A quantitative-minded God: balance and judgement in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries

WAIN-BLISSETT, XAVIER,WILLIAM

A quantitative-minded God:

balance and judgement in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries

Xavier Wain

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere thanks to a number of people who have helped and supported me through the process of writing this paper. A special thanks is owed to my supervisors Giles Gasper and Harold Mawdsley, both of whom have patiently guided me through the experience of writing a prolonged piece of academic research, which I would certainly have found significantly more difficult without their assistance and advice. An especial thanks is owed to Giles who has very patiently put up with my often odd styles of drafting. He has been a wonderful guide, consistently introducing me to new forms of research and approaches to sources. Our meetings throughout the project were always insightful and memorable and for that I can only offer wholehearted thanks.

A further thanks is owed to Amy for her personal support at times of particular stress and doubt throughout the course of the project. Her personal tolerance of me perpetually drifting off into thought about this paper, at often inopportune moments, is particularly appreciated.

Contents

INTRODUCTION

The original inspiration for this research stemmed from an undergraduate dissertation which examined the role of weights and measures as a tool and symbol of kingship in fourteenth-century England. The dissertation examined how after periods of instability and revolt kings often prioritized re-instating measurement standards in markets and towns. Kings achieved this through providing new sets of measures for local use as well as sending royal agents across the realm to ensure that local measures were correctly standardised. The dissertation also looked at how official measures were described and understood by the populace as belonging to the king, providing an important avenue for kings to project their power and influence. The dissertation then examined the potential influence of crown control of measurement on community building and medieval *nationhood*. The original purpose of this research paper was to explore the role of weighing and measuring in medieval theological thought.

The initial research for this thesis involved researching how biblical references to weights and measures were interpreted by medieval writers and thinkers. This initial part of the research went on to build the backbone of evidence for Chapter One as well as providing a focus for paper on the High Medieval Period. Through this research the phrase *pondus et pondus* was identified as being frequently used and consequently worthy of further investigation. Research into the meaning and use of the phrase *pondus et pondus* is the basis of Chapter Two. Developing from Chapter Two, Chapter Three goes on to discuss how penitential theology was reimagined, with judgement thought about in a quantitative way through the analogy of debt. These three chapters are all held together through a general theme of the paper which explores how penitential theology was reimagined, with judgment thought about in a quantitative way. Judgement of the individual became about balancing one's sin with one's good deeds and penance. This act of balancing out right with wrong was analogised through the commercial language of *pondus et pondus* in Chapter 2 and through debt in Chapter 3.

Before continuing it's important to discuss a few further pre-requisites on which this study sits. One thing which should be given consideration from the outset of this thesis is that much of the argument that follows involves working through the semantics of words, especially Chapters 2 and 3. Chapter 2 makes a convincing case that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was a term related to a specific type of mercantile fraud, whereby a merchant would corrupt measures or scales in order to be able to defraud people by buying and selling at his advantage. Having established this, Chapter 2 then goes on to argue that when writers explain that certain ways of judging others are like the act of *pondus et pondus*, they are implicitly arguing that God acts like a good merchant weighing out good and bad acts fairly. These writers also simultaneously suggest that God acts through balance. A problem that occurs here is that it is not always clear whether people are literally arguing that God operates precisely like a merchant or whether they are merely drawing a parallel. Either way what should remain clear throughout was that people were definitely thinking about God through the prism of commercial language and that central to this was a belief that God must create a perfect form of judgement which takes everything into account and that writers of the time at least saw a parallel between this and between commercial exchanges that they were witnessing in the material world around them. Chapter 3 examines texts which describe penance as a debt and the act of sinning as creating an additional debt. Here a further semantic issue arises because the word *debitum* has many potential implications and meanings. The main issue is that a debt could be owed to someone out of obligation to a person, or alternatively a commercial form of debt that can be paid off over time. To help combat this potential issue Chapter 3 makes a point of examining texts where the debt and penance is *additional* to any debt of obligation which is owed to God and tries to ensure that the writers have expressed that any *debt* can theoretically be paid off, making it like a commercial debt in practice. A further problem that arises in Chapter 3 is that with *debitum* having so many potential implications we can imagine that it is as difficult for the contemporary reader to fully comprehend what twelfth-and-thirteenth-century writers were saying as it may have been for them to fully understand what each other meant by the word *debitum*.

Logically the implications of God quantitively establishing what someone's fate should be should present issues for theories off predestination. If God were to reward and punish people according to a precise quantitative formula then God would not be shriving nor saving people through grace. However, for whatever reason this problem does not seem to be lived out in the sources.

For this study sources were found using the *Library of Latin Texts*.[1] By the digital archive's nature this both presents benefits and methodological issues for this research, though on balance the use of this tool should be seen as net benefit to this study. Three problems are presented from solely using this resource. The first is that though the resource is wide-ranging in what it covers, it is not an exhaustive list and only includes texts which have already been carefully transcribed and studied, meaning that this study is capped in the sources that it can include. A further problem is that by this databases' nature, it only considers texts written in Latin and excludes any vernacular sources. Finally, the database, only uses texts which have been 'selected from the best editions available and established according to contemporary scholarly practice', in other words the database only looks through critical editions of texts. Though this could be seen as a benefit because it should theoretically provide the closest phraseology possible to the authors intentions, the semantic nature of this study means that it may have benefitted from being able to examine other versions and editions of texts which may be slightly different to the critical editions.[2] This latter problem is probably the most serious but is easily overcome when reminded of the precise objective of the

[1] The *Library of Latin Texts* (LLT) is hosted by Brepols: https://about.brepolis.net/library-of-latin-texts/ 14/03/2023. As the series introduction states: 'The Library of Latin Texts (LLT) is the world's leading database for Latin texts. It gathers Latin texts of all genres and all periods. The texts have been taken from the Corpus Christianorum series and from many other leading editions. The LLT (a project that was started in 1991 as the Cetedoc Library of Christian Latin Texts, CLCLT) is produced by the Centre 'Traditio Litterarum Occidentalium' (CTLO). The Library of Latin Texts is part of Brepolis Latin Complete, a cluster of databases relating to the study of Latin.'

[2] It is accepted that some of the editions available through the *Library of Latin Texts* and used in this thesis are old transcriptions and do not necessarily meet with contemporary academic standards with particular reference to the *Patrologia Latina*. However, it is also accepted that in many cases better transcriptions do not exist and that consequently there is an academic consensus that these texts are appropriate for research purposes.

thesis. This study is not intended be a conclusive and all-consuming research into every possible religious connotation of measurement in medieval thought, it only intends to draw conclusions from trends which emerge. These trends are not even necessarily conclusive by themselves but paint a larger picture when placed together. In respect to only using texts which have already been examined, this should not present any issues for this research. Using this database has allowed literally hundreds of sources to be located, read, and analysed, the vast majority of which of course have no role in this final paper, in a way which would not have been possible otherwise. Though all the texts have already been studied by others, what makes this paper distinct is the particular angle which it approaches them from, this being measurement and balance and latterly its relationship to eschatology. The database has also allowed for similarity searches to take place meaning that texts could be studied which are not direct matches to the biblical texts but instead near-matches. This is important as it minimises the risk of ignoring relevant texts where the modern editor may have chosen a final script which varies slightly from a precise combination of words which were sought for. It should be clear that any issues arising from using the *Library of Latin Texts* are clearly outweighed by its benefits.

Chapter One finds that over the twelfth century *balance* took on a new role in eschatological thinking. 'Balance' had been associated with broader themes of moderation and Benedictine values, being seen as a virtue in itself, leading to a broadly Christian life and hope of salvation to follow. However, by the end of the twelfth century balance was instead associated with judgement after death and God's *modus operandi*. During the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries holiness began to be understood in quantitative rather than binary terms. Herman of Werden, Bonaventure, Hugh of St Cher, and Rupert of Deutz provide evidence of people beginning to think about the merit or ills in acts or beliefs in an abstract non-binary way. This does not in itself demonstrate any sea-change in how judgement occurred but when taken with the findings of Chapters Two and three can be said to fit into a wider pattern of understanding God's workings through quantitative nuance. Chapter two supports this through demonstrating that during the thirteenth century God's

measuring of people's moral worth began to be compared to a merchant measuring goods to ascribe them a precise value. Chapter One's findings also complement the findings of Chapter Three, which are that scholars debated the extent to which penance and purgatory were similar to a numerical and quantified debt.

Chapter Two investigates the phrase *pondus et pondus* which in its purest form is taken from Proverbs 20:10, but which also sees a significant rise in its use in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century. This chapter finds that the vogue of the term *pondus et pondus* vaguely coincides with the period of maturation of the doctrine of purgatory as identified by Jacques Le Goff.[3] It is accepted that many have pointed to purgation and ideas related to purgatory existing prior to Le Goff's earliest date of 1170.[4] Critics have pointed to earlier beliefs surrounding purgatory such as the Saint Patrick's Purgatory originating in the early 1150s and earlier visions of purgatory by people like Hildegard of Bingen who wrote her visions up in her *Liber Vitae Meritorum* in c. 1158-1163.[5] Critics like Helen Foxhall-Forbes have pointed to debates which took place in the early middle ages.[6] Many of these criticisms of Le Goff's work are valid though many critics forget that he argues that purgatory was incubated for a number of centuries before being 'born' in 1170.[7] Furthermore, Alan Bernstein has also pointed out that other big developments during the period which Le Goff focusses on were the democratisation of conscience and the uptake in confession for the laity.[8] These developments in

[3] Jacques Le Goff's work is notoriously peculiar in how it seeks to establish the 'birth' of purgatory through tracing the history of the word *purgatorium* as well as the different types of fires described post-life, some being purifying and some being punitive, among other avenues of research. Le Goff's conclusion is that the word *purgatorium* was first popularised between 1170 and 1180, though he argues that the period that it 'firmly installed itself in the mind of Western Christendom' was roughly between 1150 and 1200. Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer, (Chicago, 1986), pp. 3-4 & p. 362.

[4] Graham Robert Edwards, 'Purgatory: Birth or Evolution?', *Journal Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 36, No. 4, October 1985, p. 635.

[5] Alan E. Bernstein, 'Heaven, Hell and purgatory: 1100-1500', *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Volume 4: Christianity in Western Europe, c. 1100-1500*, eds Miri Ruben & Walter Simons (Cambridge, 2009) , & Barbara Newman, Hildegard of Bingen and the "Birth of Purgatory", Mystics Quarterly, Vol. 19, No. 3 (September 1993), p. 91.

[6] For more information on this see: Helen Foxhall-Forbes, 'The Theology of the Afterlife in the Early Middle Ages, c. 600 – c. 1000', in *Imagining the Medieval Afterlife*, ed. Richard Matthew Pollard, Cambridges Studies in Medieval Literature, 114 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 153-175.

[7] Graham Robert Edwards, 'Purgatory: Birth or Evolution?', p. 635.

[8] Alan E. Bernstein, 'Heaven, Hell and purgatory: 1100-1500', p. 201.

pastoral care would have been important in creating a more systemised idea of purgatory as well as important in the developments in eschatology that this paper examines. The chapter also finds that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was a term generally associated with a particular type of commercial fraud whereby a merchant uses falsified measures to their advantage during an exchange. Time and again sources compare this fraud to how God does not behave, implicitly comparing God to a good merchant. Through doing this the sources both compare the relationship between God and the individual at judgement to a merchant ascribing value to particular goods. Analysis of the sources reveals that there was a wide discussion about God determining a bespoke punishment for each individual which was fitting to their acts and was compared to mercantile activity. Consequently, it is clear that the process of Purgatory was being thought through the same mechanisms of a mercantile exchange. Section One of this chapter explores the history of the phrase *pondus et pondus*, establishing that it underwent a significant rise in use from the late twelfth to the early thirteenth century. Section two clarifies the phrase's commercial connotations, first noting sources which explicitly reference the phrase to a description of a particular fraud before moving on to analyse the way that various sources provide further supporting evidence linking the phrase to commercial fraud in general. Finally, this chapter evidences how writers and scholars clearly linked God providing specific and individual punishments to people with merchants who ascribe precise prices to commodities.

Chapter Three investigates how writers and scholars debated how penance and purgatory were similar to paying for a debt. It then goes on to ask to what extent this analogy was merely a communication tool to help convey a rough idea of how purgatory and penance worked or whether some scholars based their idea of how these doctrines worked upon their knowledge of debt and credit. The chapter finds clear evidence in many sources that the logic that lay behind many late twelfth-and early-thirteenth century scholars' thoughts on penance and Purgatory was that both concepts were based on the idea of cancelling out wrongdoing in the same way that debt is struck off once paid back; in various sources, this logic was accompanied by references to debt or credit. This

chapter also finds evidence of some scholars rejecting or actively distancing penitential theology from this kind of logic. In instances that associate debt with these doctrines, it is unfortunately not always perfectly clear whether the association is only being made as a vague analogy or whether scholars' thinking on these doctrines was based on debt and credit. First this chapter provides an analysis of sources which appear to both reference debt and explain the doctrines through the logic of debt. Next the chapter examines sources which see purgatory as an extension of penance, suggesting that purgatory is like a continuation or a debt payment mechanism. Then the chapter provides analysis of sources which describe penance and Purgatory through the logic of debts. The chapter then turns to scholars such as Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, and Caesarius of Heisterbach whose writings all show how there was by no means a consensus on associating penance and Purgatory with debt. Moreover, through demonstrating that some scholars were actively pushing back against the association, it is proved that the use of the analogy remained a controversial topic of debate. Finally, the chapter explores writings of some scholars whose specific phraseology makes their logic difficult to interpret. The chapter also looks at writers whose analogies demonstrate a similar logic to debt; without any of the language of debt.

CHAPTER 1 – BALANCE THE TRANSITION FROM LIFE TO DEATH

The task of this section in its original guise, was to ascertain how Old Testament biblical laws around measurement were understood by high medieval thinkers. Through looking at a wide range of sources which quoted or paraphrased biblical laws referencing measurement it became clear that, though measurement and balance had been related to a wide range of topics, the most common thread running through many of these texts was about understanding and equating the moral value of a soul or life. Through conducting this research, it became clear that in about the late twelfth century and early thirteenth century a shift was taking place in how measurement and balance was understood in relation to salvation.

To conduct the research numerous Old Testament texts were chosen for examination because of their association with measurement and balance. Measurement and balance are closely associated with each other and in many respects are interchangeable. What follows is a list of the biblical verses which were chosen for examination in Chapter 1. Each text is listed in an English translation along with the original Latin verse, and a brief explanation explaining why the phrase was included in the research. For clarity's sake each of these verses has been taken from the 'Latin Vulgate', footnoted here.[9] Different ways of translating and interpreting each text exist and are considered as appropriate when the quotations are found in medieval texts.

Table 1	
Deuteronomy 25 13-16	*Thou shalt not have divers weights in thy bag, a greater and a less: Neither shall there be in thy house a greater bushel and a less. Thou shalt have a just and a true weight, and thy bushel shall be equal and true: that thou mayest live a long time upon the land which the Lord thy God shall give thee. For the Lord thy God abhorreth him that doth these things, and he hateth all injustice*
	non habebis in sacculo diversa pondera maius et minus nec erit in domo tua modius maior et minor pondus habebis iustum et verum et

[9] https://vulgate.org/ [last viewed 05/04/2024]

	modius aequalis et verus erit tibi ut multo vivas tempore super terram quam Dominus Deus tuus dederit tibi abominatur enim Dominus eum qui facit haec et aversatur omnem iniustitiam
	The text is relevant to this study as it is clearly gives instruction on measuring weight.
Leviticus 19 35-36	*Do not any unjust thing in judgment, in rule, in weight, or in measure. Let the balance be just and the weights equal, the bushel just, and the sextary equal. I am the Lord your God, that brought you out of the land of Egypt*
	nolite facere iniquum aliquid in iudicio in regula in pondere in mensura statera iusta et aequa sint pondera iustus modius aequusque sextarius ego Dominus Deus vester qui eduxi vos de terra Aegypti
	Leviticus 19 35-36 has also been considered for this study as instructs believers on a relationship between justice and measurement.
Micah 6 10-14	*As yet there is a fire in the house of the wicked, the treasures of iniquity, and a scant measure full of wrath. Shall I justify wicked balances, and the deceitful weights of the bag? By which her rich men were filled with iniquity, and the inhabitants thereof have spoken lies, and their tongue was deceitful in their mouth. And I therefore began to strike thee with desolation for thy sins. Thou shalt eat, but shalt not be filled: and thy humiliation shall be in the midst of thee: and thou shalt take hold, but shalt not save: and those whom thou shalt save, I will give up to the sword*
	adhuc ignis in domo impii thesauri iniquitatis et mensura minor irae plena numquid iustificabo stateram impiam et saccelli pondera dolosa in quibus divites eius repleti sunt iniquitate et habitantes in ea loquebantur mendacium et lingua eorum fraudulenta in ore eorum et ego ergo coepi percutere te perditione super peccatis tuis tu comedes et non saturaberis et humiliatio tua in medio tui et adprehendes et non salvabis et quos salvaveris in gladium dabo
	Micah 6 10-14 is included in this study due to its reference to wicked balances and deceitful balances.
Proverbs 20 10	*Diverse weights and diverse measures, both are abominable before God*

	pondus et pondus mensura et mensura utrumque abominabile est apud Deum
	Proverbs 20 10 was chosen due to its clear linking of incorrect measuring processes and God's perspective on them.
Proverbs 20 23	*Diverse weights are an abomination before the Lord: a deceitful balance is not good*
	abominatio est apud Deum pondus et pondus statera dolosa non est bona
	Proverbs 20 23 was chosen due to its clear linking of incorrect measuring processes and God's perspective on them.
Proverbs 11 1	*A deceitful balance is an abomination before the Lord: and a just weight is his will*
	statera dolosa abominatio apud Dominum et pondus aequum voluntas eius
	Proverbs 11 1 was chosen due to its clear linking of incorrect measuring processes and God's perspective on them.
Proverbs 16 11	*Weight and balance are judgments of the Lord: and his work all the weights of the bag*
	pondus et statera iudicia Domini sunt et opera eius omnes lapides sacculi
	Proverbs 16 11 was chosen due to its clear linking of incorrect measuring processes and God's perspective on them.
Proverbs 22 28	*Pass not beyond the ancient bounds which thy fathers have set*
	ne transgrediaris terminos antiquos quos posuerunt patres tui
	Proverbs 22 28 is perhaps the most contentious in why its finds its way into this study as its relationship to weights and measurement is less clear cut. However, this text is clearly related to measurement, with the reasons for this being twofold. Firstly, the notion of passing beyond any unitary measure clearly indicates a calculated extreme. In other

	words, the text suggests that one's forebears have measured out the point at which a maximum, yet measured quantity, becomes an extreme. That which is measured may of course change depending upon interpretation and context. Secondly, Proverbs 22 28 is relevant to this chapter because this text could be considered to be relevant to units of measurement being used. *Bounds* could equally be thought about through a set of measurements.

It should now be clear that all of the above texts which have been chosen as the focus of this chapter clearly reference 'measuring' and 'weighing' in some way and so could be expected to give an idea of what any meaning or symbolism lies behind 'measuring' in medieval thought. A few other biblical texts were considered for analysis in this chapter, though few instances of their use were discovered using the *Library of Latin Texts*. It is acknowledged that all these texts are Old Testament, this does not represent any active choice by the writer to focus on Old Testament writings but instead reflects the concentration of interest in weights and measures in the Old Testament of the Bible.

The following chapter is broken into two sections. The first section goes through predominantly earlier texts and considers how good acts were considered as 'balanced' acts and how a virtuous life was seen as *a 'balanced'* one. The second section looks at broadly later texts which consider how holiness and purity can be measured in a quantitative way, with analogies made to either weighing or measuring. The first section covers writings by Beatus of Liebana, Rabanus Maurus, Agobard of Lyon, and Bernard of Clairvaux. All of these writers, though chronologically spread out fit into a period of theology where the monastic ideal acted as a driving force, the monastic ideal was strong in both the eighth and ninth centuries with Bernard of Clairvaux representing a revival of their principles in eleventh and twelfth centuries. Monasticism acted as a driving force in this period's spiritual objectives stemming from Benedictine beliefs in *ora et labora* (work and prayer) concentrated in moderation and a life in deep prayer.

As Section 1.1 ‘Balance as a monastic virtue’ will demonstrate, a notion of ‘balance’ played a role in these ideals of moderation, with texts counselling people not to give into extremes in life. This belief in balance as a divine ideal also took hold in how particular acts could be portrayed as bad, such as hypocrisy which was characterised as wrong because it went against balance. Section 1.2 ‘Determining a value at the end of life’ first looks at Rabanus Maurus as an anomaly in his thinking about the relationship between balance and eschatology. It argues that Rabanus Maurus did show interest in understanding how a soul could be viewed as good or bad through seeking to measure it through a quantitative lens but that ultimately with no evidence of any contemporary or even near contemporaneous writers doing this, he must be seen as an anomaly. While much more evidence exists of later writers thinking about the moral value of a soul through quantitative means. These writers include Herman of Werden, Bonaventure, and Hugh of St Cher. Finally, Section 1.3 ‘Balance and Heresy’ examines Rupert of Deutz’s understanding of heresy through the prism of *balance*. Rupert of Deutz’s understanding of heresy as being out of balance is considered as additional good evidence of the binary nature of right and wrong being questioned in favour of understanding right and wrong through a more quantitative means. This is closely linked to the previous writers as it helps form a backdrop of debate about the role measuring the value of a soul how holiness can be measured in a quantitative way. The inclusion of the contemporaries Bernard of Clairvaux and Rupert of Deutz, despite both coming from monastic backgrounds, provide evidence that a transition from balance being vital to understandings of how to live a virtuous life, to balance and measurement instead playing an important role in the measurement of holiness demonstrates that this was not stark transition from one to the other but instead shows a more gradual development in how people were thinking about balance.

Evidence of the association of measurement, sin, and judgement come from a variety of sources and writers. The earliest writer recorded in this research is Beatus of Liebana while the latest is St. Bonaventure. The first section of this chapter finds that with the exception of Rabanus Maurus, earlier Carolingian texts held an association between measurement and balance during one’s life,

which was also an interest for Bernard of Clairvaux. However, later texts by Pater the Cantor, Herman of Werden, and St. Bonaventure, shifted in interest to the correct way of judging others and measuring the sins of others. In regard to sin, a clear tension emerges between earlier and later writers, between earlier writers who saw balance as an instrument to living a virtuous life, and between later writers who see measurement and balance as fundamental to assessing and categorising sin. This in itself can be used as evidence for a shift away from an interest in how to live out a 'Christian' life to growing interest and speculation about the end of life and judgement.

1.1 Balance as a monastic virtue

This section examines texts by Beatus of Liebana, Rabanus Maurus, Agobard of Lyon, and Bernard of Clairvaux advising people not to live by extremes. These texts argue that 'balance' and moderation should be strived for during one's life and seen as good objectives in themselves. These are in contrast with Section 1.2 which the emphasises the importance of *balance* as something to be achieved post death or at the end of life.

Beatus of Liebana (c. 750 – c. 800) clearly associates finding correct balance with acting in a virtuous way during one's life. In his 'Treatise on the Apocalypse' he draws a parallel between being critical of other people's sins and ignoring one's own, with a merchant who cons his customers through using two separate types of weight[10]. Having quoted Proverbs 20:10, the text draws a parallel between merchants weighing goods fraudulently, using one set of balances for their own goods and another for someone else's, and between judging another's evil differently to one's own. The treatise claims that to be hypocritical in judgement in this way would be 'to have weight and weight' and would contravene God's desires as one would not love one's neighbour as oneself. The

[10] The meaning behind the phrase *pondus et pondus* shall be fully examined in Chapter 2 and can be read about further there, though for the purposes of this section it is worth being aware that *pondus et pondus* was a common phrase associated with a merchant performing a con whereby they use inaccurate weights to their own advantage when buying and selling goods.

emphasis in this text is that the act of hypocrisy is an imbalanced act, not that an imbalanced judgement is being made. Initially, it is not entirely clear that Beatus is drawing a parallel between mercantile balance and between moral decision-making. However, ultimately he makes himself clear that he is talking about judging others with the same standards that one uses to judge oneself.[11] Though it could be argued that Beatus is talking about the more abstract judgement of man, it should be clear that in actuality he in thinking about the action of being judgmental of others and hypocrisy. This distinction is made clear from the use of the word 'neighbour' (*proxium*, *proximum*). It is important here to differentiate between 'judgement of mankind', being a more abstract judgement, conducted after death, and between the judgement of other people which is conducted by an individual during their own life and can under certain circumstances, such as hypocrisy contribute to an individual's sinful nature. Therefore, the concept of balance is being associated with the active pursuit of living well, as opposed to a point after death. Though the text does refer to judging others, it should not be read as a judicial nor an explicitly legal text. The text references the judgement of others in order to draw comparison with the reader's sins, thus maintaining a central theme of self-reflection, balance, and measurement being an important way to understand one's own sin during this period.

