



The Doctrine of Charity in Mediaeval Literary Gardens: A Topical Approach through Symbolism and Allegory

D. W. Robertson, Jr.

Speculum, Volume 26, Issue 1 (Jan., 1951), 24-49.

Your use of the JSTOR database indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use. A copy of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use is available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>, by contacting JSTOR at jstor-info@umich.edu, or by calling JSTOR at (888)388-3574, (734)998-9101 or (FAX) (734)998-9113. No part of a JSTOR transmission may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except: (1) one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or (2) with prior written permission of JSTOR and the publisher of the article or other text.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Speculum is published by The Medieval Academy of America. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/medacad.html>.

Speculum

©1951 The Medieval Academy of America

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©1999 JSTOR

THE DOCTRINE OF CHARITY IN MEDIAEVAL LITERARY GARDENS: A TOPICAL APPROACH THROUGH SYMBOLISM AND ALLEGORY

By D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.

I

At the heart of mediaeval Christianity is the doctrine of Charity, the New Law which Christ brought to fulfill the Old Law so that mankind might be saved. Since this doctrine has extremely broad implications, it cannot be expressed satisfactorily in a few words, but for convenience we may use the classic formulation included in the *De doctrina Christiana* of St Augustine: 'Charitatem voco motum animi ad fruendum Deo propter ipsum, et se atque proximo propter Deum: cupiditatem autem, motum animi ad fruendum se et proximo et quolibet corpore non propter Deum.'¹ The opposite of Charity, as St Augustine describes it, is cupidity, the love of any creature, including one's self, for its own sake. These two loves, Charity and cupidity, are the two poles of the mediaeval Christian scale of values. For St. Augustine and for his successors among mediaeval exegetes, the whole aim of Scripture is to promote Charity and to condemn cupidity: 'Non autem praecipit Scriptura nisi charitatem, nec culpat nisi cupiditatem.'² Where this aim is not apparent in the letter of the Bible, one must seek it in the spirit beneath the veil of the letter. In the *De doctrina* there is developed a theory of literary interpretation by means of which one may remove the veil and effect the necessary discovery.

The obscurity of Scripture is useful, for it serves to exercise the intellect so that the truth may come to the reader in a pleasant and memorable way: 'Nunc tamen nemo ambigit, et per similitudines libentius quaeque cognosci, et cum aliqua difficultate quaesita multo gratius inveniri.'³ The pleasure accompanying the search for and the discovery of Charity in the Bible is thus, as H.-I. Marrou has said, a pleasure 'd'ordre littéraire,'⁴ so that reading the Bible confers aesthetic as well as spiritual rewards. To obtain these rewards, one must not only be familiar with purely rhetorical devices but also with the meanings of objects in the physical world: 'Rerum autem ignorantia facit obscuras figuratas locutiones, cum ignoramus vel animantium, vel lapidum, vel herbarum naturas, aliarumve rerum, quae plerumque in Scripturis similitudinis alicujus gratia ponuntur.'⁵ In other words, one must be able to read the Book of God's Work in order to understand His Word. In the later Middle Ages, the *trivium* was devoted to studies facilitating the literal reading of the Bible. It was for this purpose that one studied rhetoric. The *quadrivium* furnished the necessary information about creation to enable one to discover allegorical and tropological values, 'in quibus constat cognitio veritatis et amor virtutis: et haec est vera reparatio hominis.'⁶

The techniques of reading developed by St Augustine were not confined to the study of the Bible. Thus, Rabanus Maurus prefaces his transcript of part of the *De doctrina* in the *De clericorum institutione* with an indication that the methods described apply to the reading of profane as well as of sacred letters.⁷ And in the *Didascalicon*, which is basically an elaboration of the *De doctrina*, Hugh of St

Victor describes a procedure for arriving at the underlying meaning of literature of any kind. One begins with the *letter*, or grammatical structure, turns next to the *sense*, or obvious meaning, and finally to the *sentence*, or doctrinal content, which furnishes the desired allegorical and tropological values.⁸ Profane letters were thought of as being allegorical in much the same way as the Bible is allegorical. To quote Professor Charles G. Osgood, "This allegorical theory of poetry, deriving from the Ancients, and sustained in early medieval times by a naturally strong inclination to symbolism and allegory, supports the allegorical quality of literature and art from Prudentius to Spenser. Nor is it confined only to formal allegory such as the *Divine Comedy*, but suspects and seeks ulterior meaning in all art and poetry worthy of the name."⁹ In this paper I wish to examine first some of the more obvious meanings of gardens and garden materials as they are explained in mediaeval commentaries and encyclopedias. The selection of this particular chapter from the Book of God's Work is purely arbitrary; similar studies might be made of names, numbers, animals, stones, or other things. When a sufficient background of meanings, presumably of the kind studied in the *quadrivium*, has been presented, I wish to show that the conventionally established meanings are relevant to the interpretation of natural and artificial gardens in mediaeval literature. When these conventional meanings are applied in 'art and poetry worthy of the name' it becomes apparent, I believe, that mediaeval literary authors frequently share the primary aim of Scripture, to promote Charity and to condemn its opposite, cupidity. Not all mediaeval literary gardens may be included in a preliminary study of this kind, so that I have selected a few typical gardens from a wide range of literary types. At the same time, I have used illustrations which cover a very long period, from the early Middle Ages to the second half of the fourteenth century.

Many gardens are little more than groves of trees, and still others have a tree as a central feature. Some notion of the significance of the tree is still familiar, since it occupies a very important position in the story of the Fall, which involves the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil; and the Redemption involves another tree, the Tree of Life, or the Cross. In the Middle Ages, the very important position of these trees in Biblical narrative gave rise to an enormous complex of associations. Any tree may be considered as an aspect of one of the trees just mentioned, or as a transitional growth between the two extremes. A tree *per se* without further qualification suggests both of them. Any tree may have implications for the individual, for society, or for the afterlife. Thus the Tree of Life variously represents *sapientia*, the Cross, Christ, or the good Christian.¹⁰ The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil was not evil in itself, since God put nothing evil in Paradise; but eating the fruit of the tree represents turning away from God in pride. When man suffered the consequences, he knew "quid intersit inter bonum quod deseruit, et malum quod cecidet."¹¹ After they had eaten the fruit Adam and Eve concealed themselves 'in medio ligni paradisi' (Gen. 3.8). St Augustine comments: 'Quis se abscondit a conspectu Dei, nisi qui deserto ipso incipit jam amare quod suum est? Jam enim habebant cooperimenta mendacii: qui autem loquitur mendacium, de suo loquitur (Jo. 8.44). Et ideo ad arborem

se dicitur abscondere, quae erat in medio paradisi, id est ad seipsos, qui in medio rerum infra Deum et supra corpora ordinati erant.¹² To hide within the tree is to hide within oneself in self-love or cupidity. In one sense, the tree represents free will, and the eating of the fruit is the corruption of the will that follows abandonment of reason.¹³ Theoretically, the reason is made up of three parts: memory, intellect, and will. When these parts are preserved in their proper hierarchy, with the will subservient to the other two, they reflect the Trinity and constitute the Image of God in man.¹⁴ But when the will dominates in disobedience, the Image is corrupted. To eat the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is to corrupt the Image of God, and to hide under the tree is to seek protection in lying rationalization.

The shade of the tree where Adam and Eve sought refuge is frequently associated with *scientia* (as opposed to *sapientia*), for worldly wisdom is conducive to a false sense of security. This shade is vividly and eloquently described in a sermon by Hugh of St Victor:

Cave ergo ne et tu dum sub umbra, foliorum requiem quaeris, incipias pati caliginem. Nec possis in umbra positus clare discernere; quia imago quae apparet umbra, sola est, non veritas. Hanc ergo umbram foliorum suspectam habe, ne decipiaris. Quae sunt folia? Species rerum visibilibus folia sunt; quae modo quidem pulchra et virentia apparent, sed cadent subito cum turbo exierit. Quae sunt folia? Domus, vineae, horti, piscinae, sylva lignorum, germinantium, familiae, possessiones, aurum, argentum, substantiae regum et provinciarum: lyrae, citharae, tibiae, organa, scyphi, et urcei, et vasa pretiosa divitiae et pompae, et gloria: omnia haec folia sunt. Quare folia? Quia vana, quia caduca, quia transitoria: ideo folia. Virent quidem modico tempore, sed cito arescunt et cadunt. Sed tamen dum stant, umbram faciunt et habent refrigerium suum; sed est obscura umbra et inimica lumini. . . . Ideo dixi ut suspectam habeas umbram, qui te sub foliis positum confiteris. Sub foliis es, in umbra es, et sapientiam iuxta te vides. Vide diligenter ne forte non sit sapientia, sed aliud aliquid latens sub specie illius. Quae est enim sapientia in umbra foliorum? Nam umbram foliorum dilectio est et jocunditas in specie et pulchritudine rerum transitoriarum. Et habet ista sapientiam suam. Sic enim homines vacant sapientiam qua ista requies, et tranquillitas ista carnis callide et astute queritur, et prudenter conservatur . . . et lumen verae sapientiae, apud quam stultitia est sapientia ista, videre non possunt.¹⁵

Here the leaves of the tree are the objects of worldly vanity—wealth, physical beauty, music, and so on—and the shade is the deceitful comfort which things of this kind afford, a comfort fortified by a *scientia* which excludes true wisdom or *sapientia*. In the shade the image we see ‘sola est,’ without the higher meaning of Divine truth. But the leaves ultimately fall, leaving the person seeking shelter fully exposed to the heat and light from which he sought to escape. As we shall see, this light is the sunshine of God’s justice. These transitory leaves should be contrasted sharply with the evergreen leaves of the Tree of Life, which represent the unfading and eternal Word of God. They offer true protection to those who seek solace beneath them.¹⁶

Tropological elaborations of the two trees as trees of the virtues and vices were extremely popular in the Middle Ages. Unusually fine specimens appear in the *De fructibus carnis et spiritus* printed by Migne among the works of Hugh of St Victor. The edition in the *Patrologia* contains a schematic reproduction of

the manuscript illustration which shows some of the wider implications of the trees very clearly. The evil tree on the left appears under the rubric *Vetus Adam*, or man unredeemed. The tree is rooted in *superbia* and its crowning fruit is *luxuria*. On branches which droop toward the ground are six other vices depicted as fruits surrounded by vicious leaves. The tree is prominently marked *Babylonia*. The good tree on the right appears under the rubric *Novus Adam* to indicate man redeemed and in a state of grace. It is rooted in *humilitas* and its crowning fruit is *caritas*. On ascending branches hang the other two theological virtues and the cardinal virtues surrounded by virtuous leaves. It is marked *Hierosolyma*.¹⁷ Other fruits for these trees appear when they are considered on other levels. For example, when the good tree is the Cross, its fruit is Christ.¹⁸ When the tree is Christ, its fruits are the Apostles and their successors;¹⁹ when the tree is an individual its fruits may be good works.²⁰ Anagogically, the fruit is eternal life.²¹ In any event, the symbolic act of eating the fruit confers salvation on the individual. The fruit of the evil tree has corresponding and opposite values.

