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Map I. The World of the Capetians. Map by M. C. Gaposchkin.
Peggy Brown is widely admired (and occasionally feared, even by friends) for her insistence on rigorous textual scholarship. In this commitment, she does not emulate the makers of the *Bibles moralisées*, manuscripts remarkable equally for the beauty of their artwork and the surprising sloppiness, inaccuracy, and — occasionally — sheer incoherence of their texts.¹ In this essay, in honour of stimulating exchanges I have had with Peggy regarding the text of the *Bibles moralisées* over the course of several years, I revisit a manuscript genre I first studied long ago — the *Bible moralisée*, luxury illuminated volumes consisting of eight text-image pairs per page, which match biblical paraphrases and illustrations with verbal and visual commentary. Specifically, I shall explore the permutations of a single text-image pair in the four thirteenth-century exemplars, whose rendering of a biblical episode is particularly idiosyncratic and whose moralizing commentaries, with shifting objects of censure and praise, hint at a lively contemporary contest for spiritual prestige.² This focused examination further illuminates the sources and shaping of the

---

¹ This essay is dedicated with affection and gratitude to Peggy Brown, from whom I have learned more than I can possibly convey about being a scholar, teacher, colleague, and denizen of Paris.

² The manuscripts are, in the chronological order of creation proposed by Lowden, *The Making of the Bibles Moralisées*, i, p. 8: 1) Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554, a French-language exemplar tentatively dated by Lowden to c. 1220–1226, but by Tachau, ‘God’s Compass’ to c. 1208–1215; 2) Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, a Latin-language exemplar dating to either the same years as the French manuscript or slightly later (Tachau, ‘The King in the Manuscript’ suggests c. 1208–1218). These two manuscripts were almost certainly commissioned by or for members of the Capetian court. The others are 3) a three-volume manuscript known as the *Biblia de San Luis* in the Treasury of the Cathedral of Toledo, MSS I–III (hereafter Toledo, though the last quire is now Morgan Library & Museum, MS M.240), probably commissioned by Blanche of Castile c. 1226 as a gift for her son the young Louis IX, but only completed c. 1234 after an interruption of some years; and 4) a three-volume manuscript divided between Oxford (Bodleian, 270b), Paris (BnF, MS latin. 11,560), and London (BL, Harley MS 1527), executed concurrently with the later stage of the Toledo manuscript. See Lowden, *The Making of the Bibles Moralisées*, i, 8. On Louis VIII as the possible patron of Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, see Lipton,
commentary texts, the relationship between these four manuscripts, and religious politics at the early thirteenth-century Capetian court. It suggests, specifically, that the court was the site of an ongoing competition among Cistercians, Augustinians, and Benedictines for patronage and favour — a competition in which Jews were ultimately cast as the foil, and in which the manuscripts themselves may have played a very small role.

The Biblical Texts and Roundels

The text-image pairs in question contain the (very loose) paraphrase and moralization of a somewhat enigmatic episode in the Books of Kings. III Kings 19 opens with the prophet Elijah fleeing to the wilderness to escape the wrath of wicked Queen Jezebel. After a sojourn in Beersheba, followed by a forty-day journey to Mount Horeb, Elijah explains to God that he is lingering in a cave in fear for his life, and laments that he is the last remaining faithful Israelite: ‘zelo zelatus sum pro Domino Deo exercituum quia dereliquerunt pactum tum filii Israël altaria tua destruerunt et prophetas tuos occiderunt gladio et derelictus sum ego solus et quarerunt animam meam ut auferant eam’ (With zeal have I been zealous for the Lord God of hosts: because the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant: they have destroyed thy altars, they have slain thy prophets with the sword, and I alone am left, and they seek my life to take it away).3 God then instructs Elijah to return home and anoint a new Israelite king and a successor prophet, promises Elijah that his enemies will be slain, and affirms that some Israelites have remained faithful, and will be spared: ‘Et derelinquam mihi in Israël septem millia virorum, quorum genua non sunt incurvata ante Baal, et omne os quod non adoravit eum osculans manus’ (And I will leave me seven thousand men in Israel, whose knees have not been bent before Baal, and every mouth that has not worshipped him, kissing [his] hands).4

The Bible moralisée version of this exchange is distinctly odd. In all four thirteenth-century exemplars the biblical paraphrase adds a non-biblical phrase, which doesn’t merely shift, but downright upends the original import. (For a side-by-side comparison of the texts, see Table 4.1 in the appendix below) In the French-language manuscript, as is often the case, the relevant text is more a picture caption than a biblical paraphrase: ‘Ici vient Dex a Helye: “tu te glorefies en ta bontei et dis qe tuit li proudome sunt mort fors toi mes ancere ai ie mil homes qi unques ne me renoerent et n’aorent unques les ydles” et lor mostre a doi’ . (Here God comes to Elijah: ‘You glorify yourself in your goodness and say that all the upright men [proudome] are dead except you, but still I have a thousand men who have never renounced me nor ever adored idols’, and he points to them).5

Images of Intolerance, pp. 5–8. For exciting new evidence about Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, and a different suggestion regarding its dating and patronage, see now the recent article by Tachau, ‘The King in the Manuscript’; I discuss this article and the question of patronage further below.

4 Vulgate III Kings 19. 18.
5 Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554, fol. 54vA Note that the biblical seven thousand is here ‘a thousand’.
considerably alters the sense of the passage. Whereas the thrust of the exchange in the Vulgate is to reassure Elijah that he is neither alone nor in danger, here God seems to be scolding Elijah for vaunting his own virtue.

This reading is buttressed by the adjacent biblical illustration (Figure 4.1). On the left of the roundel, Elijah looks on with a distressed (or perhaps chastened) expression as the bust of God emerges from a cloud in the centre and points sternly downward at a squat seated demon-type figure, while gesturing favourably toward a group of men on the right. That these men — all dressed in lay clothing, two raising their hands as if in prayer — have ‘never adored idols’ is indicated by their erect stance: they are literally not bending their knees before the demon (hence my translation of proudome as ‘upright’), suggesting that though the Vulgate phrase ‘genua non sunt incurvata ante Baal’ does not appear in the manuscript’s biblical paraphrase, it was in the mind of either the artist or the iconographer.

God’s reproof is made yet starker in ÖNB cod. 1179, the earliest of the three thirteenth-century Latin exemplars. Here God does more than reproach Elijah for assuming he is the sole faithful man left — he also suggests that Elijah has overestimated his own exceptionality: ‘Apparuit Deus Helye et dixit: “tu glorificatus es in bono tuo et dicis quod omnes probi mortui sunt praeter te, sed ego habeo adhuc mille homines qui me numquam negaverunt nec ydolis fiuerunt et tantam quantam habes possident bonitatem’” (God appeared to Elias and said: ‘You have glorified yourself in your goodness and you say that all honourable men are dead besides you, but I still have a thousand men who never denied me, nor swore oaths to idols, and they possess as much goodness as you have’) (Figure 4.2). The biblical illustration alters the composition of the corresponding image in the French-language manuscript so as to underscore God’s dissatisfaction with Elijah. The positions of Elijah and the ‘remaining honorable men’ are reversed: the former is now on God’s left (sinister) side, while the latter are located on God’s right side, suggesting that God favours them over the prophet. To further emphasize their merit, these faithful Israelites are shown kneeling with their hands stretched towards heaven and their backs turned on the idol, which is now raised up on a tall pillar in the centre; this composition serves to contrast the humility of the faithful with the vainglory of the pagan demon. An eagle (a divine symbol) hovers above the good Israelites. The bust of God turns toward Elijah with a glowering expression and flourishes a speech banner proclaiming ‘tu glorificatus’, and the prophet presents a doleful aspect indeed, cowering in a cave with his hand over his face.