Again, a similar understanding of 'balance' in life being a virtue in itself is seen in Rabanus Maurus (c. 780 – c. 856) in his 'Ten Commentaries on Ecclesiasticus' (*Commentariorum in Ecclesiasticum libri decem*) where he draws a parallel between judicial acts of injustice and imbalance. Again, here the concept of balance rests upon moral or immoral acts which someone is presently involved in. He is firm in his association between measurement and justice, explaining that imbalance can not only be found in money but in judicial discretion.[12] Later in the same text he draws an analogy between balance being achieved through judging others in a similar way to

[11] Beatus Liebanesis, *Tractus de Apocalipsin*, ed. Roger Gryson, CCSL 107 C (London, 2012) 417, ('et sic se sicut proxium aspiceret, se in malis sicut proximum iudicaret').
[12] Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentariorium in Ecclesiastium libri decem*, PL 109, book 9, chap. 4, col. 1065, line 4, ('Statera dolosa non tantum in mensuratione pecuniae, sed et in judiciaria discretion tenetur').

oneself.[13] However, in the next breath he reverts back to comparing balance to people's physical actions during their life. He writes that imbalance can be found in people who do little work while having others work around them as well as people who do good in public and evil in private.[14] The fact that Rabanus Maurus saw legal judgement and moral judgment in the same vein should not be surprising, as Etienne Delaruelle and others have pointed out, political and moral authority were highly intertwined, with political reform seen through the light of moral reform.[15] Though Rabanus clearly holds a significant association between measurement and the judgement of a soul, this cannot necessarily be said for contemporary figures. Figures, like Isidore of Seville and Alcuin, representing earlier *writers* not contemporaneous ones, also wrote similar advice on judgement and upon judges, explaining how they ought be impervious to bribes and that they ought be impartial and sensitive in their conclusions.[16]

Achieving virtue through 'balance' in life can also be understood in the context of moderation, again, understood through the prism of 'weighing' and 'measuring' activity. Moderation should be considered as quantitative due to its fluidity, with one act of abstinence counteracting an opposing act of indulgence. The perceived virtues of moderation can be seen in Agobard of Lyon's (c. 769 – 856) *De spe et timore*. The fragmentary text *De spe et timore* invokes Leviticus 19 35-36 when he writes about the need for moderation in wine.[17] The text explains that too much wine causes intemperance and detracts from virtue, yet that St Paul argued that in moderation it could prove

[13] Ibid ('Sed et is qui sua bene gesta meliora quam proximorum, sua que errata judicat leviora quam aliorum, trutina ponderat dolosa'.)
[14] Ibid ('nec non et ille qui onera importabilia imponit in humeros hominum, ipse autem uno digito suo non vult ea tangere; ille etiam qui bona in publico et mala agit in occulto, pro iniquitate librae dolosae abominator a Domino'.)
[15] Rachel Stone, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire*, (Cambridge, 2012), p. 5.
[16] Ibid p. 165, The term used here, *earlier writers*, is merely meant to distinguish all these individuals from the later ones who first start to re-consider the role of *balance* and *measurement* in theological thinking in bulk in the twelfth-century.
[17] Agobardus Lugdunensis, *De spe et timore*, ed. L. van Acker, CCCM 52 (Turnhout, 1981), line 269, ('Omnibus namque praecipitur: Nolite facere iniquum aliquid in iudicio, in regula, in pondere, in mensura.
Quod autem saturitas uini fomentum sit omnium uitiorum, et experimento dignoscitur et Scriptura aperte testatur').

beneficial.[18] Though not specifically tied to conscience the text highlights how human virtue was associated with an attempt of achieving 'balance'. The overall purpose of *De spe et timore* remains unclear, whereas the audience is not. The text was written for Bishop Ebbo of Rheims between 823 and 826, an important figure who also served as Emperor Louis's librarian.[19] After the rebellion of 833, Agobard went from desperately trying to cultivate support from the court of Louis to launching a campaign of slander against him.[20] One could argue that the purpose of the source was to continue to vilify Emperor Louis through implication that immoderation of wine was another vice that he possessed, though Langenwalter and Cabarins both date this text to the 820s when Agobard was still furiously trying to cultivate the support of Louis. Moreover, of all the accusations of corruption and declining faculties that Agobard makes against Louis, drunkenness is not one of them.[21] At the time of writing Agobard was in the process of writing numerous other texts, such as 'On Privilege and Rights of the Priesthood' and 'On the manner of ecclesiastical rule', with which he and Bishop Bernard of Vienne hoped to instigate better standards of practice among the clergy.[22] This campaign of priestly reform may well indicate that the function of the extract on wine was to criticise certain habits of the clergy and others which were emerging around him. Moderation in the clergy's lives was no doubt a broader theme which Agobard considering when writing his *De spe et timore*.

Similarly, Bernard of Clairvaux (c. 1090-1153) saw balance as important to living a virtuous life and equated balance to the actions one performed during one's life as opposed to the purity of a soul at a point of judgement. In one of Bernard of Clairvaux's letters to Ralf of Domfront, Patriach of

---

[18] Ibid line 277, ('Amaritudo anime uinum multum potatum, hebrietatis animositas, imprudentis offensio, minorans uirtutem et faciens uulnera. Quam necessaria autem et utilis sit saluti mentis et corporis temperantia uini et in praedicto libro ostenditur, cum inter suprascriptas sententias dictum est: Aequa uita uinum hominibus, si bibas illud moderate, eris sobrius…… Sanitas est corpori et anime; et beatus Paulus demonstrat, cum dilecto discipulo medendi gratia praecipit, dicens: Noli adhuc aquam bibere, sed uino modico utere propter stomachum tuum et frequentes tuas infirmitates').
[19] Anna Beth Langenwelter, *Agobard of Lyon: An exploration of Carlolingian Jewish-Christian relations*, University of Toronto, PhD Thesis, 2009.
[20] Irene van Renswoude, *The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, (Cambridge, 2019), p. 207.
[21] Ibid p. 225.
[22] J. Allen Cabarius, 'Agobard of Lyons', *Speculum*, Jan. 1951, Vol. 26, No. 1., pp. 55-56.

Antioch, the association between measurement, and by implication balance, and the actions one performs in life is continued. He writes about the importance of asking the same of one's superiors as one expects from one's inferiors, explaining that through not doing this one would have 'weight and weight' and 'measure and measure'.[23] This phrase clearly associates imbalanced scales from a commercial transaction with not actively living a 'Christian' life as opposed to the soul being found to be in some way imbalanced in some form of judgement. He then goes on to link this idea to Matthew 8:9, where a centurion references how he is both under authority and an authority in his own right.[24] The way that the centurion chose to highlight how he was still subject to authority appears to have impressed Bernard. Though on first appearance Bernard appears unusual in linking the idea of measurement, hierarchy, responsibility and humility; this connection may well be explained through Cistercian 'love theology' and its origins. These connections are better understood when linked through the idea of achieving balance and moderation within one's life, rather than for the end of it. Moreover, this passage makes clear that Bernard associated 'balance' with moderation and not judgement.

This letter demonstrates Bernard's willingness to explain church matters through a Cistercian, or monastic lens, and links monastic ideas of holiness to balance. The letter was written to Ralf of Domfront during the period that he was Patriarch of Antioch from 1135 to 1140. The broader theme of this letter is Bernard outlining responsibility in the church and how powerful clerics can fall below the standards expected of them.

It should be clear that all the texts discussed in this section placed an emphasis upon achieving some form of 'balance' during one's life and understood this as moral and holy way of

[23] Bernardus Claraeuallensis, *Bernardi opera*, ed. J. Leclerq & H. M. Rochais, Editiones Cistercienses (Rome, 1977), 362., ('Abominabiles ergo apud Deum sumus, si non eodem pondere vel mensura superioribus').
[24] Ibid 363, ('Non possum satis mirari cautam humilem que centurionis fidem et responsionem, qua legitur as Salvatorem ita dixisse: nam et ego sum homo sub potestate, habens sub me milites').

living, defining good acts through some kind of balance or moderation, moderation being akin to balance in that it opposes all forms of extreme.

1.2 Determining a value at the end of life

In the twelfth and thirteenth century the role of balance is eschatological thinking changes from a metaphorical understanding of a virtuous life as being 'balanced', to being replaced with a belief in the importance of being able to accurately measure holiness or religiosity. An earlier tradition of this thinking can be found in the works of Rabanus Maurus but does not appear to be in anyway a widespread belief. It is of course possible that this debate around the measurement of holiness and religiosity was taking place elsewhere prior to the twelfth and thirteenth century, though chapters two and three act as supporting, if not conclusive evidence that this was not the case. It is important to again re-emphasize that the conclusions of chapter one, which largely rest on the following section, are not significant if read in isolation to the rest of the thesis. This section plays an important role in providing supporting evidence, that an interest in precise measurement of souls developed in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century and that this interest was a significant development in eschatological thought.

This section shall first analyse texts where Rabanus Maurus wrote about measuring the value of a soul and explain how these instances can be seen as isolated anomalies. Then this section shall then go through examples of when Herman of Werden and Bonaventure wrote about justice being a quantitative commodity which is measured out precisely and not spoken about in binary terms. This section shall explain how neither of these two figures were writing in a vacuum, and how the particular texts provide evidence that the precise nature of justice was being debated in places of learning in the early twelfth century.

Rabanus Mauras acts as an early proponent of the idea that the rights and wrongs of a soul or person could be understood through quantitative means, though he appears very much as an anomaly. He acts as a contrast to his contemporaries outlined in the above section, who saw

measurement as key to understanding the process of performing a Christian life. Believing that souls could be assessed through a qualitative approach was an important development which continues with later writers. The unusually early association between *balance* and judging others can be seen in Rabanus Maurus' 'Commentary on Deuteronomy' (*Enarratio super Deuteronomium*). In this text he argues that measurement should be understood in a spiritual as well as material way. He argues that people ought not use differing weights and measures when making conscience-based decisions.[25] Through explaining particular acts of conscience as things which can be accurately weighed and measured, Rabanus clearly appreciated that particular acts of conscience could be isolated from each other, and that dependent upon circumstance, the evil in every wrong act could be differentiated from another. This is quite different from the notion, addressed in Section 1.1, that the role of balance in eschatology was living a balanced life without excess. Moreover, the logical consequence of Rabanus' thinking is that the wrongdoing of each individual can be thought about in an individual and qualitative fashion.

Rabanus Maurus also saw perfect justice as resting upon balance and measurement. The logical conclusion of seeing justice as based on measurement is that measurement has a significance after, not during, life. In Section 1.1 'balance' was used to explain a 'God-ly' lifestyle, here balance is seen as providing justice after death.[26] In *his* 'Expositions on Leviticus' (*Expositiones in Leuiticum*) he makes use of Leviticus 19 35-36 to explain how justice should be fair and balanced. He argues that it is with balances, weights, and measures that justice is enacted or prevented.[27] The logical consequence of this statement is that any form of divine justice rests upon a quantitative approach

[25] Hrabanus Maurus, *Enarratio super deuteronomium*, ed. J. P. Migne, PL 108 (1864) book 3, chapter 21, col: 945, line 22., 'Proinde non solum illo corporali, sed etiam spiritali modo studendum est nobi, ut nec diversa pondera in cordibus nostris, nec in domo conscientiae nostrae mensuras duplices habeamus'.)

[26] The term '*God-ly*' though unorthodox shall be used continually during this thesis as an adjective to denote how an act could be seen as being performed in the *image of God* so to speak. As shall become clearer towards the end of the thesis, it is not only God's own *modus operandi* that was being compared to mercantile activities but also ideal *Christian* ways of thinking and behaving.

[27] Hrabanus Maurus, *Expositiones in Leuiticum*, ed. J.P. Migne PL 108, book 6, chap. 10, col: 461, line 16, ('Nunc autem nec in mensuris injuste agere, nec in pondere, nec in stateris praecepit, ne forte his ipsis quae quasi termini sunt justitiae as injustitiam').

to determining sin. Rabanus further clarifies that balancing is pivotal at judgement in particular, through warning against judging one's neighbours' sins with different measures to oneself.[28]

The same shift in emphasis, away from seeing balance as something which was to be achieved in life, to something which is plays a role in judgement post-death, is seen in much later texts, where more evidence exists of the idea's widespread circulation and acceptance. One such text was Herman of Werden's (fl. 1220s) *Hortus Deliciarum* written some four centuries after Rabanus Maurus' death. Herman of Werden writes that weight and balance are judgements of God and that his works are stones in a bag.[29] This latter section is a clear reference to Deuteronomy 25:13-16, which reads, 'Do not have two differing weights in your bag—one heavy, one light'. An association is clearly being drawn between God's works and weights, meaning that God's means of working is through measuring. When, as here, God's means of working are associated with judgements it becomes clear that Herman understands God's judgement a something adjudicated through a quantitative means, meaning that God judges each individual in a perfectly proportionate way.

Herman goes on to make the association between a religious ideal of balance and judgement through explicitly stating that God's judgements were made through quantitative means. He states that Christ makes judgements through weight and balance and that God weighs all things through weight, balance, and number giving gifts to the good and less to the evil.[30] Though in the second excerpt one could speculate that God having determined someone's good or evil through qualitative means, He then makes a binary decision as to their punishment or reward. However, the use of the word *minora* from *minor* makes clear that Herman understands that God shall give a precise, measured, and individual decision. *Minor* has numerous potential translations though all of them emphasise the idea of lesser, shorter, or smaller as opposed to less, short, or small and thus

[28] Ibid, line 33, ('Sed nec injustum in judicio mentis faciamus, nec mensuras et strateras ejus, quae naturaliter nobis insita est justitiae corrumpamus, aliter nostra, et aliter proximi peccata judicantes').
[29] Hermannus Werdinensis, *Hortus deliciarum*, ed. P. G. Schmidt, CCCM 204, (Turnhout, 2005), 200, ('Pondus et statera iudicia Domini sunt, et opera eius omnes lapides sacculi').
[30] Hermannus Werdinensis, *Hortus deliciarum*, 200, ('Christi iudicia pondus sunt atque statera… Pondere, mensura, numero Deus omnia pensat Prestans dona bonis magna, minora malis').

the word minor clearly emphasises a balanced gradation of balance which has been determined through accurate quantitative measurement.

Whether or not the precise connotations and their significance was understood by Herman's contemporaries is of course impossible to establish. However, it would appear that the text was widely circulated in amongst monasteries and used for teaching purposes, implying a potential motive to Herman for writing it. Written in 1226 the text fits into the genre of versified glosses also formulated by Lawrence of Durham, Matthew of Vendôme, and Petrus of Riga.[31] The text itself was no doubt written as a supplement for the extremely popular *Aurora*, acting as a versified gloss to the Proverbs.[32] Surviving manuscripts of this text remain low, with only two certified copies with the likelihood of a third which has been lost despite the *Auruoa*'s over 250 manuscripts.[33] However, additions to the Brussels text (Bibliothèque Royale, MS. 11525) suggest that the manuscript was heavily used during the thirteenth century, with numerous notes and annotations having been added.[34] Paul Schmidt has argued that Herman's text was a versification of Bede's commentary on the proverbs and was not an original work in itself.[35] Texts like Bede's were commonly versified for teaching purposes, with Lombard's 'Sentences', Comestor's 'Scholastic Histories', and Gratian's *Decretum* all being prime examples.[36] Paul Schmidt is right to point to many similarities between Herman's work and Bede's commentary. However, allusions between weighing, balancing, and judgement are certainly not lifted from Bede. Bede's text instead reads that weight and balance are the judgments of God with his works being all the stones of the age, before going on to consider stones as symbols of faith, citing St Peter as an example.[37] Bede continues, choosing to

[31] Monika Otter, 'Hermanni Werdinensis Hortus Deliciarum', *Medium Aevum*, Vol. 75, Iss. 2, p. 356.
[32] Jeffrey F. Hamburger, 'Herman of Werden's Hortus Deliciarum Salomonis: discovered, lost and recovered', Scriptorium, 1989, Vol. 43 (1), p. 123.
[33] Ibid p. 123-25.
[34] Ibid p. 127.
[35] Monika Otter, 'Hermanni Werdinensis Hortus Deliciarum', Medium Aevum, Vol. 75, Iss. 2, p. 356.
[36] Joseph Goering, *William de Montibus (c.1140-1213): The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care*, (Toronto, 1992), p. 48.
[37] Beda Venerabilis - *In prouerbia Salomonis libri iii* (CPL 1351), book 2, cap. 16, linea 66, ('Pondus et statera iudicia domini sunt, et opera eius omnes lapides saeculi. Lapides saeculi iustos et fide fortes appellat quales

discuss God's role in creation. Therefore, any similarity in the texts between Herman of Werden and Bede, should not undermine the argument that Rabanus was unusual in associating quantitative measurement with judgement as no section of Bede's commentary on the Proverbs suggests that he was thinking along similar lines. In fact, quite the contrary, if anything Herman's chain of thought would seem to prove originality in his thinking on measurement and qualitative judgement.

Bonaventure and Hugh of St Cher continue to understand idealised balance through a quantitative judgement. In Bonaventure's (1221-1274) 'Commentary on the Gospels of Luke', he explains Deuteronomy 25:13 and Proverbs 20:10 as meaning that individuals ought not judge their own faults less harshly than other peoples'.[38] Though Bonaventure is writing about people judging others, not God judging people he still suggests that souls can be compared in a quantitative fashion as if one was comparing goods. This is different to the previous texts on hypocrisy because with Bonaventure the focus appears to be the process of how the judgement is made not, as with Beatus of Liebena in Section 1.1, with hypocrisy being a wrong act because of its association with imbalance. Bonaventure often used aspects of bits of scripture to explain other scripture, in fact that this was a centrepiece of his hermeneutical method.[39] He makes his understanding of the interconnectedness of the Bible clear in his *Hexaëmeron* ('Collections on the Six Days'), where he writes 'one passage of scripture depends upon another. Indeed, a thousand passages are related to a single passage'.[40] Moreover, a significant influence upon Bonaventure was Hugh of St Cher (c. 1200-1263). Robert Karris' research has demonstrated Hugh's influence both more generally on the

esse desiderabat apostolus Petrus eos quibus ammonens ait: Et uos tamquam lapides uiui superaedificamini domus spiritales').

[38] Bonauentura, *Commentarius in Euangelium sancti Lucae, Opera omnia*, t. VII, ed. PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, 1895, p. 307, ('Unde contra istos Deuteronomii vigesimo quinto: "Non habebis in sacculo diversa pondera"; et Proverbiorum vigesimo: "Pondus et pondus, mensura et mensura; utrumque abominabile est apud Deum". Hoc autem est, cum homo sibi est misericors et proximo vel subdito durus; cum nihil portat, sed totum aliis portandum imponit').

[39] *The works of Bonaventure, Vol. VIII, Part 3, St Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, Chapters 17-24*, Intro. & Trans Robert J Karris, (New York, 2004), p. viii.

[40] Ibid p. xv.

'Commentary on Luke' as well as this section specifically.[41] Hugh of St Cher also made use of these sections from Deuteronomy and Proverbs to make a similar point.[42] The connection with Hugh of St Cher illustrates that this was clearly not an isolated view on measurement. Hugh of St Cher taught at the university of Paris from 1230 to 1235 and would consequently have been aware of numerous theological debates which were circulating.[43] Moreover, it informs us that Bonaventure was not thinking about comparing souls in a qualitative way in isolation from other thinkers. The fact that he takes this interpretation from the Dominican Hugh of St Cher only goes to illustrate the way that an association between judgement and measurement was an idea which was in wide circulation. Due to the depth of analysis and reference that Bonaventure provides in this text, Robert Karris' analysis of Bonaventure's 'Commentary on Luke' places it as being written about 1257 when he was a master at Paris as a opposed to the earlier date of 1248.[44] Should Karris' analysis be correct, then the period of association between measurement and judgement is lengthened somewhat, though this can be attributed to the heavy influence of Hugh of St Cher upon Bonaventure.

In concluding Section 1.2 it should be clear that a Rabanus Maurus, Herman of Werden, Bonaventure, and Hugh of St Cher all understood balance as something important to be attained at the end of life or after death and that all these writers with the exception of Rabanus Maurus were writing during the thirteenth century. The fact that these thinkers were writing later than those discussed in Section 1.1 suggests a shift in interest in how 'balance' was seen as important during the period. It should also be clear that these writers had begun to understand judgment as

---

[41] For more on links between Hugh of St Cher and Bonaventure's *Commentary on Luke* see: Robert J. Karris, 'A comparison of the glossa ordinaria, Hugh of St. Cherand St. Bonaventure on Luke 8:26-39', Franciscan Studies 58 (2000) pp. 121-236 & Robert J. Karris, 'Bonaventure's Commentary on Luke: Four Case Studies of his Creative Borrowing from Hugh of St. Cher', Franciscan Studies 59 (2001) pp. 133-236 & Robert J. Karris, St. Bonaventure's Use of Distinctiones: His Independence of and Dependence on Hugh of St. Cher', Franciscan Studies 60 (2002), pp. 209-250.

[42] *The works of Bonaventure, Vol. VIII, Part 3, St Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, Chapters 17-24*, Intro. & Trans Robert J Karris, (New York, 2004), p. 1120.

[43] Magdalena Bieniak, *The Soul-Body Problem at Paris Ca 1200-1250 : Hugh of St-Cher and His Contemporaries*, Leuven University, 2011, p. 9.

[44] *The works of Bonaventure, Vol. VIII, Part 3, St Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, Chapters 17-24*, Intro. & Trans Robert J Karris, (New York, 2004), p. xii.

something far more complicated than a binary choice between good or bad, or saved or dammed. Instead these writers had come to understand judgement as associated with quantification and balance.

1.3 'Balance' and 'Heresy'

This section shall cite texts of Rupert of Deutz, whose comments on heresy in the twelfth century demonstrate that purity of doctrine could also be measured in quantitative and not in binary terms. This section shall then have demonstrated that by the beginning of the twelfth century an interest had developed in measuring people's errors and misdemeanours through a quantitative understanding of sin and eschatology.

Though much earlier than Herman of Werden, Hugh of St Cher, and Bonaventure; Rupert of Deutz's analogy between heresy and measurement provides evidence of people beginning to question to what extent correct doctrine and belief was about binary choices, in a similar way to how writers discussed in Section 1.2 questioned whether the right and wrong in judgement worked in a totally binary way. In his 'On the Holy Trinity and It's Works' (*De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*) Rupert links heresy with Deuteronomy 25: 13-16. He references Deuteronomy 25: 13-16 and states that using different sized wights analogous to an heretic.[45] Later on in the same text Rupert gives further clarification to his logic when again addressing the text from Deuteronomy. Rupert writes that the business of a merchant is to take something and then pass on a lesser version of it.[46] Rupert then goes on to explain that people have the power to take God's words and again pass on a lesser version of them.[47] He writes that when someone does this they are correctly weighing God's word

[45]Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 21 (Turnhout, 1972) 52, ('de eo quod ait: non habebis in sacculo diuersa pondera maius et minus et quod spiritualiter haec apud se habeat haereticus').
[46] Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 22 (Turnhout, 1972) 1059, ('Eiusmodi emptores ac uenditores recte mangones quasi mancones uocamus eo quod acceperint uel emerint dando uel uenumdando mancum faciant id est minus').
[47] Ibid 1059, ('Talibus recte similis existimatur quisquis in negotiatone caelesti ac spirituali positus pretiosas uerbi dei margaritas quascumque acceperit parte aliqua in reddendo mutilat').

then corrupting it.[48] Again, he then finally explains that this behaviour is heretical.[49] The clear implication here is that adjudicating upon ideas relevant to God's *modus operandi* is like weighing goods with scales. When we consider the tradition of seeing heretics as maintaining views which are at an extreme it makes it all the more likely that using word in a theological way.