Some of this material may be clarified by reference to a simple example of the use of these meanings in art. The Ruthwell Cross, a stone monument probably dating from the first half of the eighth century, shows on its sides two panels covered with foliage. In the foliage are birds and beasts eating the fruit.²² In the light of what has been said above, it is clear that the carvings are not merely decorative. The foliage is made up of the unfading leaves of the Tree of Life, and the birds and beasts are those who in the shelter of the Word of God eat the fruit of eternal life. Monuments such as this undoubtedly suggest to their creators various levels of significance. Thus in the Old English poem, *The Dream of the Rood*, part of which appears on the Ruthwell Cross, there is a clear reference to the tropological level of meaning. Referring to the Day of Judgment, the poet observes: 'Ne þearf ðær þonne ænig unforht wesan/þe him ær in breostum bereð beacna selest.' No one who has borne the Tree within him need fear at the Last Judgment. To live righteously is to live in the image of the Tree of Life, or in imitation of Christ. Then one bears the fruit of good works which assures the fruit of the anagogical tree and a place before it.

The author of the *De fructibus*, as we have seen, associates the two trees with Jerusalem and Babylon. To see the full implications of the trees, we must examine these concepts briefly. Jerusalem (*visio pacis*) implies tropologically virtue and spiritual peace, allegorically the Church of the faithful, and anagogically the Celestial City. Babylon (*confusio*) implies the opposites of these things. The two cities, as St Augustine explains in the *De civitate Dei*, spring from two loves, Charity and cupidity. Properly, all Christians are strangers and pilgrims in the world: 'Carissimi, obsecro vos tanquam advenas et peregrinos abstinere vos a carnalibus desideriis' (1 Pet. 2.11). The manner of the voyage from Babylon to Jerusalem is succinctly described by Peter Lombard:

Sciendum itaque est duas esse spirituales civitates in praesenti: unam malorum quae incoepit a Cain, et dicitur Babylonia; alteram bonorum, quae coepit ab Abel, et dicitur Jerusalem. Illius cives facit cupiditas, Jerusalem cives facit caritas. Quae licet sint mistae corpore, separatae sunt mente, quarum una peregrinatur in altera, et captiva tenetur.

Quandiu enim sumus in hoc corpore, peregrinamur a Domino, qui de Babylonia ad Jerusalem suspiramus, id est de saeculo et corpore peccati ad coelum . . . De hac tamen captivitate incipit redire, qui incipit amare. Charitas enim ad reditum movet pedem.²³

The direction of man's journey is thus dependent on the kind of love which moves in his will. Cupidity, which is the source of all of man's sins and hence of his discontents, makes a Babylon of the individual mind, a Babylon of society, and leads to an ultimate Babylon in eternal damnation. Charity brings the peace of Jerusalem to the mind, to society, and to the Celestial City where its radiance is all-pervasive. With these loves go two fears. Cupidity is accompanied by the fear of earthly misfortune, and Charity is accompanied by the fear of God which leads to wisdom. The supreme importance of this concept in Christian doctrine may be indicated with a brief quotation from Peter Lombard, who here reflects a traditional Augustinian position: 'Omnia ergo peccata, duae res faciunt in homine, scilicet cupiditas et timor: sic econtra amor Dei et timor ejus ducunt ad omnem bonum. Amas enim ut bene sit tibi; times ne male sit tibi. Hoc age in Deo, non in saeculo. Uterque amor incendit, uterque timor humiliat.'²⁴ Both loves inflame, and both fears humiliate, but the two loves produce radically opposite results. These loves and fears are the key to the behavior of any individual, and the key to his destiny.

The fact that the word love (*amor*) could be used for either Charity or cupidity opened enormous possibilities for literary word-play. It is also, I believe, responsible for the manifest preoccupation with 'love' in mediaeval literature. A certain very significant discrepancy between the scheme represented in the traditional Augustinian position just outlined and the scheme of the trees in the *De fructibus* is relevant in this connection. The crowning fruits of the trees are *caritas* and *luxuria* rather than *caritas* and *cupiditas*. Again, if we look in St Bonaventura's magnificent account of the two cities in the Prologue to his comment on Ecclesiastes, we find the word *libido* used where we should expect *cupiditas*.²⁵ And in the treatise on the two loves written by Gérard of Liège the contrast is obviously one between the love of God and sexual love.²⁶ But this tradition is also Augustinian, for St Augustine interpreted the word *fornicatio* in the Scriptures to mean not only illicit conjunction of the sexes, but also idolatry or any aspect of love of the world as opposed to the love of God.²⁷ When *luxuria* or *fornicatio* is used symbolically, either one well describes the sin of Adam and Eve and may be justly placed as the crowning fruit of the Tree of Babylon. The evil tree thus suggests idolatrous sexual love, an extreme form of cupidity and a reflection of the Fall.

Trees exist in various stages of development, and there are many widely different types of trees. For example, a tree appears with budding leaves at the approach of summer in Matt. 24.32: 'Ab arbore et folia nata, scitis quia prope est aestas; ita et vos, cum videritis haec omnia, scitote quia prope est in ianuis.' The context shows that the budding tree is a promise of the second coming, which implies the Resurrection of the Just. The *Glossa ordinaria* contains the observation that the dry tree is revived with faith and charity, and that the new leaves are the 'verba praedicationis' which announce the summer of 'aeterna serenitas.'²⁸ On the other hand, in Ju. 12 there are some 'arbores autumnales, bis mortuae,

eradicatae.' Bede explains that the autumnal trees bear either no fruit or evil fruit. They are individuals who perform no good works and who live in despair of salvation.²⁹ Among trees of various species, the palm has a prominent place. It is a symbol of the just, since its flowers of hope do not fall but produce the fruit of eternal reward. In contrast to the flower of the flesh, Bede explains, the palm flourishes in the sunshine of God's justice.³⁰ Generally, the good tree is a green tree. Thus, in Luc. 23.31 Christ exclaims: 'Quia si in viridi ligno haec faciunt, in arido quid fiet?' The *Glossa ordinaria*, following Bede, identified the green tree with Christ and His elect, the dry tree with sinners.³¹ Hence the willow, because of its persistent green foliage is sometimes identified with the just.³² But much more commonly it represents those sterile in good works, since it bears no fruit, and it is associated with the waters of cupidity. In this sense, its green leaves are words of false piety.³³ An especially interesting variant of the Tree of Life is afforded by the sycamore. Its peculiarity arises from the story of Zacchaeus, who in Luc. 19.4 climbs a sycamore in order to see Jesus. The sycamore's leaf resembles that of the fig, but its fruit is not attractive, so that it came to be called 'ficus fatua.' In the commentaries, however, it represents foolishness in the eyes of the world and wisdom in the eyes of God. Extending this concept, commentators associate it with faith or with the Cross, and they sometimes point out that the faithful will, like Zacchaeus, climb the sycamore.³⁴ Conversely, the sycamore may represent 'vana scientia,' but this meaning is rare.³⁵ St Bernard divides evil trees into three classes: those which do not bear fruit, like the elm; those hypocritical trees which bear fruit that is not their own; and those trees which bear fruit too early so that it is destroyed before it ripens.³⁶

This brief account of the higher meanings of the tree is by no means exhaustive. Trees may be manured, transplanted, pruned, blown by winds, burned, or otherwise affected in Scriptural contexts, with consequent modifications of their significances, and there are many varieties of trees with special subsidiary meanings. Enough material has been adduced, however, to afford an initial grasp of what a tree may involve, so that we may turn our attention to other garden materials. Flowers occur in great variety in the Scriptures, and although the flower does not have quite the central significance of the tree in Christian doctrine, the commentators devote a great deal of attention to it. Thus, for example, there is a long list of flowers together with their higher meanings in the *De universo* of Rabanus Maurus. The flowers of the palm have already been mentioned above. Some specific flowers, as we should expect, have both good and evil meanings of some importance. The rose, as Rabanus describes it, is an unfading flower of martyrdom in Eccles. 23.14 and 50.8.³⁷ On the other hand, in Sap. 2.8. the heretics crown themselves with garlands of roses obviously associated with lechery and idolatry. Because of the direct Scriptural connection between the lily and Christ, the lily has customarily only a good meaning. It is well known that a combination of lilies and roses was used to show martyrdom and purity, Charity and innocence, or related ideas. Pictures of the Annunciation, like that by Filippo Lippi, sometimes show an angel presenting a lily to the Blessed Virgin Mary. In one sense, a picture of this kind is a picture of a lily and a rose. One Scriptural flower

deserves special attention and emphasis, the *flos faeni*, which represents the transitory glory of the flesh. In Isaiah 40.6-8, it is contrasted with the Word of God: 'Omnis caro faenum, et omnis gloria ejus quasi flos agri. Exsiccatum est faenum, et cecidit flos, quia spiritus Domini sufflavit in eo. Vere faenum est populus; exsiccatum est faenum, et cecidit flos; verbum autem Domini manet in aeternum.' In his comment on this passage, St Jerome uses as an illustration of the transient flower the beauty of a girl, who, in her youth, attracts many followers. But her beauty soon fades. In the same way, those who bear the earthly image, serving vices and lechery, have but a transient glory. On the contrary, those who bear the Image of God and cherish it share the glory of the Word of God, which does not fade:

Pulchra mulier quae adolescentorum post se trahebat greges, arata fronte contrahitur; et quae prius amori, posteo fastidio est . . . Exsiccata est igitur caro, et cecidit pulchritudo, quia spiritu furoris Dei atque sententiae flavit in ea (ut a generali disputatione ad Scripturae ordinem revertamur), ejus qui portat imaginem terreni, et servit vitiis atque luxuriae, foenumque est et flos praeteriens. Qui autem habet atque custodit imaginem coelestis, ille caro est quae cernit salutare Domini, quae cotidie renovatur in cogitationem secundum imaginem Creatoris, et incorruptibile atque immortale corpus accipiens, mutat gloriam, non naturam, Verbum autem Domini nostri, et hi qui sociati verbi sunt, permaneat in aeternum.³⁹

The *flos faeni* appears elsewhere in Scripture and in the work of other commentators. In Iac. 1.10, 11, it is said that the rich man, or the man who sets his heart on worldly treasure, 'sicut flos feni transibit. Exortus est enim sol cum ardore, et arefcit fenum, et flos ejus decidit.' Bede compares this flower, which may be fragrant and beautiful, but which is nevertheless transitory, with temporal felicity which fades in the sunshine of God's justice.⁴⁰ The flower of the flesh was not slow to appear in European poetry. For example, the epitaph attributed to Alcuin warns: 'Ut flores pereunt vento veniente minaci/Sic tua namque caro, gloria tota perit.' This is not a mere simile. In Isaiah and in the commentaries, the flower is contrasted with the Word of God, which as we have seen, is represented by the leaf which does not wither on the Tree of Life. An explicit contrast between the flower and the leaf appears in a position of prominence at the beginning of the most authoritative of all commentaries on the most widely read book of the Bible, St Augustine's commentary on the Psalms: 'Et folium eius non decidet, id est verbum ejus non erit irritum; quia omnis caro foenum, et claritas hominis ut flos foeni; foenum aruit, et flos decidit, verbum autem Domini manet in aeternum.'⁴¹ To the fading flower of human glory and radiance is here opposed the evergreen leaf of the Tree of Life. This contrast is familiar in the vernacular literature of the later Middle Ages.⁴² Meanwhile, it should be noted that the *flos faeni* has definite associations with feminine beauty, a kind of beauty which sometimes tempts man to seek a deceptive shade.

Gardens frequently contain wells or streams by means of which the trees and flowers are watered. Thus in Ps. 1, the Tree of Life grows 'secus decursus aquarum,' and in Apoc. 22.1-2 it stands on either side of a 'fluvium aquae vitae splendidum tanquam crystallum.'⁴³ Again, in Genesis, the Tree is associated with a river

which flows away in four streams, usually said to be the cardinal virtues. The Water of Life, which either flows by the tree or emanates from it,⁴⁴ is variously interpreted as baptism, wisdom, true doctrine, *Christus irrigans*, Charity, or the Holy Spirit.⁴⁵ This water is contrasted with the temporal water of cupidity offered by the Samaritan woman in Jo. 4.13-14, which has opposite values. Either tree may be depicted beside a river or shading a well or fountain. As we have already seen, the willow grows beside evil waters. In the later Middle Ages, the well beside the good tree also suggests the Blessed Virgin Mary, who was called 'Well of Grace.' Representations of the Cross standing beside a well were common in late mediaeval art. St Augustine associates the Rock whence flow the Living Waters, a common Scriptural designation of Christ, with the Tree of Life.⁴⁶ The fountain or well under either tree may be thought of as coming from a rock or stone basin.

Many gardens offer protection to singing birds. The *De universo* of Rabanus supplies a list of various species with their higher meanings. Although the birds in Scripture frequently tend to have an evil significance, representing evil spirits, vices, and so on,⁴⁷ St Ambrose describes the birds in the Garden of Eden at some length, showing that the song they sing is an inspiration to Charity. St Gregory finds good birds in the parable of the Grain of Mustard Seed. The very small seed grows into a very large tree, in which the birds of the air find shelter. The seed is the seed of doctrine planted by Christ, the branches of the tree are holy preachers who have spread the doctrine throughout the world, and the birds who rest in the shade are pious spirits who desire to abandon terrestrial things and fly to celestial realms.⁴⁸ A more elaborate development of these ideas appears in Bede's comment on Matthew.⁴⁹ The tree itself is an aspect of the Tree of Life.

Having considered the most important elements which combine to form gardens, we may now examine complete gardens very briefly. To begin with, the Tree of Life stands in a *hortus deliciarum*. The garden surrounding the Tree and irrigated by its waters is interpreted in various ways. Usually, it symbolizes either the Church allegorically or the individual tropologically. Anagogically it is the New Jerusalem.⁵⁰ A garden with a *fons signatus*, this time called a *hortus conclusus*, also appears in the *Canticum*; and the commentators, in accordance with their usual practice, relate the two gardens. Like the Paradise of Genesis, the garden of the *Canticum* represents the Church or the individual, although it is sometimes used in praise of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The commentaries on it yield a wealth of values for trees and flowers.⁵¹ An especially valuable tropological description of the garden may be found in Richard of St Victor's sermons. We are shown in some detail how one may prevent or eradicate weedy vices and encourage the desirable plants. In this discussion the *fons* is the 'anima devota,' and the *puteus aquarum viventium* is the Holy Spirit.⁵² The *fons* is to be associated with the well or fountain under the Tree of Life, but the appearance of the well here without the tree makes possible the literary or artistic use of wells and streams independently of the two trees. The meaning of the garden is general enough so that it may represent an individual, the world of men or the Church, or the next world. These meanings have considerably more force when we re-

member that Christ is described at one point in Scripture as a *Hortulanus*. The nature of any garden, that is, of any individual, any society of men, or any ultimate afterlife, is determined, in a given instance, upon whether Christ, or *sapientia*, is the gardener. When Christ is the gardener, the garden is ruled by wisdom and suffused with the warmth of Charity. Otherwise it is ruled by worldly wisdom or *scientia* and suffused with cupidity. To the mediaeval mind, cupidity or self-love can lead only to the discomfort and disaster of an unweeded garden.

We may conclude that the various meanings of trees, flowers, streams, and other features of gardens have a very wide scope, and that they suggest what were regarded in the Middle Ages as the most important doctrines of Christianity. In fact, their implications are wide enough so that it would be possible to use the two trees and their surroundings for a contrast just as fundamental and meaningful as that between the two cities which underlies St Augustine's *De civitate Dei*. To rest comfortably in the shade of the wrong tree amounts to the same thing as to make a home in Babylon. If one wished to distinguish the two forms of expression, one might say that the garden suggests forcibly the truth as it is contained in Genesis and the *Canticum*, whereas the city suggests the truth as it is expressed in later Old Testament history and in the Psalms. Both devices appear in the Prophetic Books and in the New Testament. The garden image emphasizes the relationship between the sexes, which is apparent on the surface in both Genesis and the *Canticum*, so that it tends to be associated with idolatrous sexual love used as a symbol for extreme cupidity. The conventional associations of both the evil tree and the *flos faeni* reinforce this tendency. But, at the same time, the sexual relationship is not a necessary adjunct of the garden, since the Fall of Adam and Eve was only figuratively sexual, as is the relationship expressed in the *Canticum*. This is not to say that cities and gardens afford the only means of making the contrast between Charity and cupidity. Since all creation is meaningful in the same way, the number of ways of making the contrast is infinite. For, it should be recalled, it is not the words *tree* or *city* which are meaningful, but trees and cities themselves. Creation is an expression of God's infinite love, but to see it there, one must set aside the shell, which is in itself the object of scientific investigation, to find the kernel beneath, the food of wisdom and, in accordance with mediaeval doctrine, the source of the only true beauty human eyes may see.

II

The appearance of the higher meanings of garden materials in early vernacular poetry may be illustrated in *Beowulf*. Competent scholars now agree that the author of the poem was a man of considerable learning and that his basic intention was pious, although the 'interpolator' still lingers in the background.⁶³ One scene in the poem appears to utilize certain features of the materials presented above, the picture of Grendel's mere. It has already been observed that a very similar description is used in one of the Blicking Homilies to suggest Hell,⁶⁴ which is simply the evil garden taken anagogically. As the *Beowulf* poet describes the scene, its general features at once suggest commonplace Scriptural associa-

tions: a stream makes a pool in a place surrounded by overhanging trees, and beside the pool is a rock. Certain attributes of the scene are extremely significant. In the first place, the pool is the dwelling of a giant, one of the generation of Cain. In Bede's *Hexameron* we find that the giants of Gen. 6.4. were 'terrenis concupiscentiis adhaerentes' and that although they were destroyed in the Flood, they arose again thereafter.⁵⁶ Figuratively, the generation of Cain is simply the generation of the unjust to which all those governed by cupidity belong. They are monsters because they have distorted or destroyed the Image of God within themselves. Babylon, as we have seen, traditionally began with Cain, and it is maintained on earth by his generation. We may say as much for the evil garden. Thus Grendel is the type of the militant heretic or worldly man, and his dwelling is appropriately in the waters which are the opposite of those which spring from the Rock of Christ. It is pertinent also that Beowulf should find under these waters a sword which is a relic of the struggle between the giants and the just in the days before the Flood (ll. 1687-1693). The poet could hardly refer more specifically to the character of the pool and of its inhabitants. The relationship between the stream and the rock is not entirely clear in the poem, but the rock is a part of the traditional scenery, one of the elements associated with either garden. The trees overhang the pool in a manner suggesting that they shade it, excluding from it, or seeming to exclude from it, the sunshine of God's justice. This impression is reinforced by the fact that the pool suddenly becomes light when Beowulf kills Grendel's mother, who may be taken as the source of the evil which her offspring spreads throughout the world:

1570 Lixte se leoma, leoht inne stod,
 efne swa of hefene hadre scineð
 rodores candel.⁵⁶

The trees are covered with frost, a feature which Professor Klaeber recognizes as being symbolic. On the word *hrinde* (l. 1363) he comments: "The epithet is eminently suitable symbolically. . . . It is not to be imagined that Beowulf found the trees covered with hoar-frost. He would not have sailed for Denmark in winter."⁵⁷ Implicit in these observations is the excellent principle that when a work by an obviously accomplished mediaeval poet does not seem to make sense on the surface, one must look beneath the surface for the meaning. Frost and ice are traditional symbols of Satan, whom God permits to tempt the human spirit to fall in cupidity.⁵⁸ Moreover, the chill of cupidity may be considered characteristic of the evil garden as opposed to the warmth of Charity in the good garden. The trees, the rock, and the pool all point strongly to the theory that what the poet had in mind was the evil garden of the Scriptures.