The other two, ‘twinned’ three-volume manuscripts echo ÖNB cod. 1179 in presenting God as reproaching Elijah, but they omit the final phrase proclaiming the faithful Israelites equal to Elijah in goodness. Their biblical texts are very similar to each other and to the earlier Latin manuscript, with slight variations in wording — Toledo retains the (incorrect) count of a thousand remaining Israelites but calls

6 Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, fol. 122C.
Figure 4.1. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB) MS 2554, 54vAa. Photo: © Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
Figure 4.2. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB) MS 1179, 122Cc.
Photo: © Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
Figure 4.3. Toledo, Cathedral of Toledo, Bible moralisée (Biblia de San Luis), vol. 1, 138Cc. Photo: by permission of La Biblioteca de la Catedral, Toledo, after M. Moleiro.
Figure 4.4. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 270b, 170Cc. Photo: © Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford.
them *boni*; Oxford corrects the count to the biblical seven thousand but follows ÖNB cod. 1179 in calling them *probi*.7

The biblical illustrations in Toledo and Oxford are nearly identical (Figure 4.3 and Figure 4.4; see also Figure 4.5 for a comparison of the roundels). Both retain the basic layout of the ÖNB cod. 1179 illustration, with Elijah on God’s left and the good Israelites on God’s right. But the artists have streamlined the composition, making it considerably clearer.8 The idol is omitted entirely. In its place we see God, no longer a small bust emerging from heaven but a full-sized standing Christ, commanding the centre of the roundel as he directs Elijah’s attention toward the group of remaining faithful, who are standing rather than kneeling. Elijah is again seated, but he appears less distraught than in the earlier manuscript — rather than covering his face with his hand, he holds his hand with his palm facing outward in an ambiguous gesture, either resigned or defiant.9 The overall effect is to focus attention on the contrasting

---

7 Toledo, fol. 138C: ‘Apparuit Deus Helye et dixit ei: “tu in bono tuo gloriiatus dixisti quod omnes boni mortui sunt praeter te, sed habeo adhuc mille homines qui me numquam negaverunt nec ydolis servierunt”.’ Oxford, Bodleian, 270b, fol. 170C: ‘Apparuit Deus Helye et dixit ei: “tu glorificatus es in bono tuo et dicis quod omnes probi mortui sunt praeter te, sed ego habeo adhuc vii. m. homines qui me numquam negaverunt”.’ Lowden, *The Making of the Bibles Moralisées*, 11, 202 has noted that Oxford tends to correct errors in Toledo’s biblical text, though the reverse also happens.

8 They seem to be following the model of the commentary illustration in Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, which presumably struck them as more balanced and easier to read than the biblical roundel.

9 John Lowden notes (*The Making of the Bibles Moralisées*, 1, 167–80) that the painters of both Toledo and Oxford often failed to understand the tracing of the under-drawing from which they were working, and consequently made errors. Usually Toledo is ‘better’, sometimes Oxford is better, and sometimes both manuscripts err. Here Oxford better realizes the under-drawing. In its biblical image, God (portrayed as Christ) carries a long scroll that unrolls to the ground just to the right of his left
attitudes of the opposed parties: the faithful Israelites appear obedient toward and receptive of God, while Elijah appears isolated and disengaged.

**Sources for the Biblical Texts**

Where does the *Bible moralisée*’s anomalous version of III Kings 19.18, with its unflattering portrayal of one of Scripture’s most venerated prophets, come from? God’s accusation that Elijah was ‘glorifying himself’ is not found in the Vulgate text, or in any thirteenth-century Bible manuscript of which I am aware.10 The episode was best known to medieval Christians via Romans 11.2–5, where Saint Paul cites God’s response to Elijah as proof that He had not forsaken the Jewish people. Paul never implies that Elijah was glorifying himself, or that God was reproaching him. However, the suggestion that Elijah lacked humility does appear in exegetical literature — several commentators on the passage saw a potential for vainglory in Elijah’s claim to be the only remaining faithful man. Augustine, for example, cited Elijah’s declaration in a sermon passage warning against pride.11 The most influential such interpretation appears in Book 31 of Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job*. Noting that God urged Saint Benedict to recognize others’ virtue and not just his own, Gregory cites and explicates God’s invocation of the 7000 remaining faithful Israelites:

> Scimus autem quod cordis sui oculum per elationis tenebras exstinguit, qui, cum recte agit, considerare meliorum merita neglegit. At contra magno humilitatis radio sua opera illustrat, qui aliorum bona subtiliter pensat, quia dum ea quae ipse fecerit facta foris et ab alis conspicit, eum qui de singularitate intus erumpere nittitur superbiae tumorem premit. Hinc est quod voce Dei ad Eliam solum se aestimantem dicitur: *Reliqui mihi septem milia virorum qui non curvaverunt genua ante Baal*, ut dum non solum se remansisse cognosceret, elationis gloriam, quae ei de singularitate surgere poterat, evitare potuisset.

---

10 For example, no such phrase appears in the corresponding passages in a late twelfth-century manuscript of the Paris Bible: Paris, BnF, MS latin, 11,535, fol. 10v (‘Et relinquam michi in Israel septem milia virorum, quorum genua non sunt incurvata ante Baal, et omne os quod non adoraverit eum osculans manus’); in the early thirteenth-century Bible given by Blanche of Castile to the Abbey of St-Victor de Paris (Paris, BnF, MS latin 14,397, fol. 103v: ‘Et derelinquam michi in Israel vii. milia virorum, quorum genua non sunt incurvata a Baal, et omne os quod non adoraverit eum osculans manus’); or in a Bible made in Paris shortly before 1231 (Paris, BnF, MS 11,930, fols 137–137v: ‘Et derelinquam mihi in Israel septem milia virorum, quorum genua non sunt curvata Baal, et omne os quod non adoravit eum osculans manus’).

(We know moreover that he who, when he behaves rightly, neglects to consider the merits of better people, extinguishes the eye of his heart through the darkness of pride. On the other hand, he who carefully weighs the goodness of others, brightens his own deeds with a great ray of humility, because when he sees those things which he has done himself also done by others outside, he deflates that swelling of pride, which strives to erupt from singularity. Hence is it, that it is said by the voice of God to Elias, who was deeming himself the sole [good man], *there remains to me seven thousand men, who have not bent their knees before Baal*; so that by learning that he was not the only one to have remained, he could avoid the boasting of pride, which could arise in him, on account of his singularity.12)

Gregory here is flagging the potential for pride only (`could arise in him'); neither Gregory the Great, nor Peter Damian (who quoted this passage), nor any of the other medieval commentators influenced by the *Moralia*, went so far as to allege that Elijah had already committed the sin that God sought to warn against, or to cast doubt on Elijah's specialness.13 To the contrary, most contemporary Christian invocations of Elijah held him up as a model of praiseworthy religious zeal.14

There is, however, at least one contemporary text that, like the *Bible moralisée*, reads God's response to Elijah as a scolding rather than either reassurance or, at worst, warning. This is a sermon preached on the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary by Garnier de Rochefort, Abbot of Clairvaux (d. after 1225).15 Noting the apparent

---


14 See for example the sermon of Geoffrey of St Thierry quoted by Giles Constable in *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century*, p. 264, which praises Elijah’s actions in III Kings 19 as a move toward interior spirituality, and which according to Constable may have been heard by William of St Thierry, the proponent of the Cistercian Order; the sermon preached by Master Jean de St-Gilles in 1231 (Davy, *Sermons universitaires parisiens*, p. 292); the anonymous Victorine sermon for Annunciation Sunday (Paris, BnF, 14,932, fol. 16vb), or the crusade sermons quoted in Georgiou, *Preaching the Crusades to the Eastern Mediterranean*, pp. 245 and 260.

15 Garnier was also briefly, bishop of Langres, before being forced by Innocent III to step down in 1199, on account of a conflict with his chapter. On Garnier, see Didier, ‘Garnier de Rochefort’, pp. 145–58 and Hoste, ‘Garnier de Rochefort’, pp. 179–83. Garnier is the likely author of the *Contra Amaurianos*, a treatise against a group of heretics educated at the University of Paris; aspects of this treatise are echoed in the *Bible moralisée* commentary. See Lipton, *Images of Intolerance*, pp. 47, 95, 125 and Tachau, ‘God’s Compass’, p. 25.
pointlessness of his theme text (Deuteronomy 22. 6: ‘If a bird’s nest happens to be before you in the way in any tree, or on the ground, whether they are young ones, or eggs, and the mother sitting upon the young, or upon the eggs, you shall not take the mother with the young’), Garnier argues for the aridity of the ‘superficial letter’ and the necessity of spiritual understanding. He then proceeds to craft a series of moralizing glosses on birds, trees, flight, and descent, each said to signify various virtues and sins. Garnier mentions III Kings 19. 18 in a passage likening Christ to a bird that finds a nesting place in repentant human hearts: ‘Unde et Eliae praesumptionem redarguit dicentis: “Domine, prophetas tuos occiderunt; altaria tua suffoderunt: et remanso ego solus”. Et dicit ei divinum responsum: “Reliqui mihi multa millia virorum, qui non curvaverunt genu ante Baal”’ (Whence also [God] refutes the presumption of Elijah in saying: ‘Lord, they killed your prophets; they undermined your altars; and I have remained behind alone’. And He spoke a divine response to him: ‘I have left to me many thousands of men, who have not bent their knees before Baal’). Garnier’s rendering of the exchange, then, implies that Elijah’s heart is rendered inhospitable to Christ by pride, and that He finds greater repose with the remaining Israelites.