Rupert of Deutz's (c. 1075/80- c. 1129) understanding of incorrect Christian teaching and learning as being like an imbalance espoused in further detail in a later section of the *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*. Again, quoting Deuteronomy 25:13-16, he then goes on to say that with ideal weights one ought live upon the land which the lord has gifted. Given the previous text, it should be clear that this should not be interpreted as a plea for perfect dimensions or anything of that nature, but instead should be understood as Rupert explaining his reader should live to God's rules faithfully. Rupert goes on to explain how merchants usually operate through buying something more for less, then give away less for more. Somewhat surprisingly, he then draws a parallel between this and explaining scripture, pointing out that there are those who receive understanding of scripture but then find a way of perverting it, deeming these people as heretics.[50] Again, this gives the idea that God's word is weighed and that heresy derives from an imbalance, with the opposite of this being religious truth and orthodoxy – balance. Consequently, one can see Rupert linking together the morality of earlier writers and his own views on heresy, through religious virtue being seen in balance in both instances. By doing so he bridges the gap between heresy and inner balance which was important in making religious judgement. John van Engen has explained that the most likely writing audience of this text was for monks, this can be seen from the number of surviving texts found in abbeys and monasteries.[51] Thus, though Rupert of Deutz wrote about the rights and wrongs of heresy as opposed judgement, Rupert does provide clear evidence of a fracturing in the

[48] Ibid 1059, ('qui dei uerbum recto intrinsecus sensu per intellectum ponderans contentiose tamen extrinsecus peruersis uocibus exponendo peruertit').
[49] Ibid 1059, ('Abominatur inquit dominus eum qui facit haec quia uidelicet haereticus et impius est').
[50] Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*, CCCM 22, 1059, ('qui dei uerbum recto intrinsecus sensu per intellectum ponderans contentiose tamen extrinsecus peruersis uocibus exponendo peruertit. Abominatur inquit dominus eum qui facit haec quia uidelicet haereticus et impius est').
[51] John H. van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, (Los Angeles, London, 1983), pp. 81-82.

understanding of what was right and wrong, preferring to understand this through a quantitative means of measurement. A potential reason for his views on heresy not spreading could be that though his works were extremely popular, with over 250 surviving copies, they were predominantly held in Southern Germany. [52]

1.4 Concluding thoughts for chapter one

Before the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, the idea of achieving 'balance' or moderation in life was seen as a moral act in itself, however at this point a change took place where balance and measurement was thought about in quantitative way through the commercial lens of a merchant using a pair of scales. Therefore, 'balance' was no longer spoken about as something that was achieved during one's life but was instead something which was achieved after death, the 'balance' went from being an 'inner-balance' of the human being to a 'balance' between good and bad which was achieved after death. 'Balance' in both cases was associated with divine perfection. This trend in association can be seen in considerations of judgement as well as visual imaginings of how heresy was viewed. Le Goff has made the case that purgatory developed for a number of reasons, although it should also be understood that this change in understanding balance and judgement was an important factor in the development of purgatory. This development in how and when balance is achieved is important as this was a necessary step for the creation of purgatory as shall be expanded upon later. The shift in understanding balance as something to be achieved at the end of life as opposed to during one's life permanently ceases the Augustinian notion that life itself was a form of purgatory and goes some way to explaining the development of pastoral care. The wider shift in seeking to achieve some form of balance or perfection after death is also an important factor in the development of purgatory as an idea.

[52] Ibid, pp. 4-5 & p. 72

One of the ways that the developments of Chapter One can be understood is the wider internalisation of conscience. Rabanus Maurus' interpretation of Deut. 25 13-16 considers balance as something which is internalised, much like sin. This internalisation is part of another shift which was taking place during this period. Peter the Cantor much like other theologians of his day argued that there were four aspects of penance, two which were internal infusion of grace and contrition of the heart, as well as two which were external confession of the mouth and satisfaction of deeds.[53] This was a view developed by Peter Abelard (c. 1079 – 1142) and then popularised by Peter the Cantor, some such as Robert of Courson (1160/70 – 1219) even went so far as to state that in extremis inner contrition would be enough to receive divine pardon.[54] The internalisation of sin and the achieving of balance should be understood within the wider context of purgation taking place post-death and the achieving of an internal balance for death not as an everyday part of life.

[53] John W. Baldwin, *Masters, princes, and merchants: the social views of Peter the Chanter and his circle*, (Princeton, 1970), p. 50.
[54] Ibid, p. 50.

Chapter 2: 'Pondus et pondus' the mercantile judge in the late twelfth and early 13th century

When researching how notions of 'weighing' and 'measuring' were understood in medieval theological thought, it is evident that the phrase 'weight and weight' (*pondus et pondus*) keeps reappearing in texts and treatises. There is further evidence in certain texts that directly links the use of this phrase to a specific form of mercantile fraud. This should not be confused with the burgeoning of medieval economic thought, which has been extensively discussed by Odd Langholm in his *Economics in the Medieval Schools* (1992) or the social views of commerce which preceded these which have been studied by Baldwin in his *Masters, princes, and merchants: the social views of Peter the Chanter and his circle* (1970). In his seminal work on medieval economics, Langholm makes the point that research focuses little upon the allegorical use or understanding of economic ideas in theology as his interests were specifically how the medieval economy was understood by thinkers of the time.[55] Langholm explains that these two different things are often found in different texts, as commentaries or explicitly theological texts 'were mentally tuned to a different task and therefore not normally inclined to pause for any thorough discussion of economic matters when the opportunity for doing so occasionally presented itself' in fact often, 'when wealth or economics is referred to in a text a moral message of possible contemporary relevance is lost in search for some hidden allegory'.[56] In contrast to Langholm, this chapter explicitly seeks to understand and grapple with the role of economic allegory in medieval theological thought and its implications. With the original intention of understanding analogies of weighing and measuring in high medieval thought, it

[55] Odd Langholm, *Economics in the Medieval Schools: Wealth, Exchange, Value, Money and Usury according to the Paris Theological Tradition 1200-1350*, (Leiden, 1992) p. 29.
[56] Ibid, p. 29.

has become clear that mercantile processes were developing firm theological associations. This chapter looks at the specific, yet reoccurring phrase *pondus et pondus*.

From about the mid-twelfth century a strong tradition emerges of using the phrase *pondus et pondus* ('weight and weight') in religious works relating to God's relationship with man, specifically for this section in regards to an 'individual's' judgement after death.[57] However by the middle of the thirteenth-century the usage of the phrase *pondus et pondus* drops suddenly. Meanwhile, this period also sees a shift in how wealth was perceived. At the beginning of this period wealth was seen as something at odds with *Christian* ideals of moderation and poverty. These ideals are easily identifiable in the foundation and subsequent growth of the Cistercians, who at around 1100 A.D. opted for a more strict interpretation of monasticism and the *Rule of St Benedict* than was being practiced by the Benedictine communities of the time.[58] In a further push for a more austere Christianity the Franciscans were formed at the beginning of the thirteenth century, with the ideal of poverty playing a central part of their mission. Though, as Odd Langholm's research has shown, by the middle of the thirteenth century, views on wealth had changed within learned circles. A more sophisticated understanding of economic structures developed, meaning that it became understood that if all individuals were to give up their wealth society would cease to function. Wealth was no longer seen as the route of all evil, instead concentration became more focussed on which ways of acquiring wealth were moral.

Odd Langholm attributes this change solely to the writings of Aristotle, though it is worth noting that prior to this the phrase *pondus et pondus* was being used in explanations of the

[57] It is important to note here the distinction between judgement of an individual after death and between the judgement of man as a collective. The judgement of an individual refers to a moment after death where any individual is judged by God, whereas the judgment of mankind is widely understood as different point after death and is associated with the apocalypse.

[58] It is accepted that the foundation chronology and dates of the Cistercians is greatly debated. Traditionally the Cistercians have been said to have been founded in 1098, though in recent years this has been questioned for more on this read Constance H. Berman's 'The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe', (Pennsylvania, 2000), and for a different perspective see Elizabeth Freeman, 'What makes a monastic order? Issues of methodology in "The Cistercian Evolution"', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37, Iss. 4, pp. 429-442.

relationship between God and the individual. In these explanations God's *modus operandi* was continually being compared with that of a merchant. 'God-ly' behaviour was seen as making correct and precise judgements about individuals. Importantly, as these judgements were being compared to a merchant ascribing a correct value to a product, they were 'precise' and 'bespoke' to each individual. Consequently, not only was God being compared to a merchant, but mercantilism was also being seen through an idealised lens, suggesting that the re-appraisal of mercantilism attributed to Aristotle was just part of a wider movement of re-imagining material wealth and economy.

Aristotelian thought saw money as an ideal tool for creating just and correct balance in exchange, thus seeing it as imperative to holding society together. Aristotle's thinking relied on the fact that money acted as a perfect equaliser between two very different goods, such as a shoe and a house; the idea being that finding the correct number of shoes that would be worth the same as a house would be extremely inconvenient, therefore the purpose of money to be a numerical substance that can represent the value any object when multiplied, added, or subtracted.[59] Odd Langholm argued that it was purely the discoveries of Aristotle's economic thought which forced a shift in how commerce was viewed, evidently the findings of this study suggest otherwise.

The fact that the *pondus et pondus* analogy ceases in popularity in the mid-thirteenth century should indicate a shift in how 'balance' was now being viewed in eschatological thought. Both this and the following chapter contend that it is no coincidence that ideals of balance die off at the same time as purgatory is confirmed. As both chapters shall illustrate 'balance' played an important role in the development of the doctrine of purgatory, though once the idea was established 'balance' was dispensed of as an analogy of how purgatory functioned, in favour of analogies concerning cleanliness. This in turn ensured that everyone's work received fair reward, allowing for complex exchanges to take place.[60] In about the same period purgatory, which Le Goff's

[59] Joel Kaye, *Economy and Nature in the Fourteenth Century: Money, Market Exchange, and the Emergence of Scientific Thought*, (Cambridge, 1998), p. 44.
[60] Joel Kaye, *Economy and Nature in the Fourteenth Century,* p. 51.

research argues came into existence in the late twelfth century, was formally established as orthodox thought at the Second Council of Lyon in 1274. It is of course accepted that Le Goff's work is greatly disputed and can be said to leave many questions relating to purgatory unanswered. However, as outlined in the introduction to this study, Le Goff's findings surrounding when precisely 'purgatory' became a 'mainstream' and 'generally' *accepted* idea remain unaltered. This study thus accepts his argument that purgatory as a place where penance was conducted and people spiritually cleansed was an idea which was formulised and became widely accepted during the thirteenth century. The link between purgatory and balance should be clear in that purgatory allowed a point post-death where imbalances in the perfections of one's soul could be purified.[61] This idea of purification is subtly different from the notion of cleansing, as cleansing suggests restoring, through perhaps removing impurities from a substance or dirt from a surface. In contrast to this, balance is about finding a quantity of two substances, where even if two substances have different densities or values, the quantity of one substance can be said to equate to the quantity of the other, leaving neither substance in excess of the other. Consequently, two contrasting ways of viewing purgatory can be envisaged, one as a place where the good and evil of an individual are balanced out and the other where an individual is purged of their evil. This chapter suggests that through interpreting the *pondus et pondus* analogy it can be suggested that during the thirteenth century both approaches were taken until finally the cleansing analogy became the accepted and orthodox view at some point before 1274 or thereabouts.

Section 2.1 'Early Uses of *pondus et pondus*' sets out the history of the phrase *pondus et pondus* prior to the twelfth century. It highlights that the phrase underwent its most popular use in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The section then goes on to analyse various uses of the term before the eleventh century, concluding that the phrase was hardly used and that no firm theme or pattern of use seemed to exist before it was popularised in the eleventh century. Section

2.2 ‘To ponder: *pondus et pondus*’ links the phrase *pondus et pondus* directly to a particular mercantile fraud whereby a merchant deliberately corrupts the measuring process to buy or sell at his advantage. The section analyses texts which give a direct description of this fraud and identify it as *pondus et pondus*. The section first looks at a comparatively earlier work by Ratherius of Verona before moving on to examining texts by a handful of writers from the early thirteenth century from varied intellectual traditions and geographical places, who again identify a specific fraud with the phrase *pondus et pondus*. This is followed by Section 2.3 ‘A broader mercantile context for *pondus et pondus’*, which examines texts from a number of writers which all provide contextual evidence linking the phrase *pondus et pondus* with mercantile fraud. This concludes the first half of the chapter which firmly associates the phrase *pondus et pondus* with a specific mercantile fraud. The second half of the chapter seeks to explain the use of the phrase *pondus et pondus* as it was used in scholastic and theological works.

Section 2.4 ‘The God merchant and bespoke judge’ is divided into a couple of sections which all aim to examine the use of the phrase *pondus et pondus* in theological and scholastic writing during its period of popular use. Section 2.5 ‘How God works: mercantilism – analogy or reality?’ analyses some texts using the phrase *pondus et pondus* and asks to what extent the particular writers understood God through the analogy of Him as a merchant. Did these writers literally understand God’s *modus operandi* as being like a good merchant or did they only see a similarity between how God worked and how a good merchant operates? This section concludes that it is not always clear which is the case but that either way writers were definitely drawing parallels between God and good mercantile practice. Section 2.6 ‘God-ly judgement: a warning to the individual’ examines texts which compare good religious judgement of individuals with the commercial practice of weighing and measuring things at market. It concludes that the correct judgement of sin was compared by some writers to a commercial exchange taking place, with religious or ‘God-ly’ judgement being a precise and quantitative act which could be said to ascribe people a value. Section 2.7 ‘Bernard of Clairvaux: a paradox’ explains how Bernard of Clairvaux, who saw wealth as a

bad thing in itself had got used to thinking about God in commercial language, comparing his *modus operandi* to a merchant. The chapter then ultimately concludes with Section 2.8, which argues that the phrase *pondus et pondus* represented a commercial fraud which was seen as 'un-God-ly', with people therefore implicitly arguing that God's *modus operandi* in judgement is like a good merchant. It contests that people understood that God judged people in a quantitative fashion balancing out their wrong acts with their right ones after death.

2.1 'Early Uses of *pondus et pondus*'

This section shall briefly examine the use of the phrase *pondus et pondus* prior to the twelfth century. It shall also demonstrate that the phrase was at its most popular use at the turn of the thirteenth century. The particular phrase *pondus et pondus* is evidently of relevance in this period as seen from its prevalence in the Latin texts found on the *Library of Latin Texts*. Using the online *Library of Latin Texts* a study of the use of the phrase has allowed the reader to understand how this phrase was used over the centuries.[62] From this investigation, it can be seen that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was used rarely between c. 200 AD and c. 500 AD, with only two recorded uses. From the period between c. 501 AD and 735 AD the phrase has only been recorded five times. While in the period between c. 1500 AD to c. 1965 AD, again there are only two recorded usages of this term. However, between c. 736 AD and c. 1500 AD, the phrase has been recorded seventy-five times. This significant peak in the term's usage is even more astounding when one considers that of those seventy-five uses, forty-one of them were between c. 1150 AD and c. 1260 AD. The significant uptake in the term's use after c. 1150 may be somewhat explained through the increase in writing and literacy that took place in this period. However, had the phrase been of such essential importance to Christianity we might expect to see the term being used more in texts by surviving patristic writers.

[62] Naturally, the reliance of this aspect of the research upon the *Library of Latin Texts* does come with various implications for the research. These have been touched on earlier on in this text and can again be reviewed on pages 7-8 of this work.

Furthermore, the drop in usage in the mid-to-late thirteenth century still leaves questions unanswered as to why the vogue for the term existed. As a result, the only likely remaining outcome is that the uptake in the use of this phrase derives from a growing interest in weight and balance due to scientific considerations or a growing awareness and discussion of commercial activity. As the texts in which the phrase is adopted tend to be theologically minded and not scientific or lay administrative, it should be concluded that the main reason for the uptake in the use of this phrase was a growing interest in using commercial models of thinking in the theological realm. Ultimately the phrase was used in numerous different contexts with much space for further exploration of the phrase, though the phrase was most commonly used in regards to the relationship between God the individual, which is the avenue which will be explored in this chapter.

Prior to the period under investigation in this study there was no widespread use of the term *pondus et pondus*. Moreover, though the phrase was occasionally used with reference to judgement and forgiveness there was no widely accepted understanding of the phrase. Between c. 200 and c. 500 AD the only two writers to use the term are Lucifer of Cagliari and Augustine of Hippo. Lucifer of Cagliari uses the term in a text where he uses it to explain the wrong in judging people in absentia.[63] From c. 501 AD to c. 735 AD the phrase is recorded by four different writers. Gregory the Great uses it in his *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam* ('Homily on the Prophet Ezechiel') to explain how deceitful merchants can use one weight to weigh their own things and another to weigh other people's, Gregory then goes on to say that people should not do this when making judgments about others.[64] Bede writes in his commentary on Solomon's book of *Proverbs*, that with 'weight and weight', one cannot truly repent as one desires sin.[65] The implication here is that repenting, yet still desiring sin would be like using incorrect weights when weighing to fix an incorrect balance. In a writing about the proverbs, a writer, perhaps Jermone, links together the ideas of 'weight and

[63] Lucifer Calaritanus , *Quia absentem nemo debet iudicare nec damnare*, CC SL, 8 (G.F. Diercks, 1978), book 1, cap. 8, line 4.
[64] Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam*, SL, 142 (M. Adriaen, 1971), lines 242 and 248.
[65] Beda Venerabilis - In prouerbia Salomonis libri iii, s. 8 p.C, CC SL, 119B (D. Hurst, 1983), line 133.

weight' and a treacherous balance explaining the importance of not being greedy.[66] As can be seen from the use of these terms, there was a vague association between the use of the phrase and 'judgement'. There are also clear links between the use of the phrase and commercial processes, especially by writers such as Bede, Pseudo Jerome, and Gregory, though by this point there was no standard metaphor which the phrase *pondus et pondus* was regularly associated with.

2.2. To ponder: *pondus et pondus*

It is clear however that by the thirteenth century *pondus et pondus* held strong commercial connotations, this is clear from the continued anchoring of the phrase within commercial contexts. This section shall examine various texts which link the phrase *pondus et pondus* to a particular mercantile fraud. Several texts across the period specifically associate the term 'weight and weight' with commerce, making clear that throughout the period, when the term *pondus et pondus* was used in theological texts, an explicit link between commerce and theology was being made. Furthermore, there is enough evidence to specify that the term *pondus et pondus* was associated with a particular commercial fraud. Before analysing how the term *pondus et pondus* was being used in a theological setting, it is important to establish that without doubt the phrase *pondus et pondus* was understood as an explicit analogy to a particular commercial fraud. As the following section shall clarify, the commercial fraud in question was one whereby a seller would sell their goods for a smaller weight to price than advertised. It is also important to clarify how deeply this understanding penetrated European High medieval society. This will thus inform the subsequent discussion over the use of the phrase *pondus et pondus* which shall take place in section three of this chapter.

Often the link between the phrase *pondus et pondus* and a commercial process is made clear through the context of the phrase. This section shall examine numerous texts where this context is

[66] Hieronymus (pseudo) (saec. VI - VIII), *Breuiarium in psalmos* - s. 8 p.C. (terminus ad quem), PL, 26 (1845), line 55.

made clear, starting from the 10th century to the mid-thirteenth century, starting with Ratherius of Verona and ending with Thomas Aquinas. The period examined in this section extends to both from before and after the period of study, only going to show to strength of the association between the term and a mercantile fraud. There seems to be a particular abundance of evidence for the link between the commercial understanding and the phrase during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The varying backgrounds of the numerous writers informs us that the associations with both the writers and the phrase were deeply rooted in scholastic society at this time, while the diverse range of intended audiences informs us that this phraseology was not exclusive to any specific task such as preaching or limited to any particular teaching, though it was clearly associated with a 'God-ly' or correct way of judging man and sin.

It should be noted that the phrase *pondus et pondus* comes from Proverbs 20:10 'weight and weight, measure and measure, both are an abominable to God/an abomination to the Lord' ('Pondus et pondus, mensura et mensura, utrumque abominabile est apud deum'). Some texts however, do just refer to the shorter phrase *pondus et pondus*. It should be clear that both in instances where the *short* or *longer* phrase is used, 'weight and weight' was associated with a specific type of commercial fraud.

As early as the tenth century Ratherius of Verona (c. 887/90 – 974) draws a clear association between the phrase *pondus et pondus* and the act of commercially defrauding someone, giving a detailed explanation between the phrase and the physical act of defrauding someone. In his *Sermones Monacenses*, he first associates Proverbs 20 10 with the practice of merchants.[67] Before going on to write about the way that dishonest merchants use double weights, with one set of weights for measuring what they buy and another set heavier set for what they sell.[68] Through

[67] Ratherius Ueronensis, 'Sermones Monacenses', *Thesaurus Ratherii*, (ed. F. Dolbeau, 2005), p. 39, ('Hoc uero et Salomon ait: Pondus et pondus, mensura et mensura, utrumque abhominabile est apud deum. Scimus quia in negotiatorum duplici pondere aliud maius, aliud minus est.')
[68] Ibid, p. 39, ('Nam aliud pondus habent ad quod pensant sibi, aliud ad quod pensant proximo'.)

mentioning the duplication of weights Ratherius gives a crucial clue to the meaning of the shorter phrase *pondus et pondus*. The act of having more than one set of weights clearly referred to this precise type of mercantile fraud commonly associated with the phrase *pondus et pondus*. Ratherius then explains how this concept could be used to a theological end, explaining how judging others with different standards to oneself could be seen in much the same light. He explains that such behaviour demonstrates a lack of love for one's neighbour and means that someone 'has weight and weight' and as such is an abomination to God.[69] This source by Ratherius is a very good evidence of merchants' fraudulent conduct being linked to an abstract notion having 'weight and weight'. This source provides irrefutable evidence that there was a link between the phrase *pondus et pondus* and commercial fraud as early as the tenth century.

A mass of evidence linking the phrase *pondus et pondus* to a specific type of commercial fraud appears at the end of the twelfth-century and beginning of the thirteenth. Sources reveal that by this period the phrase *pondus et pondus* was being linked to a particular commercial fraud by three authors: Thomas Chobham, William of Auvergne, and Hermann of Werden. The geographical spread of these writers as well as their diverse backgrounds demonstrates a particularly wide understanding of the phrase 'weight and weight' and how it was associated with a particular commercial fraud during the early thirteenth century.

One of the best pieces of evidence of this period linking the phrase *pondus et pondus* to a specific commercial fraud comes from Thomas Chobham's (c. 1093 – 1169) *Summa de arte praedicandi*. When explaining Proverbs 20:10, prior to expanding on the religious significance of *pondus et pondus*, Chobham goes into intricate detail of how the phrase was connected to a particular commercial fraud. He explains how an individual might falsify a weight on a pair of scales

[69]Ratherius Ueronensis, *Sermones Monacenses*, (ed. F. Dolbeau, 2005), p. 39, ('Omnis homo qui aliter pensat e aquae proximi, et alite rea quae sua sunt, pondud et pondus habet. Vtrumque ergo abhominabile est apud deum, quia si sic proximum ut se diligeret, hunc on bonis sicut se amaret'.)

through preventing a scale from falling naturally.[70] Chobham's contemporary William of Auvergne (1180/90-1249), in his *Sermones de tempore*, again gives precise detail of the association between Proverbs 20:10 and the particular commercial fraud of using 'double weights'. Having quoted Proverbs 20:10 he immediately explains, through analogy, a contemporary trick conducted by merchants, before moving on to explain further interpretations. He explicitly states that some merchants have different measures which they use for buying and selling.[71] This detail of the practice is corroborated in Herman of Werden's *Hortus Deliciarum Sacrae Scripturae textus*, where again having referenced Proverbs 20:10, Hermann explains how some merchants buy and sell through using two sets of measures.[72] The way that the particular commercial trick was enacted, whilst buying and selling, was clearly widely known and understood. The wide understanding of the phrase is evidenced through the fact that all three of the above explain how a second weight would have been used to deceive any potential buyer or seller. The implication is that a merchant would either buy or sell goods with a fraudulent weight. The result of this would be that if the fraudulent merchant was the buyer, the seller would sell their goods for a smaller weight to price than intended, should the fraudulent merchant be the seller then the buyer would buy goods at a greater weight to price than advertised.

