piety shields her as she inadvertently exorcizes her persecutor. With this successful example to guide his thinking, might not the medieval spectator ask himself how many demons he has set to flight by his own cautious living.

The same general pattern is seen as the Devil treats with the pope's mother (XVI). Her initial sin, that of the spirit and not of the flesh, was no less despicable than that of Théodore. Having merely insinuated the spirit of pride into the older woman's heart, the Devil uses no human agent for his coup. He is forced, however, to participate actively in the effort to thwart the fulfillment of her vow of penance. Twice he appears as a human being, for once the pope's mother was on her guard, the Devil could not approach her any other way, not to mention the pope himself. His first appearance in this guise is a success in that it gets him close to the woman, but she, like Théodore, exorcizes the tempter before she realizes who he is. His second appearance in human form shows him in full of power and subtlety as he penetrates the papal court in an attempt to deceive the pope himself. His use of the Bible and adept insinuations lay a good net for the Vicar of Christ. The Devil's
unfortunate choice of a lie is too extravagant to be accepted. It is
typical of demons to overstate or embroider their stories which seems
to point to inherent weakness that the alert Christian may detect. Hence,
a brilliant essay into the citadel of Christendom ends in a humiliating
rout. The Devil's person does, however, cause the papal heart to beat
faster for fear, and even in defeat, he is still regarded as a potent
danger. The Devil is not lightly dismissed.

The Devil's frequent use of a human agent who seems unaware of his
role as such crops up in the tribulations of Jehan the Golden Mouth (VI)
in the familiar attempted seduction by the king's daughter. Since the
susceptibility of the monk to the wiles of a woman was commonplace in
the thinking of both laymen and clergy, this particular diabolical snare
was familiar to all. It seems that part of the Devil's sense of humor
lies in setting up such situations between women and churchmen. Many
of the intrigues hatched by the Devil in the miracles sound like the
plots of the fabliaux, but the tone and moral import of course is very
different in the miracles. In the case of the king's daughter she
appears to be unaware of her diabolical liaison as she carries forward
her immoral schemes against Jehan. The young priest recognizes it for
what it is, and the Devil must abandon the agent of temptation for a
direct and undisguised confrontation with Jehan. He finds that he cannot
terrorize Jehan and must quit the scene in defeat. It is apparent that
Jehan will remain steadfast regardless of whether or not the lie about him
is uncovered. To the immense dissatisfaction of the enemy, it may be
assumed, Jehan is restored to favor.

Usually the strong in faith, like the hermits and monks or devout
women cannot be intimidated by the undisguised Devil. The tactic of
terror, by using a grotesque physical form, makes him too obvious for them.
They exorcize him on the spot, but the human disguise usually works better; at least it allows him to approach them. The devil Huet uses consummate skill in his disguise as a disciple for Jehan le Paulu (XXX). Opportunist that he is, in his masquerade as Huet the disciple he demonstrates that primeval treachery of Satan, but he is too cocksure of his victory to see it through to the finish.

As the accuser, the Devil often resorts to the use of human agents while engaged in terrestrial intrigues, but will himself be on hand in the celestial courts to point the accusing finger. His use of truths and half truths is amply demonstrated in the miracles, often with telling irony. He seems particularly bent upon besmirching the good name of pious women whom he cannot successfully tempt. Their similarity to the Virgin Mary is grievous to his evil nature. His atrocious lie to the chevalier helps to decide the foolish man to sell his good wife, whom he had never had reason to suspect of infidelity. The Marquise de la Gaudine finds herself framed by a dwarf and her husband's uncle. Most disheartening is the fact that Théodore's disguise as a man, adopted precisely in order to evade the enemy, does not fool him. The Devil finds a way to use her disguise for his own ends by causing her to be accused of unchastity with the innkeeper's daughter. As has been noted at some length, the Devil spares no pains in accusing the pope's mother of apostasy. His accusation of the pope as the one who by undue severity drove the mother to this alleged heinous betrayal of Christendom was not the least of his barbs.

In his hassles over the souls of the dead, the Devil is more often tenacious than not. Only in the Miracle de Théophile does he seem to cower before the Virgin while stating the fact that Théophile had come to him desiring the pact. He ably voices his case against the archdeacon
(III) and receives his request from the very judge. He is not successful in his plea for the soul of the child in Miracle I, for his accusation rests upon the mother, who according to law had not the right to give away the soul of her child nor anything else over the father's objection. The accusation against Pierre le Changeur had much more weight, and this might have gone well, had the Devil not foolishly challenged the Virgin to find one good deed performed by Pierre. It is typical of the Devil to overplay his hand, a trait which makes him approach human fallibility. He is quite adept in dredging up the past to accuse the provost Estienne (XIV), whom he has been tormenting at the request of God. The saints whose terrestrial interests have been much damaged by the provost bear the accusations made at the door of purgatory, but are not revenge which the Devil suggests.

As the destroyer, the Devil looks the part in his natural state. Too often, however, he uses a disguise. Despite the hideous figure he presents when he appears undisguised, mortals with whom he deals generally seem able to converse without swooning in fright unless they are on their death beds. The young maiden whom the Devil entices away from home apparently feels no fear during their conversation, so suave are his verbal skills. He does terrify the mother in Miracle I into promising him the soul of her newborn son, but it seems that she is more concerned about the Devil's potential for violence than frightened merely at his ugly visage. The pope of Miracle XVI fears the touch of the Devil, once he has discovered the hoax. On the other hand, Jehan the Golden-Mouth stands his ground at a confrontation with the undisguised enemy. The devils hovering over the souls of the emperor and the jailer (XXV) frighten the two victims with their ominous appearance, a foretaste of worse to come. The two evil harbingers of doom provide dark foils
to the angels who come to take St Valentine to paradise. Pierre le Changeur (XXXVI) is hardly less disturbed at the approach of the devils to his bedside, and their ghoulish humor enhances the nightmarish effect of their appearance complete with wheelbarrow to the archdeacon (III). Emperor Julien finds himself greeted in death by the hordes of hell, and his screams, as noted repeatedly by those who survive him attest to the terror which the destroyer evokes in his victim.

More insidious, however, is the work of the Devil in his attempts to destroy while in disguise. Thus, he plots the destruction of the chevalier’s wife, Théodore (XVIII), the pope’s mother (XVI), the former Duke Guillaume (IX), Jehan le Paulu (XXX), Jehan la Boche d’Or (VI), and St Valentine (XXV). He succeeds in having St Valentine martyred but then commits a murder himself by beating Guillaume du désert. His great triumph in the destruction of the archdeacon (III) was through the ill-advised vengeance of the Virgin.

One often recognizes the destructive influence of Satan by the domestic strife he stirs up between spouses. The Marquise de la Gaudine is betrayed by her husband’s uncle and is then sentenced to die by her own husband, who believes the false accusation made by the uncle. Such is the talent of the Devil in matters of personal relationships. The Devil claims the credit for the discord between the husband and wife over the vow of chastity in Miracle I. The wife sees the Devil in the look of desire in her husband’s eye. The wife of the chevalier bears the brunt of her husband’s ill-temper as he rudely tells her to hold her tongue when she attempts to give good advice. Hence the Devil is seen as one who enjoys creating a kind of hell on earth for those joined in marriage.

The Devil may not acquire his first choice of a victim, but he often
comes away with something for his efforts. For example, the Marquise de la Gaudine (XII) lost the dwarf to the devil as a consolation prize, as it were. Generally those whom he takes off to hell have steadfastly refused to repent and even revel in their rebellion against God, such as Julien (XXV) and the archdeacon (III). When the devils leave the scene of defeat complaining that they alwasy lose, they are indulging in typical overstatement. Those who repent of sin and throw themselves upon the mercy of God are the only safe ones, and they must contend with Satan even so.

There can be no just appreciation of the characterisation of the Devil without noting his brand of humor. Usually the Devil of the miracles seems less inclined to slapstick than to irony. Whereas it is true that a wheelbarrow figures notably in three of the Cangé plays, the emphasis on humor is not in the antics. The two devils who must pick up the emperor Julien do so reluctantly, and they do not express pleasure at this errand, since his premature death has ruined bigger plans. The archdeacon (III) is another matter, for the devils wheel him off after the trial quite pleased with their award. The use of the wheelbarrow, as we have noted in the discussion of the case of the emperor Julien, connotes the degraded character of that which is to be carried away. The devils are in a sense scavengers who pick up the refuse, the carrion, and dispose of it in what might be termed the medieval incinerator. They indulge in a particular form of badinage concerning the victim and the prospect of making him feel "at home." Likewise, the idea of the new residence is amusing to the two devils who come for the emperor and the jailer responsible for the death of the saint. Their approach, however, has been heralded with such terror on the part of the victims that the devils do little more than carry away the bodies with
casual remarks like street cleaners picking up trash. Demonic humor in this play is kept to a minimum by the poet, who felt perhaps the offensiveness of such a portrayal in a play designed to underline the horror of the death of an apostate.

They reject the idea of carrying their victim, the provost Estienne (XIV), and they indulge in some rare slapstick in their sneaky approach to the victim. Apparently they are nimbly and would like to jump upon the back of their victim as a predator might. In this play they seem to be rowdy hoodlums itching for some action. They accept their divinely appointed assignment with high spirits and display this in their joking. They seem to enjoy torture for the sheer pleasure of it, regardless of the fact that they are engaged in the eventual saving of the man's soul. Their black humor demonstrates the hateful ness of their disposition, and their gaiety underlines their sadistic natures. Curiously enough this extra levity appears to be permissible here since the provost is not doomed forever, but will be delivered in time. It seems that the devil enjoying triumph injured the sensibilities of the play, so that in their plays this unpleasant reality (that of demonic pleasure at human expense) is tolerated in the case of unsympathetic characters such as the apostate emperor, the dwarf, or the murderer. In 

Miracle XIII concerning Julien, the devil Beleal jumps for joy on the stage to such an extent that Satan feels sure that he has done something really world shattering such as setting fire to Les Halles. Here again the penchant for destruction and violence on a grand scale is revealed in their discussions. Beleal is happy over something even more colossal, however. He has begun a war, and the prospects are that the emperor Julien will wipe out the city of Cesarea, the hometown of St Basil and the citadel of St Mary. Here is a project to excite the delight of any diabolical nature. On the other
hand, the more intimate, even particular or individual kinds of harm are to be relished. Sathan boasts that no only has a monk and a laborer's wife been tempted to sin (a cliché in the annals of devilry) but he foresees the hilarity in the monk's being pushed into the washing pot or cuvier and doused with hot lye. This time the devils may report jubilantly to Lucifer, secure in the prospect of a hero's welcome.

In a time when medicine was primitiave, plagues a constant threat, and disease and pain so much a part of the daily life, it is not surprising to see an emphasis upon physical pain or pleasure in dealing with moral issues. It is appropriate that for such delights in physical tortures and violent mischief that the Devil should himself suffer from the pangs of goodness. In the presence of pious such as that of the chevalier's wife or the Marquise de la Gaudine (XII) or of Théodore (XVIII) the devils complain of severe pains or douleur. They chafe at the resistance to their wiles by such worthies as Guillaume du désert (IX). In the Miracle de Théophile Satan explicitly forbids in the pact the performance of any good deed because it gives him a stomach ache.

It seems clear that the poets did not regard the Devil as a naughty boy. He is superhuman, and even the pope trembles in his presence. All those having anything to do with him are afraid if they recognize him. The medieval man did not think hell a laughable place, and he lived in fear of its inmates, and this fear as well as hatred for the Devil is expressed repeatedly by the human beings portrayed with him onstage. One need be cautious in assuming that what amused the Devil amused the spectator, for the same situation which might be recounted in a conte à rire which contained no references as a rule to eternity and consequences for sin took on quite a different cast in the miracle which did emphasize the eternal ramifications of such sins as adultery, fornication, and
lying. Surely no one laughed at the mental anguish of Théodore as she contemplated having committed adultery, and yet it is just this kind of sin which the Devil relishes so much as a kind of bagatelle. Demonic humor is often clever irony as one would expect from former heavenly creatures of high intelligence, but they reveal their degraded station by their black humor and primitive attempts at frightening people into submission. Regardless of the Devil's guise or style he has one single-minded aim which the poets of the miracles are careful not to forget. The Devil is hateful; he plans eternal pain for the human race and he is most earnest about it. His alleged compassion in the Miracle de l'engant donné au diable (I) is actually a demonic kind of torture as a cat playing with a captive mouse. His sense of power over the terrified mother pervades the scene between them, and he is not in the least pleased when Beelzebub grants an extension of the child's life. The human beings in the miracles know that they are powerless against him on their own, and they view the Devil as a merciless enemy.