Though I have not been able to determine how well known or widely replicated this sermon may have been, Garnier’s remark seems the best explanation for the anomalous rendering of III Kings 19. 18 in the Bible moralisée. That is, the person or team overseeing the creation of the texts was familiar with Garnier’s sermon or a similar reading of III Kings 19. 18, and allowed it to seep into the biblical paraphrase. Such infiltrations of the moralization into the biblical text occur in more than one place in the manuscripts, sometimes by error, sometimes apparently by design. In this case, the infiltration seems to have been intentional, so as to allow for a distinctly polemical commentary text. That is, the reformist makers of the manuscripts saw in God’s sharpened response to Elijah a vehicle for reproaching the pride of traditionalists, and vaunting the virtue of reformed orders. But the objects of both rebuke and praise do not remain constant across the manuscripts. This shifting cast of characters provides tantalizing hints of religious rivalries playing out in the circles of the makers of the Bibles moralisées, of the manuscripts’ patrons/ recipients or both.

The Commentary Texts and Roundels

The French-language moralization to III Kings 19. 18 is the longest; it is also the most provocative (see Table 4.1). It reads:

‘Ce qe Dex dist a Helye, ‘tu te glorefies en ta bontei et dis qe tuit li proudome sunt mort fors toi’, et Dex li mostra ausi boens senefie ieu crist qi dist as genz de noire religion, ‘vos vos glorefiez molt en voscte bontei et dites qe vos estes molt boen

16 Garnier de Rochfort, Sermones, ed. by Migne, Sermo 30, col. 762.
17 For examples, see Lipton, Images of Intolerance, pp. 129, 168, 174.
18 The length of the moralization is unusual: generally the texts in Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554 are shorter and simpler than those in the Latin manuscripts.
et que vos soffrez molt, mes ancres ai ie tel gent de blanc ordene qi sunt ausi bon ou millor que vos n’estes, et qi plus soffrent de poine que vos’.

(That God said to Elijah, ‘You glorify yourself in your goodness and say that all the upright men [proudome] are dead except for you’ and God shows him some good men, signifies Jesus Christ who says to the people of the black religion, ‘You glorify yourselves greatly in your goodness and say that you are very good and that you endure much, but still I have such people of the white order who are just as good as or better than you are and who endure more pain than you.’

The adjacent commentary roundel reproduces the composition of the biblical roundel directly above (with the exception of the idol, which has no analogue) (see Figure 4.1). On the left, in the place occupied by Elijah, stand three monks in wide-sleeved black habits, the first with his hood pulled over his head. Two of these monks lean their faces on their hands in echo of Elijah’s troubled gesture. In the top centre of the roundel, the bust of God emerges from a cloud. His orientation is the reverse of God’s in the biblical image; rather than scolding the self-glorifying party, he leans toward and blesses the favoured people, standing on the right. These are all portrayed as Cistercian monks, wearing their characteristic white habits and hoods. One white monk holds a book, symbolic of Christian learning and/or devotion, and two others, echoing the faithful Israelites just above, raise their hands, either in prayer or to signal their receptivity and obedience to God.

This moralization, then, unfavourably contrasts black (traditional Benedictine) with white (Cistercian) monks, and so is a late and heretofore unnoticed chapter in what was by the early thirteenth century a hundred-year-old monastic dispute.

---

19 Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554, fol. 54va.
20 On Cistercian habits, see Peter the Venerable’s Letter 111, which discusses the whiteness of Cistercians’ robes (The Letters of Peter the Venerable, ed. by Constable, i, 274–99). For a history of the Cistercian order, see the essays in Bruun, ed., The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order; Lester, ‘The Cistercians’; and Jamroziak, The Cistercian Order in Medieval Europe. Note that though the motto of the Carmelite Order (‘Zelo zelatus sum pro Domino Deo exercituum’) is drawn from this biblical book and verse, Carmelites did not disperse beyond the eastern Mediterranean until c. 1240, Elijah was not cited as Carmelite model until 1281 (Edden, ‘The prophetycal lyf of an heremyte’, p. 150), and the Carmelites did not adopt the cappa alba until 1287, decades after these manuscripts were made. Until that date the Carmelites wore cloaks of various colors, meaning both striped and varying from institution to institution, or even friar to friar. On the Carmelite habit and self-identity, see Jotischky, The Carmelites and Antiquity, p. 62. Though Dominicans also wore white tunics and hoods, their most characteristic clothing item was the black cappa: Lerner, ‘Philip the Chancellor Greets the Early Dominicans in Paris’, p. 7.
21 The literature on the Benedictine-Cistercian debate is considerable. van Engen, ‘The “Crisis of Cenobitism” Reconsidered’, p. 274, notes that ‘already in the late twelfth century [...] observers classified as “Black Monks” or “traditional Benedictines” all those not sprung from one of the newer groups, such as the Cistercians (“the White Monks”).’ Bredero, Cluny et Cîteaux au douzième siècle considers the ‘debate’ less a confrontation between the orders than a correspondence carried on by certain individuals, prompted by specific circumstances. An important text in the debate is Idung of Prüfenig’s Dialogus inter Cluniacensum monachum et Cisterciensem, c. 1154–1173, edited in Huygens,
is more than a little surprising to find it here, in the Kings commentary of the *Bible moralisée*. Though there are some texts that carry on the debate between traditional Benedictines and Cistercians over proper observance of the Rule into the thirteenth century, the controversy had had largely subsided by c. 1210–1220, and has not been documented as preoccupying either Parisian clerics or members of the Capetian court.22

The puzzle is deepened by the fact that all three Latin manuscripts dispense entirely with this intra-Christian monastic rivalry (see Table 4.1). They still criticize traditionalists and praise the virtuous, but instead of disparaging Benedictines, they claim that Elijah signifies a very different group indeed: the Jews. In the Latin commentary texts God accuses Jews of glorifying themselves in ‘your religion and in your good works’ (ÖNB cod. 1179, where they are portrayed as thickly bearded men in pointed hats, seated and looking quite wretched, in a mirror image of Elijah above); ‘your religion and works of the law’ (Oxford, in whose commentary image two Jews resemble the less distressed Elijah above; one of the Jews plunges a knife into the breast of an animal cradled on his lap, representing the ‘works of the law’); or simply ‘your works of the law’ (Toledo, whose commentary image is nearly identical to that in Oxford, though the slaughtering Jew is aiming slightly more accurately into the animal’s throat, and the second Jew strikes a haughty pose, his hand on his knee).23

The people to whom the Jews are unfavourably compared are also modified in the Latin exemplars, with slight changes detectible in the texts and more substantive changes in the images (see Table 4.1 and Figure 4.5). In the ÖNB cod. 1179 commentary text the ‘better people’ are ‘white monks of deep [or: lofty] religion [monachos albos alte religionis], who for my sake act more strictly than you [do] [pro me arciora quam vos faciuntur’ (see Figure 4.2).24 In the image, however, they are not white monks at all, but three tonsured clerics seated within

---

22 Williams, ‘A Dialogue Between a Cluniac and a Cistercian’, p. 164 writes that the controversy faded away shortly after the deaths of Bernard of Clairvaux (1153) and Peter the Venerable (1158). The thirteenth-century texts are the *Exordium Magnum*, purportedly a document from the early decades of the twelfth century but actually written (or compiled) c. 1180–1215 by a monk of Clairvaux named Conrad, later Abbot of Eberbach, (see *Exordium magnum Cisterciense*, ed. Griesser, and *The Great Beginning of Cîteaux*, ed. Elder, trans. by Ward and Savage); several tales in Part One of the *Vie des Pères*, an Anglo-Norman vernacular text dating to c. 1230, which praise the Cistercians at the expense of black monks, though Paul Bretel notes that the polemic had lost intensity by the early thirteenth century (see Bretel, ‘Moines et Religieux dans les contes de la Vie des Pères’, p. 38); and some sermons by Humbert de Romans, studied by Jacques Dubois, ‘Ordres monastiques au xiiie siècle en France’, pp. 187–220. None of these texts cite III Kings 19. 18, though the sigh of Elijah in III Kings 19. 4 is positively referenced in the *Exordium Magnum*.