The three individuals mentioned above all came from different places as well as scholastic traditions, so the fact that they can all relate to the existence of 'weight and weight' being a specifically mercantile fraud is particularly compelling evidence that the phrase widely related to and was understood as a particular type of fraud. Both William of Auvergne's and Thomas Chobham's thought can be strongly linked to contemporary thought and understandings at Paris in the 1220s, as

[70] Thomas de Chobham, *Summa de arte praedicandi*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CC CM 82 (Turnhout, 1990), cap. 6, line 2242, ('Similiter, qui ponderant aliquid in lancibus et non permittunt lancem descendentem tantum descendere quantum descenderet si ei liceret'.)
[71]Guillelmus Alvernus, *Sermones de tempore sermo*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CCCM 230 A (Turnhout, 2010-11), 406, ('Abhominatio est Deo pondus et pondus, mensura et mensura. Quidam duplicem habent mensuram, maiorem in emendo et minorem in reddendum').
[72]Hermannus Werdinensis, *Hortus deliciarum*, CCCM 204, 257, ('Quidam mangones peruersi pondera bina, Atque duos modios semper habere solent'.)

both of these texts would likely have been written in Paris at this time. As Bishop of Paris William of Auvergne gave many sermons. The basic phrase 'weight and weight' must have been understood by his Paris congregation or else it would have made little sense for William of Auvergue to use it. Had William of Auvergne wanted to use the phrase to clarify a point, then why would he have used a phrase which may have been unknown to his audience? This is especially the case given Paris' growing position as a commercial centre.[73] We know that these sermons were read out and not just compiled for academic discourse or circulation due to the notes often left on the parchments.

It is unlikely that Thomas would not have had a good understanding of market practices. Thomas Chobham likely wrote the *Summa de arte praedicandi* in Paris during the early 1220s.[74] Thomas' use of allegory in this work was highly influenced by Peter of Poitier's *Allegoriae super tabernaculum Moysi* which was written c. 1215 and proved popular.[75] However, to typify this writing as purely the fruit of Parisian or academic thought would be to misread Thomas' life. While, more pressingly to only acknowledge Thomas' understanding of the phrase through analogous or theological thinking would also be to misinterpret him. Thomas was subdean of Salisbury Cathedral and wrote this text on a return to Paris, where he had originally been schooled. Much like William Auvergne as bishop of Paris, in his role as subdean of Salisbury Cathedral, Thomas would likely have been familiar with ordinary commercial practice and parlance. Though accounting records only really categorically prove cathedral commercial interests in England from c. 1300 A.D. onwards, the very use of the phrase *pondus et pondus* and his explanation of how a merchant could forge an inaccurate balance is suggestive enough of his intricate knowledge of commercial activity. It is highly unlikely that Chobham would have been confused at the phrase, being more than aware of conventional language surrounding commerce and how to use it appropriately. Moreover, with Chobham making

[73] Helen Deeming & Frieda van der Heijden, *Medieval Polyphony and Song*, (Cambridge, 2023), p. 56.
[74] Franco Morenzoni, 'Thomas of Chobham, Summa de arte praedicandi, ca. 1220', in *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300 -1475*, (Oxford, 2009), eds. Rita Copeland & Ineke Sluiter, p.614.
[75] Ibid, p. 614.

explicit reference to preventing the scales from falling naturally there can be no doubt that he understood the nature of the particular fraud.[76] it is not unlikely that he may have seen the fraud enacted himself.

Herman of Werden's monastic background lends further strength to the idea that mercantile fraud was understood throughout society. Herman of Werden was not educated in the schools, with there being little evidence of him ever having travelled across the Rhine, with communication between his monastery and the intellectual developments West of the Rhine appearing limited. Despite Herman's apparent isolation from Parisian scholastic developments, Herman's precise account of how a merchant could deceive another in exchange and his association between this act and *pondus et pondus* can leave us in no doubt *pondus et pondus* was not just a recognisable term for a fraud West of the Rhine.

Consequently, it should be clear from the examples listed in this section that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was linked to a particular type of mercantile fraud. It should also be understood that the association between this fraud and the phrase in question would have been recognised across Europe and across different sections of society. Finally, it should also be clear that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was understood as relating to some kind of commercial fraud across the time period in question.

2.3. Broader mercantile context for *pondus et pondus*

Other texts, though not explicitly detailing the specifics of the *pondus et pondus* fraud, do provide invaluable evidence that the phrase was associated with commercial activity and fraud. This section shall examine texts which provide at the very least circumstantial evidence of an association

[76] Thomas de Chobham, *Summa de arte praedicandi*, CCCM 82, cap. 6, line 2242, ('Similiter qui ponderant aliquid in lancibus et non permittunt lancem descendentem tantum descendere quantum descenderet si ei liceret.')

between the phrase *pondus et pondus* and mercantile fraud. Herman of Werden, who appears in the section above provides irrefutable evidence of the link between the phrase *pondus et pondus* and a specific commercial fraud, again appears in the following section as do Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Hugo de Miromari.

An early example of textual context evidencing the association between pondus et pondus and commercial fraud can in found in Gerhoh of Reichersberg's (c. 1093 – 1169) *Expositio Psalmorum.* In this text Gehoh deliberately links Deuteronomy 25:13 to a mercantile measuring process. Unlike the text found in the Latin Vulgate, Gehoh's text paraphrases Deuteronomy supplanting the word measurement for the word 'quart' or 'sextary'.[77] He then goes on to say that one would have 'weight and weight' if one were to use different measures; it is subsequently made clear that what is being measured is the amount of good that one does for others.[78] The way that the phrase is deployed, without any explanation for the commercial phraseology would suggest, along with the inclusion of 'sextary' or 'quart' that the term was widely accepted by this point as holding an implicit connection with commercial practice. Though not as much is known about Gerhoh as other writers, it would not have been unusual for him to have a reasonable understanding of commercial practices at this time.

Though as previously explained, this study does not look at 'man' and God but instead the relationship between the 'individual' and God, further commercial context is added to this text through the analogy between 'man' and God and an analogy of 'man' being bought at a price. The notion of people's lives and actions being seen through a transactional lens is furthered later in the text. The text states that everyone was bought at a price 'servi pretiose comparati', and that this price ought be repaid to God.[79] The further implications of this text shall be discussed later, though

[77] Gerhohus Reicherspergensis, *Expositio Psalmorum (Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et Cantica ferialia)*, ed. B. Pez et F. M. Wirtenberger, PL 193 (1854), part 4, psalm 38, verse 9, ('sit tibi aequus modius, aequus que sextarius'.)
[78] Ibid, verse 9, 'contra istius modi aequitatem grandem committimus iniquitatem, cum pondus et pondus, majus et minus habemus, nec aequali lance nostrum proximi que causam pensamus'.)
[79] Ibid, verse 9, ('Cum ergo simus emptitii servi pretiose comparati, aequum es tut simus pretiosi.')

needless to say it can been that this text demonstrates a firm association between *pondus et pondus* and the commercial ideas. Moreover, through arguing that 'weight and weight' is achieved through different measures, he presents a firm link between *pondus et pondus* and commercial fraud.

Hugo de Miromari writing at the same time as the three writers mentioned in Section 2.2 also affirms a contemporary understanding of *pondus et pondus* as being a commercial fraud in two of his works. In his *Liber de hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu*, he identifies having 'weight and weight' as a sin in and of itself. He lists *pondus et pondus* in the same list as other market malpractices such as fraud, robbery, deception, extortion and usuary among others.[80] Furthermore, earlier in the same text, during a discussion on the moral ills of commerce, he again returns to the notion of having 'weight and weight'. He first outlined his view that deceit, usury, and fraud are essential to commerce. He then goes on to talk of three actions, making clear that *pondus et pondus* was an action in itself, which deceives the poor: weight and weight, measure and measure, and a treacherous balance. Miromari's background again highlights that this fraud was understood in monastic circles as well as 'scholastic' ones.[81] Miromari read law at Bologna and was teaching at Montpellier by 1214. He wrote the document in question after retiring from the schools and becoming a Carthusian monk at Montrieux.[82] The understanding of *pondus et pondus* being understood as a type of fraud within monastic circles is strengthened given that of the two surviving copies of the *Liber de hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu*, the first was addressed to a fellow monk, 'Brother G', suggesting that it was written for a monastic audience.[83] All in all, Hugo de

[80] Hugo de Miromari, 'Liber de hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu (uersio breuis)', CCCM, 234 (F. Wendling, 2010), 153.
[81] Scholastic here suggests schools and universities.
[82] Scott Bruce, 'Review of Hugo de Miromari: De hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu, ed. F. Wendling, Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis 234 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010) in TMR (12.11.08).', *The Medieval Review*, 2012.
[83] Fabrice Wendling, "Hugh de Miramar's *De hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu,* an 'autobiographical' work in the posterity of Augustine's *Confessions*?", *Rursus* [Online], 6 | 2011, online 09 February 2011, accessed 05 August 2023. URL: http://journals.openedition.org/rursus/517; DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/rursus.517

Miromari provides fairly good evidence that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was linked to commercial activity and that it was understood as meaning as such within monastic circles.

In Herman of Werden's *Hortus deliciarum Sacrae Scripurae textux*, a further allusion is made to a fraud involving two weights and the phrase *pondus et pondus*. Having just quoted Proverbs 20:23 Herman writes that some merchants used two weights and two measures.[84] Obviously this alone does not prove that *pondus et pondus* was understood as a commercial fraud, although it does provide further contextual evidence that this was the case especially when combined with previous evidence from him discussed in Section 2.2.

The successful penetration of the understanding of the phrase *pondus et pondus* into monastic thought should be clear in the writings of Herman of Werden and Gerhoh. Paul Schmidt argued in his introduction to the translation that surviving annotations on Herman of Werden's 'Hortus deliciarum' suggest that it was used by German monks for teaching purposes and was presumably written for monastic circulation. Consequently, it is evident that mercantile practices and their associated phraseology was transmitted and one can assume understood, in monastic circles.

Later writers continue to associate the phrase *pondus et pondus* with commercial fraud. Thomas Aquinas (c.1225-1274) used the phrase *pondus et pondus* to reference a commercial fraud whereby a seller of wine dilutes his product with water. Though this is a marginally different interpretation of the fraud, due to its use of liquids and the process of dilution, the texts still strongly associate the phrase with a type of commercial fraud centred around misrepresenting the quantity of goods, though it is clearly a variant on the fraud and not an entirely different fraud. Thomas Aquinas was writing towards the end of the main period of study was over, so he cannot necessarily be used to show that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was associated with commercial fraud during the period. However, alongside the evidence of Ratherius of Verona which was discussed earlier, this evidence

[84] Hermannus Werdinensis, *Hortus deliciarum*, CCCM 204, 257, ('Quidam mangones peruersi pondera bina Atque duos modios semper habere solent'.)

can be used to demonstrate that the phrase *pondus et pondus* was associated with commercial fraud before, during, and after the more specific period of study for this chapter.

Aquinas later used the phrase in an exclusively economic setting. In his *De duobus praeceptis caritatis reportatio* ('Report on the two precepts of charity') he tried to explain *pondus et pondus* with relation to pint measures, fraudulent innkeepers, and usury. In explaining the phrase, Aquinas states the phrase relates both to usurers and fraudulent innkeepers, before explaining how some innkeepers mix water-down wine before selling it.[85] Linking *this* phrase with Psalms 14:1 and 14:5 Aquinas argues that usreceiary should be understood through the concept of having 'weight and weight' through distinguishing between use and ownership of items.[86] Thus it should be clear through the context and language that Aquinas links with the phrase *pondus et pondus*, that he was under no illusion that the phrase held strong commercial connotations. However, it may be fair to highlight that the connection with usuary, as well as being an unique perspective, was also probably a later development. Irrespective of precisely when the phrase *pondus et pondus* became associated with usury, the phrase still maintained a strong commercial association.

Thus, whenever the phrase *pondus et pondus* was used it would have had a different meaning to merely referencing Proverbs 20:10. It is clear that *pondus et pondus* was a specific fraud understood throughout the period across different sections of society. The phrase *pondus et pondus* therefore references a particular act associated with bad mercantile practices. As shall be demonstrated in the following section, this bad mercantilism was seen as the opposite of God's *modus operandi* in regard to justice. Through understanding this analogy, it becomes clear that for at least a time God was deemed to operate in the same way as a good merchant.

---

[85]Thomas de Aquino, ed. Marietti, [Opuscula theologica II, 1954], 267, ('Stratera iusta, et aequa sint pondera…Hoc est etiam contra caupones, qui miscent aquam vino'.)

[86] Ibid, page 267, ('In hoc etiam prohibetur usura….Sed dices foristan: quare non possum dare pecuniam sicut equum vel domum? Dicendum, quod in illis est peccatum quae bis venduntur. In domo autem sunt duo: scilicet substantia et usus. Aliud autem est habere domum, et aliud uti domo: unde separatism possum usum vendere sine domus venditione: et ita in omnibus huiusmodi'.)

Therefore, it is clear through researching the use of the phrase *pondus et pondus* in twelfth and thirteenth century texts, that the phrase quite clearly held commercial connotations across the period, with no evidence of any particular place or school of thought being associated with its use. Though places such as the schools and University at Paris can be seen to have been an important commonality between the writers who used the phrase in economic settings. However, this can be explained through increases in texts generally and the importance of Paris generally. Figures such as Hermann of Werden, Hugh of Miromari, and Gerhoh of Reichersberg who did not study in Paris all act as important counterweights to any explicit connection between Paris and an economic understanding of the phrase, while early writers such as Ratherius of Verona demonstrate that this was an archaic association.

In seeing incorrect judgement of others as having 'weight and weight', imbalance and mercantile fraud are being used to explain impure motives and by extension impurity of the soul. Therefore, the following evidence demonstrates that a visualisation of purity around the period 1200 centred on the notion of balance.[87] It is important to acknowledge how balance is different to cleanliness. There appears to be an idea that balance represents a fair, just, and equated exchange taking place. It is also true that the analogy between purity and judgement comes into strength at about the same time that the notion of a purgatorial place after death develops. Towards the end of the twelfth century and at about the same time that purgatory was officially accepted by the church this visualisation ceased. Again, the spread of scholastic and geographical traditions strengthens this case. When discussing the judgement of others, the following texts see this as an active act, highlighting the importance of achieving balance during one's life.

[87]Thomas de Aquino, ed. Marietti, [Opuscula theologica II, 1954], 267, ('Stratera iusta, et aequa sint pondera…Hoc est etiam contra caupones, qui miscent aquam vino'.)

[87] Ibid, page 267, ('In hoc etiam prohibetur usura….Sed dices foristan: quare non possum dare pecuniam sicut equum vel domum? Dicendum, quod in illis est peccatum quae bis venduntur. In domo autem sunt duo: scilicet substantia et usus. Aliud autem est habere domum, et aliud uti domo: unde separatism possum usum vendere sine domus venditione: et ita in omnibus huiusmodi'.)

2.4. The *God* merchant and *bespoke* judge

The previous section establishes with a reasonable degree of certainty that the phrase *pondus et pondus* referred to a specific commercial fraud which was known about in ecclesiastical circles the tenth to the mid-thirteenth century, and widely understood across Europe. Having established that the phrase 'weight and weight' was used by a wide range of ecclesiastical writers to refer to a particular commercial fraud it is important to establish the context and significance of this. The section to come establishes that the phrase was predominantly used by ecclesiastical writers wanting to draw an analogy between man's relationship with God. Through drawing attention to a known commercial fraud and explaining how it was like 'un-God-ly' actions, the texts essentially argue that God's *modus operandi* was similar to a good merchant. The texts demonstrate that people were discussing how God rewards or punishes each individual for their moral actions in a quantitative and precise way, in the same way that a merchant determines a precise price or value to some goods. This quantitative approach to judgement was a novel development with each person receiving a bespoke punishment after death, at their first judgement. This bespoke first judgement creates a logical path to the creation of purgatory. Before this development, it was understood that judgement after death would send people to Heaven, Hell, or possibly a further 'waiting' space, referred to by Le Goff as a *refrigerium*. However, through viewing God's judgement as a merchant with a precise pair of scales to measure punishment a problem is created for the 'waiting' space, which in itself is solved through drawing an analogy with debt. The debt analogy is the subject of Chapter Three. There is a further implication here that the ideals of mercantilism changed from being associated with greed and wrongdoing to being deemed as just and fair. This development mirrors the shift in attitudes explored in Chapter One, whereby a monastic approach to 'balance' and moderation being virtues lived through one's life developed into a belief about the importance 'balance' in judgement at death.

The following section shall explore how the notion of having 'weight and weight' was interpreted in regards to the relationship between the individual and God. The forthcoming section shall be divided into the following categories: how God understands sin and judgement through a notion of balance, warnings for man during life about how God judges individuals, warnings to the individual about how God works, and different yet related ideas from Bernard of Clairvaux and Bonaventure. It is clear from the consistent use of the phrase 'weight and weight' that judgement was being understood through an idea of measuring out good and bad acts at the end of life.

The implications of how the phrase *pondus et pondus* was used in drawing analogies about the relationship between God and man expose two ways in which commercialism and eschatology were being connected at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth centuries. First of all, it is clear that eschatology was being viewed similarly to commercial venture, whereby God was an actor in the marketplace. Secondly, that a development of applying finely balanced and precisely quantitative ideas of punishment to mankind was likely linked to a growing awareness of commercial activity within church circles. As shall be explained in the final chapter of this work, a developing trend of viewing eschatology similarly to commercial practices played a fundamental role in the original development of purgatory.

2.5. How God works: mercantilism – analogy or reality?

This section will analyse numerous texts and will discuss to what extent writers were thinking about God through the analogy of 'weight and weight'. Herman of Werden demonstrates that the idea of God's *modus operandi* being similar to a merchant was understood in monastic circles. Due to his monastic audience it is probable that he was actually thinking like the metaphor, it could equally just be a demonstration of a confusion in communication, with Herman representing a confused understanding which had set in to the East of the Rhine. In his *Hortus deliciarum* written c. 1226

Herman saw God's judgement as similar to a merchant's role in a market. In this text Hermann writes that if an individual is judgemental about other people, God will judge that individual in the same way. [88] Implicit to this idea is that God will judge people according to merit and reward, fitting in well with the concept of precise, accurate and quantitative exchange. This understanding of punishment does not divide people into vague groups for punishment but instead reflects a belief in a bespoke and quantified experience post death, lending itself ultimately but not conclusively to ideas such as purgatory, through balance. [89]

Continuing in the same text, Hermann of Werden continues with the analogy of a relationship with God being like a calculated commercial exchange. When talking about forgiveness that God gives to people Herman draws an analogy between a merchant paying a fair price and God's justice. In his *hortus deliciarum* he writes that double weights are used by merchants who have two sets of weights so that they can buy at a better rate than they sell.[90] He goes on to write that no man should be unmerciful to others and yet expect forgiveness himself as this would be a *double weight*.[91] Here God's forgiveness is being viewed like a mercantile exchange seeking to balance out forgiveness received with forgiveness given. Again, the implicit logic is that not achieving this balance in life yet expecting forgiveness from God would be defrauding him and that God being an *efficient* merchant cannot be deceived in this way.

Hermann of Werden's text is also important in demonstrating that the use of this commercial language was not likely not just a point of rhetoric to aid preaching, but was fundamental in understanding the relationship between God and man. As outlined above Hermann's text was for a monastic audience, which would have made any need to relate to lay concepts for the benefit of

[88] Hermannus Werdinensis, *Hortus deliciarum*, CCCM 204, 251, ('Si fracti facis hoc, ab eo tibi quod fieri uis, Equumpondus eritlibra placens que Deo').
[89] Ibid 251, ('Non fias iudex in facto fratris in actu, De te iudicium non agat ira Dei').
[90] Hermannus Werdinensis, *Hortus deliciarum*, CCCM 204, 257, ('Quidam mangones peruersi pondera bina Atque duos modios semper habere solent).
[91] Ibid, page 257, ('A Christo ueniam sibi qui petit atque remitti, Debita uult, aliis nec miseretur homo, Vtitur hic duplici uel pondere siue statera, Que sibi uult fieri, dum negat illa dare').

preaching less useful, heavily suggesting that people were literally beginning to think about God operating in precisely the same ways as a merchant. It is of course possible that the precise nature of this analogy was a point of confusion. From occasional mentions of France and a sparce use of French in one of his texts, Paul Schmidt has postulated that it is possible that Herman may have visited France for a study trip at some point.[92] If this is the case this would explain how Herman became familiar with the wider analogy. It is clear from the circulation of surviving manuscripts of Herman's that he was mostly being read on the East of the Rhine. However, had Herman developed an understanding of this analogy from a second-hand source it is perfectly plausible that a variant of the debates which were taking place in France concerning God being similar to a merchant did develop on the East of the Rhine.

The notion that God operates like an efficient merchant is continued by William of Auvergne on his *Sermones de tempore*, writing at a roughly similar period, though it is not clear whether William was drawing a literal comparison between God and a merchant or whether he is just using the analogy for the purposes of communication. Similarly to Herman of Werden, William suggested that in the same way that bad merchants may try and deceive someone in an exchange, people may be hypercritical in how people do good. Through the *pondus et pondus* analogy he suggests that as God operates like a good merchant, thus justice cannot be conned out of him in this way. In one of his *Sermones de tempore* ('Sermons about time') having referenced *pondus et pondus* along with the rest of the proverb, as outlined previously, he immediately went on to talk about how double measures are used in buying and selling.[93] Next he writes that this is like people who seek to receive God's gifts with 'outstretched hands' (extentas habent manus) while being mean in giving in return.[94] He then says that some people appear to do good on the outside but that inwardly they have a

[92] Hermann of Werden, *Hortus deliciarum*, ed. Paul Schmidt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), Introduction, p. IX.
[93]Guillelmus Alvernus, *Sermones de tempore sermo*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CCCM 230 A, 406, ('Abhominatio est Deo pondus et pondus, mensura et mensura. Quidam duplicem habent mensuram, maiorem in emendo et minorem in reddendo.').
[94] Ibid p. 406, ('Hii sunt qui extentas habent manus et dilaceratum cor ad accipiendum dona de manu Domini, ad reddendum uero eidem recuruas et retractas habent manus et clausum cor.')

closed heart. The way that William of Auvergne continually references God in this text and the way that he lathers the text in the language of commerce and exchange firmly demonstrates how he saw God as being like an actor in a marketplace of virtue and sin, seeing ultimate judgment like a commercial process. It is known that William liked drawing parallels and using analogies in his sermons. It is certainly true that in this particular text William is particularly lavish in the use of his commercial diction and this may be exaggerated for the benefit of his audience, but as outlined earlier in this chapter there is sufficient evidence elsewhere to suggest that these analogies were not just cosmetic but were fundamental to how certain thinkers were interpreting man's relationship with God. In this example it is not clear if William is literally seeing God as behaving like a merchant or whether he is merely drawing a parallel with fraud to aid the listener. William's listeners' would likely have been an university audience with preaching becoming a developing role for Paris theologians at the beginning of the thirteenth-century.[95]

Though William of Auvergne drew a similar parallel to Herman through considering how people may attempt to deceive God, it is less clear that he thinks of the analogy as representative of reality. However, judgement is definitely being viewed through a quantitative lens, so it is plausible that he actually considered God to behave exactly like a merchant. Though it does remain to be said that unlike Herman it is entirely plausible that he is merely using the analogy of a commercial exchange to convey to a lay listener how God is not deceived by hypocrisy and that he will find a fair punishment in the same way a merchant establishes a fair price. Either way, it cannot be proven with any certainty whether William is thinking about judgement as happening exactly like a transaction or whether this remains an analogy. Through arguing that people would receive what they had given in the same measure, William does appear to argue that good acts will be made to balance their experiences post-death like purgatory. Moreover, with *pondus et pondus* being linked to a commercial process, their judgement is visualised through the God with a set of scales, a no doubt

[95] Spencer E. Young, *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society, 1215-1248*, (Cambridge, 2014), p. 87.

deliberate action from William, his audience no doubt being accustomed to the sight of weighing and measuring at market.