If the pope and laborer are both afraid of the Devil's touch, they are scarcely more so than the Devil is of holy water or the sign of the cross so often used against him. The appearance of Estienne the provost back from purgatory reveals the suspicion and fright of the medieval man at the possible ruses and especially the fatal touch of the Enemy. The sprinkling of holy water on Estienne by the cardinal is an acid test of his genuineness, for had he been an evil spirit he could not have remained. The Devil fears the invocation of the Trinity or any member thereof, and they risk being exorcized whenever they approach in person anyone of pious leanings. This may account for the fact that they will try to insinuate into the mind of human beings evil ideas or use human agents whenever possible to carry out their schemes. (This aspect will be treated in the
next chapter). Therefore, in the miracles quite often the devils appear late in the plot to discuss what they have caused to happen while they were still remaining invisible.

Hence, it is safe to assume that all that goes awry, all that is painful or evil in the lives of the personnages has been instigated by the Devil. Whether or not he deigns to appear in person seems to depend upon whether or not he thinks no other way can be successfully pursued. The Enemy prefers to work and play away from mortal scrutiny. He never knows, however, when he will be unmasked by an act of God, so that his plot is exposed. This is not a frequent occurrence in the plays, but there is always a possibility tacitly implied. In the miracles, while the devils discuss their treachery, the poet has drawn back the veil for the audience, just as it was believed that God drew aside the curtain for the fortunate few, in order to see just what kind of creature the Christian must overcome.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

1. For the text of this ordinance see Petit de Julliéville, Mystères I, 414-415.

2. Ibid., p. 417.


4. In Miracles XXXI and XXXII the characters do not acknowledge the Devil as being an influence upon them. The king’s mother, herself a diabolical creature, mentions the Devil in an oath in Miracle XXXII.

5. These are nos. XXXI and XXXII. In the former the sermon lauds Mary as having never sinned and therefore effective in emptying hell of its prey. In the second one concerning the King of Theirry there is not even a sermon alluding to the Devil or to hell.

6. The faithful in Paris and its environs were bound to have been aware of the purge going on in the South. After 1320, Pope John XXII empowered the Inquisition at Carcassonne to prosecute those who worshipped demons, entered a pact with them, made images, or used sacred objects to work magic. The Inquisition gradually developed its concept of witchcraft as heresy superimposed on magic. See Rossell Hope Robbins, The Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology (New York, 1959), p. 8.

7. Two notable cases are the impotent man at Bethsaida (John 5: 2-9) and the Syrophoenician woman whose daughter was troubled by a demon mentioned by both Matthew (15: 22-24) and Mark (5: 25-31).

8. At Souillac the abbey church as a relief of Theophilus pledging allegiance to the Devil, who grasps his hand in the symbolic act of feudal suzerainty. See plate 10 in Henry Kraus, The Living Theatre of Medieval Art (Bläomington, 1967), p. 34.

9. Grace Frank observes that these requirements are perhaps the personal ideas of Rutebeuf concerning devilish behavior in Medieval French Drama, p. 109. They are in fact quite in keeping with the model in the Miracles de Nostre-Dame by Guastier de Coinci, whose devil dictates:

Ja ne querra mais en sa vie
En Dieu n’en sa mere Marie,
Nostier n’eglise n’amera
Ne bien n’aumosne ne fera,
Ce dit ses selz et temoigne.

(vv. 419-423)


10. A. Thomas resurrects two entries in the registres which allude to accidents occurring during the shooting of canons in the productions of Théophile in 1380 and in 1398. He supports Petit de Julliéville’s contention (Mystères, I, 394-395) that the canon was an important accessory
10. (cont'd) to the role of the Devil who is angry and hence exhales his wrath by means of a vacarme which suggest his name. "Le Théâtre à Paris et aux Environ à la fin du quatorzième siècle," Romania, XXI (1892), pp. 607-608.

11. Rutegeuf's apparent model in the versified legend of Gautier de Coinci is an imposing, frightening personage whose spectacular arrival at the house of the sorcerer is heralded by a great earthquake and noisy procession of spirits.

Emi aus tox voit un dyable
Si grant et si espoentable
Qu'a son semblant fait bien sembler
Terre doie faire trablé.

(vv. 337-340)

12. Whereas Mark's Gospel merely mentions the temptation having taken place (1: 12-13), both Matthew (4: 3-11) and Luke (4: 5-8) record specific temptations, but the boast of the Devil is most amply given by the latter: "And he the devil led him up, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, 'To thee will I give all this authority, and the glory of them: for it has been delivered unto me, and to whomesoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship before me, it shall all be thine,'"

13. There seems to be quite a bit of speculation about the concept of the soul and body being separately tormented. This idea of tormenting the body to save the soul seems to spring primarily from St Paul's judgment concerning a fornicator in the Church at Corinth: ",.,.to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (I Corinthians 5: 5). If both soul and body are given over to Satan, the individual was doomed according to the medieval man.

14. In this instance a page out of daily life is inserted into the heavenly scene and thereby humanizes Jesus and Mary, a common tendency among the miracles, as shall be noted further. A like process in the characterization of the Devil brings together the two poles of the spiritual world at the human juncture.

15. Several Church Fathers were puzzled about the discipline among the ranks of demons. Saint Thomas Aquinas reveals his uncertainty over whether or not a demon defeated by man descended immediately to hell or not. It could be that they continue to tempt others. See "Demons," in Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, 16 vols. (Paris, 1936), IV, col. 396. The poet writing this play evidently acts for the idea of banishment to the nether regions for the defeated demon.

16. This is further reflected in the miracles by trial scenes before Jesus the Judge which will be treated later in this study. There are also scenes of haggling or struggle between heavenly angels, such as Gabriel and Michael, and the infernal angels.
17. The use of beatings as punishment seems to have drifted over to the miracle from the lighter literature of the day, principally the fabliaux, which are often brutal and repugnant. Unfortunately this was, as J. Bédier has observed, neither the less numerous nor the least accepted during the Middle Ages. One such fabliau known as Le Chevalier qui faisait parler les muets by Garin was recast by several poets and is preserved in seven manuscripts. Joseph Bédier, Les Fabliaux (Paris, 1893), p. 286. The text of this fabliau is in Recueil général et complet des Fabliaux des XIII et XIV siècles, ed. Anatole de Montaiglon, Gaston Raynaud, 6 vols. (New York, 1964) VI, 68-89. This element seems to be appropriate, however, in its application to the Devil who is the dark, malignant personnage in the miracles.

18. Petit de Julleville offers this possibility in Mystères, I, 129-310.

19. This aspect of the plot is similar to the Miracle de Robert le Diable (XXXIII) of the Cangé manuscript.

20. This rash act so incomprehensible to a modern mind was perfectly in keeping with the rather well defined dogma of the day that women were inferior beings and very apt to do grossly evil things. Her early league with Satan in the Garden of Eden was not forgotten by the medieval man, but rather emphasized. In popular literature such as the fabliaux this theme is recurrent ad nauseam. A typical recital of the role of women often begins with her creation from Adam's rib:

Onques n'en prist ne plus ne mains,
Si en fist fame à ses deux mains;
Por ce sueffre fame tant cope,
Que nostre sires le fist d'os.
Qui accoustume fame à batre
Deus fois le jor ou trois ou quatre,
Au premier jor de la semaine,
Dix fois ou douze la quinsaine,
Ou ele jœunast, ou non,
Ele n'en vaudroit se aix non.
Fame ot biau col et viau viaire;
Con i oublia Diex à faire,
Qu'il ne s'en estoit donez garde:
Li maufes i vint et l'esgarde,
Un petit s'abesse et encline,
Et vit au tiers neu de l'eschine
Qu'il n'i avoit c'un seul pertuis.

21. In this situation, which seems to reflect the commonly accepted procedures at the birth of a child, the thought of eternity and of the welfare of the new souls plays a dominant role in the rite of baptism. G. G. Coulton suggests, however, that "for the majority of layfolk, heaven and hell never became consistent and effectual realities until their deathbed. Few indeed can have been the mothers who gave more than lip-homage or superficial acquiescence to the doctrine of the unbaptized child; and this inevitable reaction of the indifference or revolt goes far to explain the popularity of purgatory." Five Centuries of Religion, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1923), I, 73. This alleged inattention to such a traditionally weighty matter is incompatible to the picture in the drama, such as the one under study, written by laymen as well as clergy. Neglect of a child's spiritual safety may have persisted in the lowest classes, sefts perhaps, whose mean lives were often valued less than those of good animals. They lived in obscurity and they do not figure in the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnage, so that it would be difficult to judge their actual beliefs and practices. People of substance, however, who supported the Church and its institutions could hardly have dismissed this most imperative sacrament of infant baptism. Purgatory, on the other hand, was an idea which gave hope to the family of the erring ones and which also accommodated the stark realisation that humanity could not possibly live up to the standard of righteousness prescribed by Jesus, St Paul, St Peter, and St John. Designed to purify the soul through suffering, Purgatory fitted one to stand in the presence of Absolute Holiness: it did not yawn to receive infants. What mother, medieval or modern, could really bear the thought of her baby suffering in Purgatory for the want of a few drops of water and a dedicatory formula pronounced over its head. In this present time Roman Catholic children born alive or dead receive the sacrament of baptism in families which may not hold to the doctrine of original sin.

22. Stadler-Honegger considers the son a "sorte d'Oedipe médiéval," because, being entirely innocent, he will expiate the errors of his parents. *Étude*, p. 6.

23. See verses 690-695, and 709-712 of *Miracle I*.

24. Nos, III and XXXVI also feature a tribunal similar to this.

25. The judgment of a twentieth century scholar such as Stadler-Honegger is, however, based upon a spiritual remoteness as well as by remoteness of time from the very real menace of Lucifer felt by the medieval spectator. With the vision of the heartless, potentially violent Devil towering over the weak mother and her newborn infant still relatively fresh in the minds of the spectators, this scene of trickery by the Virgin at the expense of Lucifer must have been a thrilling triumph, fighting fire with fire, as it were. For Stadler-Honegger's appraisal see *Étude*, p. 6.
26. This is a capital instance which shows to some extent the effect of the humanising of the Virgin in the miracle. The dignity of heaven suffers in the mind of a modern reader from the untrustworthy behavior of St Mary, a trait which she shares with her human sister. This odd dichotomy of royalty and commonality seems to be a carry over from the idea held by all strata of medieval society that women do not think or behave in a forthright manner when challenged or at any time, for that matter, if it should suit their inscrutable purposes. Witness the fabliaux and St Bernard.

27. Again the human element asserts itself in this apparent analogy between mother and Son, but it is from the seamier elements of human nature as has been noted in certain fabliaux. It is highly unlikely that the medieval spectator agreed with this opinion, but it provided him a chance to feel superior to the devils, whose reasoning was so shallow. What the audience would have accepted more readily as the Virgin's "hold" over Jesus is her having nurtured him as a baby. The allusion to her having suckled him is used by her in this situation (vv. 1358-1363) and is not an isolated instance. The earnest Cistercian prior of Heisterbach relates that a lay-brother of Hemmenrode grievously tempted, prayed and said, "In truth, Lord, if Thou deliver me not from this temptation, I will complain of Thee to Thy Mother!" The loving Lord, master of humility and lover of simplicity presently relieved the temptation as though he feared to be accused before his mother's face. Another having overheard the prayer smiled at his brother's simplicity and repeated it. The novice in these dialogues then remarks, "Who would not be edified by Christ's so great humility?" See G. G. Coulton, Life in the Middle Ages (New York, 1933), p. 65. See also Caesarius of Heisterbach, The Dialogue on Miracles, trans. H. von E, Scott and C. C. Swinton Bland I, Book VI, ch. xxx, p. 442.

28. Stadler-Honegger's championing of the devils is oddly naive as she calls them justes, citing Lucifer's pact with the mother and a later instance when he places the case in the hands of Jesus. What is more, she called them "généreux et compatissants" taking Beelzebub's relenting another eight years at face value and ignoring the father's speech, which credits Mary's influence with this decision. The menace of Lucifer's presence appears to be lost upon this critic. What a terrible condition man would be in if he could never retract hastily spoken words, and worse yet, be blackmailed into signing an agreement in exchange for the life of one's children! That is compatissant—hardly.

29. Petit de Julleville says that it is unknown just at what epoch the clerks of the Bascoche began to stage annual mock trials at Carnaval time, but that may be before they began giving theatrical productions such as farces and moralités. See LCMs p. 96.


31. Mary is pleading for eventual salvation at the expense of the body in something of the spirit of St Paul in I Corinthians 5: 5. See note 13.