23 On Jews and the Old Law in the *Bible moralisée*, see Lipton, *Images of Intolerance*, pp. 54–81.

24 Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, fol. 122c: ‘Hoc significat iesum christum qui dixit iudeis: “vos estis in vestra religione et vestris operibus bonis glorificati, et dicitis quod vos estis multum boni, sed habeo tales, scilicet monachos albos alte religionis, qui pro me arciora quam vos faciuntur”’. 
a structure, the foremost of whom wears a black hooded cape or robe over a white tunic and reads a book resting on a desk or lectern. These figures are most likely Augustinian canons, who were represented by two important abbeys in Paris, both of which were major centres of scholarship and had close ties to the Capetian court.25 In the Toledo manuscript, the favoured people are expanded: ‘white monks and other faithful of deep [or: lofty] religion, [monachos albos et alios fideles alte religionis] who for my sake act more strictly [pro me artiora faciunt]’ (see Figure 4.3).26 In the roundel, ‘those who act more strictly’ are neither white monks nor regular canons. Instead, one barefoot black (Benedictine) monk, hands folded before him in humility, stands in front of five barefoot men dressed in brown monastic habits — these may also be Benedictines, or perhaps Carmelites.27 In Oxford, ‘white monks’ have been omitted entirely from the text, with God lauding simply ‘monks of deep [or: lofty] religion [monachos alte religionis], who act for my sake more strictly than you do [pro me artiora quam vos faciunt]’ (see Figure 4.4).28 The corresponding image, though based on the same under-drawing as the corresponding Toledo medallion, has coloured all the monks’ habits black; they are also not barefoot.

How can we understand this surprising series of commentary texts and images, and account for the various changes and inconsistencies between and sometimes

---

25 The most prominent Augustinian house in thirteenth-century Paris was St-Victor de Paris. On relations between St-Victor and the Capetian court, see note 61 below. The other important Augustinian house was the Abbey of Ste-Geneviève, which in 1148 adopted the Augustinian Rule under the influence of St-Victor. The late twelfth-century Abbot of Ste-Geneviève, Étienne de Tournai, was Louis VIII’s godfather. On the habit of the Victorines, see Bonnard, Histoire de l’abbaye royale, p. 58: the habit consisted of a long linen tunic or surplice with wide sleeves falling almost to the feet, and covered by a black cape to which one attached a hood. See, too, a sermon by Abbot John of St-Victor, who noted that ‘we cover our nudity in white clothes’ (Paris, BnF, MS latin 14,932, fol. 85v), and Sermon 127 of Philip the Chancellor, (Philippi De Greve Cancellarii Parisiensis, fol. 203), which notes that regular canons wore black and white. Dominicans, who adopted a modified form of the Augustinian rule, also wore black robes over white tunics. But these figures, seated in a structure and holding books, are very unlikely to be Dominicans, who in the three-volume manuscripts are generally depicted preaching. In fact, there do not seem to be any mendicants portrayed in either Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179 or Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554, suggesting that these first two manuscripts were completed before mendicants had gained influence in court circles or become prominent enough in Paris to enter its visual culture. Note that the ‘lazy divine’ [theologian] scolded for seeking advice from astronomers in Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554, fol. 10vd sits in a similar structure and wears a very similar habit.

26 Toledo, fol. 138c: ‘Hoc significat quod Ihesus Christus dixit iudeis: “vos gloriarnini in operibus legis sed habeo tales, scilicet monachos albos et alios fideles alte religionis qui pro me artiora faciunt”’.

27 On Carmelite habits, see Jotischky, The Carmelites and Antiquity, pp. 74–76. I do not think these brown monks can be Franciscans, since elsewhere in this manuscript Franciscans are clearly identified by tell-tale knotted cords, and their robes have fitted sleeves. See for example Toledo, vol. 2, fol. 28b, where the knotted cord of the grey friar is clear, or Morgan Library, MS 240, fol. 7vb. Franciscans are also clearly identifiable in Oxford, Bodleian, 270b; see, for example, fols 14c, 136b, 146b. As mentioned above, there are no identifiable mendicants in either Vienna manuscript.

28 Oxford, Bodleian, MS 270b, fol. 170c: ‘Hoc significat quod Ihesus Christus dixit iudeis: “In vestra religione et operibus legis glorificatis sed habeo tales, scilicet monachos alte religionis, qui pro me artiora quam vos faciunt”’. 
within our manuscripts? It seems clear that some arise from error or misunderstanding (see Figures 4.2 and 4.5). For example, instead of maintaining the visual parallelism between biblical and commentary images so marked in the French manuscript, the commentary roundel in ÖNB cod. 1179 reverses the composition of the biblical roundel above. The Jews are not placed below Elijah, to whom in their vainglory they are compared and whom they outwardly resemble, but rather are situated below the ‘remaining Israelites’ kneeling in prayer. The designer (whether artist or iconographer) may have simply been following the model of the ÖNB cod. 2554 commentary image, where the scolded Benedictines are on the left and the commended Cistercians are on the right, and was unconcerned with visually echoing the biblical scene above. But because he replaced the small bust of God with a full-sized Jesus Christ in the centre, while retaining the original placement of the two groups of monks, the ‘good’ group is consequently located on Jesus’s left or sinister side (the viewer’s right), while the ‘bad’ group is to Jesus’s right — a decidedly unconventional configuration. Did the designer prefer the more complex and chiasmic composition that resulted from placing Elijah and the Jews in a diagonal relationship? Or did the artist simply misunderstand the biblical scene he himself had painted, assuming (understandably) that that the prophet Elijah was the favoured figure in the episode, and that the people kneeling next to the idol were sinners? In any case, the lack of visual parallelism, and/or the violation of moral hierarchies apparently displeased the redactors of the two later Latin manuscripts, in both of which the mismatch is corrected, so that the Jews are located immediately below Elijah and to Jesus’s left.

Whatever the reason for the compositional variations, the different identities of the preferred and criticized groups seem unlikely to be the product of error. The morphing of Benedictines into Jews, and of white monks into regular canons, and then into black and brown monks, must have been intentional. Someone instructed the artists of ÖNB cod. 1179 and Toledo to create images that diverge from the text, and someone else adjusted the text of Oxford to suit the prescribed commentary image. They did so for reasons grounded partly in the exegetical background, but also, I will argue, in polemical history and Capetian religious politics.

The Exegetical Background

There is nothing in the medieval exegetical tradition that accounts for the criticism of either black monks or Jews, or the exaltation of white monks, in the Bible moralisée III Kings 19. 18 commentaries. As we have seen, Gregory the Great cited the passage to warn against pride, but he did not use the verse to criticize Jews or any particular segment of society, and naturally said nothing about Cistercians. Indeed, I have not yet located any text that turns God’s remark against specific contemporaries. The Glossa ordinaria on III Kings closely paraphrases Gregory’s Moralia in Job (though it attributes the gloss to Rabanus Maurus):

‘Tanto prophete quid difficile fuit cognoscere in hoc mundo famulos remansisse Deo? Sed qui humilis etiam occult Dei noverat, elatus et aperta nesciebat. Unde
certum est quod humilitatis radio se illuminat, qui aliorum bona subtiliter pensat, quia dum ea que ipse fecerit facta foris et ab aliis conspicit, eum qui de singularitate intus erumpere nitetit, superbie tumorem premit. Hinc est quod voce Dei ad Eliam solum se estimantem dicitur. Reliqui mihi septem millia virorum, ut dum non solum se remansisse cognosceret, elationis gloriad que ei de singularitate surgebat inclinaret,

This is what is said by the voice of God to Elias, who was believing himself to be alone. "I have left to me seven thousand men", so that as long as he knew himself not to be the sole remaining, he would turn away from the glory of elation which rose in him from his singularity.29

William of St-Thierry echoes Gregory in using the verse to warn Christians against pride, but cites no one group or monastic order.30 Abelard criticized Elijah's pride in order to urge monks toward humility, but likewise singled out no particular order for either censure or praise.31 Andrew of St-Victor, who wrote one of the relatively few extended high medieval commentaries on the Books of Kings, does not comment on God's response to Elijah's lament at all, and in fact affirms Elijah's sense of specialness by noting that no other prophet or worshipper dared openly to profess faith in God.32 In the sermon quoted above that indicted Elijah's presumption, Garnier de Rochefort also keeps his remarks about Christian pride entirely general.33 The massive commentary created by the studium of Hugh of St Cher, which long ago was (incorrectly) identified as the source for the commentary text of the Oxford-Paris-London exemplar, merely echoes Gregory the Great.34