Gerhoh of Reichersperg acts as early examples of a writers who understood judgement by God as being similar to a mercantile exchange. Both writer seem to understand God as similar to a merchant in how He measures people's immediate reward and punishment after death. In his 'Exposition of the Psalms' (*Commentarius aureus in psalmos et cantica ferialia*) Gerhoh clearly sees measurement as an important bond between man and God. Having quoted (Proverbs 16:11) he writes about the peril of having 'weight and weight', before saying that man should help his neighbour by the same measure and even the same 'sextary' as people want to be helped by God.[96] He later writes that man was *bought* at a price and that ultimately man has a duty to repay the price that it was bought at.[97] With the use of the term 'sextary' as well as the constant reference to the payment of God there can be no doubt about God's role here being compared to an agent in a market place. Moreover, the role which is being described here is God measuring up the virtue of people against the sacrifice which Christ made on the cross. Though this is widely accepted elsewhere with 'man', what is peculiar here is the particular analogy with the marketplace and the 'individual'. The implication of this is that Gerhoh understood salvation as something which was paid for through good acts in life; though this is not necessarily new and relates to Anselm's understanding of the Passion, the development of seeing God precisely measuring out people's punishment like a merchant weighing goods is. The balancing here occurs after life with correct equilibrium being reached once God has ensured that the individual has experienced the precise outcome of their actions.

It is clear that all three of the writers outlined above thought about God's *modus operandi* as being like a merchant. With each of them it is difficult to gauge whether they actually think that God

---

[96] Gerhohus Reicherspergensis, *Expositio Psalmorum (Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et Cantica ferialia)*, ed. B. Pez et F. M. Wirtenberger, PL 193 (1854), part 4, psalm 38, verse 9, ('quemadmodum nobis a Deo subveniri cupimus, eadem scilicet mensura, eodem modio, eodem que sextario!').
[97] Ibid, verse 9 ('cum ergo simus smptitii servi pretiose comparati, aequum est ut simus pretiosi').

literally behaves like a merchant or whether they were merely drawing parallels. However, what cannot be disputed about all three of these writers is that each of them understood God's judgement as a precise and quantitively worked out act, punishing people in a precise and bespoke fashion.

2.6. *Pondus et pondus*: a warning to the individual'

Further texts use the idea of having 'weight and weight' as a warning to individual about how they compare themselves to ideal standards and others. These texts are similar to the previous ones discussed in that they analogise and view the process of discriminating between good and bad acts as well as people, through a commercial lens. Through referencing a purely commercial practice the authors chose to further associate a religious idea of judgement with commercial practice. Though the following texts compare individuals' judgements to commercial practice, they similarly associate correct judgement of an individual with commercial practice and quantitative method. In other words, all three of the texts discussed draw a comparison between 'God-ly' judgment, which is correct and balanced with incorrect judgement which is imbalanced and subsequently like having 'weight and weight'.

Though very little is known about Herman von Rein, fl. 1150, he is a comparatively earlier proponent of the notion that God acts similarly to a good merchant when compared to other writers examined. Herman argued that it is right to act like a good merchant buying and selling with unaltered measures and likewise this ought be people's approach to making judgements of others. In his analogy, Hermann wrote about using different sets of weights, with one assumed to be faulty, for buying and selling. This process is compared with judging different sets of people differently, using different standards for different people.[98] Again, in making this analogy, Hermann drew an implicit parallel between purity and divinity. In essence he argued that a 'God-ly' form of judgement relies

[98] Hermannus de Runa, *Sermones festivals*, ed. E. Mikkers, I. Theuws, R. Demeulenaere, CCCM 64, (Turnhout, 1986), sermon 87, line 203, ('Scimus quia in negotiatorum duplici pondere aliud maius est, aliud minus; nam aliud pondus habent, ad quod pensant sibi, et aliud pondus ad quod pensant proximo; ad dandum pondera leuiora, ad accipiendum uero grauiora praeparant.')

upon a faultless system of balance, suggesting that God can be understood through the conceptualisation of balance and fair commerce.

In his *Summa de arte praedicandi* Thomas de Chobam talks about measuring sin by using scales. In this particular text he wrote about how when people assess their own sins they act as if preventing the scale cup from falling because they do not want to fully consider the 'bitterness' (*amaritudinis*) of the their acts.[99] The implication of this is that truthfulness in reflection can only be achieved when inner balance is sought. This text therefore continues theme of understanding God-ly judgement as a purely quantitative process. Though, in this case there is no implication of money the broader reference to scales is heavily suggestive of a market practice. It should be clear from both of these examples that 'God-ly' judgement is a quantitative notion and relies upon a precise understanding of actions resulting in a bespoke solution.

2.7. Bernard of Clairvaux: a paradox

Bernard of Clairvaux has been sectioned off from other writers in this chapter because of the paradox he presents in different works. One of his texts suggests that wealth in the church is a bad thing while in a different text he still draws a parallel between 'God-ly' acts being like those of a good merchant, similarly in one of his letters he draws a parallel between self-sacrifice and reward.

In his *Parabolae* ('Parables'), Bernard gives a general condemnation of wealth when writing about the four horses of the apocalypse in a section on how the Cathars are the embodiment of the pale horse. He writes about the rider of the black horse having 'weight and weight' and hypocrisy, though this text is not about individual hypocrisy instead about a period of the church's existence. In Bernard's understanding of this section of the 'Book of the Revelation' he understands each horse to

[99] Thomas de Chobham, *Summa de arte praedicandi*, CC CM 82, cap. 6, line 2242, ('Hii sunt qui peccata sua ponderant quamdiu durat dulcedo peccati, et cum uenitur ad amarum non permittunt lancem descendere, quia pondus amaritudinis peccati nolunt considerare.')

represent a period of the church's life with the white horse symbolising the church in a period of peace, the red horse in a period of persecution, the black horse in a period of hypocrisy, and the pale horse representing the antichrist.[100] Here Bernard provides a classical early 'Cistercian' view of what was considered wrong with the Church in the twelfth century. This text makes it abundantly clear that Bernard believed that wealth was an issue for Christianity, yet in the following text through drawing a parallel between '*God-ly'* behaviour and good mercantile practice he demonstrates that during this period even those who still considered wealth to be problem for Christianity were familiar with thinking about moral behaviour in the terms of commercial exchange.

In his *Sententiae* ('Sentences'), Bernard describes people who honour God with words but not with their hearts having *pondus et pondus*.[101] In this particular instance Bernard argued that deliberate imbalance of the soul is 'un-God-ly'. From both of these sources it is clear that Bernard has a vague notion of balance being 'God-ly' and that imbalance is opposed to this and can be associated with the idea of hypocrisy. While in Bernard's Letter 391 'to the English people', he makes some allusion to the idea that good deeds can be traded for eternal reward in a commercial sense. He advises the English people to go on the Second Crusade writing 'Take up the sign of the Cross and you will find indulgence for all the sins which you humbly confess. The cost is small, the reward is great'.[102] Thus Bernard does not provide an entirely uniform use of analogising commercial language.

---

[100] Bernardus Claraeuallensis, *Bernardi opera*, ed. J. Leclercq & H.M. Rochais, (Rome 1972), vol. 6,2, 287, ('Incursus daemonii meridiani vicinum iam tempus est Antichristi Inde quattuor equi in Apocalypsi: primus albus, id est lenis et placidus, et qui sedet exit ut vincens vincat, habens coronam laetitiae pro tempore pacis, tenens arcum belli contra haereses, id est sanctae praedicationis instrumentum, per quem emittat sagittas potentis acutas, id est efficaces Sancti Spiritus sententias; secundus rufus, id est sanguineus, habens sessorem cum gladio magno ad tollendam pacem de terra, et ad occidendum, scilicet ad effundendum sanguinem martyrum; tertius niger, id est obscurus, sessorem habens hypocrisim cum statera venditionis, et in ea pondus et pondus, sicut supra dictum est; quartus pallidus, id est extremae morti proximus, qui sessorem habet mortem et infernum sequentem.
Mutato paululum ordine, primum enim tempus fuit persecutionis; equus albus in ecclesia tempus est pacis, rufus persecutionis, niger hypocrisis, pallidus Antichristi Haec autem quattuor tempora sequens parabola melius indicabit.')

[101] Ibid page 183, ('In domo istorum est pondus et pondus, statera et statera, utrumque abominabile coram Domino. Horum multitudo non modica est. Hypocrita enim hic omnis populus est, ut ait propheta: POPULUS HIC LABIIS ME HONORAT, COR AUTEM EORUM LONGE EST A ME.')

[102] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, ed. Bruno Scott James, (Stroud, 1998), Letter 391, p.462.

Only in Letter 391 does Bernard present any notion of *trading* with God, though the other two examples do demonstrate that he was clearly familiar with talking about God in commercial terms more generally.

2.8. Conclusion of Chapter Two

This chapter contests that broadly from the twelfth century a commercialism of judgement took place with judgement increasingly being seen as quantitative procedure. The visualisation or analogy which was often used to explain this was the kind of weighing scales used in a commercial exchange. This visualisation changed judgement into a process of quantifiably deducing the amount of holiness an individual possessed. Part of the significance of this change in perception was that it linked into other changing ideas about the end of life which were developing in this period such as ideas surrounding purgatory, as outlined in the introduction, and developed further in this thesis. Once the moral value of each individual person is considered in a quantitative fashion it means that there must be a moral difference, greater or otherwise, between two souls which are saved or *vice versa*. This logic creates a problem for justice as two people can gain the same reward despite possessing different moral worths. A conclusion that this problem feeds into is the creation of purgatory, as outlined in the wider thesis.

Therefore, in conclusion to this chapter, a number of things should be self-evident. First of all, *pondus et pondus* was a commercial fraud in itself, as clearly defined by a number of authors such as Ratherius of Verona, Thomas Chobham, William of Auvergne, Herman of Werden, and Thomas Aquinas. These authors make clear that *pondus et pondus* was a market fraud whereby a buyer or seller would use counterfeit weights or measures to conduct a deceitful exchange to their financial advantage. This fraud was evidently understood and universally recognised by the term *pondus et pondus*. The recognisability of the term is made most clearly by Miromari's listing off it along with other recognisable market malpractices. The widespread nature of the phrase is evidenced through use by writers both writing for and from a variety of sections of society, with writers like Herman of

Werden writing for exclusively monastic audiences while William of Auvergne wrote included the phrase in his sermons addressed to the laity. The period of the phrase's use is successfully bookended by Ratherius of Verona and Thomas Aquinas, jointly demonstrating that the phrase was in general parlance from the eighth century until at least the middle of the thirteenth centuries. The geographical spread of these writers is also worth noting, with Herman of Werden writing for an audience East of Rhine, himself never having been to the scholastic centre that was Paris, while writers like Thomas Chobham spent most of their careers in England, demonstrating that *pondus et pondus* was not just understood as a particular fraud in the vicinity of the Paris schools.

The second part of this chapter makes clear that during the twelfth and thirteenth century a debate was taking place about to what extent God operated like a good merchant. God was clearly being compared to good mercantile conduct, fairly measuring goods to set a just price or reward for good or bad acts. In this way, God was being seen as an actor in a market place of sin. God's *modus operandi* and 'God-ly' judgement were seen as the opposite of *pondus et pondus,* in effect seeing good mercantile behaviour in a wholly positive light. The fact that mercantile behaviour was being understood in a positive lens refutes some of the argument laid down by Odd Langholm that it was entirely the rise of Aristotelean thought alone which made wealth and profit less of a moral issue for thinkers of the period. Evidence presented in this chapter makes clear that this was a trend which had its origins pre-dating the circulation of Aristotle's thought.

The commercialisation explained in this chapter provides a way of understanding judgement that rests on a quantitative measuring of right and wrong. This quantitative understanding of measurement manifested itself in the mercantile analogy of weighing goods at a market as writers developed a growing awareness of market practices and potentially because it was believed that this was a quantitative way of measuring which people could easily understand and were familiar with.

The fact that judgment was being paralleled to a commercial fraud represents numerous developments surrounding eschatology during this period. First of all it demonstrates that as

theology became increasingly structured and pastoral thinking developed in this period, the relationship between God and man was increasingly being characterised through more contractual or formal models; even figures such as Bernard of Clairvaux who took huge issue with the role of wealth in Christianity, were still growing accustomed to understanding 'God-ly' behaviour through commercial models. It is also clear that commercial ideas began to have an effect on theological ones long before economic models examined by Joel Kaye entered the theological realm. Finally the date that the phrase *pondus et pondus* fell out of use suggests to us that a reframing of the way that judgement was understood took place. As shall be seen in the final chapter, this ties in with other developments concerning how purgatory and penance were connected. This development suggests that a partial reason behind judgement being seen as working through balance was in itself due to developing ideas surrounding purgatory that were happening concurrently.

Chapter 3: Debt, penance, and value

The way that purgatory and penance was described in this period suggests that among other issues which were being discussed, was a debate concerning whether and to what extent parallels could be drawn between penitential acts, purgatory, and debt. These debates should be seen as a development of the debates stemming from Anselm of Canterbury's *Cur deus homo*, though whereas Anselm considered sin creating a debt for whole of mankind, the writers discussed here consider individual sin creating a debt for the individual. This chapter demonstrates that discussion of debt in the relationship between God and mankind was broadened to include individual sins and debt incurred by the individual. This chapter then goes on to further suggest that the idea of an individual incurring penitential debt after death played an important role in the development of the doctrine of purgatory in this period.

The fact that popular dates for writers using and discussing the term *pondus et pondus* vaguely started around the period where Le Goff found that the word for 'purgatory' was first used and realising that the use of the phrase had declined by the establishment of purgatory at the Second Council of Lyon in 1274 raises legitimate questions about how commercial and quantitative thought had become in thinking about the relationship between God and the individual. Consequently, the original basis behind this chapter was to explore how concepts like purgatory and penance related to quantitative measures like time and money. When finding sources for this chapter, again the *Library of Latin Texts* was used, with many of the advantages and disadvantages discussed previously discussed. For this chapter a further advantage of using this resource was that specific searches could be conducted, specifically pinpointing texts which used specific words of phrases in close vicinity to each other. In order to ensure that the research for this chapter threw the largest possible net, various combinations of words were searched for, including: words referencing purgatory, time, debt, penance, and *refrigium*. The word combinations that were searched for can be found in the table below. In each case 'similarity searches' were selected to again provide the broadest possible, yet feasible results for study. The way that the search worked was that for Table 2,

texts where only selected where the two words of each of row could be found together within a text, while each row of words in Table 3 was also searched for; these texts where then saved and studied later before the next row of words was entered into the *Library of Latin Texts* search function.

Table 2	
purgatorius	*tempus*
purgatorius	*debitus*
refrigerium	*tempus*
refridgerium	*debitus*

Table 3
purgatorius et debitus
poenitentiae et debitus
purgatorius et peccantum

From the initial four searches it became clear that *tempus* was combined with *refrigerium* and *purgatorius* significantly less than *debitus*. Whenever *tempus* did occur in the same text as *refrigerium* or *purgatorius*, *tempus* tended to make some kind of reference to time and life on earth and did not suggest that writers were thinking about purgatory through the quantitative prism of time. Consequently, the second round of searches used to compile a source base for this chapter focussed upon sources which would potentially further reveal how people associated debt with purgatory and penance, and also for a further understanding of purgatory, penance and sin.

A second conclusion which can be reached from the research of the words in Table 2 is that *refrigerium* was never spoken about in reference to *debitus* and was only ever spoken about with reference to *tempus* when writers explained how people had behaved during their lives, while on numerous occasions as shall be contested later in this chapter concepts of ‘debt’ were brought up in

reference to the purifying nature of purgatory. This fact in itself reaffirms Le Goff's argument that *refrigerium* was a place of waiting and refreshment after death and not a place of purification. The fact that *refrigerium* was not a place of purification is important in understanding it as an entirely separate concept to purgatory.

It is also worth accepting that associations between debt and sin were by no means a completely new occurrence during the thirteenth century. During previous centuries debt and sin were linked together through the legal concept of a 'wergild'. 'Wergild' was a particularly important legal concept during the early medieval period with most of the source material relating to it being legal texts.[103] 'Wergild' was understood as a way to force a peaceful settlement after a violent encounter resulting in a death. The *Lex Burgundia* or *Lex Gundbadi* fl. c. 500 explained a payment ought to be paid to a wronged party depending upon the deceased rank. For instance a noble was worth 150 *solidi*, a middle-ranking individual 100 *solidi*, and a minor person 50 *solidi*. It also stated only half the amount would need to be paid if the death was incurred through self-defence.[104] Given that crime and sin was often seen in tandem in this period, it is relevant to question whether this process was about placing a numerical value upon sin.[105] However, ultimately it should be clear that 'wergild' was more of a material and legal concept than a scholastic one. 'Wergild' was clearly more about bringing about a legal procedure which encouraged a peaceful form of conflict resolution after a crime than an abstract understanding of sin. Despite this early association between debt and sin, the developments which this chapter charts are clearly novel as the debt is not of any material form. Whereas 'wergild' was a material and legal concept, discussions which took place in the thirteenth century about sin creating a debt for an individual was a purely abstract eschatological concept.

Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1093 to 1109, wrote a number of famous works emphasising aspects of Christ's life. In his *Cur Deus Homo* Anselm argues

---

[103] Stefan Esders, 'Wergild and the Monetary Logic of Early Medieval Conflict Resolution', in *Compensation and Penance: The Monetary Logic of Early Medieval Conflict Resolution,* eds. Lukas Bothe, Stefan Esders, & Han Nijdam, (Leiden, 2021), p. 2
[104] Ibid pp. 3-4.
[105] Ibid pp. 17.

that during the fall a 'debt' was incurred by mankind as a whole, for not giving God the honour he deserved. Anselm then went on to argue that more must be given to God in compensation than man is able to give, therefore God created *a Deus Homo* or Christ to facilitate man giving a burden of debt to God which only God is great enough to give. Anselm argued that this debt was paid at the crucifixion. However, it is important to clarify that Anselm was only talking about mankind and the Passion and was not describing the individual's relationship with God and any 'personal' 'debt' uncured because of individual sins committed throughout one's life. Anselm's thinking in the *Cur Deus Homo* has been widely debated by a number of philosophers and historians, with some criticising him for developing an overly legalistic explanation of the passion which does leave enough space for love. Part of this dispute stems from the lack of love and grace shown by a God who operates through mechanisms of precise debts and payments. However, of course *debitum* has many different potential translations all of which would place a different emphasis on Anselm's thinking on the *Cur Deus Homo*. A particular reoccurring issue in the chapter is differentiating between debt and obligation. Debt naturally has commercial connotations while the associations with obligation can either be considered in a hierarchical sense or alternatively as a logical imperative. Giles Gasper has argued that though many people have interpreted Anselm as presenting an entirely legalistic argument for the creation of a Deus homo, that they misinterpret him in an overly legalistic way. Anselm was only attempting to present a neat and 'beautiful' solution to the problems and contradictions of the Passion.[106]

It would be logical to conclude that the linking together of debt and individual sin derived from three factors. First of all, Anselm's widespread association between sin and debt would seem an obvious precursor to the debates discussed in this chapter. It would also seem logical that the 'growth of the individual' in this period would also likely have been an important background development, aiding the growth of thinking about debt in relation to sin and the individual. A further

[106] Giles Gasper, 'Anselm of Canterbury and Christology', 2024, unpublished.

factor which no doubt played an important role in a growing debates on seeing the relationship between God and the individual like a commercial exchange was the commercial change taking place in Europe at this time. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries Europe saw a marked increase in commercial activity and growth. There has been substantial research charting the growth of commercial activity during this period. [107]

Moreover, just as Anselm's attempt to frame the passion through a lens of debt and repayment proved controversial, so did subsequent debates reframing the relationship between individual sinners and God through a lens of debt repayment prove controversial. As is seen at the end of this chapter, some writers clearly attempted to push back against the use of metaphors conflating individuals' sins and debts. It should also be noted that in the same way that it can be difficult for contemporary scholars to distinguish between different intended emphasise of word

[107] It has been estimated that the population of England rose from 1.1 million in 1086 to 3.7 million in 1346, while the populations of Milan and Venice rose from 20,000 to 100,000 in the same period, in combination with other evidence there can be no doubt about the extent of commercial growth; Robert S Lopez, *The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages, 950-1350*, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1971), p. 68. This period also saw marked increase in money supply, by 1319 800 tons of silver was circulating England as coined money, this was 24 times the as much as had been in the mid-twelfth century; Peter Spufford, *Power and Profit: The Merchant in Medieval Europe*, (London, 2002), p. 12.

Again, the period saw an uptake in the building of infrastructure that both facilitated and acted to as a precursor to commercial growth. Ninety-eight of the six-hundred- and-thirty-two surviving Genoese wills from 1155 to 1253 left an endowment to for bridges to be built, this was a vogue that extended beyond this area. When Bishop Hugh of Grenoble died in 1132 he left money to build a stone bridge over the Isère; in 1130 Thibaud, Count of Blois built a bridge over the Loire; between 1135 and 1146 the 'Steinerne Brücke' was built across the Danube, with the bridge across the Main at Würzburg and the 'Judith Brücke' in Prague both built at a similar time; Spufford, p. 176. The period also saw a significant development in road building and maintenance. In 1236 Frederick II arranged for the maintenance of roads with the 'Sachsenspiegel' of Eike von Repgow categorising roads by size and developing rules governing who would get priority at bridges and narrow places; Spufford, p. 181.

The expansion of urban space in this period can also testify to the development of wealth and commercial exchange in this period. It has been argued that generally speaking, historically there has been a direct correlation between a town's perimeter and its population or wealth; Dereke Keene, 'Towns and growth of trade' in *New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. IV c. 1024 – c. 1198 Part 1*, eds. David Luscombe & Jonathan Riley-Smith, (Cambridge, 2008), p. 51. In 1106 the perimeter of Cologne was expanded from 122 to 223 ha, after 1162 Pisa expanded its' perimeter from 30 to 114 ha, while between 1150 and 1200 the perimeter of Genoa expanded from 22 to 52 ha; Keene, p. 51. This brief list is by no means exhaustive, and more examples could be used to demonstrate the phenomenon which took place across Europe. Again, the numbers of small towns also demonstrate a growth in commercial activity and prosperity. From 1150 to 1200 the number of small towns in Russia expanded from 50 to 80, while in Germany and England the number of commercial settlements increased progressively, by 1000 each had 90 and 70 respectively, by 1100 140 and 130, and by 1200 250 and 230; Keene, p. 52.

debitum, it would be likely that writers and their contemporaries would have suffered similar issues and may not have always fully understood what each other meant.

Exploring the idea of debt creates its own issues for both translation and interpretation. The notion of debt is also bound up with the idea of obligation. The connection between debt and obligation can similarly be seen alongside analogies which contrast freedom to money.[108] In both of these understandings money, or its lack, is directly comparable to the amount of freedom that one possesses in life. This section shall demonstrate how in the early thirteenth century, analogies of debt were being used to discuss people's moral value at the end of life and their resultant freedom or lack of after death. This chapter consequently plays an important role in the overall findings of this paper, those being that during the early thirteenth century the relationship between the individual and God was being reconceptualised through the notion of money and quantitative thinking. This reconceptualization took place before the popularisation of Aristotle's economic thought which has been so painstakingly covered by the research of Odd Langholm and also predates the 'new model of equilibrium' which Joel Kaye charts from 1280 to 1360.[109]

Developing further what has been said above, when interpreting a text, a debt which stems from the repayment of an act *or* money is quite different from a debt to God which is owed because of God's innate good. In the texts under discussion in this section, the context has been used to ensure that the 'debt' which is being discussed is always a 'debt' which can be 'paid off' as opposed to an eternal debt. Furthermore, though Aquinas (at the end of our period) argued that mankind owes an eternal debt to God through its moral actions, this is a separate discussion as what follows is a discussion of penance as a debt, this is an additional and personal debt to God quite separate to any shared debt. It is important to establish what is meant by 'debt'. Debt ultimately relies on an idea of 'balance', yet is similar to cleansing and medicine. Still balance prevails and elsewhere terms of

[108] Philip Goodman, *Theology of Money*, (London, 2009), p. 103.
[109] Joel Kaye, *A History of Balance, 1250–1375: The Emergence of a New Model of Equilibrium and its Impact on Thought*, (Cambridge, 2014), p. 5.

'debt' and payment reoccur. When considered through God's *modus operandi* it is possible to see how justice could be obligated to work like a commercial or monetary debt. A more pertinent question to ask is to what extent the analogy of commercial debt was seen as a direct parallel as opposed to an explanatory analogy.