32. The uncle in the Miracle de la Marquise de la Gaudine would have been a likely candidate for hell, but instead of his being killed in combat by the knight, he is merely brought to confession. This time
32. (cont'd) Mary did not lose her temper to the effect that she ordered the vailleau to be killed as she did in Miracle III concerning the archdeacon. Had he stayed with Jehan le Paulu (XXX), it is likely that in the wake of the murder he could have affected a condemnation.

33. The exit lines of this miracle, if one follows the criteria set up by Stuart and Penn, doubtlessly require a setting for hell and perhaps several extra playing mute demons. For Satan, standing near his wheelbarrow, mentions the great noise of celebration which they will make in carrying off the archdeacon. Behemoth seconds the idea enthusiastically.

34. The source of this plot seems to be a romance entitled Macaire, the Franco-Italian version which has been edited by F. Guessed in the series Anciens poètes de la France (Paris, 1866) t. IX. Stadler-Honegger cites Gaston Paris (Annales du Midi, 1900), XII, 555 in her Etude to the effect that a series of dramatic works and romances were composed surrounding the love of the Count Bernard of Toulouse and Judith, the second wife of Louis le Pleux. She further comments that this miracle is a "dernier reflet d'un monde féodal prêt à disparaître." p. 45.

35. According to the legend she disguises herself first in her husband's clothes and then seeks asylum in a monastery, where she is received as a monk. See Jacques de Voragine, La Légende dorée, trans. M.G.B., 2 vols. (Paris, 1843), I, 150-153.

36. Stadler-Honegger commends the Devil in this play along with those of Miracles XVI and VI as those who "tentent d'une façon plus fine." She cannot, however, understand why the Devil did not appear as Théodore's husband. Etude, p. 54. This is an instance when the poet has improved upon the legend, for the husband did not recognize Théodore in her monk's garb when they met briefly in the street. By having her brother-in-law recognize her, the enemy made a stronger case as one not selfishly involved (vv. 1116-1129).

37. For a thorough discussion of the role of Herod in the Officium Stellaee in its several extant versions see Karl Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1933), II, 75-101.

38. The text of the song is not included nor is there any indication that the angels sing on the main stage. It seems reasonable to surmise that from the elevation of the Ciel structure, the voices may float down as Satan returns to the stage and cocks an ear. It may be that the angels mimed their singing, which only the Devil on the stage professed to hear, but this latter alternative in unlikely in view of the singing tradition of the miracle.

39. Jesus applied this epithet to the Devil in talking to the Jews: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and standeth not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof" (John 8: 44).
The plot of the Miracle de Théodore may well have followed the model in the story of the Hère du pape, since it contains many circumstances and Satanic techniques almost identical to it.

41. Saint Pris of Miracle XIV of the Cangé manuscript warns away the devils with similar caution.

42. Les Mystères, I, 125. This evaluation, as already noted, has been accepted by such scholars as Frank, Stadler-Honegger, and Ahamann.

43. This play seems to combine three historical persons into one: Saint Guillaume le Grand (ca. 755-812), Count of Narbonne, who after having stopped the advance of the Arabs retreated to an abbey which became Saint-Guilhem-le-Désert; Guillaume IX, duc d'Aquitaine, who was excommunicated in 1104 for having persecuted the bishop of Poitiers; and his son Guillaume X, who in 1131 recognized Pierre Lyon, the antipope Anaclet, but returned to Innocent II under orders from St. Bernard.

44. Jesus called the Devil not only a liar, but a murderer as well. See note 39 for the text in John 8: 44.

45. Etude, p. 36.

46. Curiously enough, the miniature which accompanies Miracle IX shows four hairy devils, probably all black at one time, but the ink has smeared and faded so that only one of them is solid black, while the others are brown. All have red eyes. One of the brown devils has just landed a blow upon the prone figure in brown, who is obviously Guillaume. The three other devils have clubs uplifted over their horned gorilla-like heads. On the left side of the miniature are the Virgin and Child with two angels. If the artist read this version of the play he surely knew that only two devils figure in the beating according to the dialogue, and they are disguised, unless they threw off their cloaks in order to chastise the hermit. One wonders that if in staging the miracle, the player augmented the number of demons in this scene. The nearly total absence of rubric in the entire manuscript gives a great deal of leeway to this diabolical scene and to those of other plays featuring the Devil. The Jeu d'Adam sets a precedent in the use of several mute demons who accompany one speaking devil, and were this play to have come down without rubrics, the mute devils should have been lost to history and thus altered our understanding of the religious drama considerably.

47. This demonic opposition parallels that of Gautier de Coinci, who related that the Devil threatened him in a dream. See chap. I, p. 18 of this study.

48. In the high Gothic art the devil seems to be the very antithesis of the slim, elongated saints by his muscular, even fat physique in the various representations. He often has wild hair, which suggests the flames of enfer. The miniaturist for the Cangé manuscript draws all the demons as hairy, monkey-like creatures with claws or talons for hands and feet. They seem to be hovering in the air (III) as they come for the archdeacon seated at table with companions, or as inmates of hell (XIV) with pointed wings, showing rows of white teeth in a hideous grimace. They usually have horns. In the latter illustration one looks more like a horned bat.
49. The devil in this miracle is compared by Stadler-Honegger to those in Miracle XVIII concerning Théodore, both as "méchants et malis." *Étude*, p. 144.

50. There is a strong similarity between this fille amoureuse and the one who accused Théodore. Both are unconscious agents of the Devil.

51. Stadler-Honegger applauds the Devil's active role in this play describing it to be "d'une façon raffinée et plus suivie." *Étude*, p. 144.

52. See note 39.

53. According to Jacques de Voragine's *Légende dorée*, most of the female saints were beautiful and pure. Saints Christine, Marguerite, Férotville, Agathe, Agnès, Suzanne, Barbe, Thais, Dorothee were desirable young women or very young teenagers whose beauty of face was matched by beauty of soul.

54. This was most likely a trap door in the floor of the stage, which allowed the total disappearance of the body. Dorothy Penne comments that realism was based on good sense and suggests that since, for the scene of beheading, the victims were thrown down at one point and told to stay there, a trap door could easily be under the spot where a dummy's neck could be interposed to spill its sack of red water. The Staging of the "Miracles de Nostre-Dame per Personnages" of MS Cangé (New York, 1933), p. 66.

55. The narrative of Peter's denial as told by Matthew (26: 69-75) ends with the words: "And he went out and wept bitterly." The happy sequel to his repentance was the Christ's forgiveness and a powerful ministry after the ascension of Christ. On the other hand, Judas despaired and, as Matthew (27: 3-5) records it, he hanged himself.

56. As already noted in chapter II, such a belief in the inhabiting of statues by demons was inculcated by the early Church Fathers. The warning of Tertullian against idolatry had found its way into all major teachings of the Church.

57. The miniature which accompanies this miracle does not show the devil with a wheelbarrow, but two black, hairy creatures with horns who fly at the head of the emperor, who is seated at the table.

58. There is an interesting mixup between the names. In lines 313 and 315 one is given to understand that Beleal is designated as the Deuxieme Diable, but later becomes the first in line 659.

59. It is possible that the Premier Dyable assisted at the death of Julian and had just come from that event when he found his cohort (v. 659).

60. According to the *Légende dorée*, there were several ways of shortening one's stay in Purgatory. Citing Grégoire le Grand, St Augustine, and Pierre de Cluny add illustrating with several examples, Jacques de Voragine mentions that masses sung by priests in commemoration
60. (cont'd) of the dead, the prayers of friends, giving alms in the name of the defunct, fasts made by relatives as well as indulgences of the Church were the acceptable means. (Paris, 1843), I, 384-391.

61. Michaelus Psellus (a.d. 1018-1078) proposed six kinds of devils according to habitation. The first kind of devil is fiery and lives in the upper air. These demons are no dealings on earth, for they will never descend to the lower regions until the Day of Judgment. The second group consists of aerial spirits who inhabit the air around us and can form visible bodies of air. They wish to destroy mankind. With God's permission they can agitate the air and cause storms. The third set of demons is terrestrial, having been cast from heaven for sins. They live in the woods and forests primarily and lay snares for hunters. Some live in the fields and caverns and they enjoy leading night travelers astray. Some live secretly among men. One finds the fourth group under water in rivers and lakes for the most part. This aqueous clan is turbulent, angry, deceitful, and appears more often to women than to men. They lead an easier life than most demons, but they do raise storms at sea and sink ships. The fifth variety of demons is subterranean, living in caves of mountains, and they also have a mean disposition. They cause earthquakes, winds, and fires, but chiefly molest those working in mines for treasure. The sixth group is heliophobic and never appears in the daytime. They are dark, inscrutable, malicious, and restless. Their icy passions are beyond human comprehension. They never deal with witches, and no charms can keep them at bay. They can kill men with their breath or by a touch in the night. They shun human voices and every noise. See Rossell Hope Robbins, *Encyclopedia of Witchcraft*, pp. 132-133. The entire treatise by Psellus in French translation is rare, entitled *Traité par dialogue de l'énergie ou opération des diables*, traduit en français du grec, trad. F. Moreau (Paris, 1573), pp. 227-247.

62. The abbey at Villeneuve-les Avignon contains a revealing bit of decoration which bears enduring witness to the continual struggle, particularly of the most saintly ascetics, against the temptation of unchastity. There is a relief of the Vice of Unchastity above the door inside one of the cells that line the cloister of Chartreuse-du-Val-de-Bénédictie. The subject of the relief is obscene, presenting a recumbent woman reclining with a goat. It appears to be a private reminder to the solitary pair of eyes that woman as the Daughter of Eve has a denatured penchant for creatures and bestiality. See plate 16 in *The Living Theatre of Medieval Art* by H. Kraus, p. 43.

63. Adultery as depicted in the fabliau is told from a nontheological point of view and little concern with the eternal consequences of right and wrong, whereas in the miracle this sin causes great anguish to Théodore (XVIII) who commits it and to Jehan Cristothomes (VI) who is accused of it.

64. By the time these miracles were staged, the Devil and his minions were well departed from the artistic conception of the fallen angel as he is depicted in the fresco of the Church of Bazant in Egypt. This representation which dates from the sixth century shows a manly face with strong jaws, an ironic smile, and upturned eyes. See Jacques Levron, *Le Diable dans l'Art*, fig. 2, p. 15.
CHAPTER V

THE DEVIL BEHIND THE SCENES

In the twenty-eight of the *Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages* the Devil either remains invisible to the spectator or has no lines to say; however, his presence and handiwork are not only tacitly assumed but expressly mentioned in all but *Miracles XXI* and *XXXII*. In the latter, the villainess uses the dyable in an oath while expressing her jealousy over the love which her son, the king of Thiery, has for his wife. In such a play, however, the Devil’s use of the Queen Mother as a human agent for evil is obvious in the heinous plot to kill her three infant grandsons and substitute three puppies, thereby causing her son to cast away his wife. Fortunately for the innocents, the maid chosen to murder them cannot carry out the crime. The injured wife, Osanne, arrives safely in Jerusalem and is eventually reunited with her husband. In this plot the unmistakable stamp of the Devil was about as easily discerned by the medieval spectator as when he viewed the same diabolical machinations worked out by demons against such other heroines as the wives in *Le Chevalier qui donna sa femme au diable* and *La Marquise de la Gaudine*.

Other notable human agents of the Devil whose self realization generally throws the blame for their wrongdoing upon the Enemy are none other than the pope in *Miracle VIII*, who repents of his affront to the chapel dedicated to St Peter and wishes to give to the saint two carbuncles. Saint Peter tells him to offer them to the Virgin instead, since she was the one who saved him from the fatal *liaison* with the Devil, but before St Peter makes this assertion concerning the pope’s servitude to the Devil, Our Lady sends him to the pope with a message concerning Satan’s hold over him:
Avant, Pierre, sans demourer
Diz a ce pecheur ton message
Et s'ame mez hors du servage
Au Sathanas.

(vv. 885-888)

Hence, the pope's motivation is derived from the influence of the Devil or "li mauvais esperis" as he is termed by Dieu in this play.

Most pathetic in the capacity of unwitting agent of the Devil is the mother who inadvertently drowns her newborn son (Miracle XV). The unbaptized child is allowed to slip under water when its mother unwisely takes a bath while holding it and falls asleep, exhausted from her recent, difficult labor. The mother's pleas before the judge demonstrate how typically the medieval believer saw the Devil's hand in daily life, especially in such a situation as this. The medieval conscience is reflected in part by the mother's recital to the judge:

Quant je le tieng entre mes braz,
Voir est qu'il ne demoura pas
Que de dormir l'affection
Me vient par la subgeccion
De l'ennemi: si m'endormi,
Et en dormant mes braz ouvri,
Et mon enfant si m'eschapa;
Par ma meschance.

(vv. 793-800)

The title, Miracle de un Enfant Que Nostre Dame Resucita, tells how the Devil lost both victims, the dead child and the mother who was to have been executed for infanticide.