Grendel's mere has other attributes which tend to reinforce this interpretation. We are told that the hart pursued by hounds chooses rather to give up its life than to hide its head in the grove surrounding the pool. Literally, this description makes little sense, since a hart could hardly fear a fate worse than death. But the associations of Ps. 42 lead us to recognize in the hart the faithful Christian who seeks his Lord in the Living Waters. Thus Bede wrote in his poem on this Psalm:

cervus ut ad fontes sitiens festinat aquarum,
 sic mea mens ardet te, conditor alme, requirens
 viventemque sitit te cernere libera lucem.

But the hart in *Beowulf* carefully avoids Grendel's waters, which he knows will not assuage his thirst. The example of Adam and Eve has warned him that this is not an effective hiding place. He prefers death to the eternal damnation which results from hiding under the wrong trees. We may see the opposite of the hart in the monsters which swim about in the pool or rest on its banks. The poet says somewhat cryptically of them,

ða on undernmæl oft bewitigað
 sorhfulne sið on segrade,
 1430 wyrmas ond wildeor.

Professor Klaeber's note on this passage has a tone of despair: "In any case, consistency is not to be postulated in the descriptions of the scenery."⁶⁹ However, if we see in these monsters those who allow their spirits to be killed by Grendel, the sea voyage they make does not involve an actual sea, somehow contiguous with the pool, but is merely the last journey which leads, in this instance, to damnation. In so far as the epic as a whole is concerned, the interpretation of Grendel's mere as a reflection of the evil garden is consistent with the attitude toward the poem expressed in the introduction to Klaeber's most recent edition. The suggestion of Christ which Klaeber sees in *Beowulf* should lead us to expect further suggestions of the same kind consistently and thematically interwoven in the poem. Although it is obvious that *Beowulf* is not Christ historically, every true Christian lives in imitation of Christ, and there are certain virtues and abilities which a ruler must exhibit in the course of this imitation. In the Grendel episode *Beowulf* shows himself capable of purifying a society of men from the forces of cupidity. The fact that neither Christ nor the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is mentioned in the poem is in keeping with the principles of Augustinian literary interpretation. An intellectual effort is necessary to discern Divine truth in the arrangement of materials in the poem, and it is from the fruitful pursuit of this effort, not from the decoration on the outer shell, that the poem's aesthetic value arises.

In *Beowulf* the evil garden is repulsive on the surface. But the shade of the tree undoubtedly seemed attractive to Adam and Eve, and, moreover, we who succeed them are also tempted by it. There is, thus, no reason why the evil garden should not be made to appear superficially attractive. A picture of a more attractive evil garden appears at the beginning of the Old English 'Doomsday' based on the *De die iudicii* attributed to Bede:

Hwæt! Ic ana sæt	innan bearwe,
mid helme beþeht,	holte tomiddes,
þær þa wæterburnan	swegdon and urnon
on middan gehæge	eal swa ic secge.
5 Eac þær wynwyrta	weoxon and bleowon
innon þarm gemonge	on ænlicum wonge,
and þa wudubeamas	wagedon and swegdon;

purh winda gryre wolen wæs gehrered
and min earme mod eal wæs gedrefed.

The poem goes on to express the speaker's fears concerning his state of sin and the coming of Doomsday, when the world and its garden will be no more. It should be noticed that the wood is 'helme beþeht,' indicating that the speaker is hiding from the sun of God's justice. He sits 'holte tomiddes,' *in medio ligni*. Beneath the trees in this 'gehæge' bloom the flowers of the flesh watered by the streams of worldly wisdom. But a storm arises. That is, the wood where Adam and Eve sought protection, even though its flowers and rippling streams may seem attractive, will soon pass in the storm of God's wrath.⁶⁰ In spite of the flowers and murmuring streams, the speaker is not altogether comfortable. A famous successor to this poet also found himself uneasy in this grove:

Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita
mi ritrovai per una selva oscura
che la diritta via era smarrita.

A very suggestive picture of the good garden, rich in conventional detail, appears in the Old Irish *Saltair na Rann*, a verse paraphrase of Scripture. I quote the translation of the late Robin Flower, who observed justly that the words of the poem 'remember an accumulated beauty of tradition.'⁶¹

The Tree of Life with bloom unchanged,
Round it the goodly hosts are ranged,
Its leafy crest showers dewdrops round
All Heaven's spreading garden-ground.

There flock bright birds, a shining throng,
And sing their grace-perfected song
While boundless mercy round them weaves
Undying fruit, unfading leaves.

A lovely flock! bright like the sun,
A hundred feathers clothe each one,
And pure and clear they chant together
A hundred songs for every feather.

Here are the unfading flowers, leaves, and fruit of the commentaries, and the birds of the parable who sing the *canticum novum* of Ps. 32.3 and Apoc. 14.3. The tree grows in the anagogical *hortus deliciarum*, freshening its surroundings with the Water of Life in the form of dew.⁶² It is apparent from these illustrations that the various elements connected with the two gardens may be combined in a variety of ways to suit the needs of a given poet or audience, and that other materials, like frost or dew, may be associated with them. The Irish poet wished to convey the harmonious beauty of Charity in the Celestial Kingdom. Throughout these pieces there runs an implicit contrast between human cupidity and the ideal of Charity, and in all of them the intention is to make Charity understandable and desirable.

The literature to be examined now was written after the appearance of the *Didascalicon*, so that we may use the terminology of the three levels of interpretation — *letter*, *sense*, and *sentence* — with some justification. We have seen that

the evil garden may be superficially attractive, as it is in the poem on Doomsday. For purposes of courtly irony and humor it was made even more attractive in the twelfth century. The *De amore* of Andreas Capellanus has been taken very seriously by a number of modern critics, who in this respect follow the example of Bishop Tempier, but through an examination of the garden in it we may be able to see that the author's intention was not actually very different from that of the *Beowulf* poet. An ironic presentation of the evil garden for purposes of satire has the same ultimate effect as a straightforward presentation to illustrate Christian herosim on the part of one conquering its evil. In the fifth dialogue of the *De amore* the nobleman who addresses a noble lady uses as a part of his seductive argument a description of a garden said to show the fates of lovers of various types. This garden is divided into three sections. The central part, called Amoenitas, is covered by the branches of a tall tree bearing fruit of all kinds. From its base springs a fountain of clear water. Two thrones for a king and queen of love stand beside the fountain, very richly decorated. A great many couches are situated in this inner garden, and by each one flows a small stream from the fountain. When knights and ladies occupy the couches they are entertained by jugglers and by musicians playing on all kinds of instruments. The delights of Amoenitas are reserved for those women who 'sapienter se amoris noverunt praebere militibus et amare volentibus cunctum praestare favorem et sub comento amoris subdole amorem petentibus digna praenoverunt responsa tribuere.' They give their gifts freely, but with the restrictions necessary to true love. As Andreas explains in I, x, true love must center on a single object. The second garden area, surrounding the first one, is soggy and marshy with the waters of the fountain, which are here unbearably cold. Meanwhile, the sun pours down unmercifully, for this part of the garden is unshaded. It is occupied by women who 'petentium omnium fuerunt annuentes libidini et nulli petenti suae ianuae negaverunt ingressum.' These women, clearly, lack a certain kind of wisdom. Finally, the outer area is very dry and hot. The earth bakes in the sun, which burns terribly. Ladies in this area sit on bundles of thorns, which are obligingly revolved beneath them by attendants. These ladies are followers of the God of Love who refused his knights altogether. A beautiful road stretches from the edge of this outer garden into the center, and on it no one feels any pain at all.

On the surface, or level of *sense*, this description seems to reinforce the nobleman's argument that the lady should submit to him, since the outer section of the garden seems rather uncomfortable, and he insists that she will occupy it if she does not submit. But underneath, on the level of the *sentence*, the description is perfectly harmonious with what Andreas says in Book III. The assorted fruit of the tree at the center of the garden suggest at once the hypocritical trees which do not bear their own fruit in St Bernard's classification of evil trees, and the shaded atmosphere of temporal wealth and amusement closely resembles the shade described in the sermon by Hugh of St Victor. The stream flows from this Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil into the rivulets mentioned in 'Doomsday.' Beside the fountain stand the thrones which are the obverse of the *sede Dei et Agni* of Apoc. 22.1. The presence of a god and goddess on these thrones simply empha-

sizes the idolatry to which cupidity may lead and which distinguishes 'true' lovers from the merely lustful. To understand this distinction fully, we should remember that by mediaeval standards idolatrous love, whether it involves the act of fornication or not (whether it is 'pure' or 'mixed'), is a much worse sin than simple lechery. To love a woman more than one loves God is to abandon the faith completely in violation of the First Commandment, but the sin of simple fornication, although mortal, is not irremissible. The idolator in 'pure' love is thus a much worse sinner than the peasant with occasional casual lapses. In the middle garden area, between the other two, the lustful but indiscriminate rest uneasily in the icy waters of Grendel's fenland, fully aware of their iniquity and unprotected from the sunlight of God's justice by any idolatrous delusions.⁶³ They have not been able to find a place of shelter *in medio ligni*. Finally, the situation of those in the outer garden area vividly illustrates the torments of *concupiscentia carnis*. Here the thorns of desire torment the flesh, but conscience prevents further progress in sin and leaves the occupants mercilessly exposed to the hot sun. The road from the area of concupiscence to the second area is an easy one, once conscience is subdued; and from there, with the hardness of heart that comes from indulgence, one may move readily to join the Old Adam in Amoenitas, that romantic day-dream which turns the lust of the flesh into a blind Babylonian paradise with its own 'spiritual' trappings. The story does indeed show the fates of lovers and describes well their *hortus deliciarum*; but the catch in it is that it is not altogether necessary and certainly not reasonable to follow the God of Love at all. He may be the individual 'per quem universus regitur mundus,' but *mundus*, whether we call it Babylon or Fortuna, *transit*. There is another God and another garden, not quite so worldly. What is the effect of having the nobleman in his courtship solemnly and unwittingly recommend the wrong wisdom, the wrong love, and a destiny in Hell under the rule of Satan? Clearly, the effect is ludicrous. I suspect that Drouart la Vache and his friends found this dialogue especially amusing.