In the early thirteenth century sin and wrongdoing was being associated with a view to balance and mercantile activity. As seen in Chapter One, prior to the thirteenth century, balance was seen as an important virtue to embrace in everyday life. This notion of 'balance' was highly associated with the monastic ideal of moderation. Whereas, during the period of this study, the interest shifted to a developing belief that 'balance' was an important ideal to be achieved at the end of life not a virtue to be lived out during one's life. As seen in Chapter Two, during the period of study, God's *modus operandi* for judgement began to be viewed as similar to that of a merchant buying goods. Writers explained how God weighed and measured peoples good and bad acts, achieving a balance between their moral state and fate, like a merchant balances out the quality of goods and price. This chapter explains how during this period sin was re-imagined so that it became akin to a debt on an account ledger which must be cancelled out. It would seem logical that in turn this idea of cancelling out the debt of sin can be seen as a partial cause for the development of purgatory. Ultimately, the fact that debt is supposedly paid off through penance means that a sense of purity prevails around the notion of balance.

Section 3.1 'The logic and language of debt' examines writers and texts who both used the language and vocabulary of monetary debt when describing ideas related to penance, as well as the 'logic of debt'. What is meant when the study argues that a writer has used the 'logic of debt', is that the writer was not just drawing a parallel between debt and penance but expressed an understanding that penance worked in precisely the same way that a commercial debt did. Section 3.1 concludes that Peter Cantor, Stephen of Bourbon, William of Auvergne, and the *Summa Halensis* all use the language and logic of debt. Section 3.2 'Purgatory a debt repayment scheme' argues that some texts clearly understood the link between penance and purgatory through the 'logic of debt'

outlined above. This section examines texts by Peter the Cantor and Hugh of St Cher. Section 3.3 'Pushing back against commercialism' argues that a number of writers were deliberately and actively pushing back against a growing movement that sought to understand penitential theology like a commercial debt. This section looks at works by Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, Alexander of Hales, and evidence by Caesarius Heisterbach. The first three of these writers placed partial emphasis on how purgatory was not something that existed purely to complete penance in but a separate place where all that were not damned necessarily had to go regardless of any penance fulfilled. Caesarius of Heisterbach provides evidence of different views at the top of the church on how penance worked. Section 3.4 'Balance: the language of debt or the logic of debt?' stresses that though in a number of texts the logic of debt and balance is used it does not necessarily use the language of debt, some texts even used different analogies all together such as medicine but still maintain a logic of balance. These instances show that among those debating debt in penitential theology there was not always an unanimous understanding of what 'debt' meant and what its implications were. This section does not negate any of the previous evidence that demonstrates a link between developing penitential ideas and commercial frameworks but it does highlight the confusion that spread between contemporaries stemming from the different language that was used. This section should also act as an example of how metaphors can confuse a concept as much as they can aid communication and understanding.

Overall, this chapter concludes that at the beginning of the thirteenth-century, likely stemming from Anselm of Canterbury's intellectual legacy as well as a growing awareness of commercial practices in scholastic circles, ideas related to commercial debt diffused into theological thinking. It is clear that, while no consensus was reached in its favour, a view was popularised that completing penance was like paying off a debt to God. In this way, penance could be quantified by a theoretical amount and thought of in a numerical or quantitative fashion, consequently some argued that after a sin was committed the sin would create an exact equivalent amount of penance for the sinner to complete, this penance could be thought of as 'owed' to God. This penitential thinking

acted in contrast to concepts of penance which were based on cleanliness as they relied on the fact that theoretically an individual's debt to God could be balanced out. This chapter goes on to conclude that this notion of thinking about the relationship between God and man in commercial terms was a contributary factor in the development of purgatory. Even in cases where it was argued that penance was not like a debt or that purgatory was a necessary stage for everyone, it becomes clear that the extent that penance could be considered similar to debt and how this related to purgatory was an area highly contested during the thirteenth century.

3.1. The logic and language of debt

This section explores writers using both the language and logic of debt to describe the consequences of sin. This section looks first at texts by Peter Cantor, the Stephen of Bourbon, William of Auvergne, and the *Summa Halensis*. In his *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis* Peter the Cantor (d. 1197) uses debt (*debito*) as a synonym for sin, demonstrating that the logic of sin is comparable to the logic of debt. In his first chapter, while discussing inconsistencies that people can face in confession, through receiving greater or lesser penances as well as addressing the issue of forgetfulness during penance, he refers to sin as being a 'debt'. He argues that sometimes a greater debt is burdened upon an individual during penance and sometimes lesser ones.[110] This wording clearly sees the act of sinning as causing a debt for oneself in the future, through creating a necessary penance, or as it could otherwise be termed, an imbalance of accounts between God and the 'individual'. This language highlights that Peter the Cantor understood that doing a penance was more than an act that every human had to fulfil and was unique to the individual and their sins, the bespoke nature of these penance ensure that the 'debt' which is being spoken off works in a similar way to a monetary debt, where an individual only pays what they themselves have loaned and associated costs. Though

[110] Petrus Cantor, *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis - Secunda pars: Tractatus de paenitentia et Excommunication*, ed. Jean-Albert Dugauquier (Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 7, 1957), p. 192, ('Quandoque maior debito penitentia iniungitur, quandoque minor, quandoque condigna'.)

the text does accept that penance can be problematic as different penances can be given to fulfil the same debt, it does accept that there is an ideal debt to be fulfilled. Peter the Cantor's logic of debt and penance is also made clear through this text. When debt is substituted for sin, it becomes clear that his understanding of sin and penance is that sin creates debt automatically, and that the debt is subsequently paid off by penance.

This passage appears in question 110 about relaxing penances various issues concerning this. The notion of penance being associated with a debt that has to be paid is strengthened through various passages in this text. The text argues that an important role of penance is to 'erase the past', though this language could be synonymous with a language of cleansing, it can also be interpreted as a language of debt. The idea of erasing can equally suggest that the role of penance was to take an individual back to a point of perfection which was imagined through purity – this phrase bridges a gap between cleansing and accounting: *delenda* is associated with destruction and therefore entirely removing the signs of wrongdoing not cleansing. Moreover, the idea of penance being about removing a 'debt' is again suggested through the analogy which Peter draws between penance and cloth. He argues that insufficient penance is like wearing clothing which does not cover the entire body, with the consequence of leaving an individual exposed to the dangers of purgatory. The comment about purgatory is again suggestive of the fact that purgatory is a continuation of penance conducted on earth.

Although, as outlined above, there are clearly methodological problems with trying to see sin and debt as synonyms for each other there are clear instances where this appears to be the clear intention of the particular author. This chain of thinking from the author is often made clear through other language within the text. This link between sin and debt is best made through the explanations of penance, with the link being that sin creates a debt which is paid off through penance. Again, texts that clearly demonstrate an intended parallel between the idea of sin and debt seem to coalesce around the 1240s with all individuals having been in or around the University of Paris at around that time. The clearly deliberate usage of commercial language relating to debt while discussing penance,

along with the specific context of the relevant sources highlights how drawing parallels between debt and sin was an orthodox practice at this period.

Further evidence of penance being seen as a way of paying a debt to God can be found in Stephen of Bourbon's (1180-1261) 'Tract on various predicable materials' (*Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*). In a section discussing whether leopards can change their spots Stephen discusses the fate of sinners who delay their penance. While doing this he writes about the idea of delaying paying a debt of penance, explaining that in fulfilling penance, much like in debt repayment, delay in payment only makes the situation for the penitent worse.[111] The fact that Stephen was thinking about penance as a *payment* demonstrates how in his view the penance involved a transaction with God which was akin to commercial activity. The word *soluere* could be translated in numerous ways, with contemporary meanings ranging from loosening and realising oneself from an obligation to outright 'paying' in a commercial sense.[112] Whether through translation one seeks to emphasise the idea of paying debt or of loosening an obligation, there would still be heavily implied contractual arrangement between God and the penitent. The contractual and commercial basis of Stephen's logic is only emphasised through the added use of *debitum* with all of the associations that that holds.

Later to further his point, he quotes Gregory the Great when he says that failure to 'dilute' sin with penance makes it easier for the penitent to sin again.[113] In this instance there is clear change in language being used between the two writers. Though both describing the same scenario, Gregory's language addresses the purity of penance, while Stephen's emphasises the completion of a transaction. This should be understood as a deliberate choice in language representing the Stephen's understanding of penance. As with other writers featuring in this research, Stephen was educated at

---

[111] Stephanus de Borbone, *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus (prologus et prima pars)*, ed. J. Berlioz et J.-L. Eichenlaub, CCCM 124 (Turnhout, 2002), line 428, ('Sic peccator quo plus tardat soluere penitentie debitum, in pluribus maculis inuentur dum de uito ruit in uitium'.)

[112] http://clt.brepolis.net/dmlbs/pages/QuickSearch.aspx - 'soluere/solvere'.

[113] Stephanus de Borbone, *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus,* ed. J. Berlioz et J.-L. Eichenlaub, CCCM 124, line 429, ('Vt dicit Gregorius: "Peccatum quod per penitentiam non diluiur mox suo pondere ad aliud trahit'.)

the University of Paris during the first quarter of the thirteenth century, where as this research shows the 'commercialisation' of the relationship between God and man appears to have been a very live issue. This should be interpreted as a clear continuation of the framework created by Anselm to think about sin but adapted for the individual as opposed to the Passion.

Stephen of Bourbon's works have often been used to discuss elite and popular understandings of religion.[114] Stephen's work has proven particularly useful for historians due the way his texts often reflected personal experiences gained through his extensive preaching missions in South East France, as used by historians such as Jean-Claude Schmitt, citing a notorious instance Stephen coming across two women in Auvergne venerating a dog as a saint.[115] Therefore, when considering orthodoxy Stephen can also be of use through his role in the campaign of lay education, which was only encouraged by the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.[116] As a purveyor of orthodoxy, the language and parallels that Stephen used to describe penance is unlikely to have been controversial and suggests that this understanding of penance had gained popularity in the schools at this time. While it should also be considered that such language may have gained popularity due the relative ease that it allowed for conversing with the laity.

The *Summa Halensis* clearly demonstrates the logic of debt and sin and was not merely using the analogy. The idea of debt being synonymous with penance would appear to re-occur a number of times in the second book of the *Summa Halensis* ('The *Summa of Alexander of Hales'*). During a discussion on a predicament whereby an individual has taken a vow of chastity and then subsequently got married, a consistent reference is made by the author for a debt to be paid.[117] First of all the author explains the paradox, that being that should the individual consummate the

---

[115] Catherine Rider, 'Elite and Popular Superstitions in the Exempla of Stephen of Bourbon', *Studies in Church History*, 2006, Volume 42, pp. 78-80.
[116] Ibid, p. 79.
[117] It is acknowledged that the Summa Halensis was most like a collaborative work among a number of Franciscans in Paris, though the word author is and shall be used in this paper in order facilitate easier reading. For more on this see: Victorin Doucet,'The History of the Problemofthe Summa', Franciscan Studies 7 (1947)pp. 26-41 & Victorin Doucet,'The History of the Problem of the Summa(Continued)', Franciscan Studies 7 (1947), pp. 274–312.

marriage, they would break their vow, while should the individual not break their vow, the marriage could be said to not be fulfilled.[118] The author then goes on to say that should the marriage be consummated, the individual would be obliged to pay a 'debt', which one could more precisely term a 'penance.'[119] Should there be no consummation then no 'debt' would be required. The solution that the author provides is that should the marriage be consummated the individual could pay the debt and then return to a celibate life afterwards.[120] The logic that the author has shown in this text is that much like a loan can be taken out and repaid, a sin can be committed and with appropriate penance repaid. As such there can be doubt that author's express intent was to draw a parallel between how debt works and the relationship between the individual and God.

Moreover, the inclusion of the above passage in the *Summa Halensis* is further good evidence to suggest that it was orthodox to understand penance through the model of debt. The two main aims of the *Summa Halensis* have been pithily summed up by Ayelet Even-Ezra as being to 'make other texts redundant' and by being concise and comprehensive.[121] It can be implied that novelty in would have been restricted. The text was written in a period of tension between the friars and secular masters at Paris.[122] It would thus have added further reason for the friars to develop a text which was both orthodox and their own. However, these two notions should not be seen in opposition to each other, 'The character of the text is never only a matter of innovation: it is also a conscious choice of whom to follow and whom to associate with'.[123]

---

[118] Alexander Halensis, Summa theologica (Summa Fratris Alexandri siue Summa uniuersae theologiae - opus Alexandro, moderante conflatum): secunda pars secundi libri, studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 1930 [Alexandri de Hales Summa theologica, vol. III] page 638, ('Quarto quaeritur utrum in matrimonio post votum continentiae emissum persona peccet semper quae votum emisit, petendo vel reddendo debitum, aut non'.)
[119] Ibid, page 638, ('manente autem matrimonio et copula carnali subsecuta, tenetur reddere debitum; nullus autem tenetur ad contraria'.)
[120] It is accepted that the *Summa Halensis* was written by numerous people. However, given that it is not possible to accurately assert who wrote each section of the *Summa Halensis*, for the purposes of this document, unless explicitly stated otherwise the term the 'author' shall be used as a catch-all phrase for all the contributors. Ibid, page 638, ('[Solutio]: Ad quod dicendum quod agere debet poenitentiam de voti transgressione ....., reddere debet debitum; nec peccat sic reddendo, cum consummatum sit matrimonium.')
[121] Ayelet Even-Ezra, 'The Summa Halensis: A text in context', in *The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context*, ed. Lydia Schumacher (Boston, Berlin, 2020), pp. 220-21.
[122] Ibid, pp. 224-25.
[123] Ibid, pp. 227.

Moreover, the orthodoxy of the text should be implied through the wide number of writers who contributed to it. With a current consensus that the text was written by a number of authors at the 'Franciscan' school of Paris between 1236 and 1245, it would be hard to write off sections of the text as anomalies, especially given the context of writing outlined above.[124] Ignatius Brady has suggested that the purpose of the *Summa Halensis* was to write up much of Alexander's thought into a Summa, creating a 'Franciscan' legacy.[125] While this may have some truth to it, it would have been against the author's interests to have included any elements which may have been controversial and thus jeopardized the legacy that was trying to be created.

A similar occurrence can be seen in one of William of Auvergne's *Semones de communi sanctorum et de occasionibus* ('Sermons on the communion of saints and occasions'), he makes a further reference linking purgatory to a debt. He explains that purgatory is like a penitential prison and that through mankind leaving, one can see debts being forgiven.[126] In the preceding section before the passage discussed, William makes references to debts of a commercial nature, making it clear that by 'debt' William is referring to a commercial type of debt that one can be released from. He talks about debt being tied up with redemption, which is a 'treasure' which has a 'price'.[127] Moreover, William is clearly alluding to debts which one is freed from as opposed to a debt of obligation, as he talks about being freed from these debts. It is inconceivable that William would not have been aware of the debates that were taking place at the University of Paris, having been appointed a Master of Theology 1223 and then Bishop of Paris in 1228.[128] Moreover, in reaction to what was being discussed in the University of Paris, in January 1241 William published his ten

---

[124] Lydia Schumacher, 'The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context', in *The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context*, ed. Lydia Schumacher (Boston, Berlin, 2020), p.1.
[125]Lydia Schumacher, *Early Franciscan Theology: Between Authority and Innovation*, (Cambridge, 2019), p. 5.
[126] Guillelmus Alvernus (Guillelmus Arvernus), *Sermones de communi sanctorum et de occasionibus*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CCCM 230C (Turnhout, 2013), page 190, ('Sic nos a carcere penitentiali et purgatorio reddimus debita pro debitas condonantes'.)
[127] Ibid p. 190, ('Taceo illud, quia etsi non haberent nisi debita quibus illis se persecutores obligant, ditissimi essent. Non est modicus neque contempnendus thesaurus, debita scilicet quibus se uel alii sic obligati sunt. Est enim thesaurus ipse precium nostre redemptionis'.)
[128] Roland J. Teske, *Studies in the Philosophy of William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris (1228-1249*), (Marquette, 2006), p. 10.

propositions in philosophy and theology.[129] Surviving copies of William's sermons are scattered with lines such as "Tell the tale" and "continue along these lines".[130] As such the fact that William goes out of his way to note down his thoughts in a precise way suggest that his words were particularly carefully considered suggesting additional thought and a very deliberate use of analogy.

It should be clear from the analysis of the above texts that numerous scholars of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries both used a language and 'logic of debt' to explain penitential theology. It should also be clear that writers who spread these ideas were not fringe figures developing doctrine of little relevance but were instead mainstream orthodox thinkers, suggesting that this re-imagining of the relationship between God and the individual was a fairly commonly accepted set of ideas.

3.2. Purgatory: a debt repayment scheme and extension of penance on earth

The way that purgatory was considered as an extension of penance suggests that sin and penitential theology was being thought of through the logic of debt and that interpreting *debitum* through a commercial sense is necessarily an intention of the writer. Again however, it can never be clear to what extent *debitum* was used as a tool of communication and to what extent God's *modus operandi* was literally being thought of as a 'creditor'. The link between penance and purgatory does provide evidence that thinking about God's relationship with the individual through a commercial lens was a factor in the development of purgatory as a clearly defined doctrine.

Again, Peter the Cantor can be seen as a forerunner in thinking about the relationship between penance and debt. In his *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis Secunda pars* ('Summary of the sacraments and the counsels of the soul') Peter the Cantor, clearly understood purgatory as an extension of penance, writing that penance was paid through the church with the

[129] Ibid p. 17.
[130] Lesley Smith, *Fragments of a World: William of Auvergne and his medieval life*, (Chicago, 2023), p. 72.

effect being that the individual is freed from a debt.[131] Following this Peter writes that through not fulfilling the payments demanded by the church the individual will be punished in purgatory.[132] In essence at the crux of Peter's understanding of purgatory is a sense that it is a place of payment, not just as is otherwise contested, a place of cleansing. *Debitum* does not have any immediate link with cleansing whereas, the link between *debitum* and monetary debt remains obvious. With this having been said, it is clear that as far as Peter the Cantor was concerned, a line of thought resulting in the existence of purgatory stemmed from an idea of purgatory being a place of settling accounts with God and creating a balanced account.

Again, central to Hugh of St Cher's understanding of purgatory is the idea that it acts as a place for extending the availability to fulfil penance. In his Super *Apocalypsim expositio* he argues that purgatory is 'due' for people who with good intention start their penance on earth but die before it is completed.[133] Establishing whether Hugh viewed purgatory through more of a lens of 'purification' or 'cleansing' as opposed to debt is difficult to establish. He wrote that people who had completed their penance and died in a state of grace would go straight go Heaven, making clear that he saw purgatory's role as a place only for those who had failed to attain a sufficient satisfaction required.[134] Important to appreciate here is that penance is not necessary without sins having been committed. Therefore, if the purpose of purgatory is to extend the opportunity to complete penance, it must be one that can be completed and which were brought about solely by the acts of the individual, much like a commercial debt. He appears not to question whether or not a priest could have prescribed an insufficient penance. However, again the fact that he terms Heaven, similarly to

---

[131] Petrus Cantor, *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis - Secunda pars: Tractatus de paenitentia et excommunication*, ed. Jean-Albert Dugauquier (Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 7, 1957), page 417, ('Item. Penitencia remittitur huic auctoritate ecclesie. Ergo alius soluit que rapuit. Ergo liberatus est a debito.')

[132] Ibid p. 417, ('Ergo liberatus est a debito suffragiis ecclesie factis pro eo uel faciendis. Si factis, quomodo cum nondum obtulerit nummum et eam sibi obligauerit? Si faciendis, ergo nondum liberatus est, sed si discederet, in purgatorio puniretur.'

[133] Hugo de Sancto Caro (pseudo), *Super Apocalypsim expositio I ('Vidit Iacob') in editionibus quibusdam cum Thomae de Aquino operibus impressa, Thomas de Aquino*, ed. Parmensis, t. XXIII (1869), p. 404, ('Secunda pars sunt qui inceperunt poenitentiam, sed non compleverunt, et in gratia decesserunt, et his debetur Purgatorium'.)

[134] Ibid page 404, ('Item prima pars hominum sunt illi, qui inceperunt poenitentiam, et compleverunt, et in gratia decesserunt; et his debetur Paradisus'.)

purgatory, as something which was 'due' or 'owed', suggests that he understood one's presence in the afterlife to be a somewhat contractual arrangement. This again would support the notion that he believed purgatory to be a mere extension of debt that was gained on earth and begun 'paying' off through penance. Furthermore, the fact that Hugo does not see purgatory as a necessary state for all humans underscores the notion that he understands purgatory as a place one goes to due to accruing a penance in a similar way to a monetary-like debt.

In his *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis* ('Summary of the sacraments and the counsels of the soul'), during discussion on whether it is the church or individuals who have the authority to lessen a penance, Hugh makes the link between the logic of penance and the logic of purgatory even clearer. He argues that penance must respond to purgatory and as such if a bishop can lessen a penance, he must be able to do the same in purgatory.[135] Not only is this good evidence that Peter saw purgatory as linked to penance, but it demonstrates that he ultimately considered them to be one and the same. Moreover, the text explicitly tells us that a purpose of penance *satisfactio temporalis* is to reduce time in purgatory. Though in this passage there is no language explicitly linking it to the idea of debt, the fact that one of the penitential states mentioned above lessens the other would serve to demonstrate that he understood that there was a finite and particular amount of penance which was to be attained in order for salvation, a *debt* to be paid off as it were as opposed to a perpetual debt owed to God. Debates around the existence of purgatory clearly centred on the idea of continuing to *pay* of a debt and 'balance books' with God, with time in purgatory acting as a way of paying back a debt.

Therefore, from the evidence reviewed in this section it should be clear that a number of thinkers clearly saw a continuation between penance and purgatory and often termed this in the language of debt. The way that penance is individually accrued and the fact that it is reduced to

[135] Petrus Cantor, *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis - Secunda pars: Tractatus de paenitentia et excommunicatione*, ed. Jean-Albert Dugauquier (Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 7, 1957), page 416 ('Item. Satisfactio temporalis respondere debet purgatorio et illum extinguere. Ergo si episcopus auctoritate sua potest remittere et illum, nunquid potest dicere: 'Remitto tibi quartam partem purgatorii'.)

ultimately nothing makes it similar in logic to a commercial debt. When this is termed alongside the language of debt it clearly demonstrates a vein of thinking which sees penance as debt. When as these thinkers have done, purgatory is seen as a natural extension of penance it becomes clear that purgatory was being imagined as similar to a form of debt repayment after death. This form of debt repayment is clearly demonstrates an understanding that God's form of judgement is like a quantitative procedure, ensuring that perfect justice is administered and that each person makes individual amends for their sins after death.

3.3. Pushing back against commercialism

Clear examples also occur of writers deliberately choosing to push back against the idea of God's relationship with man being like a commercial debt. With evidence in texts by Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, and an anecdote recorded by Caesarius of Heisterbach, it can clearly be seen that some thinkers attempted to deliberately push back against an understanding of penitential theology in which purgatory and penance were any form of debt. The fact that these writers give evidence of opposition to understanding penitential theology through the prism of debt does not negate the argument that it was a trend in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, if anything it strengthens the argument, making clear that some thinkers were active in trying to turn the tide against this form of thinking.

The fact that the question of balance and penance was still a point of contention in the mid-thirteenth century can be seen from what Thomas Aquinas writes on the subject in his 'Commentary upon the Sentences' (In *IV Sententiarum distinction*). Thomas wrote this work while lecturing in Paris between 1252 and 1256.[136] The work likely makes up lecturing notes and thus provides an excellent view of what issues of contention were arising at the University of Paris. While explaining justice in this text, Aquinas draws a distinction between two types of 'debt'. He writes quite explicitly that

[136] John F. Boyle, 'Thomas Aquinas and his Lectura Romana in Primum Sentiarum Petri Lombardi', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, (Leiden, Boston, 2010), p. 149.

penance repays a 'debt' to God which comes about through sin.[137] Before discussing how some obligations specifically do not rest upon balance he explains that Tullius had considered religion as affiliated with justice because of this link.[138] The point which Aquinas ultimately moves on to make is that some virtues are not equally reciprocated, like the need to honour one's parents and like penance which can never truly act as a recompense for the sin committed.[139] This chain of thought highlights that though he disagrees with the notion of penitential acts providing a route to a balanced transaction with God, the idea was clearly one that was circulating at the time of writing. Aquinas writes all this while commenting upon Distinction fourteen and penance. Much like the Alexander of Hales' (c. 1185-1245) commentary below, in Lombard's original distinction there was no commentary on post-life happenings, suggesting that this was a new and developing area of debate during this period.