With the bourgeoisie and the nobility, the Devil has equal access. In the Miracle de la femme du roy de Portugal (IV) the young queen plays the role of a latterday Jezebel in that she bids her cousin to do her an immense favor and then kills her. The surprise which awaits the spectator is the queen's repentence, where in a prayer to the Virgin she describes the shadow of the Devil over her heart:
Vierge pure, sainte lumière,
Qui seule pouez enluminer
Qu'enennemi a fait aombre
Par pechies ort et aombrement
Et de tebubres encombrant
Vueilliez mon cuer oster l'ombre
De pechies dont mené sans nombre
Sont maint pecheur a dâpnement.

(év. 1107-1114)

Two plays which feature cruelty towards priests and saints leave no doubt that those who persecute Christians are the mouthpieces and embodiments of the Enemy. In the *Miracle de un parroissien esconmenié* (XVII) the premier curé discusses one of his parishioners, whose mistreatment of the clergy identifies him as the Devil's own, although the priest does not mention Godart's name at that time.² It appears that the Devil harries the clergy through Godart to an even greater degree than he had through Guillaume of Aquitaine of *Miracle* IX.

*Si li vrais Dieu qui tout adrese
Mon parroissien ne remont,
Qui ne het jusques a la mort
Pour ses mefais qu'en li deprise,
S'ame des enennes sousprise
Sera, s'il perservere ainsi

(év. 48-53)

In his second encounter with Godart, the priest tells him what he thinks of him in no uncertain terms, despite the fact that the excommunicated parishoner wants to repent. When Godart confesses to the penacier in Rome, the priest accepts readily the excommunicant’s testimony that the Devil has enticed him:

*Amis, l'ennemi, qui entort
Tousjours les pecheurs en sa corde,
Selon que ta bouche recorde,
T'avoit durement encorde
De son las et desaccorde
Du roy pitieux et concordant;

(év. 1018-1023)

Dacien kills the emperor Philippe and begins to persecute Christians in the *Miracle de Saint Lorens* (XXXVIII). If this were not evidence
enough that the Devil is dictating policy through Dacien, this iniquitous
man swears continually by Mahon or Mohammed. As every believer in the
audience knows, to pray to any other than those sanctioned by the Church
was to be deceived by the Devil. The son of Philippe takes the state
treasury and seeks asylum with pope Sixtus, who gives the money to Saint
Lorens for distribution to the poor. The heathen Dacien arrives on the
heels of Philippe's son to demand the money. Frustrated in his errand,
Dacien has the pope killed.³ Saint Lorens gathers the poor together and
makes an appearance before Dacien to warn him of the end he will suffer
for his sins. This exhortation rouses Dacien to murderous rage, and he
orders the saint to be whipped to a bleeding pulp. Dacien swears by his
gods and idols to make of St Lorens a sacrifice. Hence, the Devil need
hardly appear, when he is so ably represented in the raging pagan Dacien.
The Devil also made an overt claim to this kind of cruelty when the emperor
Julien went after St Basil in Miracle XIII.

The angel Michael comes with a linen cloth to wipe the brow and
the bleeding wounds of St Lorens. Dacien reacts to this visitation in
much the same way one would imagine the Devil himself would, for he calls
the saint a devilish enchanter (vv. 1834-1839). Whereas the end of the
play is missing, there is ample evidence that Satan's final blow would
be to have St Lorens burned alive by order of Dacien in accordance with
the legend.⁴ The diabolical intentions of Dacien are clear, as we leave
the saint praying at center stage while being bound at the stake.⁵ With
a little imagination one can visualize the jubilant demons cavorting
around the place of execution.

Similar to the Devil's manipulation of Dacien is his control over
Trajan, who has St Ignatius thrown to the lions (Miracle XXIV). The
emperor Trajan's idolatry signals the fact that he belongs to Satan,
and he attempts to sway St Ignace from his beliefs and calls him a fool to forget high position and power. He further accuses the saint of spreading falsehood and displaying devilish guile. The irony of this assertion need hardly be emphasized. This accusation is evidently lodged because of the disciples who cling to the saint, who denies any connection with Satan and countercharges that Trajan honors the Devil by his idolatry.  

Delving into French history, the playwright brought to light what must have been the Devil's influence in the life of Clovis the Frank before his conversion (Miracle XXXIX). Upon hearing of the death of his newborn son Nigomire, Clovis is upset about the child having been baptized a Christian. The poet represents the king as believing that, had the son been entrusted to his gods, the child should yet be alive. He remonstrates with his Christian wife Clothilde:

De ceste nouvelle me serre
Le cuer et oy douleur amère,
Vous avez trop hasted mere
Esté de la cretienner,
Et tien de vray, se dedier
L'eussiez fait, dame quoy c'on die,
A mes diez, encor fust en vis;
Mais pour ce qu'a baptesme eu,
Je voy plus vivre n'a peu;
Dont mal me fait.

(vv. 1454-1463)

Oddly enough, Clovis is supposed to invoke Mahon and Appolin, two incongruous deities, but this serves nevertheless to point up the Devil's success in blinding Clovis to the truth. Although Clothilde had requested at the outset that Clovis convert, he promised only to avenge her partents' death and thereby wins her hand. When Clovis does convert to Christianity and seeks baptism, he asked the usual questions put to a candidate for baptism. In this case the questions contain special poignancy, and to the satisfaction of the archbishop the king Clovis agrees to renounce Satan, his works, and his rites.
Perhaps the most tragic of the intrigues wherein the Devil works behind the scenes to produce chaos is to be found in the *Miracle de Robert le Diable* (XXXIII). Another French historical character is seen as the innocent victim of parental foolishness, similar in its effects to that of the *Miracle de l'enfant donné au diable* (I). Robert's appellation, *le diable*, gives a clue to the presence of the Devil in the young man's life. In a conversation early in the play the barons are discussing with the Duke of Normandy the terrible things of which his son Robert is guilty.

The duke admits to the truth of the charges and says that he would be glad to see his son die. This is strong language for a father, but this sentiment underlines the horror with which he regards this devil of a son. His only recourse seems to be to disinherit his heir. Fortunately, this tactic brings the buried truth of Robert's evil ways into the open, for upon hearing of his being disinherited, Robert vows that he will be even worse than before. The first squire reports to the Duchess, Robert's mother, that her son comes to the castle, that he is dressed in armor, and like a devil on the rampage.

Instead of the expected scene of carnage, however, there unfolds an episode of self realization calculated to wring sympathy from the audience for the sinner, for the desperate young man asks his mother why he cannot resist doing evil, when he knows no evil from either his mother or father. Then it is that the duchess tells Robert the secret of his evil nature. The guilty party is herself, for she, like the mother of Samuel, was barren for many years and felt that her prayers were falling upon deaf ears. In her resentment she bitterly rejected God and invited the Devil to give her a son. Knowledge of the truth frees Robert as it has others from the bonds of Satan, for his attitude becomes one of contrition for
his past sins. He fears, however, the consequences of his evil life and renounces the Enemy in a moving prayer to Dieu:

Ha! sire Dieu, grace me faictes,
Se je ne met remede en moy,
En grant aventure me voy
D'estre damne sans finement,
L'anemi ne tent nullement
Qu'a ce que m'ame puis avoir;

(vv. 761-766)

Robert's full recitation of his life before the pope reveals a sensitive, tortured soul whose cursed life was as great an ordeal to himself as to others (vv. 1094-95). He recounts his bellicose childhood, which prompted the sobriquet le dyable:

Je le vous diray sans delay,
Puisqu'il fault que je le vous die;
Fils sui du duc de Normandie;
Mais je me repute et scoblent,
Sire, que je vail pis qu'un chien,
Tant sui a Dieu abhominable;
Robert ay nom, surnom le dyable;
Si ques, pour Disu, conseilliez moy,
Ou je suis perduz, bien le voy;
C'est a brief conte.

(vv. 1070-1079)

The pope bids Robert kneel and begin his sad story. What Robert actually does is to confess for his mother. Since the Devil was capable of influencing the conception of children, as already noted in Miracle I, Robert's birth and subsequent nefarious life were due entirely to the Devil's having heard and granted the Duchess' prayer. He then claimed his gift by directing Robert's actions from childhood. In this manner the Devil's hold on Robert is loosened, and the formerly possessed one becomes a champion of the Christians against the Saracens, to the effect that the emperor is amazed at Robert's prowess. Appropriately dressed in white, Robert seems to be an angel of deliverance to the embattled Christian chevaliers. 8 This drama is an important disclosure of the Christian view of life and of fate as an ideology opposed to the Greek
idea of Fate as an inexorable hound which outwits and defeats the will of man. There are Oedipal elements in the story of Robert, as in that of the first miracle of the Cangé group, but knowledge of the truth opens the door to possible salvation from the fateful curse of the Devil.

In the *Miracle de Une Femme que Nostre Dame garde d'estre arse* (XXVI), the son-in-law of Guibour, the femme in question, makes the foolish boast that he has had intimate relations with her as well as with his wife. The Devil skillfully destroys the son-in-law by arousing Guibour’s ire to the point of hiring two thugs to kill him. At her confession which leads to her being condemned to die, Guibour acknowledges the Devil’s suggestion to her that if the son-in-law were to die, the ugly rumor would also die.

Qu’en secre ne fu revelée  
Ceste dolente renommé,  
Dont j’oy tel courroux et tel ire  
Que je ne savoie que dire,  
La me trouble sens et avis  
L’i ennemis par tel devis  
Que depuis tous jours ma pensée  
A este mise et adresse  
A ce, comment qu’il deust prendre,  
Que feisse morir mon gendre  
Qu’il me semboit, s’il estoit mors,  
Que plus ne couroit li recors  
De mon diffame.  

(vv. 724-736)

In the confession one notes that the Devil’s tactic is to trouble the mind of his victim instead of confronting her in person with a plausible story or suggestion. By such constant agitation he is able, or so it appears, to insert the idea of murder into a receptive mind. The psychology of such a reaction is very well conceived in view of the opening scenes of the play, which disclose the still young and lovely Guibour accompanied to church by Aubin, of whom she is obviously proud (vv. 94-99). Although it is not explicitly suggested that Guibour might
have felt some justice in the rumors about her own attraction for the young man. She is almost overly concerned about her reputation. At any rate the Devil's subtlety in this instance causes the woman to panic almost in the same way that Jehan le Paulu did when he grasped for self preservation under the palpable guidance of the enemy(XXX). In the latter situation the temptation and action were precipitous, whereas in the former it takes some time for brooding before the murder is brought about.

Guibour's husband Guillaume and their daughter go on a pilgrimage to pray for the life of the murderess, and their suit is granted. There arises the question of which is worse, character assassination or the payment of blood money, since both are obviously instigated by the Devil. Guibour's confession seems to have moved the Virgin to spare her the fire of execution. In gratitude the prisoner, upon release by the bailiff, joins a convent, where her struggles against Satan's attacks will be confined, most likely, to those of homesickness or remorse.  

The character of Berengier in the Miracle de Oton, Roy d'Espagne (XXVIII) emerges as a diabolical kind of Iago to his Othello in the manipulation of people surrounding Oton. Instead of using a third party with whom to incriminate Denise, Oton's wife, Berengier boasts that he himself is irresistible to women and engages Oton in a wager of land that Denise who is also daughter of Alfons, the king of Spain, will prove to be no different from any other woman. Rather than the handkerchief of Desdemona, Berengier employs Eglantine the maid to steal for him the jewel most precious to Oton's wife. This he triumphantly shows to Oton. The treachery of Berengier is known, however, and a townsman discloses to Denise the plot and comments upon the convincing lies of that demon Berengier. The Virgin visits Oton and informs him of
Berengier’s trick, and the king also sees in this treachery the handiwork of the Devil through Berengier:

El mère Dieu, com me deploist
Le temps que j’ay si mal gasté!
L’ennemi m’avoit bien tasté;
Mais, Dieu mercy, ne suis pas morts.

(vv. 1662-1665)

Similar to the perfidy of the uncle displayed in the *Miracle de la Marquise de la Gaudine* (XII) is that of the emperor’s brother in the *Miracle de l’Empereur* (XXVII). In the *miracle* the Devil, though unseen and unheard, is nearly successful in the destruction of another innocent woman. During the emperor’s absence from Rome the brother feigns illness in order to entice the empress to his bedside. She expresses concern for him until he reveals that he dies for the love of her. She states that she is his friend and leaves him. Eventually he accuses her to the emperor, who sentences his wife to death. This sort of injustice is one of the standard pieces of the Devil’s repertoire.