If Andreas' garden is ironic, it is possible that the first two books of his treatise are generally ironic. There is no space for a thorough examination of this possibility here, but a few remarks may be devoted to it in support of the interpretation of the garden presented above. In the first place, the opening definition is quite sound theologically as a definition of fleshly love: 'Amor est passio quaedam innata procedens ex visione et immoderata cogitatione formae alterius sexus, ob quam aliquis super omnia cupit alterius potiri amplexibus et omnia de utriusque voluntate in ipsius amplexu amoris praecepta compleri.' That fleshly love, as opposed to Charity which proceeds from reason, arises 'ex visione' is well attested in Scripture and in doctrinal works.⁶⁴ The 'immoderata cogitatione' is familiar in the Ninth Commandment and in its penitential elaborations. Again, the object of this love, for which Andreas uses the verb *cupio*, is certainly very similar to the supreme fruit of the tree of Babylon in the *De fructibus*. The definition itself thus not only makes it clear that Andreas proposes to discuss the wrong love, the *fornicatio* of the Garden of Eden, but it also shows that he knows what he is doing. To make his meaning unmistakable, he goes on at once to associate this

love with the wrong fear, the fear of earthly misfortune: 'Vulgi quoque timet rumores et omne, quod aliquo posset modo nocere; res enim imperfectae modica turbatione deficiunt. Sed et, si pauper ipse sit, timet, ne eius mulier vilipendat inopiam; si turpis est, timet, ne eius contemnatur informitas vel pulchrioris se mulier annectat amori; si dives est, praeteritam forte tenacitatem sibi timet obesse. Et, ut vera loquamur, nullus est, qui possit singularis amantis enarrare timores.' Andreas explains that all those who are incapable of lechery or idolatry are disqualified. The true lover needs both. The old man over sixty cannot maintain the lechery necessary; and the boy under eighteen, although he may be physically able, tends either to be embarrassed or too inconstant for idolatry. The blind man cannot indulge in *concupiscentia oculorum* and so cannot get himself well under way, and the over-passionate lover will not pause for idolatry. It may be true that court poets wrote extravagant poems of love and admiration for their feudal overlords, even when these overlords were ladies, but this kind of love is not Andreas' subject. His pictures of various types of people expressing their cupidity in a foolishly inflated style are, I believe, deliberately solemn but ludicrous nonsense, intended to be humorous. The transparent flattery, hypocrisy, and sophistry in which the speakers indulge is enlivened by bits of obvious perversions of doctrine like the denial of free will in the seventh dialogue. And the ideas expressed are patent comments on the lovers themselves. The doctrine of 'service,' for example, of which much has been made by modern writers on 'courtly love,' is a theological commonplace; all those who give themselves up to the world in cupidity are in bondage. As Boethius put it (III, Met. x):

Huc omnes pariter uenite capti
quos ligat fallax roseis catenis
terrenas habitans libido mentis.

True freedom lies elsewhere (V, Pr. II): 'Humanas uero animas liberiores quidem esse necesse est, cum se in mentis diuinae speculatione conseruant; minus uero, cum dilabuntur ad corpora; minusque etiam, cum terrenis artibus colligantur. Extrema uero est seruitus, cum uitii deditae rationis propriae possessione ceciderunt.' Or, to quote Peter Lombard again, 'Uterque amor incendit, uterque timor humiliat.' When Gérard of Liège described carnal love, which he contrasted with Charity, as a 'miserable servitude,' he was reflecting a traditional doctrine.⁶⁶ And this is exactly what Andreas refers to when he says (I, iii), 'Nam qui amat, captus est cupidinis uinculis aliumque desiderat suo capere hamo.' In literature, the servitude is expressed in feudal terms, but subjection to God was also expressed in feudal terms. God is the permanent Liege Lord of the feudal hierarchy, and it is from this fact that the feudal contract acquires its validity. To serve a lady in self-love, to 'goo hoodles to the Drye Se' for some fair 'piggesnye,' is not only to make a ludicrous deviation from the pilgrimage of man but also to make a ludicrous parody of the structure of feudal society. Finally, if we take an attitude of this kind toward the first two books, we have no need to seek 'sources' for them in remote and improbable areas like Bulgaria and Andalusia, nor are we obliged to accuse Andreas of being a 'dualistic' heretic. As for Bishop

Tempier, I think everyone will agree that official condemnations of books are not always based on an understanding of the books, or, to take a more favorable attitude toward the bishop, that the best books may be misused. Humor arises from an exaggerated departure from a standard of values. To see the humor in Andreas, we must first understand the values from which his lovers depart. There is nothing illogical in the assumption that Andreas' purpose was to ridicule cupidity and to show by contrast the reasonableness of Charity.

Many specimens of the two gardens appear in the romances. Edmond Faral, commenting on a selection of these gardens, wrote: "Il est remarquable qu'à la base de ces descriptions se trouve le souvenir du paradis terrestre, décrit d'abord dans la *Genèse*."⁶⁶ To this we may add that the descriptions frequently also owe a great deal to the *Canticum*. Such a garden appears, for example, in Chrétien's *Cligés*. When Fenice is recovering from her 'martire' in the tower prepared by Jehan, the voice of the nightingale is heard in the land. This sweet voice turns her thoughts once more in the direction of Amoenitas:

6360 Grant bien me seïst uns vergiers,
Ou je me poïsse deduire.

Characteristically, Jehan has already prepared a garden. We see it as Fenice enters:

6400 Par l'uis est antree el vergier
Qui mout li pleist et atalante.
Anmi le vergier ot une ante
De flors chargiee et anfoillue,
Et par desus iert estandue.
6405 Einsi estoient li raim duit,
Que vers terre pandoient tuit,
Et pres jusqu'a terre beissoient
Fors la cime don il neissoient.
La cime aloit contre mont droite.
6410 (Fenice autre leu ne covoitte).
Et desoz l'ante est li praius
Mout delitables et mout biaux,
Ne ja n'iert li solauz tant hauz
A midi, quant il est plus chاوز,
6415 Que ja rais i puisse passer,
Si le sot Jehanz compasser
Et les branches mener et duire.
La se va Fenice deduire,
Et an sor jor i fait son lit,
6420 La sont a joie et a delit.
Et li vergiers est clos antor
De haut mur qui tient a la tor,
Si que riens nule n'i antrast,
Se par son la tor n'i montast.

Here the tree is an 'ante,' a grafted tree which, if it bears fruit at all, does not bear its own.⁶⁷ The branches droop downward like those of the tree of the vices, and they are carefully arranged so as to exclude the rays of the sun. In the shade of the tree the lovers seek the 'refrigerium' *in medio ligni* described in Hugh of

St Victor's sermon, keeping the *scientia* which sustains this shade by them in the person of Jehan. Although the wall is scientifically constructed so that no one may enter except through the tower,⁶⁸ it is at once surmounted by one Bertran, who

6450 Soz l'ante vit dormir a masse
Fenice et Cligés nu et nu.

Thus the elaborate worldly wisdom of Jehan proves of no avail to the lovers as they lie in spiritual oblivion.⁶⁹ Chrétien uses this Babylonian garden with its tree of cupidity not only to reinforce the irony of his story, but to contribute to its humor. The antics of his twelfth century Eve and Adam are a mockery not only of their love, but of those in the audience who would take them seriously.⁷⁰ In this connection, Fenice's insistence that she does not want to be another Yseut is simply a preposterous determination to make her submission to idolatry complete, and the ruse by means of which she accomplishes her purpose is in itself a laughable comment on the illusory character of the consummation she so persistently desires. *Cligés* is not an 'anti-Tristan'; it carries the Tristan theme to an even greater extreme. If anything, it is a 'super-Tristan.' Chrétien's purpose, like that of Andreas, was to show the foolishness of idolatrous cupidity in an entertaining way that his audience could understand. Implicitly, he wished to promote the opposite of cupidity, Charity.

Other garden scenes in the works of Chrétien and his contemporaries immediately suggest themselves. One recalls, for example, an orchard where there is a pine tree shading a fountain, or the dark wood of *Morois*, or another nightingale. But I wish to show the appearance of these things in literature of other types. The works so far discussed are not formal allegories, and the analyses presented are not intended to show that they are. There is a difference between a work whose 'symbolism' resides solely in the things referred to and a work which contains personified abstractions. I wish to examine one of the latter type now, a poem which contains one of the most elaborate and influential gardens in mediaeval literature, the *Roman de la Rose*. An analysis of the opening description of the garden with the help of the background we have established may reveal things 'apertement' that are there, as in a dream, stated 'covertement.' The garden appears to the dreamer 'tot clos de haut mur bataillé,' in the manner of Jehan's garden and its obverse in the *Canticum*. The wall is designed, like its various predecessors, to keep unsympathetic persons out. On it are depicted figures of various types to show who those are who may not enter. Generally, they are those whom Andreas describes as being incapable of love.⁷¹ The wall gives special assurance that the garden within is a place 'Ou onc n'avoit entré bergiers,' for every successor of the *pastor bonus* seeks rather the garden described by Genius much later in the poem, presided over by a somewhat less romantic gardener. When the dreamer hears the sound of the birds within, who, like Fenice's nightingale, represent the opposite of those admirable birds in the *Saltair na Rann*, he wishes to enter the garden of love at once and by any means. That is, the delight expressed by those who enjoy *Amoenitas* awakens *concupiscentia carnis* in himself.

With this kind of love within him, he has no use for the *ostium ovium*, but finds instead its opposite, a little door attended by a blonde, 'gente e bele.' This lovely creature displays the typical symptoms of *accidia* and is named Oiseuse. Her superficial splendor disguises a not very admirable character. Chaucer, seeing her through the eye of reason rather than through the eyes of the flesh calls her

The ministre and norice unto vices,
Which that men clepe in English ydelnesse,
That porter of the gate is of delices.

Without sloth the love awakened in the dreamer would die by 'leveful bisnesse,' but sloth lets him into the garden of Deduit, an *Amoenitas* which is appropriately planted with trees brought 'de la terre as Sarradins.' A grove of such trees, however it may appear to the fleshly eye, can be nothing underneath but the frosty grove of Grendel's mere.