A slight change can be seen in Aquinas' near contemporary Albert the Great (c. 1200-1280), who pushes back against the idea of penance being a form of balancing good with bad. While Albert does align with Aquinas in seeing penance and purgatory as a form of debt, he differs in that he sees purgatory as a necessary stage regardless of the penance which has been done. Albert argues that guilt is also once guilt and debt have been discharged, purgatory follows.[140] The relevance for this in balance is that Albert evidently sees purgatory as a place of purifying not just a place of correcting or balancing. The difference being that Aquinas implies that once sufficient penance is achieved purgatory becomes less relevant. Though a similarity that both accept is that penance cannot pay off a debt of alone and therefore in most cases purgatory is final cleansing phrase. Their emphasis of this

[137] Thomas de Aquino, *IV Sententiarum*, ed. Prima Americana t. VI, VII-1 et VII-2 (1948) (reimpr. ed. Parmensis, t. VI (1856) et t. VII (1858), distinction 14, question 1, line 20, ('Alio modo ex hoc quod contra Deum peccavit; et sic reddit Deo debitum poenitentia'.)
[138] Ibid line 20, 'Unde sicut religio ponitur pars justitiae a Tullio'.
[139] Ibid line 20, ('unus enim est conjunctus culpae, qui est debitum poenae aeternae: et illo soluto manet adhuc reatus et debitam poenae purgatoriae'.)
[140] Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii in quartum librum Sententiarum*, ed. Aug. Borgnet, 1894 [opera omnia, vol. 29], p. 542, ('illo soluto manet adhuc reatus et debitum poenae purgatoriae non proportionatae viribus poenitentis'.)

point should be seen as a reaction against the 'pure debt' theory had been circulating amongst their predecessors.

Again, though Albert appears to see purgatory as an extension of penance, he makes clear that purgatory is a required state of being for all. In arguing that purgatory was a required state of being for all, Albert is clearly reacting against some who argued that purgatory's role was about complete debt repayment. The analogy of cleansing appears more in keeping with Albert's thinking. In his *Commentarii in quartum librum Sententiarum* ('Commentaries on the fourth book of Sentences') he explains how purgatory is an extension of penance on earth. His commentary on the Sentences was, like many others' based on his teaching notes, from when he was teaching in Paris in circa 1243 to 1244.[141] The surviving copies were likely edited by stationers in Cologne circa 1249.[142] Therefore, we should be aware that the text does not replicate entirely the lectures of Albert but it would be reasonable to imagine that they are a reasonable representation. He explains that once the penitent has completed their penance on earth the punishment of purgatory still awaits.[143] The punishment of purgatory is seen as not proportionate to each penitent and thus should not be seen as pure debt which has been carried on. Thus, according to Albert, though penance and purgatory are both linked, penance still appears as a necessary state for mankind. Yet the 'debt' of purgatory remains a debt which must be paid, Albert writes that once purgatory has been passed 'the debt does not remain'.[144] Following in line of others who had begun to see inward repentance as being of more importance than outward repentance, Albert also notes that in order for repentance to be fulfilled contrition, confession, and satisfaction are required and that without these repentance cannot be achieved.[145]

---

[141] James A. Weisheipl, 'The Life and Work of St Albert the Great', in *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays 1980*, eds. James A. Weisheipl, (Toronto, 1980), p. 23.
[142] Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii in quartum librum Sententiarum*, p. 542.
[143] Ibid page 542, ('unus enim est conjunctus culpae, qui est debitum poenae aeternae: et illo soluto manet adhuc reatus et debitum poenae purgatoriae non proportionatae viribus poenitentis'.)
[144] Ibid page 542, ('Soluto autem illo, non manet reatus'.)
[145] Ibid page 542, ('Ad totum autem peccati morbum hunc delendum dico, quod requiruntur tria, scilicet contritio delens primum, confessio delens secundum, et satisfactio delens tertium: difficultas autem tollitur

It is clear that the relationship between balance, debt, and purgatory was being debated in Paris during the 1220s. Evidence of this can be found in Alexander of Hales' 'Gloss of the Four Books of Sentences' (*Glossa in quattuor libros Sentiarum*). The text was written by Alexander between 1200 and 1227, while he was in Paris.[146] It has been suggested that this commentary on the Lombard's Sentences are in essence his teaching notes from when he found himself teaching in Paris between 1223 and 1227.[147] Alexander raised the question, should a priest prescribe an insufficient penance would the penitent suffer in Hell.[148] The fact that he raises this question suggests that it was an issue of contention in Paris in the 1220s. However, following this Alexander argues that this would not be the case as through confession, the punishments of Hell are exchanged for purgatory. Explaining his thinking further, Alexander goes on to argue that with mortal sin, even if one fulfils a penance he is still indebted for purgatory. With this it should be clear that in explaining his interpretation of purgatory, Alexander specifically felt the need to push back at notions that purgatory was like any form of debtors' prison. He further goes on to argue that if the penitent deliberately went to a particular priest in order to gain a lighter penance, then he is a 'debtor to eternal punishment'.[149]

Given the role of the priest in prescribing penance, it should not be surprising that the passage above is found in Hales' commentary on Lombard's seventeenth distinction, which is on confession.[150] However, with no especial mentioning of the afterlife in Lombard's 'Sentences'

---

boni consuetudine in omnibus his. Et sic patet, quod potestas poenitentiae perficitur in his tribus, et sine his tribus non est perfecta'.)

[146] Christopher M. Cullen, 'Alexander of Hales', in *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, eds. Jorge J. E. Gracia & Timothy N. Noone, (Blackwell, 2002), p. 105.

[147] Henrick Lagerlund, *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, (Springer, 2020), p. 115 & Ignatius Brady, 'The distinctions of Lombard's book of Sentences and Alexander of Hales', *Franciscan Studies*, 1965, Vol. 25, p. 95.

[148] Alexander Halensis*, Glossa in quattuor libros Sententiarum: glossa in librum quartum*, studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 1957 (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi, tom.XV), 299, (' Respondemus: si sacerdos iniungat alicui pro mortali aliquam poenitentiam indiscrete et iste adimpleat, non absolvitur quantum ad Deum; immo, licet sit contritus, debitor est poenae purgatoriae.')

[149] Ibid page 229, ('Immo, si hanc habuerit discretionem [ac simul opportunitatem] de cognoscendo discreto sacerdote et negligentiam habuerit accedendi, fit debitor poenae aeternae.')

[150] It is accepted that it was not Peter Lombard who divided up his Sentences into distinctions and that this was done at later date, presumably for teaching purposes. It is entirely likely that Alexander Hales was the first person to divide the text this was, for a full discussion of this please refer to: Ignatius Brady, 'The distinctions of Lombard's book of Sentences and Alexander of Hales'.

Distinction seventeen and with no earlier commentaries on the Sentences for Alexander to be reacting to, it would appear that controversy over the relationship between penance and purgatory was highly contested in the schools at this time. Given Alexander's need to highlight how he thought purgatory was not merely a penitential version of Hell and that purgatory was still a necessary state following mortal sin, should be read as a deliberate attempt to get away from the notion merely seeking to balance out one's good and bad acts.

However, Alexander clearly sees punishment after death as some form of debt, if not a debt that follows the same pattern as a monetary debt. The fact that Alexander writes about there being a 'due' penance suggests that he believes that for each wrongdoing there is a finite and ideal penance much like a measured quantity discussed in Chapter Two. However, his explanation of Hell as a debt does present issues for this interpretation. Given that Hell in indefinite punishment, it is impossible for it to be seen as a specific 'repayment', instead the debt must be a debt that is owed as a result of prior lack of obedience or contrition to God and not a debt that can be repaid. In other words, a bit like Aquinas after him, Alexander appears to believe that purgatory acts as form of debt repayment, where balance is achieved prior to absolution, as well as a debt of obedience which everyone owes to God, with the only way of making recompense for a lack of obedience being in a state of perpetual debt in Hell.

It is clear from an anecdote given in Caesarius of Heisterbach's (c. 1180 – c. 1240) 'Dialogue of Miracles', that the idea of sin being wiped away without due payment proved contentious even at the top of the church. In one of his anecdotes Caesarius explains an instance where a cardinal has a dispute with the Pope concerning the authority of negating penance. Caesarius explains that a mother, having commit incest with her son, appeared at Pope Innocent III's court seeking a sufficient penance.[151] However, Pope Innocent admonished her of her sins only having seen how ready she was

[151] Caesarius Heisterbacensis, *Dialogus miraculorum*, Fontes Christiani, FC 86/1-5 (textus ed. a J. Strange, 1851), page 402, ('Ante hoc quadriennium, eodem, si bene memini, anno, quo defunctus est Innocentius Papa, mulier quaedam igne libidinis succensa, proprium adamavit filium, de quo concepit et peperit filium alterum……Videns dominus Papa in muliere tantam contritionem, et quia vere esset poenitens,')

to obey a penance. Following this the Pope was rebuked by an un-named cardinal for providing an insufficient penance. This instance clearly sees the cardinal and the pope at opposing views about whether penance is in any way a debt. The pope clearly sees no necessary need to fulfil a penance in order to be absolved of sin, in contrast to the cardinal who believed in a form of recompense needing to be made to cancel out the sin. This particular passage may not demonstrate a particularly concerted effort to push back against seeing the relationship between God and the individual as a debtor and creditor, nor does it expose any particular theology behind the individuals' thinking but it does highlight the way that different individuals within the church took such opposing views on the need to fulfil penance in order to be absolved of sin.

The sources examined above provide clear and determined push back against any understanding of sin as causing any kind of 'debt' with God. Moreover, the fact that a number of these texts were written while teaching in the universities suggests that the conceptualising of sin as creating a debt with God was an important topic of debate in the early thirteenth century, demonstrating that it was a popular topic of discussion. Aquinas provides evidence of this being a point of contention between c. 1252 – c. 1256, Albert the Great between c. 1243 and c. 1244, and Alexander of Hales between c. 1200 and c. 1227. Caesarius of Heisterbach also provides clear anecdotal evidence of the relationship between penance and any 'debt' with God as being highly contentious with Pope Innocent III and his cardinals. This section therefore reinforces the claim of the chapter that during the first half od the thirteenth century penance and purgatory were seen by some as a form of debt repayment to God. This analogy was certainly important in the development of the doctrines of penance and purgatory, while this section highlights the fact that this debate was problematic both at the University of Paris and with ecclesiastical authorities. It is noticeable that these debates seem to take place after the clarification of purgatory at the Second Council of Lyon and that these debates appear to be limited to the first half of the thirteenth century.

3.4. Balance: a language of debt or logic of debt?

In some cases, though the terminology of debt was used it is not clear that the penitential relationship between God and the individual is being considered as actually working in the same way of a commercial debt. It is entirely possible that debt is being used as a phrase signifying obligation and that God's *modus operandi* is thus merely being explained as a series of logical steps that must occur for order to be achieved. Whereas in other cases a logic of a monetary debt may appear to evident but without any language of debt it can be hard to prove either way. As in some examples that follow it could in fact be a logic of balance but not necessarily a logic of debt. In his *Summa de sacramentis et animae consili Secunda pars* ('Summa of the Sacraments and the Counsels of the Soul'), Peter the Cantor links penance to debt on numerous occasions, though he stops short of actually stating that penance is precisely like paying of a debt. In his first chapter, written on repentance and sin, he explains that a particular penance is due, which a person must be burdened or charged with.[152] (*Debitus* – due) Though the use of *debitus* here can be interpreted as an obligation or service, as opposed to a hint towards any form of commercial debt, the word does heavily imply the idea of a particular penance being sought for a particular sin. Therefore, though this text is not new in the way that it considers sin, its novelty lies in the way that it bridges a gap between penance being considered as a specifically prescribed action and characterises this through the language of debt. The problem lies in the fact that though the debt can be specifically prescribed to match a precise amount of wrongdoing, it would not necessarily follow that that the logic behind the debt has anything to do with debt. There is in fact a long history of particular penances being prescribed against particular wrongdoings, especially in confessionals left with the clergy. The characterisation of the penance through debt highlights that the penance is not just like a remedy which can be administered but is instead similar to, though not necessarily comparable to a debt

[152]Petrus Cantor, *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis - Secunda pars: Tractatus de paenitentia et excommunicatione*, ed. Jean-Albert Dugauquier (Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 7, 1957), part 76, page 22, ('Iste erit reus homicidii, ergo iniungenda erit ei penitentia debita tali peccato'.)

which when paid back to balance an account with God. In this particular case, as little other context is given about this 'debt', it would be too presumptive to conclude that this debt was supposed to be taking the form of a monetary debt and so it remains unknown precisely what Peter the Cantor describing.

Further confusion is brought in a sermon by William of Auvergne which does not use the language of debt to explain penance but instead appears to somewhat use the logic of balance. The link between penance and a sense of balance is pithily summed up by William of Auvergne in his sermon 223. While drawing more broad analogies between his listeners and ships, he instructs that people ought neither be too harsh in fasting nor fail to perform 'due' penance.[153] The fact that William advises people that there is a point at which penitential acts can harm one's own relationship with God demonstrates that he was not visualising penance as an act of cleansing. Instead, William saw penance as a method of ensuring that one's good acts balanced out one's bad. He appears concerned that in people being to assiduous in their penance, they may go too far and create an imbalanced relationship with God. Though William is notorious for heavy language rich in analogy, it is clear that this reflection on balance was not just a mere generic turn of phrase or thinking. He explained himself in his 'Faces of the World' (*De Faciebus Mundi*) that the role of analogies was to provide a more enhanced theological interpretation.[154]

Further evidence that around the University of Paris, penance was being thought about through a consideration of balance is found in Alexander of Hales' 'Gloss of the Four Books of Sentences'. When answering question fifty-two, Alexander drew a parallel between medicine and penance. He argues that repentance is a medicine and that medicine works through opposites.[155] Though the parallel Alexander is drawing is with medicine not a set of scales, it is still clear that he is

[153] Guillelmus Alvernus, *Sermones de tempore sermo*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CCCM 230 A, 315. ('uide ne nimis onerata sit nauis tua ieiuniis et afflicttionibus et huiusmodi, uel parum, skillet ne debitam penitentiam facias'.)
[154] Lesley Smith, *Fragments of a World: William of Auvergne and his medieval life*, (Chicago, 2023), pp. 10-11.
[155] Alexander Halensis, *Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'*, studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 1960 (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi, tom. XIX, XX et XXI), , page 992, ('Poenitentia ergo cum sit medicina, et medicina nata sit fieri per contraria, relinquitur quod poenitentia debeat fieri per contraria'.)

writing about a sense of balance needing to be achieved, with good acts needing to cancel out bad ones.

Similarly, writing by Thomas Aquinas though not explicitly referring to any monetary style debt does use a logic similar to the logic monetary debt or balance when explaining the role of purgatory. In his *De rationibus fidei ad Cantorem Antiochenum* ('On the Reasons of Faith to the Cantor of Antioch') Thomas Aquinas draws together penance, purgatory, and the fulfilment of an *obligation* or debt. Aquinas likely wrote this work in response to questions raised by the Cantor of Antioch and thus reflects contemporary topical questions raised between in a place where Latin Christians mixed with Eastern Christians and Muslims.[156] He explains that purgatory must exist because there must be a place after temporal life where incomplete yet well intended penance can be completed.[157] In case there was any doubt, with this explanation Thomas drew a firm connection between purgatory and penance, explaining that the former is merely an extension of the latter. Through this logic he also affirms the tradition of seeing penance as something which is exactly and precisely measured out, much like much a unit of currency or measure, much like the logic of debt. Therefore, though no explicit link is drawn between a balance of payment and penitential action, it is clear that Thomas saw purgatory as a state of existence designed to counterbalance the harm left through sinful actions and thus akin to a transaction with God. Though, it should be noted that important to Thomas' thinking is the idea that this counterbalance can only be achieved if repentance is sought, this does not negate the idea of payment as trade is consensual, if anything it strengthens the analogy. The very fact that an entire chapter of this work is dedicated to a purgatorial state is suggestive of how different interpretations of scripture led to differing understandings of a purgatorial state post death. Moreover, it highlights the way that issues such as

---

[156] https://isidore.co/misc/Res%20pro%20Deo/Aquinas/Bilingual/Rationes.htm [accessed 14/07/2023].
[157] Thomas de Aquino, *De rationibus fidei ad Cantorem Antiochenum, textus Leonino aequiparatus*, ed. Marietti 1954 [Opuscula theologica I], page. 266, ('Amplius, contingit aliquos ante mortem perficere non potuisse poenitentiam debitam pro peccatis, de quibus poenituerunt; nec est divinae iustitiae conveniens quod poenam illam non exsolvant…… Oportet igitur ponere aliquas poenas temporales et purgatorias post hanc vitam ante diem Iudicii'.)

purgatory divided Christians. Given that this text was perhaps written for the benefit of people who were unfamiliar with the idea of purgatory, one should interpret Thomas' choice to explain the existence of purgatory through the lens of *debitam* as significant to his understanding of its role. Without Thomas expanding on his language at all, his logic of purgatory can easily match a cleansing interpretation of purgatory as well as it could a debt theory of purgatory. Thomas' text therefore highlights the problematic issue of interpretation highlighted in the introduction to this paper.

Consequently, it can be seen that at times it can be near impossible deduce the logic behind any particular analogy. What the texts by Peter the Cantor and William of Auvergne do show however, is that beyond thinking about penance as just a debt, other analogies for penance were in circulation which still understood penance as solution to sin through balancing out wrongdoing. This is important because it lifts the lid on potential different analogies which were in circulation which in some way sympathised with the idea that penitential theology could be a quantitative procedure. However, without significantly more research than is possible for the remit of this paper it is not possible to conclude on which if any analogies came first. The reader must satisfy themselves that commercial thought played its role in imagining a penitential theology.

3.5 Concluding thoughts for Chapter 3

This chapter has confirmed that, likely stemming from Anselm of Canterbury's *Cur Deus Homo*, which argued that through Christ's death in the Passion a debt was paid to God by mankind, debt found its way into theological thinking about the relationship between God and the individual during the late twelfth and early thirteenth century. This way of thinking about the relationship between God and the individual was highly contested with a concerted push against it by thinkers such as Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas, and Albert the Great. From the sources that these individuals leave it is clear that these ideas were particularly highly contested in the schools of Paris. It is also true that other analogies did use similar a similar logic to debt, balancing out wrong acts with right ones, to explain penitential theology. It is not clear which came first a the assimilation of

debt into penitential theology, would have which subsequently spread a logic of debt but through different analogies or whether a quantitative logic of balance pre-dated development of a logic of monetary debt in penitential thought. However, it is certainly true that though that during the period, as again seen in Chapter 2, commercial ideas did enter in some way or another into theological thinking. The arrival of commercial thinking into theological thought was likely a contributory factor in the emergence of purgatory, being one of the numerous traditions purgatory emerged from.

4.0. Conclusion

This paper has touched on numerous issues and topics with some areas of debate being left clearer than others. What follows here is a summation of the evidence and arguments made in this paper, which it is hoped hasbeen clear thus far. Chapter One argues that around the twelfth century 'balance' as religious ideal shifted away from being something which was aspired for in life and seen, along with moderation, as a moral good in itself to becoming something which was aimed for at the end of life or post death; this shift was partly due to a more general shift that was taking place in the period, away from Christianity being defined through monastic ideals such as *ora et labora* to a growing emphasis on more systemised theology and pastoral care. Throughout the chapter one constant which remained the same was that balance was equated to holiness and imbalance to hypocrisy and lack of holiness. The development which took place during the twelfth century was also about achieving balance at the end of life and thinking about this as bespoke and individual quantitative process, so that correct 'judgement' at the end of life and God's *modus operandi* was about balancing out good with bad, this was seen in Section 1.2 with Hugh of St Cher, Herman of Werden, and Bonaventure. In their writings on judgement these writers emphasised that God's judgement of an individual would partly depend on how they had acted. Finally, in section 1.3 a text by Rupert of Deutz was looked at where he looked at heresy through a quantitative lens, identifying heresy as something which could be identified through its extremes and through an ill-measured or balanced view scripture. This chapter is important in setting out how 'balance' at the end of life became an important areas of thinking, something was is elaborated on in the following chapters.

Chapter two finds that the phrase *pondus et pondus* or 'weight and weight' was popularised during the period around the thirteenth century. Using the *Library of Latin Texts* it can be found that the phrase survives in 75 instances between c. 736 and c. 1500, with 41 of these instances from c. 1150 to c. 1260. When studying these instances, it becomes clear that there was a clear tradition of parallelling God to a good merchant, describing His acts as similar to those of a good merchant. Despite the evidence of this tradition existing, it was not always clear whether the use of this parallel

was just as a teaching and preaching tool or whether it actually represented a new way of thinking about the relationship between God and man. The final section of this chapter does at least demonstrate that some thinkers were worried that that this did actually represent a shift in thinking about the relationship between God and man, whether or not that had been the original intention of their predecessors.

Section 2.1. 'To ponder: *pondus et pondus*' finds that prior, during, and after our period the phrase *pondus et pondus* held strong commercial connotations which were understood and used by writers from varied backgrounds and scholastic traditions. It is further worth noting that while the phrase itself comes initially from Proverbs 20:10, in most instances looked at in this paper the phrase *pondus et pondus* was used as a standalone phrase. The most clear-cut pieces of evidence linking the phrase *pondus et pondus* to a specific commercial fraud come from Herman of Werden, Thomas de Chobham, and Hugo de Miromari. In his *Hortus deliciarum*, having quoted *pondus et pondus* Herman went on to explain that some merchants would use two weights of measures, one falsified set for buying good and another for selling. Thomas de Chobham explained the phrase by stating that some merchants would act fraudulently through not letting the scales fall naturally. The subsequent section, 'Broader mercantile context for *pondus et pondus'* provides further and clear supporting evidence linking the phrase to commercial activity. Most significant of these sources is a passage in Hugo de Miromari's *Liber de hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptus* listing *pondus et pondus* as a sin in itself.

Section 2.4 'The God merchant and bespoke judge seeks to explore the use and meaning of the phrase, understanding how it was used beyond its slim commercial understanding. The section argues that texts analysed used the phrase *pondus et pondus* to describe essentially 'un-God-ly' activity. The implicit logic is that God is like a good merchant, with the consequence that God's *modus operandi* was being directly compared to mercantilism. God's actions are considered to be him weighing up and accurately measuring people's worth, like a merchant measuring the value of goods. This judgement took place 'after' death and the consequence would depend upon how

people's acts balanced out on the metaphorical scales. As this happened after death but before Heaven this logically bled into a way of thinking about purgatory. This chapter also provides evidence of mercantilism being seen as good prior to the popularisation of Aristotle's economic thought, which has been extensively researched by Odd Langholm.

Chapter two then broke down incidents of the use of *pondus et pondus* into various different sections examining the use of *pondus et pondus*. These sections were: 2.5 'How God works: mercantilism analogy or reality' which analysed how God understood sin and judgement in relation to balance and whether writers actually understood God as operating like a merchant or whether they were merely drawing a parallel between God and a merchant; Section 2.6 '*Pondus et pondus*: a warning to the individual' which looks at three texts which warn their audience about God's judgement; and finally Section 2.7 which examines related texts by Bernard of Clairvaux and the paradox that he represents. Analysis of these texts found that both God's view of judgement and his modus operandi was thought through the prism of balance in commercial exchange.

Section 2.5 'How God works: mercantilism - analogy or reality?' examines three texts which clearly draw analogies with God's mode of judgement with a mercantile process, though with each particular writer it cannot be certain either way whether they actually understood God as behaving like a merchant or whether they were merely drawing comparisons between God and a merchant. Herman of Werden saw God as like a merchant – drawing direct parallels between mercantile practices, referring to the use of double weights and God's judgement of the individual. Herman is difficult to use as a barometer for understanding how far the association between God and mercantilism had spread. His writings were not used as a preaching tool but instead for monastic education, reducing any need or purpose of him to use metaphors to explain Gods' practices to a lay audience. However, it could also be the case that Herman represents a general confusion across the Rhine, over the use of the metaphor between God and merchants. Either way, it seems evident from analysing the text that Herman saw this use of this analogy as a reality not a mere analogy. William of Auvergne uses an analogy of *pondus et pondus*, though problematically so thick were his sermons

with analogy it is difficult to determine whether William saw the relationship between God and the individual as actually being like that of a commercial process of whether in fact he merely wanted to give a vague understanding to his listener and had just sought to use an everyday incident to explain it. Gerhoh of Reigersbergensis who was also examined in this section, understood God rewarding the individual in direct proportion to how an individual had helped other ins their life. Overall, it is not clear whether these writers actually understood the relationship between God and the individual as something which actually worked like a commercial exchange or whether these writers were merely trying to draw parallels between God and a merchant. However, they do appear to swing towards the idea of God actually working like a merchant. What a close analyse of these texts certainly does demonstrate is that there did appear to be disagreement within scholastic circles about to what to what degree God could be said to behave like a merchant and how this was best characterised.