This diabolical plan goes well until the brother is stricken with leprosy, which seems a fitting curse. Through his appeal to the pope for healing he confronts unknowingly the empress who has been miraculously saved from death and brought to the court of the pope. The leper is urged to confess all hidden sin and thereby save himself from perdition. At last, the brother reveals his secret evil and places the temptation to seduce his sister-in-law at the door of the Devil (vv. 1952–53).

The problem of incest arises twice in the *miracles*, and among the royal houses at that. In *Miracles XXIX* and *XXXVI* a daughter is horrified to learn of her father’s plan to marry her. In the former, the *Miracle de la fille du roy de Hongrie*, the daughter cuts off her hand, and the king retaliates by condemning her to be burned at the stake. Trapped in a diabolical net set by her unnatural father, the damsel is only too glad
to be spared the sin of incest and willingly goes to her death, provided
that her soul be defended from the Devil?

Tres doux Dieu, encore miex l’aim
Avoir perdue et mort sentir
Que moy a tel fait consentir
Que mon pere me cogneust
Ne charnelleant a moy jeust;
Et se pour ce mourir me fault,
Douix Dieu qui es lassus en hault,
Quoy que le corps soit mis en cendre,
Douix Dieu, veuilles m’ame defendre
Des enemis.

(vv. 482-496)

As is usually the case, those most aware of the Devil's presence
and potent evil are those who are nearest to God in their thoughts and
who are resisting the constraints of circumstances or temptation. Not
until he receives the word that his orders concerning the execution of
his daughter have been carried out does the king realize that Satan
possesses him. In the following prayer to the Virgin he confesses his
senseless villainy and the fact that the Devil has a claim on him:

Ha! mere Dieu, vierge pucelle,
En ces laz m’a bien Satan pris,
J’ay trop vilainement mespris
D’avoir fait sans cause mourir
Celle que tenir et garir
De mort encontre tous dausse,
S’en moy raison ne sens susse;
Dont se pour il me desconforte,
J’ay droit; car je doubl ne m’emporte
En enfer l’ennemi tout vis,
Hair doy bien, ce m’est avis,
Qui d’elle prendre m’enorta
Et nouvelles m’en apporta
Premiersament.

(vv. 590-603)

Queen Katherine in the latter Miracle de la fille d’un roy dies
giving birth to a daughter. While she is enduring the ordeal, the king
and his knights are praying in the chapel and seem very much aware at
this time of the power of the Enemy. The second knight prays to the
crucifix, which reminds him of the sacrifice of "Jhesu le roy celestre,"
in the hopes that it will defend him "de l'ennemi et de ses laz." This pious attitude wanes in the course of years, for the king's prolonged grief prompts the courtiers to suggest that he marry his daughter Ysabel, since she is so much like the mother she never knew.

Ysabel is understandably outraged by her father's plan, but she does not maim herself as does the daughter in the former play. Miming with the help of the angel Gabriel, she seeks refuge at the court of the emperor. In a complicated dénouement the latter marries Ysabel, and his own daughter weds Ysabel's father.

The familiar liens of Satan are often mentioned by secondary personnages of the miracles. His victims as well as the spectators recognize, if too late, his guile. In the Miracle de l'Abbesse Grosse (II) the bishop and his priests discuss the rumor that is circulating about the abbesse. All agree that Satan is the cause of her sin, if indeed she has transgressed. These men of the cloister know that the Devil is more diligent against the pious than against the careless folk. The bishop decides to visit the abbess to verify or squelch the rumor.

Another story which concerns a nun seems to point up the medieval ideal of fidelity to a religious vow regardless of the difficulty. In the Miracle de la nonne qui laissa son abbaie (VII) the honorable estate of marriage and motherhood does not atone for having broken a vow. When Our Lady pays a visit to the former nun, who has fled the convent to marry a chevalier, she tells the faithful mother of two that she has been deceived into great sin by the Devil. This visit naturally upsets the former nun, who sees for herself a future, an eternity in perdition if the Virgin does not intercede. She remembers what a struggle with conscience she had when attempting to withstand the temptation to follow her lover. On one of her nocturnal essays to meet him she stopped at the chapel to pray to
the Virgin:

Vierge, qui tant neus a voulu
Contre Satan, je vous salu
En disant: Ave Maria,
Gracia plena, dominus tecum, benedicta tu
in mulieribus
Et benedictus fructus ventris tui;

(vv. 355-359)

In response to this prayer the image of the Virgin prevents the nun from leaving the chapel until she promises to return to the dormitory. The unseen Devil is temporarily frustrated in his temptation of the nun.

According to the morality of the age, the temptation of the Devil is too powerful against this most pious of nuns, and she elects to abandon her spiritual husband, the Christ, which all those taking the veil regarded as tantamount to adultery.11 The first nun and the abbess search for their absent sister and remark on the fact that Satan tries hardest to ensnare the most holy of heart. The nun herself believes that she has left the first and best calling to spiritual perfection in her life for the lesser, carnal way of life with a man.

The pope in the Miracle de un Pape qui vendit le basse (VIII) is grateful for the intercession of Mary, who untied the liens of Satan which held him. A converted larron confesses in the presence of a hermit to having been under the power of the Devil in the Miracle de un marchant et un larron (XI):

A li vuesi tout este rendu
Car je me sant ja delivré
Du Sathan, qui mout m'a livré
Travail et paine.

(vv. 695-698)

Godart, the excommunicated (XVII), cites in his confession to the "Doulx roy celeste" the deception of the Devil as his downfall, and thereby presents another testimony to the guile of the Enemy (vv. 750-755).

A merchant who has borrowed too much money from a moneylender finds
himself unable to pay back the loan. He attributes his plight to the
deception of the Devil, for not only has he overextended himself, but he
has foolishly pledged to become the servant of the Jew to whom he owes
the sum. The religious implication of such servitude dismays the merchant:

Ha! trezouldx Dieu, père de gloire,
Tant sui dolans ne say que dire,
Des yeux pleure, du cœur soupirer,
Car laudement m'est mescheu.
L'anemi m'a bien deceu,
Deceu voire et assoté,
Quant, je n'ay niex le jour notté
Notté? mais en mon cœur escript,
Qu'en plege baillay Jhesu Crist
Et la treschoulce mère chiêre,
Quant il m'est si mal advenu
Que du jour ne m'est souvenu
Que devoie au juif paier
Son avoir, qui moult esmaier
Mefait! las! et n'ay je pas droit?

Car le jour si sera demain
Que le convenant de ma main
Li juray que son serv seroie
Ou cas que le paieroie.

(vv. 953-967, 976-979)

To the merchant this note or covenant is like a pact with the Devil
himself.

In several plays the Devil's role in the scheme of earthly life is
rehearsed, thus explaining the predicament which exists at the present
time. A bit of theology seems to lie at the tip of everyman's tongue,
for the history of man and the Devil's part in its unhappy scenes is
background to the personal history of every individual. In the Miracle
de Saint Silvestre (XX) the saint explains to Constantine the Fall of
of Man through the guile of the Serpent. The birth of Christ, called
the "Second Adam," was necessary to overcome the "Evil Serpent," as
Silvester terms the Devil:

Or fu cel Adam du serpent
Vaincu; par ce secondeament
Fu un second Adam formez
Vierge, par lequel fu matez
Là maus serpens qui le tempata;
Car aussi comme Adam mata
En paradis le fruit mengant,
De Crist fu matez en vivant
Là maus serpens.

(vv. 1307-1315)

The servants include snatches of popular theology as they discuss death and the Last Judgment in reference to the late-queen's demise in the *Miracle de la fille d'un roy* (XXXVII). They believe that sinners who have not served God "En enfer sans fin mis semont" (v. 745). In the long prayer of Simeon in the *Miracle de la Nativité Jhesu Crist* (V) he expresses the great desire to see the Messiah, who will buy back the human race from the Devil:

El sire, longuement nous as
Anoncie par tes mains prophètes,
Et tant belles promesses faites
Du rachat de ligne humaine
Que li Sathans en enfer ma dre.

(vv. 368-372)

In the *Miracle de Sainte Bautheuch* (XXXIV) the saintly Queen Bautheuch prays while her husband is on a pilgrimage. In her prayer she also emphasizes the efficacy of the crucified Jesus in the salvation of the human race from the clutches of the Devil (vv. 1038-1045).

In a somewhat predictable fashion in the *Miracle de Barlaam et Josaphat* (XXI) and the *Miracle du Saint Panthaleon* (XXII) the theology of Christianity, in particular the Fall of Man through the treachery of the Devil, is explained by a believer to pagans who subsequently convert. In the former play one convert, Barlaam, is recalled to the court of the king named Avennim to explain himself. The king is angry at the testimony of his former courtier and hopes that Mahon will do him ill. Josaphat, the king's son, likes Barlaam and wishes to hear the story of God and man which the Christians tell. The latter obliges him; the following fragment
presents the role of Satan in the history of man:

Mais Dieu qui en sa deité
A de personnes trinité
Voient comment en son servage
Sathan tenait humain lignage
Et qu'en enfer tous descendoient
A la valeur qu'il mourient,
Son fil en terre nous tranist,
Qui en une vierge se mist
Et la prist nostre humanité,

(vv. 647-655)

Josaphat is moved to accept this belief, and his conversion exasperates the king who, on the advice of his council, places the daughter of another king in Josaphat's way as a snare. She tempts Josaphat by saying that she will convert if he will marry her or at least share her bed. Josaphat turns this proposition over to the Virgin as having the taint of Satanic suggestion (vv. 1515-1523). At the request of Dieu the Virgin visits Josaphat and makes a successful rescue from the clutches of Satan. In this instance the woman is again a tool of Satan in the popular medieval concept of her.

The latter play presents another pagan milieu where the father of Panthaleon and the cousin, named Gomer, swear by Dyanne la belle and by Mahon. Master Morin, to whom Panthaleon is apprenticed, swears by Mahomet. Hermolaus instructs Panthaleon in the folly of idolatry and in the tenets of Christianity, even the unpleasant ones:

Es cieulx conne sains esperites
Aront les bons leur mansion;
Les mauvais a despacion
Pardurable en enfer pour lors
Seront en ames et en cors,
Croy biau fils, que pas ne te mens
La souffrorg divers tournens
Dont nul ne peut le dire la samme,

(vv. 172-179)

This picture of the destiny of the sains esperites juxtaposed with that of the mauvais and coupled with the promise of power over sickness and
evil through the sign of the cross and the name of Jesus convinces Panthaleon to believe. His faith is given an immediate test, for what should appear on the scene but an actual serpent, as if sent once again by its ancient master, the Devil, to attack the human race. This time the serpent's gaping jaws threaten a young child. Panthaleon decides to test his God against this beast by calling on the Tresdoulx Jhesu. The serpent falls dead before it can harm the child, and from this initial triumph over the serpent Panthaleon continues a life of miracle healings.

Hence, woven into the fabric of the lay theology is the insinuating presence of the Devil as the Enemy of mankind. He is viewed as the powerful jailer of the souls of men, whose bonds or liens are subtle, but strong on earth and literally unbreakable in hell. The power of God and the intervention of the Virgin may ease the punishment of those relegated to purgatory for purification. Reiterated in those miracles which do not feature a visible dyable, or at least a mute one, is the belief that he is an arch enemy of the Virgin. In the Miracle de un chanoine qui se maria (XIX) a certain young man vows himself to the service of God but finds himself encouraged to marry by his family. Toward the beginning of the play his prayer ends with the request that the Virgin protect him from all the diabolical dangers which beset every believer. In this instance the family becomes an agency of demonic attack upon the priest, who succumbs to the apparently materialistic spirit which prevails among the members. His cousin advances what seem to be legitimate reasons for becoming a family man, thereby becoming the Devil's advocate. At last the young man cedes to his uncle's will and marries the daughter of Barré de Sens, a valiant knight. While praying in the chapel the bridegroom receives a visit from the offended Virgin who upbraids him for his disloyalty. The priest laments his folly as
recognizes the piège of the Devil in the counsel of his friends:

Las! de quelle heure ay je pris femme?
Je voy que je peris corps et ame,
Et es mains de mes ennemis
Me suis mis, et par mes amis,
Se remedie brefement n'y met.

(vv. 886-890)

The Devil's victory is thus short lived, and the priest leaves his wife a note on her pillow saying that he has gone into a hermitage. At first outraged, the young bride decides to become a nun herself over the objections of her mother, and thereby follows the laudable example of her husband.

The preacher of the Miracle de l'Evesque a qui Nostre Dame s'apparut (X) relies heavily upon the opinions of Saints Bernard and Jerome. In his sermon he comments upon the enmity between the Devil and Mary, saying "ce nom est espandu en enfer pour estre cremu..." The bishop discusses with his aides the very good sermon which they have just heard, adding his own view of Mary's able defense of the believers:

Seigneurs, c'est bien raison et droit
C'on la serve en devocien,
Car de l'infenral mansion
Sommes par elle deffendu.