29 EGO SOLUS. RAB<ANUS>. Biblia latina cum Glossa ordinaria, ed. by Morard and Gibiino. On the Glossa ordinaria on Kings, see van Liere, 'Andrew of St Victor', pp. 249–63.
30 William of St-Thierry, Opera Omnia. Pars I: Expositio Super Epistolam ad Romanos, ed. by Verdeyen, Book Six, xi. 7. lines 504–10, p. 150: 'Reliqui, inquit, mihi. Quid est? Reliqui mihi? Ego eos elegi, quia vidi mentes eorum non praesumentes de se, non de Baal. Non sunt mutati; sic sunt, ut a me facti sunt. Sic et nunc reliquiae secundum electionem gratiae salvae factae sunt. Cave, Christiane, superbiam. Licet enim sanctorum imitator sis, totum semper gratiae fecit, non meritem tuum.' See also Robson, 'With the Spirit and Power of Elijah'.
31 See Abelard, Sermones, ed. by Migne, Sermo 33, col. 601 and Expositio in Epistolam ad Romanos, ed. by Migne, col. 659: 'Cave, Christianum, superbiam!'
33 Garnier de Rochefort, Sermones, ed. by Migne, Sermo 30, col. 762: ‘Unde et Eliae praesumptionem redarguit dicentis: “Domine, prophetas tuos occiderunt; altaria tua suffoderunt: et remanso ego solus”. Et dicit ei divinum responsum: “Reliqui mihi multa millia virorum, qui non curverunt genua ante Baal”.’ The verse is not cited in any other sermon I have examined, nor does it appear in any of the sermons discussed in Bériou, Lavement des maîtres de la Parole. Schneyer, Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters does not list a single sermon that takes III Kings 19. 18 as its theme, though of course this reference work does not list verses referred to in the body of sermons.
34 ‘Reliqui mihi, etc. Gloss: ut dum se solum non remansisse cognosceret, elationis gloriad, quae ei de singularitate surgebat inclinaret. Relictus sum ego solus, non mentitur, quia ita credebant. Sed falsum credebant, et dixit ex elatione, patet in Gloss. Gregorii, dicentis: Tanto prophetae quod difficile fuit
One contemporary exegetical text comes somewhat close to the Bible moralisée commentary, in that it replicates some of the Latin vocabulary, but it too lacks any mention of Jews, or comparison of black monks with white monks. This is the commentary on the Books of Kings by Stephen Langton, whose influence on the Bible moralisée has been noted by several scholars. In relation to an earlier verse (III Kings 19. 12: ‘And after the fire, the whistle of a gentle breeze’), Langton, like the Latin Bible moralisée commentary texts, refers to the ‘stricter life’ of monks, explaining, ‘Ventus urens est gratia. Sicut sibilus aure quae ad bene operandum mentem hominis accendit, desolatur fortes et exterminat errorem mundi et desiccat venas Egypti, id est, peccata quae proveniunt ex amore mundi. Et nota quod qui sibilat os contrahit, qui loquitur, os dilatat. Sibilum igitur facit Deus clautralibus, quia artiora discipline consilia proponit. Nobis os dilatat, quia latoriis vie licentiam concedit, dum tamen a rectitudine non deviet’ (Therefore God whistles for monks, because [for them] he sets forth plans for a stricter [artiora] discipline; for us [seculars], he opens his mouth, because he grants permission for a more lenient way of life, while nevertheless not straying from righteousness’). Langton does not extend his discussion of monks’ stricter way of life to verse 18, which he discusses just a few lines later. Instead he echoes Gregory and the Glossa Ordinaria in noting that God reminded Elijah of other good men as a caution against pride. But we again approach the wording of the Bible moralisée commentary when Langton subsequently comments, in regard to those good men who did not kiss the hand of Baal, that ‘Osculari manum: est glorari [sic] de operibus, et opera quae debet deo, sibi attribuere’ (to kiss the hand is to boast [gloriari] of [good] works and to grant to oneself, works that one owes to God). It may be that this or some similar text (or oral teaching) by Langton provided the original inspiration for the Bible moralisée III Kings 19. 18 moralization. Langton was the leading Parisian master of sacra pagina during the years when any cleric likely to have been involved in the making of the Vienna Bible moralisée manuscripts would have studied there. But if Langton’s gloss inspired the Bible moralisée commentary, it was a loose inspiration at best.

agnoscere, in hoc mundo famulos remansisse Deo? Sed qui humilis occulta Dei noverat, elatus etiam aperta nesciebat. Unde certum est, quod humilitatis radio se illuminat, qui aliorum bona subtiliter pensat, quia dum ea, quae ipse fecerit, facta foris, et ab aliis conspicit, eum qui de singularite intus erumpere nititur, superbiae rumorem premit’ . From Vgonis de S. Charo, pp. 282–83. I also consulted Paris, BnF, MS lat. 59, fol. 191v (Biblia sacra cum Hugonis de Sancto Caro glossa, fourteenth century).

36 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 204, fol. 88v. This commentary dates to c. 1187–1193.
37 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 204, fol. 88v; see also Paris, BnF, MS lat. 384, fol. 115v.
38 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 204, fol. 88v; see also Paris, BnF, MS lat. 384, fol. 115v.
39 Simon Langton, who was Stephen Langton’s brother, was a member of Louis VIII and Blanche’s pre-coronation entourage, which also included a Master Martin and William the Clerk. Lindy Grant, Blanche of Castile, p. 48. Nicholas Vincent suggested Simon Langton as a possible redactor of Vienna, ONB cod. 1179 in his ‘Review of Lipton, Images of Intolerance’, pp. 937–38.
Monastic Polemics: Artiora Pro Me

Stephen Langton readily conceded the artiora discipline of cloistered monks; as a secular cleric, he acknowledged and was apparently not defensive about his own more lenient lifestyle. But within monastic circles, the terms artius, artior and altius, altior were deployed competitively. A claim to live ‘more strictly’ than traditional Benedictine monks characterized the Cistercian Order from the time of its founding: a letter dating to c. 1100 states that Robert of Molesme, the Order’s founder, announced that he left his home monastery out of a desire to live the Rule of Saint Benedict ‘artius […] atque perfectius’.40 Others preferred to describe the Cistercian way of life as ‘lofty’ rather than ‘strict’. Indeed, one historian has claimed that ‘the difference between the “official” and “unofficial” records [of the early Cistercians] can be epitomized in two adverbs, artius and altius: should the Rule of St Benedict be followed “more strictly”, or is the keynote “more highly”?41

But the Cistercians did not have a monopoly on the term artius. Other orders also congratulated themselves on the strictness of their life, often at the expense of their perceived rivals. Such claims were particularly common among regular canons. The twelfth-century Premonstratensian Adam of Dryburgh (d. c. 1212) criticized black secular canons (ut cygnos nigros) by asserting that they didn’t live arctum, but rather grew their tonsures long, and wore fancy cloth. By contrast, he claimed, Premonstratensians wear simple and modest clothing, and never appear without our white superpelliciis.42 Bishop Étienne de Tournai, a former abbot of the Augustinian house of Ste-Geneviève and godfather to Louis VIII, was somewhat more modest about his own order, writing encouragingly to a canon of the Victorine abbey of St-Euvert (Orléans) who had retired to live in the forest as a hermit: ‘…non levem concepi fiduciam te et alciora ct arciora posse in heremo sustinere’ (I realized that you are not of light faith, and able to sustain the deeper/loftier and stricter things (alciora et arciora) of a hermitage).43 In a sermon to regular canons included in his massively popular ad status preaching collection, the Parisian-educated Jacques de Vitry (who himself was a member of the Priory of St Nicholas at Liège, which though unaffiliated followed the Augustinian rule) praised his audience for leaving the world for a stricter life (artiorem vitem) and adopting stricter statutes (arciora statuta).44 The terminology also appears in a text with close ties to the Capetian court: Guillaume le Breton notes in his continuation of the royal chronicle begun by Rigord that Bishop

42 Adam of Dryburgh, Liber de ordine, ed. by Migne, Sermo iii.3, cols 462–66.
43 Lettres d’Étienne de Tournai, ed. by Desilve, p. 231. The letter dates to sometime between 1184 and 1191.
Gaufridus of Meaux entered St-Victor de Paris because he wanted to subject himself more strictly (arctius) to divine contemplation.45

Though I have not yet located any monastic text that explicitly enlists God’s response to Elijah in order to criticize a rival order, it seems clear that monastic polemics underlie the III Kings 19. 18 commentary in the Bibles moralisée, either directly or via university scholarship.46