Section 2.6 '*Pondus et pondus*: a warning to the individual' looks at three texts which warn their audience about God's judgement. These texts were written by Herman von Rein and Thomas de Chobham. Each text draws a direct comparison between ascertaining individual wrong done a commercial exchange. All of these examples consider how the precise amount of wrong done can be measured quantitatively much like the precise value of a product and be valued through quantitative means through a weighing scale. Herman von Rein understood good or *holy* judgement of others' was very much like a merchant conducting good mercantile practice. Therefore, it logically flows from that, that God and 'God-ly' practice is akin to fair commerce. Similarly, Thomas de Chobham appeared to understand confession and inner-reflection as being like a transaction that was taking place, with the weighing of right and wrong being like the weighing of goods. Overall, each of the texts which were analysed warns the audience that God's judgement and judgement which can be considered 'God-ly' is like a transaction. Not only do these texts demonstrate that thinkers were understanding God's modus operandi through the prism of commercial exchange and mercantilism but also that mercantilism was seen as a good in itself, suggesting that a more acute understanding of concerns about accumulation of wealth were clearly developing prior to the popularisation of

Aristotle's economic theory, which Odd Langholm has held solely responsible for changing ideas about wealth that were developing.

Section 2.7 'Bernard of Clairvaux a paradox' examined a text by Bernard of Clairvaux which acts as an important counter-balance to the previous section as Bernard's interpretation *of pondus et pondus* varies from others mentioned as well as his views on wealth. Though it probably worth concluding that Bernard's thinking says more about himself, his motives, and what he was responding to, than it says about his contemporaries. We must assume that he understood *pondus and pondus* to have some kind of connection with wealth. This assumption makes sense with his view of each of the four horses of the apocalypse representing four episodes in the church's history. From his book of *Sentences* we must also presume that he understood imbalance as opposed to God. Crucially, his main importance in this study is to remind us that not everyone necessarily now viewed commerce as a good thing which was akin to God's *modus operandi*. Bernard highlights that the developments charted in this chapter was not a universal development but a partial one, involving some thinkers in some places.

Chapter three, 'Debt, penance, value' argues that during the first half of the thirteenth century parallels were being drawn between penitential acts, purgatory, and debt. These parallels were not accepted by everyone, with sources indicating that it was part of a wider development in the understanding of purgatory by thinkers of the time. These debates ceased by the mid-thirteenth century and it was argued that this was likely because understanding penance and purgatory through other means such as opposed to debt or balance became dominant. The chapter accepted that there was a long history of people thinking about the relationship between mankind and God through the prism of a debt being paid in the Passion. Important in this tradition was Anselm of Canterbury and his *Cur Deus Homo*. However, the sources examined in this chapter do not reference debt and mankind but instead a concept of debt owed by individuals to God as a result of personal actions taken place in life.

It has also been noted that there was already an association between debt and penance which pre-dated the texts examined in this chapter. Debt and penance had been linked through the concept of wergild, whereby an individual or group would pay damages to a wronged party as part of a penance. Though wergild was linked to penance, it was ultimately more of a material form of dispute resolution, as previously noted in Chapter 3. Therefore, it remains true that the debt discussed in Chapter three was not related to wergild in that the debt was purely theoretical and in the instance of purgatory can be differentiated through only being 'paid' after death.

Section 3.1 'The logic and language of debt' found that some writers both wrote and thought about penance through the prism of debt. This section examined the *Summa Halensis*, as well as texts by Peter the Cantor, and Stephen of Bourbon. Peter the Cantor was found to use the language of commercial debt, considering a new debt to be created when a sin was committed like a monetary debt, making it distinct from any debt of obligation and believed that this debt could be gotten rid of through sufficient penance. Stephen of Bourbon drew a distinct parallel between how delaying penance was like delaying paying a debt, while also deliberately re-phrasing thinking by Gregory the Great to make debt *more* and purity less explicit in his thinking about penance. The *Summa Halensis* explicitly using calculated logic of debt in explaining a paradox about a person having taken a vow of chastity while also getting married. Not only does the logic use the language of monetary debt, but it also explains that penance can act like a loan created to bridge a paradoxical moral situation and then can be paid off with no subsequent ill-effects. In each of these texts, it is clear that writers of the early 1200s both thought that penitential theology was like a debt and while also using the language of debt to explain penance. William of Auvergne is also discusses due to him describing purgatory as a 'penitential prison', and combining this language with a great deal of other commercial diction. Moreover, the texts analysed in Section 3.1 were not eccentric outliers but were instead relatively well respected and established thinkers, demonstrating the probable mainstream nature of their views.

Section 3.2 ‘Purgatory: a debt repayment scheme and extension of penance on earth’ looked at texts by Peter the Cantor and Hugh of St Cher and found that they understood a link between penance and purgatory with the two concepts being linked through the logic of debt. Peter the Cantor argued that if one did not complete a penance which the church demanded, then this would have to be fulfilled in Purgatory. While Hugh of St Cher explained that people who could not complete their penance which they had in good faith started on earth, would complete this penance in purgatory. He furthers this in his *Summa de sacramentis et animae consilius*, where he argues that penance and purgatory are linked and that if a bishop can reduce a penance he must surely be able to reduce purgatory. These texts make clear that again, thinkers of the period were actively using the logic of debt to explain and understand how penance worked, using this logic to explain how purgatory worked.

Section 3.3 ‘Pushing back against commercialism’ argues that prior to the vogue of trying to understand penitential theology through the prism of debt ceasing, there appeared to be a movement against this kind of thinking. Thomas Aquinas tried to explain that there were two types of debt, obligation and debt incurred through sin. Albert the Great accepted Aquinas’ chain of thought and argues that purgatory does discharge a debt but that this is a debt of obligation. Both these writers were clearly concerned about the overly commercialised way that God’s relationship with the individual was being considered. Each of them tried to explain this problem away through emphasising how a debt could be accrued through an obligation and therefore thus not thinking about God’s *modus operandi* as a debt collector. In his *Gloss of the Four Books of Sentences* Alexander of Hales argued in confession the punishment of Hell are swapped for the horrors of purgatory, in a deliberate move to unlink purgatory from any idea of debt. He also argued that time in purgatory is due to having commit mortal sin which confession could not remove in its entirety, again in a clear attempt to dislodge the association between monetary debt and purgatory. This section also includes an anecdote recorded by Caesarius of Heisterbach which narrates an exchange between probably Pope Innocent III and one of his cardinals. The two individuals disagree how much

penance would be sufficient for a mother who had come before him. Their exchange reveals different attitudes to penance with the cardinal arguing that the lady cannot have been admonished for her sins because she will not have completed the precise amount of penance. This anecdote highlighted that there was certainly a push-back by some at the top of the church, like Innocent III for seeing the relationship between God and the individual like a commercial exchange

Section 3.4 examined texts by William of Auvergne, Peter the Cantor, Alexander of Hales, and Thomas Aquinas explaining that it is often difficult to know with certainty what each writer means when they reference *debitum* but also that some writers may appear to use the logic of *debt* and but use a different analogy with William of Auvergne and Alexander of Hales sued as examples. Each writer used an analogy in describing penance which maintained a logic of balance but not debt, illustrating the fact that clearly other analogies were used to describe penitential theology in a similar way to debt. A text by Thomas Aquinas is examined, highlighting that though he saw purgatory as an extension of penance due to his wording it would be truthful to say he understood penitential through the prism of debt, as his explanation would work just as well for understanding penitential theology through the prism of purity as it would debt, highlighting the complicated semantic nature of Chapter 3.

This paper achieves two principal conclusions, first of all, it is clear that at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century penitential thought went through a period of quantitative logic. Thinkers and scholars continued with an earlier tradition of identifying *balance* as an holy perfect ideal. However, rather than seeking balance and moderation in their everyday life, understanding this as a virtue within itself, they reimagined balance as a point of perfection to be reached at or after death. This was part of a wider shift away from a monastic based Christianity, towards a church more interested in pastoral care and internalisation of faith. Thinkers combined the concepts of balance and quantification to reimagine judgement after death. They imagined that central to God's *modus operandi* at judgement was a desire to for people to balance their wrong doings with acts of atonement. Consequently, penance and purgatory often became linked in

peoples' minds with earthly atonement leading on to further atonement post death. This way of thinking about death and salvation was not limited to a small group, sect, or area but was popularised from figures like Stephen of Bourbon preaching in far corners of France, to William of Auvergne preaching in the centre of Paris, and among monks studying East of the Rhine.

An important development which came from this reappraisal in the relationship between God and the individual was the development of an additional logic for the discovery of purgatory as a doctrine. At the same time as the relationship between God and the individual was reappraised the doctrine of purgatory was being debated and propagated. Understanding the relationship between God and the individual at judgement in quantitative terms necessarily had an impact on how purgatory was envisioned. Once the individual could be thought to seek further atonement after death having had a personal amount of sin calculated it was only natural that purgatory could be thought out and explained a through the prism of a debtor and a creditor. Imagining God as being able to define an independent and exact amount of sin through weighing individual's sins in an exact and quantitative way was evidently a persuasive explanation for purgatory's existence, so much so that figures who opposed this logic such as Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, and Alexander of Hales went out their way in the schools of Paris to actively dissuade people of this logic. Thus the development of a quantitative understanding of the penitential relationship between God and the individual should be added to the plethora of reasons for purgatory's discovery.

A second major conclusion of this research is that during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries commercial thinking seeped into theological thought. God and his *modus operandi* began to be likened to a good merchant trading fairly. Consequently, in opposition to Odd Langholm's research, commercialism began to be considered to a moral good prior to the popularisation of Aristotle's economic theory. Likewise commercial thought of debt and credit entered into theological thought with it being compared to penance and purgatory. Similarly, if we accept that Aristotle was only translated in Europe in the middle of the thirteenth century, through mercantilism being associated with God, then we must disagree with Odd Langholm who argued in his that it was only

the circulation of Aristotelian thought which led to mercantilism being less frowned upon from the latter twelfth century. Also, this paper suggests that medieval thinkers were more aware of market practices earlier than is generally thought, many of the reference do debt and merchants discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 suggest a higher level of commercial understanding within the school, and in instances like Herman of Werden, monasteries than has generally been emphasised.

In much the same way that Anselm of Canterbury's *Cur Deus Homo* proved controversial as it was deemed too not possess enough love and grace from God, it is evident from section 3.3 that analogies between God's *modus operandi* and mercantilism and the analogy which made penitential theology into something akin to a monetary debt proved equally controversial. As touched on previously, Giles Gasper has argued that Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* has in the past, as now, been wrongly interpreted for one important reason, among other reasons, that being difficulties in knowing how to interpret and translate 'debitum'. Then as now, the words used can prove difficult to interpret, therefore it may never be clear exactly which writers genuinely tried to explain God's *modus operandi*, if any, as literally being like commercial exchanges and which writers were only trying to draw a parallel for teaching and preaching. Also, it may never have been precisely clear for the writers' contemporaries.

A legitimate question springing from the research of this paper is to what extent analogy is a useful tool for communication. A number of times throughout this paper it has been noted that it can be somewhat difficult to establish whether writers were literally thinking about God as behaving like a merchant or thinking about penance as a debt, as opposed to being merely comparing them for the benefit of explaining a complex piece of theology to the audience. Whether it was ever the intention of some writers to draw such parallels between God and commerce or whether at times it was more of an issue of a metaphor being more of a hindrance than a help in conveying beliefs about God we shall never know, perhaps as a final thought, some of the writers examined in this paper should have heeded George Orwell’s advice that as ‘thought corrupts language, language can also

corrupt thought. A bad usage can spread by tradition and imitation even among people that should know better'.[158]

[158] George Orwell, 'Politics and the English Language', *Horizon*, (London, April 1946), p. 7.

Bibliography:

Primary Sources

Agobardus Lugdunensis, *De spe et timore*, ed. L. van Acker, CCCM 52 (Turnhout, 1981).

Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii in quartum librum Sententiarum*, ed. Aug. Borgnet, 1894 [opera omnia, vol. 29].

Alexander Halensis, *Summa theologica (Summa Fratris Alexandri siue Summa uniuersae theologiae - opus Alexander Halensis (Alexander de Hales), Glossa in quattuor libros Sententiarum: glossa in librum quartum,* studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 1957.

Alexander Halensis, *Summa theologica (Summa Fratris Alexandri siue Summa uniuersae theologiae - opus Alexandro, moderante conflatum): secunda pars secundi libri*, studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 1930 [Alexandri de Hales Summa theologica, vol. III].

Alexander Halensis, *Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'*, studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 1960.

Alexandro, moderante conflatum: secunda pars secundi libri, studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae 1930 [Alexandri de Hales Summa theologica, vol. III].

Beatus Liebanesis, *Tractus de Apocalipsin*, ed. Roger Gryson, CCSL 107 C (London, 2012).

Beda Venerabilis, *In prouerbia Salomonis libri iii*, ed. D. Hurst, J.E. Hudson, CPL 1351, (Turnhout, 1983).

Beda Venerabilis, *In prouerbia Salomonis libri iii*, s. 8 p.C, CC SL, 119B (D. Hurst, 1983).

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, ed. Bruno Scott James, (Stroud, 1998).

Bernardus Claraeuallensis, *Bernardi opera*, ed. J. Leclerq & H. M. Rochais, Editiones Cistercienses (Rome, 1977).

Bernardus Claraeuallensis, *Bernardi opera*, ed. J. Leclercq & H.M. Rochais, (Rome 1972).

Bonauentura, *Commentarius in Euangelium sancti Lucae, Opera omnia*, t. VII, ed. PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, 1895.

Caesarius Heisterbacensis, *Dialogus miraculorum*, Fontes Christiani, FC 86/1-5 (textus ed. a J. Strange, 1851).

Gerhohus Reicherspergensis, *Expositio Psalmorum (Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et Cantica ferialia),* ed. B. Pez et F. M. Wirtenberger, PL 193 (1854).

Gerhohus Reicherspergensis, *Expositio Psalmorum (Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et Cantica ferialia)*, ed. B. Pez et F. M. Wirtenberger, PL 193 (1854).

Gregorius Magnus, *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam*, SL, 142 (M. Adriaen, 1971).

Guillelmus Alvernus, *Sermones de tempore sermo*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CCCM 230 A (Turnhout, 2010-11).

Guillelmus Alvernus, *Sermones de communi sanctorum et de occasionibus*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CCCM 230C (Turnhout, 2013).

Hermannus de Runa, *Sermones festivals*, ed. E. Mikkers, I. Theuws, R. Demeulenaere, CCCM 64, (Turnhout, 1986).

Hermannus Werdinensis, *Hortus deliciarum*, ed. P. G. Schmidt, CCCM 204, (Turnhout, 2005).

Hieronymus (pseudo) (saec. VI - VIII), *Breuiarium in psalmos* - s. 8 p.C. (terminus ad quem), PL, 26 (1845).

Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentariorium in Ecclesiastium libri decem*, ed. J. P. Migne, PL 109.

Hrabanus Maurus, *Enarratio super deuteronomium*, ed. J. P. Migne, PL 108.

Hrabanus Maurus, *Expositiones in Leuiticum*, ed. J.P. Migne PL 108.

Hugo de Miromari, '*Liber de hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu (uersio breuis)*', CCCM, 234 (F. Wendling, 2010).

Hugo de Sancto Caro (pseudo), *Super Apocalypsim expositio I ('Vidit Iacob') in editionibus quibusdam cum Thomae de Aquino operibus impressa*, Thomas de Aquino, ed. Parmensis, t. XXIII (1869).

Lucifer Calaritanus , *Quia absentem nemo debet iudicare nec damnare*, CCSL, 8 (G.F. Diercks, 1978).

Petrus Cantor, *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis - Secunda pars: Tractatus de paenitentia et Excommunication*, ed. Jean-Albert Dugauquier (Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 7, 1957).

Ratherius Ueronensis, 'Sermones Monacenses', *Thesaurus Ratherii*, (ed. F. Dolbeau, 2005).

Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 21 (Turnhout, 1972).

Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 22 (Turnhout, 1972).

Stephanus de Borbone, *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus (prologus et prima pars)*, ed. J. Berlioz et J.-L. Eichenlaub, CCCM 124 (Turnhout, 2002).

Thomas de Aquino, ed. Marietti, [Opuscula theologica II, 1954].

Thomas de Aquino*, IV Sententiarum*, ed. Prima Americana t. VI, VII-1 et VII-2 (1948) (reimpr. ed. Parmensis, t. VI (1856) et t. VII (1858).

Thomas de Aquino, *De rationibus fidei ad Cantorem Antiochenum, textus Leonino aequiparatus*, ed. Marietti 1954.

Thomas de Chobham, *Summa de arte praedicandi*, ed. F. Morenzoni, CC CM 82 (Turnhout, 1990).

The works of Bonaventure, Vol. VIII, Part 3, St Bonaventure's Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, Chapters 17-24, Intro. & Trans Robert J Karris, (New York, 2004).

Secondary Sources

Baldwin, John W., *Masters, princes, and merchants: the social views of Peter the Chanter and his circle*, (Princeton, 1970).

Bernstein, Alan E. , 'Heaven, Hell and purgatory: 1100-1500', *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Volume 4: Christianity in Western Europe, c. 1100-1500*, eds Miri Ruben & Walter Simons (Cambridge, 2009).

Berman, Constance H., *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe*, (Philadelphia, 2010).

Bieniak, Magdalena, *The Soul-Body Problem at Paris Ca 1200-1250 : Hugh of St-Cher and His Contemporaries*, (Leuven, 2011.)

Boyle, John F., 'Thomas Aquinas and his Lectura Romana in Primum Sentiarum Petri Lombardi', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, (Leiden, Boston, 2010).

Brady, Ignatius, 'The distinctions of Lombard's book of Sentences and Alexander of Hales', *Franciscan Studies*, 1965, Vol. 25.

Bruce, Scott, 'Review of Hugo de Miromari: De hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu, ed. Wendling F., Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis 234 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010) in TMR (12.11.08).', The Medieval Review, 2012.

Cabarius, J. Allen, 'Agobard of Lyons', *Speculum*, Jan. 1951, Vol. 26, No. 1..

Cullen, Christopher M., 'Alexander of Hales', in *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, eds. Gracia, Jorge J. E., & Noone, Timothy N., (Blackwell, 2002).

Deeming, Helen & van der Heijden, Frieda, *Medieval Polyphony and Song*, (Cambridge, 2023).

Doucet, Victorin, 'The History of the Problem of the Summa', *Franciscan Studies 7* (1947).

Doucet, Victorin, 'The History of the Problem of the Summa (Continued)', *Franciscan Studies 7* (1947).

Edwards, Graham Robert , 'Purgatory: Birth or Evolution?', *Journal Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 36, No. 4, October 1985.

Esders, Stefan, 'Wergild and the Monetary Logic of Early Medieval Conflict Resolution', in *Compensation and Penance: The Monetary Logic of Early Medieval Conflict Resolution*, eds. Bothe, Lukas, Esders, Stefan, & Nijdam, Han (Leiden, 2021).

Even-Ezra, Ayelet, 'The Summa Halensis: A text in context', in *The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context*, ed. Lydia Schumacher (Boston, Berlin, 2020).

Foxhall-Forbes, Helen, 'The Theology of the Afterlife in the Early Middle Ages c. 600 – c. 1000.', *Imagining the Medieval Afterlife*, eds. Richard Matthew Pollard, Cambridges Studies in Medieval Literature, 114, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Freeman, Elizabeth, 'What makes a monastic order? Issues of methodology in "The Cistercian Evolution"', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37, Iss. 4.

Gasper, Giles. 'Anselm of Canterbury and Christology', 2024, unpublished.

Goering, Joseph, *William de Montibus (c.1140-1213): The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care*, (Toronto, 1992).

Goodman, Philip, *Theology of Money*, (London, 2009).

Hamburger, Jeffrey F., 'Herman of Werden's Hortus Deliciarum Salomonis: discovered, lost and recovered', *Scriptorium*, 1989, Vol. 43 (1).

Karris, Robert J., 'A comparison of the glossa ordinaria, Hugh of St. Cherand St. Bonaventure on Luke 8:26-39', *Franciscan Studies* 58 (2000) pp. 121-236.

Karris, Robert J., 'Bonaventure's Commentary on Luke: Four Case Studies of his Creative Borrowing from Hugh of St. Cher', *Franciscan Studies 59* (2001).

Karris, Robert J., 'St. Bonaventure's Use of Distinctiones: His Independence of and Dependence on Hugh of St. Cher', *Franciscan Studies 60* (2002).

Kaye, Joel, *A History of Balance, 1250–1375: The Emergence of a New Model of Equilibrium and its Impact on Thought*, (Cambridge, 2014).

Kaye, Joel, *Economy and Nature in the Fourteenth Century: Money, Market Exchange, and the Emergence of Scientific Thought*, (Cambridge, 1998).

Keene, Dereke, 'Towns and growth of trade' in *New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. IV c. 1024 – c. 1198 Part 1*, eds. Luscombe, David, & Riley-Smith, Jonathan, (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 47-85.

Lagerlund, Henrick, *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, (Springer, 2020).

Langenwelter, Anna Beth, *Agobard of Lyon: An exploration of Carlolingian Jewish-Christian relations*, University of Toronto, PhD Thesis, 2009.

Langholm, Odd, *Economics in the Medieval Schools: Wealth, Exchange, Value, Money and Usury according to the Paris Theological Tradition 1200-1350*, (Leiden, 1992).

Le Goff, Jacques, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. by, Goldhammer, Arthur, (Chicago, 1986).

Lopez, Robert S, *The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages, 950-1350*, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1971).

Newman, Barbara, Hildegard of Bingen and the "Birth of Purgatory", *Mystics Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (September 1993).

Morenzoni, Franco, 'Thomas of Chobham, Summa de arte praedicandi, ca. 1220', in *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300 -1475*, (Oxford, 2009), eds. Copeland, Rita & Sluiter, Ineke.

Orwell, George, 'Politics and the English Language', *Horizon*, (London, April 1946).

Otter, Monika, 'Hermanni Werdinensis Hortus Deliciarum', *Medium Aevum*, Vol. 75, Iss. 2.

Rider, Catherine, 'Elite and Popular Superstitions in the Exempla of Stephen of Bourbon', *Studies in Church History*, 2006, Volume 42.

Schmidt, Paul, Hermann of Werden, *Hortus deliciarum*, ed. Paul Schmidt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), Introduction, pp. IX-XVIII.

Schumacher, Lydia, *Early Franciscan Theology: Between Authority and Innovation*, (Cambridge, 2010).

Schumacher, Lydia, 'The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context', in *The Summa Halensis: Sources and Context*, ed. Lydia Schumacher (Boston, Berlin, 2020).

Smith, Lesley, *Fragments of a World: William of Auvergne and his medieval life*, (Chicago, 2023).

Spufford, Peter, *Power and Profit: The Merchant in Medieval Europe*, (London, 2002).

Stone, Rachel, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire*, (Cambridge, 2012).

Teske, Roland J., *Studies in the Philosophy of William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris (1228-1249*), (Marquette, 2006).

van Engen, John H., *Rupert of Deutz*, (Los Angeles, London, 1983).

van Renswoude, Irene, *The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, (Cambridge, 2019).

Weisheipl, James A., 'The Life and Work of St Albert the Great', in *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays 1980*, eds. Weisheipl, James A., (Toronto, 1980).

Young, Spencer E., *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society, 1215-1248*, (Cambridge, 2014).

Electronic links

https://about.brepolis.net/library-of-latin-texts/, [last viewed 14/03/2023].

http://clt.brepolis.net/dmlbs/pages/QuickSearch.aspx - 'soluere/solvere' [last viewed 12/04/2023]

https://isidore.co/misc/Res%20pro%20Deo/Aquinas/Bilingual/Rationes.htm [last viewed 14/07/2023].

https://vulgate.org/ [last viewed 05/04/2024]

Wendling, Fabrice, "Hugh de Miramar's *De hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu,* an 'autobiographical' work in the posterity of Augustine's *Confessions*?", *Rursus* [Online], 6 | 2011, online 09 February 2011, [last viewed 05/09/23], URL: http://journals.openedition.org/rursus/517; DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/rursus.517