(vv. 110-113)

In the historically based Miracle de Berthe (XXI) the sermon which begins the play makes use of the opinions of St Bernard. Among them is the belief that Our Lady never did sin, for which one may, in the often repeated words of the saint, say to her: "Dame, par la planté de grace qui en toy est, tu as le ciel raspli, enfer vuidé, la ruynes de paradis restoré, et aux chetis attendans mercy vie pardurable qu'ilz avoient perdu donné. Celle vie pardurable nous vueille ceste glorieuse vierge a tous empeter. Amen..." This assurance of such power against the Devil cloaks the performance of the play in safety as one observes
the ghostly hand of the Enemy at work.

The former nun in the *Miracle de la nonne qui laissa son abbaie* (VII) sees before her the same fate as the newly married *chanoine* of the *Miracle de un chanoine qui se maria* (XIX) apart from the mercy and protection of Our Lady. The foolish merchant of *Miracle XXXV* goes to a chapel to pray to the Virgin for help to get out of the bondage of the Devil. Mousse the Jew comes to collect his due in a situation analogous to that of the Devil approaching to claim the soul of his victim, but the Devil's plot is foiled by a visitation from the Virgin and the conversion of the Jew. The motet sung by the clerks which ends the play summarizes the Virgin's power over that of the Devil, who had worked so successfully against Adam's seed:

```
On doit bien, vierge, loer
Quant pour nous d'enfer desneer
Dieu se fist en vous homme,
Qui de la mort nous acquitta
Ou Adam touz nous endebta
Par le mors de la pomme.
```

(vv. 1621-1626)

Another song is sung to this effect in the *Miracle de Une Femme que Nostre Dame garda d'estre aree* (XXVI) just after the Virgin has forbidden the fire to touch Guibour, the woman to be burned at the stake for having had her son-on-law Aubin slain (vv. 1136-1142).

The converted thief of *Miracle XI* is lost on the road and thinks first of the Virgin for protection against the unseen Enemy. Immediately he sees a merchant, who, in talking with him, advances the notion that Satan is dogging the tracks of the former thief in order to trap him again:

```
Qu'est ce la, sire, avez ja fait?
Par qui estes vous destournez,
Qui si tost vous en retournez?
Je doubt que Satran ne vous guête,
Qui bée a ce que vous remette'
   En son servage.
```

(vv. 623-628)
The larron wishes to live as a hermit with the one introduced to him by the merchant. He gives his spiritual biography in terms of the two contenders for his soul, the Virgin and the Devil.

\[\text{J'ay trop long temps ci folie;}\]
\[\text{Li Satan m'avoit bien lié,}\]
\[\text{Orendroit m'en apperçoy bien;}\]
\[\text{La vierge a rompu le lien}\]
\[\text{Dont il me tenoit en ses lais.}\]

(\text{vv. 712-716})

In the second miracle of the Cangé group, the abbess fears the visit of the bishop on the morrow, when it will be discovered that she is pregnant. She implores the Virgin to prevent Satan from disgracing her publicly.

The murderers of the fourth miracle pleads to the Virgin not only to forgive her, but to protect her soul from the Devil, who will most certainly damn her. The pope in the eighth miracle expresses gratitude to the Virgin for having delivered him from the bonds of Satan (\text{vv. 945-949}). Later on, as he makes his gift of two carbuncles to the Virgin, he again testifies to the enmity between her and the Devil (\text{vv. 1224-1228}).

Godart, the excommunicated of the seventeenth miracle, is sent to the Fol of Alexandria, who prays for him, addressing the Virgin as the enemy of the Devil. At the visitation of the Virgin with her heavenly company the Fol pleads for Godart in person, again appealing to the rigorous animosity which she harbors toward the Devil (\text{vv. 1823-1830}). The angel Gabriel sums up the popular feeling in regard to the rampant power of Satan, which would engulf all mankind, were it not for the intervention of Our Lady:

\[\text{Dame, se le monde a amie}\]
\[\text{Ne vous avoit, li ennemis}\]
\[\text{L'aroit tost a deshonneur mis}\]
\[\text{Et acentés.}\]

(\text{vv. 1152-1155})

With these several witnesses to the mutual hatred of the Devil and
Mary, though not an exhaustive array, from the miracles where in the Devil
does not appear as an active personnage with lines to speak, there is
established the consciousness of the fierceness of Satanic hatred for the
Virgin and her dévots. The angels, the pope, the apostles, the terrestrial
monarchs, the common men and women among the bourgeoisie, all recognize
themselves as being caught up in a gigantic struggle between the hosts of
heaven and the Devil with his legions. Closely associated with the
influence of the Devil upon human life is the love of Mammon. In the
opening lines of the *Miracle de un parroissian escommané* (XVII) the
emperor's son realizes the error of his way in a prayer to God in which
he mentions specifically the love of money and possessions as the Devil's
hold on him from which he seeks deliverance:

Elas! mal suis appareilliez
Pour mon ame et mal conseilliez,
Quant je voy et puis bien entendre
Que j'e plus désiré atendre
Aus aux granx joies perpetuelles.
Mort m'a père et mère telu;
Richesse n'y a riens valu.
Et bien sçay que morir me fault
Aussi: si seroit grant defaut
A moy se la char et le monde
Et l'ennemy fault et immonde
Pour l'amour de Dieu ne laissez.

(vv. 13-25)

Saint Alexis of *Miracle XL* despises the world as vanity. He
abandons his bride Sabine and gives away his money and cloak. He adopts
the rule of poverty in order to evade Satan, or so he tells God in a
long prayer. The heroine of the *Miracle de Sainte Bautheuch* (XXXIV)
gives alms to the poor and other monetary gifts to convents in order
to keep other souls from the clutches of the Devil:

Car reternir d'autrui l'argent
Met conscience en si mal point
Que touz jours le mort et le point
Le ver de remors, n'est pas doubte;
Et pis y a, que maint s'en boute
Et maint enfer je dy voir
Pour retenir l'autrui avoir:

... . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Et aussi sera desploise
Ma monnoie en aumosne faire,
Selon que pourray sans meffaire,
A ces povres querans leur vie,

(vv. 386-392, 402-405)

The good woman seems to comprehend the Devil's power over the lives of those who despair in poverty.

It is to avoid the same danger in despair that God sends the Virgin to comfort the pope in the eighth miracle. As a penitent his fruitless prayers to the obstinate Mary cause him to be a potential victim of the Devil. There is also some danger of the unforgiven pope's being carried off by Satan in his sleep; hence his vigilance in prayer in the chapel.

The presence and activity of the Devil so constantly alluded to by the characters creates a somewhat sinister atmosphere for the viewers. To balance the picture, however, the defenses of the believer against the Devil's malignant power are also divulged frequently. In the prose sermon which appears towards the beginning of the Miracle de l'Evesque a qui Nostre Dame s'apparut (X) three things are to be feared by the Devil: the sign of the cross, the name of Jesus, and the name of Mary. Clovis in the thirty-ninth miracle takes the sacrament of baptism to ensure his soul from diabolical harm, renouncing his former idols and all other traces of Satan's influence upon his life. Confession is an effective weapon against the Devil as attested by the pope in the Miracle de l'Empereris de Rome (XXVII) as he admonishes the leprous brother of the emperor to confess his hidden sin. Again the desire to do harm or give shame to the Devil is incentive to do the right thing.
It appears, then, that the message of the miracles which introduce
the Devil as a visible, active, speaking personnage is echoed in the
other, more numerous miracles which feature the Devil as the unseen,
silent Enemy. The same panorama of human griefs is displayed: jealousy,
defamation of character, greed, accidental drowning, cruelty of various
sorts including torture, idolatry, incest, and murder literally haunt the
lives of the personnages because of the restless hatred of the Devil. In
the terrestrial play called Life as reflected in the miracles, the mortal
players regard the author of their woe as a subtle enemy who remains
invisible most of the time, usually relying upon mental impression or
sending one's family or friends to accomplish his temptations. He uses
the human institutions of justice to mete out injustice and plays upon
natural and noble sentiments and emotions such as conjugal love in order
to cause transgressions. He is apt to work most diligently against the
most devout, and if he is not successful in temptation, the Devil proceeds
to destroy as soon as possible those who resist him. The medieval believers
seem to enjoy the way this tactic backfires, even when apparently successful, for generally when a saint dies violently at the instigation of the
Devil, others inspired by the martyrdom leap into the breach and take up
the struggle. Often two souls or more are led into the Christian fold as
an immediate result of the Devil's murderous plots.

The miracles demonstrate as probably no other kind of medieval drama
does that, although a formidable element in daily existence, the wiles
and attacks of the Devil could not overwhelm the believer, provided that
he used the weapons which the Church offered to him. The superhuman Foe
gave to the medieval man a sense of eternal destiny as an active and
important participant in the struggle to establish the Kingdom of God
against the perpetual opposition of the Devil.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

1. The assessment of the play by Stadler-Honegger seems to betray a certain outrage over the easy pardon granted to the criminal. The cold blooded calculation of the young queen is traced in order to point out the poorly prepared change of heart: "Presque mathématiquement, comme la pièce doit se terminer, la criminelles se repent, et tout de suite la Vierge intervient en faveur de son 'ame' et ordonne au mari de pardonner à sa 'sainte femme,'" Etude, p. 18. The source for this miracle is supposedly the oriental tale, De la roynce qui occist son senschal which is preserved in Nouveau Recueil de Fables et contes inédits des poètes français des XIIe, XIIE, XIVe, et XVe siècle, ed. Méon, 2 vols. (Paris, 1823), II, 256-278.

2. The source of this miracle seems to be Gautier de Coinci's D'un escommunié, ed. Koenig (Bk 3), though loosely followed.


4. In the Légende dorée this form of martyrdom was the lot of Saint Laurent, op. cit., I, 221-228.

5. In such scenes of cruelty as given in this miracle and in those of Miracle XXIV concerning the sufferings of Saint Ignatius there is a foretaste of things to come in the later mystères based upon the lives of the saints. These plays indulge the taste for morbid or pathetic subjects by prolonging the torture of the martyrs. Some of these are the works of skillful writers such as Jean Molinet, whose Mystère de S. Quentin appeared in the mid-fifteenth century.

6. Saint Laurent's extreme charity toward his persecutors is due perhaps to his closeness to the Christ by virtue of his having been an alleged disciple of St John, according to the Légende dorée, I, 129-132.


8. There is a similar absurd claim in the Chanson de Roland that Marsile the Saracen does not love God, but serves Mohammed and even Apollo.

9. Some liberties have been taken with the legend, for in the roman, Robert becomes a hermit instead of marrying the emperor's daughter (vv. 4952-4968). Robert le Diable, Roman d'Aventure, ed. E. Loeuth (Paris, 1903), pp. 194-195.

10. This miracle is deemed the most interesting of the collection by Stadler-Honegger. She acknowledges a few mystique, but states that the realistic spirit triumphs: "trôme de sphère d'ailleurs dont le genre ne sera pas récondé par les auteurs qui suivront." She further asserts that Guibour and the nun of Miracle II are the only dramatic heroines in the modern sense of the word in the entire collection. See Etude, p. 171. It appears that these two heroines, if indeed they are unusual, find their dramatic strength in the fact they are not only
10. (cont'd) Energetic and decisive human beings, but they recognize the kind of dichotomy which motivates them, which they couch in terms of Satanic influence versus Godly influence. Théodore of Miracle XVIII earns high marks in the same category.

11. Typical of this attitude towards the Christ, is that of the thirteen-year-old Saint Agnes of the Légende dorée, who refused to marry the son of the proconsul because "elle ne pouvait violer l'alliance qu'elle avait contractée avec son premier époux." This "premier époux" was the Christ. See ed. P. Paris, I, 94–98.

12. In her résumé of the probable relationship of the plays by authors Stadler-Honegger groups these two with miracles XXIII, XXIV, and XXV as having the same author, who is "peu artiste, peu poète." Étude, p. 166.
CONCLUSION

The Devil fits into the scheme of life as presented in the miracles in a natural, orthodox manner. His primeval presence and influence are assumed by the other characters to have a place in world history as surely as do storms at sea, hurricanes, plagues, wars, illness, accidents, and poverty. Indeed, the Devil's control as the "prince of this world" is an axiom which the medieval poet and his public do not question, although this aspect of the Devil's activities is not the center of interest in the miracles. What does concern the medieval Christian is the Devil's particular influence over his life and the means of counteracting this influence. The miracles inculcate a demonology pertinent to men's daily lives by precept and by example.