They Glorify Themselves in Their Law: Jews in the Monastic Debate

Monastic texts also provide models for the polemical comparison of monks and Jews. When the Anglo-Norman Benedictine monk and chronicler Orderic Vitalis (d. c. 1142) described the founding of Cîteaux, he wrote that while the monks of Molesme were resisting Abbot Robert’s desire to make them live a stricter life, he ‘withdrew from them with twelve likeminded brothers who had decided to keep the Rule of Saint Benedict strictly to the letter, as the Jews keep the law of Moses…’47

This passage is often cited as praise of the Cistercians on Orderic’s part, but surely we might ask whether a medieval Christian monk would truly find Judaic-style literal observance of the law praiseworthy.48 In other passages Orderic was clearly critical of the Cistercian Order, lamenting their penchant for keeping their services ‘secret’, their incorrect chant practices, and the general fad for novelty.49 William of Malmesbury, too, echoed supersessionist exegesis (of Matthew 5. 18; Luke 16. 17) and implied a similarity to the Pharisaic opponents of Christ when he wrote that Cistercians think they ‘nec iota unum nec apicem praetereundum putent’ (neglect not one iota or letter of the Benedictine Rule).50

In fact, in the mid-twelfth century Cluniac-Cistercian controversialists consistently accused each other of being ‘more Jewish’.51 Cluniacs called Cistercians ‘new

45 Guillaume le Breton, entry for 1214, in Œuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, ed. by Delaborde, i, 257, ch. 176. This is Geoffroi Tressy de Poissy, bishop from 1208 until his resignation in 1213. See Gallia Christiana, ed. by Congregation of St Maur, VIII, 1620–22.
46 I have found only one text that specifically cites Cistercians in conjunction with this biblical verse, but the context and import are unrelated to our commentary text. It is a letter written by Bernard of Clairvaux, defending the Cistercians of York by saying the Roman curia (by which he meant Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester) should not compel men to ‘bend knee to Baal against their consciences’. Epistle 236, dated after 26 September 1143. S. Bernardi Opera, ed. by Leclercq, Talbot, and Rochais, VIII, 112.
48 For a more positive reading of Orderic’s attitude, see Jane Patricia Freeland’s introductory discussion to her translation of this text in ‘Robert and the Monks of Molesme Discuss Observances’, pp. 19–25.
49 Fassler, Gothic Song, pp. 96–97.
50 William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, ed. by Migne, 4. 336, col. 1288.
51 On this aspect of the dispute see Lipton, ‘Unfeigned Witness’, pp. 45–73 and Knight, The Correspondence Between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux, pp. 49–51; 56; 199; 279 (‘Cistercians and Cluniacs as Orthodox Jews and Gentiles respectively’). Peter the Venerable called
Pharisees: overly legalistic, exclusively attached to the letter of the Rule and incapable of understanding its spirit; Cistercians (most memorably Bernard of Clairvaux), echoed anti-Jewish polemics when they charged Cluniacs with materialism, luxury, and ostentation. Because I have written at some length about this discourse elsewhere, I will cite here just a few additional texts, written in the second half of the twelfth century, and so close in time to the making of the earliest *Bible moralisée* manuscripts. An anonymous, pro-Cistercian *Dialogue* between a Cluniac and a Cistercian dating to c. 1160–1170 likens the Cluniac approach to the Rule to the Jewish approach to the Law, and presents the Cluniac as a crafty interlocutor who sought (in the words of the editor) ‘to entangle the Cistercian in his talk’, just as the Pharisees had sought to ensnare Jesus. A little known text of c. 1160 detailing the decision of Lord Amedeus of Hauterives to leave the Cistercian house he had recently entered for a Cluniac house, describes Amedeus as having been corrupted by vices stereotypically associated with Jews: excessive love of learning, deep avarice, attachment to luxury and carnal indulgence. Abbot Nicholas of Clairvaux (d. c. 1178/1179) drew more explicitly from anti-Jewish rhetoric when he contrasted his own order with that of the Cluniacs: ‘Uno denique consensu reliquimus omnia, et de Veteri Testamento et umbra Cluniacensium, ad Cisterciensium evolvimus puritatem’ (And finally with common accord we leave all things, and from the Old Testament and the shadow of the Cluniacs we fly up into Cistercian purity). And the text that may be considered one of the last entries in the debate (Conrad of Eberbach’s *Exordium Magnum* of c. 1210) calls Cluny ‘degenerated because of foreign and adulterated customs’, and ‘darkened and veiled’ — terms more typically applied to Jews. In light of this discourse, it is not hard to see why, when the creator of the ÖNB cod. 1179 commentary saw fit to replace the black monks in the French-language *Bible moralisée* with another unsatisfactory group, Jews came to mind.

**Religious Preferences at the Capetian Court**

Up to this point, I have attempted to trace the various textual traditions that shaped the treatment of III Kings 19.18 in the *Bible moralisée*. It is a complex and confusing path. Faced with the task of verbally and visually glossing a somewhat baffling biblical dialogue, about which the Church Fathers and most major medieval biblical scholars said remarkably little and consequently one for which no readily available gloss lay at hand, the manuscripts’ makers stitched together and then reassembled fragments of late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century exegesis, preaching, and monastic polemic. Such effort could easily have been avoided: the Kings commentaries in the Vienna *Bibles moralisées* are far from comprehensive, leaving out many verses and episodes. It was hardly necessary
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54 Nicholas of Clairvaux, *Epistolae*, ed. by Migne, Epistola 8, col. 1603.
55 The Great Beginning of Cîteaux, ed. by Elder, p. 68.
for the manuscripts to include the exchange between Elijah and God. I suggested above that this particular biblical text may well have been selected (and modified) specifically because it allowed for the presentation of pointed spiritual comparisons, first between black and white monks, and then between monks/canons and Jews.

But why would the creators of ÖNB cod. 2554 want to echo a fading monastic critique? The rivalry between black and white monks, even if perpetuated in a handful of early thirteenth-century texts, seems far removed from the courtly, urban, and scholastic concerns that generally preoccupy the commentary of the Bibles moralisées. This may, in fact, be why the creators of ÖNB cod. 1179, which otherwise shares so much of the wording of the French commentary, replaces black monks with Jews: perhaps it seemed either pointless or indecorous to replicate intra-monastic polemics. But if that were the case, the makers of ÖNB cod. 1179 could simply have decided not to include the verse at all — they dedicate only five text/roundel pairs to all of III Kings 19.1–19, as opposed to eight such pairs in the companion French manuscript.56 So we need to consider why ÖNB cod. 1179 opted to retain the III Kings 19.18 commentary but replace Cistercians with Augustinians in the commentary image, and why the later exemplars change the monks’ identities yet again.

At this point, I move from the realm of text to that of the larger context; in the process I will indulge in a degree of speculation that may appall the rigorous scholar to whom this volume is dedicated; I can but beg for Peggy’s forbearance. My working hypothesis is that the manuscripts’ differing glosses on God’s response to Elijah were tailored to their respective recipients or reading/viewing audiences, and reflect the diverging religious preferences of various members of the Capetian court.

Before pursuing this argument, I must concede that there is considerable uncertainty regarding the patronage and readership of both ÖNB cod. 2554 and ÖNB cod. 1179.57 While my own suggestion that Louis VIII was the probable recipient of ÖNB cod. 1179 has been widely (though not universally) accepted, and most scholars have agreed that Blanche of Castile is the likely patron and owner of the contemporary French-language manuscript, two recent studies offer reasons to revisit those conclusions. In her forthcoming article, Katherine Tachau reports that with the aid of advanced imaging technology she has been able to decipher the previously (largely) illegible inscription adjacent to the dedication roundel depicting an enthroned king in ÖNB cod. 1179.58 The king named in the first line is, surprisingly, neither Louis VIII nor any other
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56 Here is a full breakdown of III Kings 19.1–19 in the manuscripts: Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, fols 122a–122va (5 pairs); Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554, fols 54a–54vd (8 pairs); Oxford, Bodleian, MS 270b, fols 170a–171va (5 pairs); Toledo, fols 138Aa –139vAa (5 pairs).

57 The patron/commissioner of each manuscript need not be the same as the recipient/reader: a person might commission a manuscript that they intended to read with or to others (children, relatives, friends, followers), or they might plan to give the manuscript to another person, who then might share its contents with other people still. For current scholarly thinking regarding the manuscripts’ patrons, see note 2 above.