Once inside, the dreamer is completely overcome. He feels that no paradise could be better than this plantation of heresy:

635 E sachiez que je cuidai estre
Por voir en parevis terrestre;
Tant estoit li leus delitables
Qu'il sembloit estre espiritables;
Car, si come lors m'iert avis,
640 Il ne fait en nul parevis
Si bon estre come il fasoit
Ou vergier qui tant me plaisoit.

The fleshly delights are spiritual to the romantic eye of the dreamer. Various figures, who seem Angels to him, disport themselves within. With Deduit is sweet-singing Leece, and the folk generally are entertained by the musicians of *Amoenitas*. Dame Cortoisie with very polite seductiveness invites the dreamer to the dance, the 'olde daunce' which he is eager to learn. Deduit wears the chaplet of roses he acquired in Sap. 2. Leece, his love, like a 'rose nouvelle,' and 'li deus d'Amours' accompany him. The dreamer, this time not altogether incorrectly, thinks of the latter as an Angel from Heaven. With the god is Douz Regarz, the stimulator of *concupiscentia oculorum*, bearing two bows with five arrows each. One set of arrows fosters idolatry, the other simple lechery.⁷² Various fine ladies attend the god: Biautez, Richece, Largece, Franchise, and Cortoise, all described with humorous irony. Oiseuse and Jonece follow in the dance. The merry-makers approach the trees, where their delights are most compelling:

Les queroles ja remanoient,
Car tuit li plusor s'en aloient
O lor amies ombreier
Soz ces arbres, por doneier.
1295 Deus! com menoient bone vie!
Fos est qui n'a de tel envie.

The dreamer has seen the joys which idleness and youth may follow *in medio ligni paradisi*. In this garden the trees are well adapted for excluding one's awareness of God's justice:

Mais li rain furent lonc e haut,
 1370 E, por le leu garder de chaut,
 Furent si espès par deseure
 Que li solauz en nes une eure
 Ne pooit a terre descendre,
 Ne faire mal a l'erbe tendre.

Moreover, there are shaded wells and streams to water the tender flowers of the flesh that grow under the trees.

In this garden, which Beowulf purified, and which Bede and Dante found uncomfortable, the dreamer finds himself situated pleasantly beside 'une fontaine soz un pin,' a scene vividly reminiscent of that with which the surviving portion of Beroul's *Tristan* begins. There Tristan and Yseut found their Amoenitas, like Adam and Eve 'sub cooperimenta mendacii.' The fountain issues from a marble stone, the rock of Grendel's pool seen from an attitude of luxuria. In the *Roman* of Guillaume the fountain is clearly identified as that beside which died 'li biaux Narcisus,' who, like Adam, is a very obvious type of the man who learns to love 'quod suum est,' except that, unlike Adam, Narcissus never repents. The legend of his death as it is told in the *Roman* is a vivid illustration of the absurd sterility of cupidity in general and of idolatrous love in particular. But the poet 'covertement' draws another moral from the story, much in the same way that the noble suitor in the *De amore* drew a surface moral from his garden:

Dames, cest esemple aprenez,
 Qui vers voz amis mesprenez;
 Car, se vos les laissez morir,
 1510 Deus le vos savra bien merir.

In other words, Eve should be less stingy with her apples. But the poem is, as Guillaume assures us, a presentation of the truth, and it is true 'apertement' that if we take 'morir' as a reference to the spiritual death resulting from idolatry, the dames who encourage it will, like Eve, merit God's wrath.

With some misgivings the dreamer looks into the well. There lie 'deus pierres de cristal' which we should contrast with the carbuncle in the Well of Life as it is described later by Genius. These crystals enable the dreamer to see the garden on one side at a time. For they are the eyes of the flesh, the dreamer's own eyes, and to see all of the garden through them, he must turn his head. Having succumbed to *concupiscentia carnis*, the dreamer is now ready to indulge in *concupiscentia oculorum*, which leads, as St Paul tells us, to pride of life. The wrong love, it will be remembered, proceeds 'ex visione.'⁷³ In the waters of Babylon the eyes of Narcissus betrayed him, for he fell into the net of Cupid or *cupiditas*; and so the dreamer is caught — 'captus est in cupidinis vinculis' — for he sees 'rosiers chargiez de roses,' each one a fine specimen of St Jerome's *flos faeni*. Among them, the dreamer prefers the buds, for the full blown roses last only a day, whereas the buds remain fresh a little longer:

1645 Les roses overtes e lees
 Sont en un jour toutes alees,
 Mais li bouton durent tuit frois
 A tot le moins deus jorz ou trois.

'Qui portat imaginem terreni, et servit vitiis atque luxuriae, foenumque est et flos praeteriens.' The dreamer is not the man to linger in the wet garden of Andreas; having seen the delights of the shade, he soon centers his attention on one bud. So strong is his desire for this little 'primerole' that he readily swears homage to the God of Love, who, as we should have no trouble seeing now, is Satan decked out in fine 'humanistic' trappings. In the remainder of Guillaume's poem, which is not quite the 'sentimental novel' one distinguished critic has accused it of being, Reason fights a losing battle to save the dreamer as he moves toward the consummation of his idolatry. The poem as a whole, including Jean de Meun's part, is a humorous and witty retelling of the story of the Fall, designed to impress the members of a courtly audience as they laughingly discern 'apertement' what is presented 'covertement.' Under the inspiration of Guillaume de Saint Amour, Jean wishes to show that the Fall of man is in his day accomplished with the full cooperation of the fraternal orders.⁷⁴

Jean de Meun, who was in a much better position than we are to understand Guillaume's garden, confirms in the observations of Genius the general interpretation here given to the garden:

Pour Deu, seigneur, prenez ci garde:
 20350 Qui bien la verité regarde,
 Les choses ici contenues,
 Ce sont truffes e fanfelues.
 Ci n'a chose qui seit estable,
 Quanqu'il i vit est corrompable.
 20355 Il vit queroles qui faillirent,
 E faudront tuit cil qui les frent.

Genius goes on to contrast this garden with another garden where there is a fountain of Living Waters which bestow eternal health and freedom from thirst (cf. Jo. 4.13-14). It is watched over by a wise 'bergiers,' the *pastor bonus* whose successors, among whom Jean does not include the friars, are excluded by the wall from the garden of Deduit. The fountain produces the threefold but unified stream of the Trinity. Over it is a fruitful olive tree, much more glorious than the pine, bearing an inscription:

20521 "Ci cueurt la fontaine de vie
 Par desouz l'olive foillie
 Qui porte le fruit de salu."

And beneath the tree 'whose leafy crest showers dewdrops round' are truly unfading herbs and flowers of the virtues. In this fountain there are no deceiving crystals, but a great carbuncle glowing of its own light with undying splendor. This is the Image of God, reason with its three aspects — memory, intellect, and will — which in its proper harmony leads man to partake of *caritas* rather than *cupiditas*, and thus to partake of God, for as St John says, *Deus caritas*.

Of the various gardens in Chaucer's works, the one in the Merchant's Tale affords perhaps the most suitable final example for this discussion, for it shows that the traditional materials we have been examining could appear in a fabliau. I assume here, perhaps rashly, that Chaucer's story is what Boccaccio thought of

as 'poetry worthy of the name' and not merely what the Nun's Priest calls 'chaf.' An old knight, Januarie, who has for sixty years enjoyed the pleasures of Andreas' wet garden, desires, with a great deal of amusing perversion of doctrine, to move over into the shade by marrying. 'Nam umbram foliorum dilectio est et jocunditas in specie et pulchritudine rerum transitoriarum.' The use of marriage for this purpose, 'non propter Deum,' is preposterous, but he convinces himself of the feasibility of this procedure with a great show of worldly wisdom. Thinking over the possibilities, he decides on a little bud named May, and while lying in bed stimulates himself 'ex . . . immoderata cogitatione.' After some indecision, in the course of which Chaucer makes the old knight's foolishness quite plain — except, that is, to Harry Bailey who sees in everything a reflection of his own marital difficulties — he does marry, showing meanwhile definite symptoms of Pape-lardie. But his squire, one Damyan, is overcome by *concupiscentia oculorum* when he sees May and takes to his bed with the lover's malady, an extreme form of *accidia*. The lady, who is not very well served, learns of Damyan's illness, and out of truly modern sentimentality takes pity on him, for 'pitie renneth soone in gentil herte,' especially when one has the aid of Franchise. To increase and protect his Deduit, Januarie builds a *hortus conclusus*, in which there stands a laurel by a well. It is an attractive place:

2030 So fair a gardyn woot I nowher noon.
 For, out of doute, I verrailly suppose
 That he that wroot the Romance of the Rose
 Ne koude of it the beautee wel devyse;
 Ne Priapus ne myghte nat suffise,
 2035 Though he be god of gardyns, for to telle
 The beautee of the gardyn and the welle,
 That stood under a laurer alwey grene

The motivation underlying such gardens is somewhat cynically expressed in their 'god,' who here appears in a classical but transparent disguise. The references to Priapus, an obvious symbol of the painful frustration of cupidity which began with the Fall, and to the *Roman de la Rose* are clear indications, I believe, that Chaucer had something more than the mere surface narrative in mind. In the garden the 'married' couple disport themselves in summer:

And whan he wolde paye his wyf hir dette
 In somer seson, thider wolde he go,
 2050 And May his wyf, and no wight but they two;
 And thynges whiche that were nat doon abedde,
 He in the gardyn parfourned hem and spedde.