For centuries a body of ideas had accumulated about the person of the Devil, so that in the Middle Ages certain general concepts were established firmly enough to be common knowledge, and this popular demonology finds expression quite admirably in the miracles which discuss the Devil but do not present him as a speaking personnage. In several plays we have observed that the history of man and his present existence as well as his eternal future are inextricably bound to the person of the Devil, and therefore various preachers rehearse for such pagans as Constantine and his mother (XX), St. Panthaleen as a boy (XXII) and for others of like ignorance the story of the Garden of Eden and the Fall of Man as a result of the temptation by the Devil through the agency of the serpent. They do not shrink from relating the terrible consequences of sin which is in essence disobedience to God by heeding the promptings of the Devil, but rather urge their hearers and persecutors alike to repent before the Devil Destroys them, as he will all who
reject the love of God and his Son, the Christ. The earthly ministry of Jesus, the temptations offered by the Devil, which he withstood, his death and resurrection, his intercession on behalf of the sinner who repents are all recounted in one miracle or another as the hope of mankind against the destructive machinations of that fallen angel, Lucifer, and his evil agents.

The most humble of society demonstrate an awareness of the Devil's historic and theological place in man's existence, and this belief does not end in a tradition of no consequence. For example, the servants in one king's household (XXXVII) on the occasion of the queen's death discuss the fate of sinners who die unabsolved of their sins as being whisked off to hell to be forever tormented by the Devil as naturally as they would chat about a fire in the bakery. Although invisible to them, the Devil has and does exist and will continue to work evil into the lives of men until the Last Judgment, when he, his demons, and unrepentant human beings will be cast into the lake of fire forever. These ideas are not too banal to be repeated several times throughout the Cangé repertoire. Therefore, in the miracles the Devil is an historical personage whose initial rebellion against God has been carried forward through the ages with man, God's prized creation, who becomes the focal point of the struggle. All misfortunes in life spring from the malignant presence of the Devil's hosts, and this is perhaps more eloquently expressed in the miracles which speak about him than in those which feature him as an active plotter. Representatives of royalty, nobility, bourgeoisie, and ecclesiastical classes attest to the same subtle influence upon their lives, which has caused them to fall to temptation. These temptations as we have noted range from incest and murder to leaving one's religious vows to marry. None of the characters doubts the actual
present-day power of the Devil behind the scenes of external reality.

In addition to the history and theology concerning the Devil, his particular characteristics are displayed in various situations which dramatize what everyone believes to be true. There seems to be little difference between secular history, which may feature such nationally important names as Clovis, Guillaume d'Aquitaine, Berthe and Pepin, Robert le Diable or ancient ones such as Diocletian, Trajan, or Julien, and the hagiology that presents such worthies in the faith as St Laurent, St Alexis, St Bautheuch, or St Panthaleon: the Devil may appear, and his **raison d'être** is constant. He attempts to destroy his victims by various means, fashioning the temptation to the person, so that in these **miracles** the orthodox view of him is presented with the medieval percep-
tiveness of demonic subtlety and termerity. Unlike the modern writers, the medieval poet did not distinguish the secular from the sacred in his world view of man's destiny, for the **miracles** bring together under the single aegis of the Church all men: pagan and Christian alike find themselves confronted with the Devil's power and must answer for their deed, which they do as a result of this confrontation. Hence, the apostate Julien (XIII) screams in terror as he catches sight of the hordes of demons coming for his soul, whereas St Valentine (XXV) is met by the heavenly angels and St Mary at the moment of his execution, because he would not allow the Devil to terrify or threaten him into recanting through the agency of a pagan emperor.

The accents of Tertullian and Jean Chrysostome sound again in the **miracles**, with such persecutors of Christians as Trajan, Dacian, or Julien, who are immediately identifiable as agents of the Devil. As these Church fathers taught and the **miracles** demonstrate, it is the Devil's work to stamp out Christianity, but God sets the ultimate
limits upon the Devil's activities. This absolute dominion over the 
inmates of hell is particularly underscored in the Miracle de un 
prevost que Nostre Dame delivra (XIV), where the Devil's own minions 
are specifically assigned to carry out a direct command of God.

A salient characteristic of the Devil as portrayed in this 
repertoire is his pride. It is implicit in the story of his primeval 
revolt against God, as the one angel who believed himself to be worthy 
and capable of placing himself on equal terms with the Creator. This 
trait is shared by all the evil agents who boast one to another of their 
conquests. On several occasions they express satisfaction with them-
selves to their victims as well as to each other. The pair who attack 
the pope's family (XVI) can scarcely accept defeat, the prize being so 
high and the merit so great in the eyes of Lucifer. The reiterated truism 
that the Devil works hardest to ensnare the most pious seems to support 
the idea that his pride is bolstered by successful encounters with the 
more difficult prey. In addition, the demons try to instill the sin of 
p pride in the hearts of men, thus transforming them into enemies of God's 
will. Two notable successes in this maneuver ruined the happiness of the 
believers in question, for they were induced to relive upon their own 
strength or to glory in their alleged merit, which quickly resulted in 
moral defeat.

In no less than seven of the Miracles de Nostre-Dame par personnages 
and in the contemporaneous Chevalier qui donna sa femme au diable one 
or more devils enunciates his hatred for the Virgin as the motive for 
launching an attack upon human victims. Those believers who are 
especially devoted to the Virgin, such as the chevalier's wife or the 
couple who vow chastity in her Honor (I) or Jean Chrysostome (VI), find 
themselves beset with persecution or temptation or both. This enmity
which rages between the Virgin and the Devil is attested to by human
victims in at least another eight miracles of the Cange repertoire
and is even alluded to in the music, such as the motet sung by the
clerks in miracle XXXV. On the other hand, there is obvious respect
for the "vrai juge," and his arbitration is even sought by the devils
at times.

Besides the outstanding work of persecution, Satan is adept at
stirring up domestic strife and causes fathers to abandon their natural
affections for their daughters for an incestuous one (XXIV, XXXVII). At
every turn he is there to twist and distort human ties, so that a knight
is willing to forgive his perfidious companions, on one hand, while he
gives away his faithful wife, on the other, and a mother rashly wills
her unborn child over to the Devil during a quarrel with her husband.
Theodore is unfaithful to her husband (XVIII), and two noblewomen are
condemned by their husbands on false charges of infidelity, so that,
whether or not the Devil actually succeeds in leading astray a woman
he will work to ruin her reputation. He persecuted in this way the
Marquise de la Gaudine (XII), the chevalier's wife, and even Guibour,
whose son-in-law spreads rumors about his alleged liaison with her
(XXVI). The Empress of Rome is not too exalted to be out of danger from
this quarter, and although the Devil does not appear to claim the credit,
it is attributed to him by the other characters. The pride of the pope's
mother (XVI) was the Devil's avowed triumph, which he feverishly worked
to maintain in the face of the woman's penance. In another instance
a demonical queen mother plots against her daughter-in-law (XXXII) with
such blinding jealousy that she orders her three grandsons murdered
and three puppies put in their place in order to discredit the young
mother in the eyes of the father, the king of Thierry. Hence the Devil
hatches ghastly plots, which demonstrate how low he can bring the human race, once it has given ear to him. In one instance, however, two devils themselves beat an obstinate saint to death (IX) and thus fulfill literally the epithet of murderer uttered by Christ in John 8: 44.

It is probably with such hideous crimes in mind that the medieval artists and poets attempted to show the Devil as an ugly animal-like creature. Retaining enough anthropomorphic features to allow him great mobility on stage, the Devil does confront his victims occasionally with the end in view of frightening certain ones into submission. He succeeds admirably with the mother of the newborn son (I), who has neither strength nor presence of mind to withstand successfully the threat to her infant. As a result a pact is made which the woman need not have contracted, had she used one of the exorcism formulas so readily employed by Jean Chrysostome, for example, when he was compelled to face the undisguised Devil in all his menacing strength (VI). The jeune fille who is enticed into the world by the Devil to earn a livelihood for her parents by prostitution appears to be almost mesmerized by the glib persuasion and striking appearance of the Devil, although she is revolted by the idea. Both jailer and emperor who persecute St Valentine are horrified by the appearance of demons who come to take them to hell (XXV). The emperor Julien (XIII) finds the demonic hordes equally terrifying at his demise. There is nothing cute or playful about these demons, for they are serious and mean harm in no slight measure.

The Devil's scorn of the human race and his use of it as merely a tool of vengeance against the Virgin is reflected in demonic humor as well as in the activities. The use of the wheelbarrow to carry off the dead figures in three of the miracles of the Cangé group, where the apostate Julien (XIII), the archdeacon (III), and the persecutors of
Saint Valentine (ExV) are properly dumped like refuse into the barrows and pushed off to hell by demons who act as grisly street-sweepers or scavengers clearing the earth of useless matter. This view of the damned is in marked contrast to that of the dead saints, whose souls are tenderly gathered by the angels as precious jewels. It is significant that in the case of the provost (XIV) the devils do not use a wheelbarrow to carry him to purgatory, but rather, bind him like a fol and lead him away something in the manner of the demons who lead away Adam and Eve and the prophets in that famous twelfth century ordo. The provost has not been abandoned by God to the unchecked "mercies" of the Devil and is not yet considered useless waste. He is, however, the butt of demonic jokes which humiliates him. Generally the demons find some outlet for their perverse humor in irony rather than in slapstick antics or verbal abuse of each other, the latter of which is so much employed in the contemporaneous Passion du Palatinus. The Devil in the Chevalier qui donna sa femme au diable speaks of his "prudence" in the execution of his evil projects, and there is some levity over the new inmate's reaction to his infernal maison as the demons wheel away the murderer in Miracle III. The demon Behemoth observes that the archdeacon's heart of iron will be an excellent test of the heat of the infernal fires (Vv. 1027-29). It is with particular zest that Sathan and Vehemot plan a welcoming tour of their domain for their "guest" Estienne (XIV).

These examples of diabolical humor tend to arouse a rueful acquiescence in the mind of the spectator rather than a raucous guffaw. That which makes the Devil laugh is not generally what makes the spectator laugh, except perhaps in one instance, when in a conversation with Beleal Sathan relishes the plight of a certain lustful monk who will
shortly find himself in the woman's washtub with the sheets in a bath of lye (XIII). Most makers of fabliaux told this kind of tale, to the immense delight of the medieval public of all ranks, and it is quite likely that in this case it elicited laughter from the phlegmatic folk who gathered for this particular miracle. Nearly everyone enjoyed the idea of an erring clergyman's getting a just reward for his sins. Beleal finds it terribly amusing also:

Hahay! hahay! que je me ri
De ce que l'as si bien trouvée!
Alons nous en sans demourée
En enfer, nous y serons ja
Miex venu que ne fu piega
Diable nesun,

(vv. 346-351)

It is not likely, however, that the spectators found Beleal's plot so funny, even though he skips and leaps for joy over his little war. His project of sending the apostate Julien against St Basil's home city and of tearing down the statue of St Mary is not quite so sympathetic a plan as that of Sathan's, which is less far reaching in consequence and has perhaps an element of justice in it. The clever Huet who, having stamped the hermit into a murder, triumphs over Jehan le Paulu can scarcely be imagined as a laughable character, although he is apparently enjoying the situation immensely (XXX).

That which is amusing to the spectator is the Devil in defeat.

This is true for the most part even in other types of plays, such as the Passion du Palatinus or the Presentation of Mary in the Temple, for in their abuse of each other, their bravado, or their fear before the power of God or the Virgin they allow the spectator to triumph vicariously. The demons who lose their case before the heavenly tribunal (I, XXXVI) are objects of derision, and their foolish observation that Jesus fears his mother and therefore decides in her favor is just an example of
their spiritual blindness or lack of discernment. It is not likely that
the people laughed when the devils won their case against the archdeacon
in Miracle III.

There have been some observations made by modern critics concerning
the "humanizing" efforts of medieval man in regard to the Devil. It
seems to be a common opinion that man creates his gods and his demons in
his own image and therefore shifts blame onto them for his shortcomings.
This idea seems to be demonstrably true with most religious systems which
deal with the problem of evil, but in the pure Christianity of the
first century, this was not so; man's guilt rested upon man, and even
in the Middle Ages Christians believed by an large that the shortcomings
or sins of man were man's responsibilities, even though the Devil was seen
as the instigator. The reality of the Devil's historical and actual
existence and activity which finds ample demonstration in the miracles
that feature him as a visible, speaking personage leaves no room for
modern critics to speculate upon him as a convenient, theoretical
scapegoat for human foibles. The Devil in the miracles is not a vestige
of a former, pagan superstition, for those who fall under his influence
accept the responsibility of penance and restitution in order to rid
themselves of the very real consequences which accrue to the yielding
of one's will to that of the Evil One. In effect, the Devil's power is
limited by God, and this is supported in nearly every play in the miracle
repertoire. It is, therefore, the human response to the Devil's wiles
which counts, be he potentate or peasant.