58 Tachau, ‘The King in the Manuscript’, as in note 2 above. I thank Prof. Tachau for her generous and collegial responses to my queries about this article before its publication, and eagerly await the publication of her forthcoming book.
Capetian, but a ‘Waldemar’ — almost certainly Waldemar II of Denmark (r. 1202–1241), whose sister Ingeborg had married Philip II Augustus in 1193, only to be immediately (if unsuccessfully) repudiated. There is still much to work through regarding the implications of Tachau’s important discovery, but it undoubtedly complicates our understanding of the manuscript’s origins. And Lindy Grant has cast doubt on the assumption that Blanche of Castile owned the French-language manuscript (ÖNB cod. 2554), noting in her outstanding biography that the highly educated queen read Latin with facility, and would not have needed a vernacular translation.

Nevertheless, I cannot help but be struck by the fact that the differing identities of those who ‘live more strictly’ for God in the two earliest Bibles moralisées III Kings 19.18 commentary images dovetail perfectly with the known partialities of King Louis VIII and his wife, Blanche of Castile. Like his father before him, Louis VIII showed favour to Augustinian regular canons throughout his reign. When Louis was born, Philip II Augustus had asked Étienne de Tournai, abbot of the Augustinian house of Ste-Geneviève, to act as godfather to the new prince; Louis VIII seems to have remained close to Étienne for the rest of that prelate’s life. In 1222 Philip had expressed the intention of founding a monastery on the site of a chapel built the year before to commemorate his victory at the Battle of Bouvines; it was left to Louis to issue the monastery’s charter, richly endow it, and arrange for twelve canons to be sent from St-Victor de Paris to staff the abbey, which he continued to generously support throughout his reign. The Augustinian house of St-Victor de Paris was an even more regular beneficiary of Louis’s generosity and judicial favour. To be sure, Augustinians were not the only order to receive Louis’s largesse; he also endowed Cistercian and other houses. But though when Louis VIII made his will in June 1225 he left small bequests to every religious house in his realm (as well as individual gifts to sixty Premonstratensian abbots, forty Victorine abbots, sixty Cistercian abbots, and twenty Cistercian abbesses), it was the Victorines who were singled out for the highest honour: he ordered that a new Victorine monastery be founded in his memory, to be paid for by the sale of the gems and gold from his crown jewels.
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59 On Philip and Ingeborg’s marriage, see Baldwin, The Government of Philip Augustus, pp. 82–87.
60 Grant, Blanche of Castile, pp. 240–41.
61 For a paternal and affectionate letter from Étienne to Louis dated to c. 1199, in which the prelate (by then Bishop of Tournai) thanks the young prince for his letter, promises to send him a horse, and encourages him to remain studious, see Lettres d’Étienne de Tournai, ed. by Desilve, p. 367.
62 Vattier, ‘L’Abbaye de la Victoire’, pp. 4–8. For Philip’s will, see Layettes du Trésor des Chartes, ed. by Teulet, 1, no. 1546, 550–51; for Louis’s munificence, see Petit-Dutaillis, Étude sur la vie et le règne, p. 410. See Petit-Dutaillis, Étude sur la vie et le règne for various privileges accorded the abbey by Louis VIII. See also the remarks of Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, p. 59; and Grant, Blanche of Castile, p. 215.
63 See also the remarks of Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, p. 59; and Grant, Blanche of Castile, p. 215.
64 Lester, ‘Saint Louis and Cîteaux Revisited’, pp. 17–42. Lester notes, however, that Louis VIII’s 1214 gift to the Cistercian nunnery of St-Antoine, which is the first Capetian donation to the Cistercian Order, may have been designed to please Louis’s wife Blanche.
65 Layettes du Trésor des Chartes, ed. by Teulet, 11, no. 1710, 54–55. Peggy Brown has written about Louis’s will in Brown, ‘Royal Testamentary Acts’, pp. 420–21. She does not discuss the fact that Louis’s request regarding the founding of a Victorine abbey was disregarded.
Blanche, too, was on good terms with St-Victor, to which she gave a fine Bible and loaned large sums of money, and whose abbot John would become ‘practically a pensioner of her household’ after his retirement in c. 1234. But her own spiritual inclinations clearly lay elsewhere: she followed her Castilian family’s tradition in showing a particular fondness for the Cistercian Order. In 1222, the year before her husband ascended the throne, Blanche was granted ‘benefits of prayer’ by the abbot of Citeaux; and in 1227 the young King Louis IX requested that the entire Cistercian Order pray for his father and grandfather, and for his mother after her death; given that Louis was thirteen at the time, the request most likely reflected Blanche’s own wishes. She continued to patronize the Cistercian Order for the remainder of her life, founding three Cistercian houses and bestowing gifts on many more. When Blanche died in 1252, she was buried at her request not beside her husband at the royal Abbey of St-Denis, but in the Cistercian nunnery of Maubuisson, one of the houses she had founded.

But the most striking, even startling, demonstration of Blanche’s partiality for the Cistercian Order was her decision to disregard her husband’s directive that a Victorine monastery be founded in his memory, and to found a Cistercian monastery instead — the Abbey of Royaumont. As Lindy Grant has noted, “The foundation of Royaumont was a strange business.” Blanche and Louis were apparently a genuinely devoted couple, and she had been an active partner and helpmeet to her husband — not the sort of widow one would expect to openly contravene the terms of a beloved spouse’s will. In making this decision, she must have been convinced that it would be for the benefit of Louis’s soul not just to be prayed for by the Cistercian Order (as their son had already formally requested, presumably at her behest), but to have a Cistercian monastery dedicated to his memory.

Suggestions (Rather than Conclusions)

One possible explanation, then, for the variations in the III Kings 19.18 commentaries in the two earliest Bible moralisée manuscripts is that they reflect different streams of piety, and perhaps accompanying and even competing reformist discourses, at
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68 Lester, ‘Saint Louis and Citeaux Revisited’, p. 29; Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, p. 223.
70 Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, p. 225.
71 Branner, *Saint Louis and the Court Style in Gothic Architecture*, pp. 32–33 assumes Blanche was responsible for making Royaumont Cistercian rather than Victorine. Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, p. 211 agrees that the decision must have been Blanche’s. Grant notes that in 1227 Blanche obtained dispensation from the pope for overturning an unspecified vow, and speculates that the vow in question may have been her promise to Louis to found a Victorine house. For alternate suggestions, see Berman, ‘Two Medieval Women’s Property’, p. 154.
72 Grant, *Blanche of Castile*, p. 211.
73 On Blanche’s closeness to Cistercian advisors (especially the former Cistercian monk Bishop Walter of Chartres), see Grant, ‘The Queen and the Abbots’, pp. 139–48.
the court of Louis and Blanche, which mapped onto or shaped those royal figures’ respective proclivities. This does not necessarily entail that Louis was the patron and/or intended recipient of ÖNB cod. 1179, or Blanche of ÖNB cod. 2554. Louis and Blanche were by no means the only courtly figures to cherish special ties to either the Cistercian or the Augustinian Orders. Many individuals must have shared Louis’s and Blanche’s respective preferences, and been influenced by the conversations and practices fostered in their courtly milieu. However, as scholars have long noted, the extreme luxury (and consequent cost) of the manuscripts strongly points to royal rather than noble patronage; this is now strengthened by the fact that at least one of the Vienna Bible moralisée manuscripts undoubtedly ended up in the possession of the Danish king. This narrows the possible list of patrons. Philip II Augustus, the other royal Capetian possibility, also patronized Augustinian, especially Victorine, houses. But since Philip could not read Latin, the language of ÖNB cod. 1179, he seems an unlikely candidate for owner, commissioner, or recipient of that manuscript. And given that he showed little interest in books, art, or scholarship, it is hard to imagine Philip wanting to own a luxurious illuminated moralized Bible.

In her forthcoming article, Katherine Tachau has forwarded another possibility—that Philip (or more likely his ecclesiastical advisors) commissioned ÖNB cod. 1179 as a gift for King Waldemar II c. 1212–1213 in order to enlist the Danish king’s support for Philip’s projected invasion of England (and assuage his presumed anger at how poorly his sister Ingeborg had been treated). This is certainly a possibility, and in fact may gain some support from the manuscript’s III Kings 19.18 commentary, since as Tachau documents there was a strong Augustinian presence in Denmark, and two important Danish prelates with close ties to both Ste-Geneviève and St-Victor de Paris served as diplomatic intermediaries between the Danish and French courts. But as Tachau notes, Philip’s interest in regenerating the Danish alliance was short-lived; his reluctant reception of Ingeborg back to court was not accompanied by any other conspicuous gestures of generosity or appeasement toward her or her relatives; and a costly illuminated manuscript, which must have taken well over a year to create, seems an awkward means with which to seal such an alliance, as well as out of character for Philip. Moreover, ascribing the Latin Vienna manuscript to Philip’s initiative leaves open the question of who commissioned the French-language manuscript.