We are, I think, in the garden of Deduit, under Tristan's pine tree, in the garden of Jehan, in *Amoenitas*, and beside Grendel's pool. Ultimately, we are back at Eve and Adam's *in medio ligni paradisi*, whence the river that feeds Januarie's well runs. The 'laurer' is, in truth, 'alwey grene,' for the pattern of the Fall is perennial in human experience. Significantly, having built his *hortus deliciarum*, Januarie goes blind, a fact which emphasizes his spiritual blindness. Taking advantage of the literal blindness, May has a duplicate key to the 'smale wyket'

of the garden made, so that she and Damyan may use it. If Januarie's rationalizations and the ridiculous behavior of Damyan and May are amusing, what happens next reaches the apex of the comic, for Chaucer makes the underlying value from which his characters deviate quite plain:

But now to purpos: er that dayes eighte
 Were passed, er the month of July, bifil
 That Januarie hath caught so greet a wil,
 2135 Thurgh eggyng of his wyf, hym for to pleye
 In his gardyn, and no wight but they tweye,
 That in a morwe unto this May seith he:
 "Rys up, my wyf, my love, my lady free!
 The turtles voys is herd, my dowve sweete;
 2140 The wynter is goon with alle his reynes weete.
 Com forth now, with thyne eyen columbyn!
 How fairer been thy breestes than is wyn!
 The gardyn is enclosed al aboute;
 Com forth, my white spuse! out of doute
 2145 Thou hast me wounded in myn herte, O wyf!
 Ne spot of thee ne knew I al my lyf.
 Com forth, and lat us taken oure disport;
 I chees thee for my wyf and my confort."

The veil is off. The garden of the lover is the garden of the *Canticum* turned upside down for purposes of ironic comedy. The Scriptural echoes in this passage are not mere literary decoration. They show the extreme foolishness to which cupidity like Januarie's may lead. For the doting knight, May represents what the lady in the *Canticum* represents to the faithful: she is his Holy Church, his Blessed Virgin, his refuge from the transitory world. The traditional nightingale, an obverse of the turtle, the spring atmosphere, and the beauty of the rose stand here undisguised. But the humor of Chaucer's story does not slacken. Januarie's wall affords no better protection than Jehan's, so that May, the 'white spuse,' is able to climb a tree to meet her Damyan in its branches. It is not a sycamore, but a pear tree, and the fruit it bears is in a very striking way the fruit which crowned the tree called *Vetus Adam* in the *De fructibus*. Januarie's garden is the garden which all those governed by cupidity think to build for self-concealment, and his fate is the fate of all those who try to make of wedlock the wrong kind of 'paradys.' In spite of Januarie's assertion to the contrary, a man may, as the Parson assures us, 'sleen hymself with his owene knyf.' And, as he continues, 'Certes, be it wyf, be it child, or any worldly thyng that he loveth biforn God, it is his mawmet, and he is an ydolastre.' To take this story as being merely an elaborate merry tale is to miss both the 'sentence' and the best of the 'solaas.' To those who, like Chaucer, 'lyve in charite,' or at least attempt to do so, the behavior of others who hide under the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is sometimes pathetic, and sometimes, when innocent victims fall also, it is tragic. But it can be uproariously comic as well, for cupidity often leads to ridiculous self-deception.

The works we have examined include a wide variety of types, from epic to fabliau, and they extend from our earliest non-celtic vernacular literature well into

the latter fourteenth century. But in all of them, from *Beowulf* to the Merchant's Tale, there is evidence for a real similarity of attitude. The gardens which we have touched upon consistently enforce a single lesson. There is no evidence of pagan ideals or superstitions in the picture of Grendel's mere, no evidence of any seriously maintained system of 'courtly love' in Andreas' description of Amoenitas, no sentimental naturalism in the gardens of the *Roman de la Rose*, and no 'humanism' of the kind which exalts human flesh above God, except as an object of satire, in the garden of the Merchant's Tale. On the contrary, all of these works either condemn or satirize cupidity and hold forth Charity as an ideal either directly or by implication. This is exactly what we should expect of Christian authors. Moreover, the assumption that the authors had in mind a series of higher meanings seen in the light of wisdom tends to resolve apparent inconsistencies and contradictions in their works. In this respect, this study supports the findings of a very early mediaevalist: 'Miraris? parum abest quin dicam theologiam poeticam esse de Deo: Christum modo leonem modo agnum modo vermen dici, quid nisi poeticum est? mille talia in Scripturis Sacris invenies que persequi longum est. Quid vero aliud parabole Salvatoris in Evangelio sonant, nisi sermonem a sensibus alienum sive, ut uno verbo exprimam, alieniloquium, quam allegoriam usitatori vocabulo nuncupamus? Atqui ex huiusce sermonis genere poetica omnis intexta est.'⁷⁵ The persistence of the higher meanings involved in poetic allegory gives to the thousand years of the mediaeval tradition a surprising unity and continuity. And this continuity is enforced by the attitude that Christ's New Law is the ultimate expression of truth and the only source of any real beauty.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

¹ III, 16 (10).

² *Loc. cit.*

³ II, 8 (6). Cf. Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon* (ed. Buttimer), p. 55, where the principle is applied to non-Scriptural literature. The argument was still being used as a defense of poetic obscurity by Petrarch and Boccaccio. See C. G. Osgood, *Boccaccio on Poetry* (Princeton, 1930), pp. 61-62, 170, note 10, 171, note 16.

⁴ *Saint Augustine et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 1938), p. 489. I am indebted to Professor B. F. Huppé for calling my attention to this work and for many other helpful suggestions.

⁵ *De doctrina*, II, 24 (16).

⁶ G. Paré, A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay, *La renaissance du XIII^e siècle* (Paris and Ottawa, 1933), pp. 233-237. The quotation is from Hugh of St Victor, *ibid.*, p. 234, note 1.

⁷ *PL*, CVII, 296. Cf. C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge* (Paris, 1944), p. 41.

⁸ *Didascalicon*, p. 125.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

¹⁰ St Augustine, *De Gen. contra Manich.*, *PL*, xxxiv, 203; St Gregory, *Moralia*, *PL*, 75, 988; St Bede, *Comm. in Gen.*, *PL*, xci, 203, *Expl. Apoc.*, *PL*, xciii, 204; Bruno Astensis, *PL*, clxv, 87; St Martin, *PL*, ccix, 413; etc.

¹¹ St Augustine, *De Gen. contra Manich.*, *PL*, xxxiv, 203.

¹² *Ibid.*, 208.

¹³ Cf. the *Quaest. in Gen.* attributed to Bede, where Isidore is quoted to this effect, *PL*, xciii, 269-270.

¹⁴ See St Augustine, *De Trinitate*, xiv.

¹⁵ *Hom. IX in Eccles.*, *PL*, clxxv, 171-172.

¹⁴ See St Augustine on Ps. 1, *PL*, xxxvi, 68 (partly quoted below); St Bruno of the Carthusians, *PL*, cliv, 641; or St Martin on Apoc 22.2, *PL*, ccix, 418: 'Et folia ligni, scilicet praecepta Christi quae tegunt et ornant fructum, id est verba praedicationis ejus sunt ad sanitatem gentium, gentilium videlicet conversorum si implentur. Christus ergo reddet fructum, et apostoli eorumque successores post eos praedicando, per universum mundum spargent folia, id est praecepta ipsius Christi.'

¹⁷ The root of the good tree (rather than its crowning fruit) is sometimes *caritas*, and, conversely, the root of the evil tree is sometimes *cupiditas*, the *radix malorum*.

¹⁸ Honorius, *In Cant.*, *PL*, clxxii, 425.

¹⁹ St Martin, *PL*, ccix, 413.

²⁰ Bruno Astensis, *PL*, clxv, 87; cf. *ibid.*, 131-132, 180, etc.

²¹ St Bruno of the Carthusians, *PL*, cliv, 641.

²² This account is based on the description in B. Dickens and A. C. Ross, *The Dream of the Rood* (London, 1945), pp. 1-13.

²³ In Ps. 64, *PL*, cxci, 581. Cf. St Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xiv, 28. The references to Cain and Abel are not, of course, historical. Abel begins the generation of the just, to which all faithful Christians belong, regardless of physical parenthood. Cain begins the generation of the wicked, among whom must be included all those who love in cupidity.

²⁴ Comm. in Ps. 79, *PL*, cxci, 765-766. Cf. St Augustine, *PL*, xxxvi, 1026; or the *Summa sententiarum* (authorship disputed), *PL*, clxxvi, 113, where Isidore is quoted.

²⁵ *Opera* (Quaracchi, 1882 et seq.), vi, 4.

²⁶ Ed. Wilmart, *Analecta reginensia* (Vatican, 1933), p. 183: 'Et [quia] vere nullus tantus labor, nulla tanta miseria est in praesenti vita quam illicito et carnali amore capi et superari, et eius imperis deservire, quia auferit deum, auferit animam, cor et corpus a deo, idest in tantum ut non permittat hominem et mulierem sui iuris et sue potestatis esse; sed in seruitute miserabili detinentur, nec se de tali iugo possunt excutere, quando uolunt, sicut sciunt experti. At uero econtra, nichil dulcius, nil iocundius nichilque fructuosius est quam deum toto corde diligere et amoris eius obsequia se assidue mancipare . . . Ad contra, amor carnalis tam nobilium quam rusticorum, tam diutum quam pauperum in immundicia terminatur et consummatur. . . Sic seruiunt carnales amatores et amatrices in immunditia miserabili, et idcirco debemus ut possumus amorem carnalem et illicitum fugere et contempnere, et deo per perfectum amorem totaliter adherere.'

²⁷ Sermo CLXII, *PL*, xxxviii, 867: 'Non solum fornicatio in sacris Litteris specialiter, sed etiam generaliter arguitur et nominatur . . . advertamus, illam esse generalem fornicationem animae humanae, quae non adhaerens quisque Deo, adhaeret mundo.' Cf. *De sermone Domini in monte*, 36.

²⁸ *PL*, cxiv, 162.

²⁹ *PL*, xciii, 127.

³⁰ *PL*, xciii, 12. Cf. St Augustine, *PL*, xxxvii, 1179; *Glos. ord.*, *PL*, cxiv, 671.

³¹ *PL*, cxiv, 346-347; cf. Bede, *PL*, xcii, 615.

³² Alanus de Insulis, *Distinctiones*, *PL*, ccx, 932; cf. *Allegoriae in sacram scripturam* (twelfth century, authorship unknown), *PL*, cxi, 1545.

³³ See the references in note 32 and St Gregory, *Moralia*, *PL*, lxxvi, 671-676; *Gregorianum*, *PL*, cxiii, 298. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, xvii, vii, 47 (ed. Lindsay), associates the willow with sterility on other grounds.