The Devil himself is not human, and it is a particularly happy
perception on the part of the play which gave these miracles that the
Devil uses human agents or will himself assume the form of a human being
in order to cause the fall of a good soul. The use of the human disguise
is reserved as a rule for situations in which the intended victim is so devout that he cannot be further moved either by mental suggestion or by fright, as when the Devil comes suddenly in undisguised hideousness and threatens. In order even to get near such persons as the wife of the chevalier, Guillaume du désert (IX), Jehan le Paulu (XXX), the pope's mother (XVI), or Théodore (XVIII), the Devil dons the human form. Rather than an attempt to humanize the Devil this technique is dramatized to show what great subtlety and daring of which he is capable. It is an attempt to dramatize on the stage, along with other truths of the faith, the very imminent danger of relying upon family and friends for one's conscience, and that anyone who advises something counter to the known will of God is in all likelihood an agent of the Devil or the Devil himself. Had not the Christ turned to Peter and said, "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art a stumbling-block unto me; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of man." (Matthew 16:23) Are not the chronicles of the Middle Ages full of instances when the human form cloaked the baneful presence of a demon? The miracles could scarcely ignore this common occurrence in their presentation of the realities, the actualités of life as the medieval man perceived it.

As several commentators, such as Petit de Julleville and Otto Patzer have pointed out, the miracles reflect more nearly than any other form of medieval drama the moeurs and the people of a large cross section of society of the fourteenth century. For example, the ordeal of childbirth finds graphic presentation in several plays, and one may be tempted to smile at the neighbor in the first miracle who places the Life of Saint Marguerite upon the suffering woman's chest in order to hurry along the birth of the child (vv. 290-293). The husband is duly ordered from the room. It comes as no surprise that two women die in
giving birth (XXIX, XXXVII) for we understand the superstition which accompanied the primitive knowledge of medicine. With such apparent attention to the externals of daily life it would indeed be strange if the underlying reality, that of the spiritual domain, were not faithfully portrayed in the miracles. Although this aspect of medieval life does not seem to appeal to the imagination of modern critics, who are tempted to minimize or explain it away in terms of modern understanding of psychology, it is perhaps best to take a cue from the attitudes of the characters in the miracles in assessing the importance of the largely unseen reality which includes the Devil and his infernal subjects.

The pope who shrinks from the touch of the Devil even as he is exorcizing him underlines for the spectator a real danger (XVI). Such scenes probably caused the folk in the audience to look askance at their neighbors for a moment and even cross themselves for safety. The pope's mother and Théodore, who have each inadvertently exorcized the enemy disguised as a man, quake in retrospect when it dawns upon them how close they have been to such a creature. Hence, one may understand the medieval reticence with strangers and the greeting "Dieu vous gar" when such a possibility is ever in mind.

The weapons prescribed against the Devil and played out on the stage tend to underscore the spiritual aspect of the Devil's person—that is, his superhuman and mercurial substance. Nobody offers to strike him or touch him in any way. It is understood that he and his minions are stronger, more powerful, and dangerous than any human adversary. The miracles demonstrate admirably the medieval understanding of St Paul's warning that "our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places"
(Ephesians 6:12). It is perhaps that such a consciousness of this reality which makes the life in the miracles a grim struggle rather than a light-hearted promenade. Hence, the use of invocations to the Virgin, the Trinity or any member thereof, holy water, and the sign of the cross are the "spiritual" arms which every believer may employ against the Enemy.

Somebody played the Devil or his minions in fifteen of the forty-three miracles which have been studied here, and this ratio seems a just, though inadvertent, reflection of the kind of behavior the medieval believers anticipated. It was believed that most diabolical undertakings were done in secret, that is from an invisible vantage. When the poet does write in the Devil or his demons as personages he uses great economy of dialogue and personnel; that is, unlike the later mystères which tend to multiply the number of demons who come together to compare notes, assign tasks and comment upon the proceedings, the number of speaking devils does not exceed two in any one of the miracles. The emphasis in the latter is generally upon the work and results obtained by the Enemy as he is known, and not so much upon his personal attributes and those of his cohorts. One is less concerned with the hierarchy than in later plays, for Lucifer is mentioned a few times as "le roy" by other devils named Belial, Sathan, Behemot or Vehemot, and Beelzebub. It appears that Beelzebub is second in command to Lucifer from the fact of his working so closely with "le roy" in the first miracle of the Cangé group. In the third one Behemot allows Sathan to share in his successful plot to catch the archdeacon, and he appears more self assured than the nervous Sathan in the presence of Christ during the trial. When there are two devils working together, there is some differentiation of personality and in tasks. In the play concerning the
eperor Julien the grandiose schemes of Beleal, who is evidently looking forward to a hero’s welcome when he reports en enfer, contrast with Sathan’s more intimate and apparently humorous project against a laborer’s wife and a monk (XIII). The latter seems to be content with the sheer fun of the thing and less concerned about the approbation of his sovereign Lucifer. In the miracle about the proost (XIV) the premier dyable, Sathan, is much depressed and answers irritably (v. 433) the greeting of his cohort Vehemot, who has just been commissioned to take the provost to purgatory. Sathan cheers up somewhat at the prospect of torturing the newcomer. These two appear again in the struggle with angels over the soul of Pierre le Changeur (XXXVI). Sathan is an able accuser before the tribunal, but Vehemot goes overboard and warmly challenges the Virgin to find one good deed in Pierre’s past. She does. These subtleties of character delineation are in keeping with the vague idea that different demons had different kinds of tasks of varying importance. Some start wars and others encourage individual vices, but in the miracles there is no consistent assignment discernible to any particular demons, unless it be Sathan or Sathanaz as he is sometimes styled. Very often the rubrics merely designate Premier Dyable, Second Dyable, l’Ennemi. One learns the names of the demons if the other characters address them by name. One extraordinary demon named Huët impersonates a young man in order to insinuate himself into the confidence of the hermit Jehan le Paulu (XXX). His opportunism is one of the excellent studies in the demonic character, for his discourse is full of double meaning, and his timing is flawless up until his premature exit from the scene, leaving the stunned murderer to collapse in what he expects will be fatal despair. It is unusual for demons to plan an extended visit as a human figure among men, for the danger of exorcism seems to
haunt them whenever they encroach upon the private lives of pious men and women.

One of the valuable bits of lore to the medieval spectator was the idea that not only could he defend himself from the Devil's onslaughts but he could react positively by inflicting pain on the Devil and his legions. This could be done in two major ways, as demonstrated in the miracles. The instructions to Théophile by the Devil state specifically that any pious deed gives him severe stomach cramps, and are to be avoided at all costs. The inference is not lost upon the medieval believer that every time he performs acts of charity or mercy he is in fact paying back the Devil in a very practical fashion. Since the Devil was credited with the illnesses suffered by men, it was only just somehow to repay in kind. There is nothing Scriptural to back this belief, but it was evidently a widespread conviction, for on more than one occasion the Devils complain of great physical suffering because of the piety of certain individuals. Another satisfying thought was that in thwarting the temptations which beset him, the believer sent the devil responsible back to hell to report failure and to receive a beating and other torments at the hand of "le roy Lucifer." The miracles feature several instances when the unsuccessful devils decide to try for another victim before reporting in to headquarters because of their fear of the displeasure of Lucifer. These plays seem to show consistently that the medieval man regarded the demonic society as an essentially cruel and vindictive one, and he hoped to deflect its sadistic activities from himself to the members of the evil league of demons.

In the vast panorama of medieval society teeming with courageous, restless, ambitious, selfish, fearful, vindictive, passionate, tender, and devout characters drawn from nearly every walk of life one will
discern, sometimes in the foreground and often in the background, the dark outlines of the "prince of this world" as a participant in the pathetic dramas large and small which the miracles present in good faith. Unlike the farces, which exaggerate for comic effect, or the moralities which personify certain intangibles and qualities of the human soul or conduct in an allegory of life, the miracles attempt to inculcate spiritual truth dressed in a physical, almost cinematic representation of earthly life as the medieval spectators experienced it. Thus necessarily the Devil enters the picture as a personnage of no mean importance, as he provides the motivation for all that is negative in the existence of the other characters: he is the catalyst which causes the abrasive and damaging explosions in the close associations of mankind. Far from being a whimsical or mythological character, the Devil as a personnage represent the real one whose existence and activities are as credible and discernible to the poet and his public as those of God and the Virgin. Aside from his historical interest illicited by such personnages as Clovis or St Alexis, whose venerable lives are merely inspiring legend now, the Devil who treated with them remains for the medieval spectator a very present reality.
NOTES FOR CONCLUSION

1. Sathanaz calls Enfer a "Fil a putain" more than once (vv. 1346, 1379), and Enfer says that Sathanaz has lost his senses for even thinking of defying the Christ.

2. The ironic references to enfer occur in Miracle III, especially in the passage of verses 1070 through 1084, where the words meurjoye, a storeroom for provisions, and hostel, an inn or house or refuge, are both implied by the demons.

3. Petit de Julleville says that about one quarter of the repertoire shows the mesure de la noblesse and of the court of the fourteenth century as seen from the point of view of the middle class. He suggests that another quarter of the plays gives a more accurate view of the bourgeoisie and the common people. A dozen or so mount the ecclesiastical circles from the papal court down to the house of a chanoine. The rest deal with the legends of the saints with one play derived from the canonical and apocryphal gospels and another dealing with an historical event, the conversion of Clovis. Mystères, I, 135.

Otto Patzer confines his remarks to what he terms the "worldly side of life" and in particular the feudal system and war customs such as the guaranteed safety of a herald (XXXVIII) who brings messages and the duty to take up arms for one's suzerain (VII), trial by combat (XII, XVII, XXXIII) to name a few. He also mentions the merging importance of the prosperous bourgeoisie in the military affairs as a change of the late fourteenth century.

4. Urban Tigner Holmes notes that in the late twelfth century all births were attended by midwives and that men were forbidden to be present on pain of death. See Daily Living in the Twelfth Century. (Madison, Wisconsin, 1964), p. 140.
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V. 1, Play No. 1 Miracle de l'enfant donné au diable
Play No. 2 Miracle de l'abbesse grosse
Play No. 3 Miracle de l'évesque que l'archidiaque murtrit
Play No. 4 Miracle de la femme du roy de Portugal
Play No. 5 Miracle de la nativité de nostre seigneur Jhesu Crist
Play No. 6 Miracle de saint Jehan Chrysothomes
Play No. 7 Miracle de la nonne qui laissa son abbaie
Play No. 8 Miracle de un pape qui vendi le basme

V. 2, Play No. 9 Miracle de saint Guillaume du desert
Play No. 10 Miracle de l'évesque a qui nostre Dame s'apparut
Play No. 11 Miracle de un marchant et un larron
Play No. 12 Miracle de la marquise de la Caudine
Play No. 13 Miracle de l'empereur Julien
Play No. 14 Miracle de un prevost que Nostre Dame delivra
Play No. 15 Miracle de un enfant que Nostre Dame resucita
Play No. 16 Miracle de la mère du Pape

V. 3, Play No. 17 Miracle de un perciassin escommenié
Play No. 18 Miracle de Theodore
Play No. 19 Miracle de un chanoine qui se maria
Play No. 20 Miracle de saint Sevestre
Play No. 21 Miracle de Pariaam et Josephat
Play No. 22 Miracle de saint Panthaleon

V. 4, Play No. 23 Miracle de Amis et Amille
Play No. 24 Miracle de saint Ignace
Play No. 25 Miracle de saint Valentin
Play No. 26 Miracle de une femme que Nostre Dame garde d'este arse
Play No. 27 Miracle de l'empereis de Romme
Play No. 28 Miracle de Oton, roy d'Espaigne
V. 5, Play No. 29 *Miracle de la fille du roy de Hongrie*
Play No. 30 *Miracle de saint Jehan le Paulu, hermite*
Play No. 31 *Miracle de Berthe*
Play No. 32 *Miracle du roy Thierry*

V. 6, Play No. 33 *Miracle de Robert le Dyable*
Play No. 34 *Miracle de sainte Bateuch*
Play No. 35 *Miracle de un marchant et un juif*
Play No. 36 *Miracle de Pierre le changeur*

V. 7, Play No. 37 *Miracle de la fille d'un roy*
Play No. 38 *Miracle de saint Lorens*
Play No. 39 *Miracle de Clovis*
Play No. 40 *Miracle de saint Alexis*


*Une jeune fille, laquelle se voulut abandonner a péché in Recueil de livrets rares et curieux. pub. by M. de Montaron. Paris: Guirandot, 1829.*