³⁴ See St Gregory, *Moralia*, *PL*, lxxvi, 444-446; Bede, *PL*, xcii, 559-560; *Allegoriae*, *PL*, cxiii, 1053; Alanus, *Distinctiones*, *PL*, ccx, 964. Cf. Urban T. Holmes, Jr, *A New Interpretation of Chretien's "Conte Del Graal"* (Chapel Hill, 1948) p. 22, note 12, and p. 32.

³⁵ Rabanus Maurus, *De universo*, *PL*, cxr, 513. This work not only contains a useful general discussion of the tree but a list of trees of various kinds together with their higher meanings. See also Rabanus on Ecclus. 24, *PL*, cix, 929-931.

³⁶ *Sermones*, *PL*, clxxxiii, 378-379.

³⁷ *PL*, cix, 930 and 1116.

³⁸ For the significance of this term, see Gregory, *Hom. in Evan.*, ii, 38, *PL*, lxxvi, 1285-1286.

³⁹ *PL*, xxiv, 416-417.

⁴⁰ *PL*, xciii, 12; Cf. St Martin, *PL*, ccix, 187.

⁴¹ *PL*, xxxvi, 68. The Scriptural quotation is from a pre-Vulgate text of Is. 40.6-8.

⁴² A series of poems based on the contrast between the flower and the leaf was collected by George L. Marsh, 'Sources and Analogues of "The Flower and the Leaf"', *MP*, iv (1906-1907), 121-167; 281-387. Marsh concluded that in the ME poem the contrast represents a conflict between sensuality and reason. This conclusion is consistent with traditional Scriptural imagery.

⁴³ St Martin, *PL*, cciix, 418, explains the somewhat puzzling location of the tree here as follows: 'Vel citra fluvium, id est in hac vita, habemus lignum vitae, scilicet corpus et sanguinem Christi in quibus reficimur, et ultra flumen, videlicet in futuro habebemus ipsum praesentem.'

⁴⁴ For a suggestion that the river in Paradise flows from the tree, see St Augustine, *De Gen. ad litt.*, *PL*, xxxiv, 375. Cf. Bruno Astensis, *Expos. Apoc.*, *PL*, clxv, 730.

⁴⁵ Bede, *Comm. in Gen.*, *PL*, xci, 203; Rupert, *PL*, clxxvii, 274; Strabo, *PL*, cxiv, 754. This water also appears in *Ecclus.* 24.40 ff. Rabanus, *PL*, cix, 943, comments: 'Ego sapientia Dei effudit in mundum flumina doctrinae evangelicae, quae abundantissime reficiunt et satiant avidas mentes electorum.' Cf. note 50, below.

⁴⁶ *De Gen. ad Litt.*, *PL*, xxxiv, 375.

⁴⁷ E.g., see Bede on *Iac.* 3.7, *PL*, xciii, 28.

⁴⁸ *Moralia*, *PL*, lxxvi, 97. For the birds of St Ambrose, see *PL*, xiv, 237 f.

⁴⁹ *PL*, xcii, 173-174.

⁵⁰ Bede, *PL*, xci, 203, gives several alternative interpretations of the garden. Cf. Richard of St Victor, *In Cant.*, *PL*, cxcvi, 490. The river of wisdom in *Ecclus.* 24.42 also waters a garden: 'Dixi: Rigabo hortum meum plantationum et inebriabo prato mei fructum.' Rabanus, *PL*, cix, 944, comments: 'Hortus enim plantationum sapientia sancto est Ecclesia, quam ipso Veritas [sc. Christus] suo dogmate semper irrigat et inebriat, ut fructum pratus spiritalis quotidie proferat, in doctrina videlicet catholica et sacris virtutibus, et merito, quia illuminata a vera luce quae illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum (Jo. 1.9), a sole iustitiae ipsoque oriente . . .'

⁵¹ A concise but detailed summary of both allegorical and tropological meanings for this garden appears in a sermon by Hugh of St Victor. I quote part of it, *PL*, clxxvii, 1036, as an illustration: 'Habet ergo sancta mater Ecclesia hortum per conversationem bonam, clausam per disciplinam, fontem per sapientiam, signatum per figuram. Habet paradisum malorum puniceorum in passis martyribus, cyperos in praelatis rectoribus, nardum in subjectis humilibus, crocum in eruditis doctoribus, fistulam in punctis poenitentibus . . . Et istae sunt spiritalis sanctae matris Ecclesiae divitiae . . . Matrem Ecclesiam, charissimi, nobis in his omnibus imitemur, ut cum ipsa sponsum in decore suo videre mereamur, et cum sponsa in coelis gloriemur. Habeamus et nos paradisum malorum puniceorum, adversa pro Christo saepius patiundo, et oppressis quotidie compatiendo; cyperos, discrete nos regendo; nardum, nostris praelatis humiliter nos subdendo; crocum, luce sapientiae effulgendo . . .' Although the various commentaries on the *Canticum* differ in detail, for the most part they are not actually inconsistent.

⁵² *PL*, cxcvi, 487 ff.

⁵³ See Fr. Klaeber, *Beowulf*, pp. xlviii-li, civ, cxix, cxx-cxxiv.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, note to 1357 ff., pp. 182-183.

⁵⁵ *PL*, xci, 84 f.

⁵⁶ This light should not be confused with the *fyrleoht* of the monster's den (l. 1516), which comes from the flame of the wrong love.

⁵⁷ *Beowulf*, p. 183.

⁵⁸ See St Gregory, *Moralia*, *PL*, lxxvi, 510.

⁵⁹ *Beowulf*, p. 185.

⁶⁰ Bede's comment on *Gen.* 3.8 may furnish the basis for the description in the poem, *PL*, xci, 214: 'Deambulat Deus in illis, non stabat, quia in praecepto illius non stabant. Et bene ad auram post meridiem, quia ab illis auferebatur lux illa ferventior veritatis, appropinquantibus errorem tenebris. Absconderunt se, et reliqua. In medio namque ligni se abscondit, qui versus a Deo, in erroris sui atque arbitrii voluntatibus vivit.' Cf. Gregory, *Moralia*, *PL*, lxxvi, 671-676. This poem is examined more thoroughly in a study of Caedmonian poetry by Professor B. F. Huppé, now in the course of preparation.

⁶¹ *The Irish Tradition* (Oxford, 1947), pp. 62-63.

⁶² For the dew, see St Gregory, *Moralia*, *PL*, lxxvi, 182.

⁶³ The marshy ground is described *ibid.*, 671-676.

⁶⁴ See Gen. 39.6-7; Jer. 9.21; Eccles. 9.7-9; Prov. 23.33-34. The notion is repeated by writers of unquestioned piety as a warning. E.g., see the *Liber de modo bene vivendi*, PL, CLXXXIV, 1241; 'Oculi annuntii sunt fornicationis. Visio est primo occasio fornicationis. Mens enim per oculos capitur. Per oculos enim intrat ad mentem sagitta amoris.'

⁶⁵ See note 26, above.

⁶⁶ *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romances courtois du moyen age* (Paris, 1913), p. 372.

⁶⁷ An indication of hypocrisy. It is not difficult to discern a very remarkable kind of hypocrisy in Fenice.

⁶⁸ The tower is, I believe, the reverse of the Tower on the Toft at the beginning of *Piers Plowman*. That is, it is a reflection of the Tower of Babel, associated by the commentators with Babylon, and the opposite of the tower or tabernacle on Sion of Ps. 14. Only by erecting the Tower of Babylon in one's heart may one enter Amoenitas to enjoy its delights. The intruder, Bertran, does not enter the garden for this purpose and hence has no need for the tower.

⁶⁹ Sleep is a common symbol not only for sexual embrace, which is probably implied here, but also for oblivion to the Word of God. See *Allegoriae*, PL, CXII, 913.

⁷⁰ The humor of Chrétien's treatment of the story is apparent on the surface in ll. 6016-6023 or ll. 6462-6463. When the actions of the characters are seen against the proper standard of values, the whole story becomes very lively. The theme of the two loves is introduced plainly in 5706-5718.

⁷¹ The wall in the *Canticum* is usually interpreted to mean faith or discipline without which one cannot become a true member of the church. Perhaps the function of the wall in the *Roman* needs some explanation. The first figure on it is Haïne, whose presence demonstrates that one cannot hate a flower of the flesh and take joy in it at the same time. Near her is Felonie, suitable, perhaps, for those who wish to remain in the wet garden of Andreas but incompatible with true idolatry. *Covoitise*, which makes people wish to receive but not to give, centers attention on the acquisition of wealth and thus destroys love. For, as Andreas says (I, II), 'In amantis ergo conspectu nil valet amoris actui comparari, potiusque verus amans cunctis expoliari divitiis vel omni eo, quod humano posset excogitari ingenio, sine quo quis vivere non potest, penitus privari eligeret quam sperato vel acquisito amore carere.' Beside *Covoitise* stands her relative, *Avarice*, the destroyer of the worldly display of fine clothing and the 'largece' necessary to success in courtship. The first 'rule' that the nobleman gets from the god of love in Amoenitas is 'Avaritiam sicut nocivam pestem effugias et eius contrarium amplectaris.' *Envie* follows, for she is not only subject to the same kind of limitations as is *Covoitise*, but is also incapable of looking anyone in the eye. The envious cannot make a necessary beginning with *concupiscentia oculorum*. *Tristece* and *Vieillece* are also there. The first can never know the society of *Dedit*, and the second has inadequacies which we have already seen in Andreas. The pretensions of *Papelardie* also keep one away from the garden. Finally, *Povreté* is excluded because, to use the mock lament of Andreas, 'Manifesto igitur experimento cognosco, quod ita superveniente inopia incipiunt fomenta amoris deficere.' In general, the 'virtues' attributed to the lover are worldly virtues stemming from pride.

⁷² Beauty of the flesh, simple-mindedness, sentimental pity, 'villainous company,' and sweet-looks all foster idolatry. Pride, fraud, shame, despair of consummation, and a wandering eye all tend to make the lover lose faith in his chosen goddess and seek satisfaction elsewhere.

⁷³ See note 64, above. As in the *Liber de modo bene vivendi* the 'arrows' of love are said in the *Roman* to enter through the eyes (l. 1694). True Christian love enters through the reason.

⁷⁴ A study of the literary influence of Guillaume de St Amour is being prepared by Mr C. R. Dahlberg.

⁷⁵ F. Petrarca, *Le familiari*, x, 4.