74 Louis and Blanche had their own establishment starting in 1209, the year of Louis’s knighting and the birth of their first child: Grant, Blanche of Castile, pp. 44–45.
75 Tachau, ‘The King in the Manuscript’, offers persuasive evidence that the manuscript did in fact reach Waldemar, or at least one of his castles. On the assumption of a royal patron, see Lowden, The Making of the Bibles Moralisées, 1, 9; Tachau, ‘God’s Compass’; Grant, Blanche of Castile, p. 240.
76 See note 62 above.
78 Tachau, ‘The King in the Manuscript’.
80 It may be worth noting that Ingeborg herself seems to have been devoted to the Cistercians. If Philip had indeed decided, either on his own or at the recommendation of advisors, to commission a rich gift for Waldemar, he might also have commissioned a companion volume for Ingeborg at the same
Another possibility is that Waldemar II commissioned the manuscripts for himself and his sister, either on his own initiative or at his sister’s request (Ingeborg herself had limited funds at her disposal). But this too raises questions. The majority of commentary texts in the two Vienna manuscripts speak to French and specifically Parisian concerns (the university curriculum, student vices, the Albigensian Crusade, princely involvement in Jewish moneylending, etc.). Even though the patron/recipient may have had little or no say in the commentary’s contents, it still would be strange for a book made at the command of a Danish king to omit any mention of Danish or northern concerns, and focus so overwhelmingly on local French and Parisian ones. The case for Waldemar or Ingeborg is also complicated by the existence of the two later three-volume manuscripts, one of which was almost certainly commissioned for the young Louis IX by his mother Blanche.

In the end, the royal figures whose intellectual interests, cultural inclinations, and political concerns are most closely reflected in the content of the Vienna Bible moralisée manuscripts, and whose spiritual proclivities best match those expressed in their III Kings 19. 18 commentaries, are Louis VIII and Blanche of Castile. They, too, seem to be more likely candidates than Philip Augustus to present a luxury manuscript to Waldemar II. The invasion of England was a project of more immediate (and lasting) interest to Louis than to his father — Louis was the one who led the invasion in May 1216, claiming the throne by virtue of his wife’s descent from Henry II — so he and Blanche had at least as great a motivation as Philip to flatter and please Waldemar II.81 In fact, after King John’s death in January 1216 Philip seems to have distanced himself from the entire affair.82 Unlike Philip, Louis and Blanche were known to be patrons of scholars and collectors (and givers) of books.83 A final point in favour of attributing such a gift to Louis and Blanche is the fact that, in striking contrast to Philip’s coldness toward his wife, Blanche was apparently on good terms with Ingeborg: Lindy Grant has suggested that the Ingeborg Psalter, a luxury illuminated manuscript that was definitely in the possession of the Danish queen by 1214, may have been originally made for Blanche, who subsequently gave it to Ingeborg.84 Another sign of the women’s solidarity is the fact that on 2 August 1224 the two women processed together (along with Blanche’s niece Berengar of Leon, Queen of Jerusalem) from Notre-Dame to the Cistercian convent of St-Antoine-des-Champs to pray that Louis VIII might be victorious at the Battle of La Rochelle.85
An alternate possibility is that ÖNB cod. 1179 was not originally envisioned as a gift to Waldemar II, but rather was originally commissioned for the enjoyment and edification of members of Louis’s and Blanche’s own court, either immediately following or at the same time as the creation of ÖNB cod. 2554. The royal couple may have commissioned the manuscripts jointly, or Blanche may have commissioned both, one for her husband and one for non-Latin-reading members of their family and circle.86 In this scenario, ÖNB cod. 1179 was at some point re-purposed as a gift for Waldemar (the presentation inscription, written on the outside margin of the last folio, has to my mind the feel of an afterthought, and the dedication portrait is so generic as to apply to almost any king).87 Such an approach to Waldemar may have been made as Louis was gearing up for the invasion of England. Or it may have been a later gesture of goodwill toward Waldemar made at the behest of, or in honour of, Ingeborg sometime after Louis’s accession in 1223 and before Ingeborg’s death in 1237. One possible impetus
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86 This group could include female relatives, less than scholarly male relatives, or children. Chapman, ‘The Female Audience for the Bible moralisée’, suggested that various gendered aspects of Vienna, ÖNB cod. 2554 imply a female readership. The exaltation of Cistercians in the III Kings 19. 28 commentary would fit such an idea, given the key role played by noble and royal women in supporting the Cistercian Order. See Lester, ‘The Cistercians’. I thank Prof. Lester for sharing a typescript of this chapter with me.

87 Tachau, ‘The King in the Manuscript’ rightly argues that neither the crown nor the fleur-de-lys sceptre in the dedication portrait need necessarily indicate that the figure is a Capetian king. She further argues that the throne in the Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179 dedication roundel resembles the throne in Waldemar’s seal more than the thrones in Philip’s and Louis’s seals — a strong and intriguing observation. But it is hardly definitive. Philip Augustus is depicted sitting on a high-backed throne in a manuscript of the Grandes Chroniques de France made c. 1275 for King Philip III, (Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, MS 782, fol. 280), suggesting that Capetians did not identify themselves with any one style of throne. (I thank Anne D. Hedeman for identifying the manuscript for me.) Moreover, to my mind the fact that the enthroned king from the 1213 St-Victor de Paris-produced manuscript of Ptolemy’s Almagest (reproduced by Tachau) looks very similar to the king in the Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179 roundel somewhat tells against seeing that latter figure as a schematic portrait of Waldemar II. There is no reason why the illuminator of a Parisian astronomical manuscript would gesture toward the Danish king, whereas one can easily imagine that he might model his mental image of an ancient king on Capetian representation. Tachau suggests, additionally, that Waldemar was from the very beginning the intended recipient because her paleographical analysis indicates that the inscription was penned by the same scribe who wrote many of the manuscript’s moralizations. I find this evidence again less than fully definitive; any scribe who had been employed in the making of the book could easily have been called back subsequently to add an inscription. As noted above, the inscription appears in the outside margin on the last folio — a somewhat strange location for a royal dedication. The dedication poems in that same c. 1275 copy of the Grandes chroniques manuscript, for example, are carefully aligned beneath the dedication image (fol. 326v). I might add here that I agree with Tachau’s dismissal of Haussmier’s assertion that all four manuscripts must necessarily have been made after Honorius’s 1219 bull Super Speculum banning the study of civil law in Paris, which is apparently echoed in their texts. As Tachau shows, several earlier texts anticipated the wording of the bull. But I do not understand why she then insists that the manuscript was made before 1219. The absence of mendicants does not seem definitive — just because they arrived in Paris in 1217 (Dominicans) and 1219 (Franciscans) does not mean that they would immediately appear in manuscript illumination.

I find the most compelling temporal limits to be the references in the Vienna manuscripts to the Albigensian Crusade as ongoing, which would date them to between 1209 and 1229.
for giving away the manuscript could be Louis VIII’s untimely death in 1226; another could be that the commissioning or completion of the three-volume manuscripts (made between c. 1226 and 1234) rendered the shorter Latin manuscript redundant.88

Here, then, is one hypothetical scenario for the creation of these commentary sequences. I think, in accord with the suggestions of other scholars regarding the chronology of the manuscripts, that the ÖNB cod. 2554 III Kings 19. 18 commentary text and roundel were the first to be realized. Whereas it is easy enough to understand why its criticism of black monks was changed to criticism of Jews in subsequent texts, it is almost impossible to imagine the reverse happening. When the cleric assigned to compose the French manuscript’s III Kings commentary found little inspiration regarding this verse in the Glossa ordinaria or other well-known texts, he consulted Stephen Langton’s Kings exegesis (perhaps in manuscript, perhaps in the form of university lecture notes). Either the reference there to monks’ artiora discipline made this compiler think of Cistercians, or he simultaneously remembered or came across a Cistercian text along the lines of Garnier’s sermon, describing Elijah as presumptuous. This Cistercian text may have explicitly likened the righteous Israelites to Cistercians and Elijah to black monks; alternately, the compiler may have fused his source texts to create the resulting comparison. Though ÖNB cod. 2554 was by no means consistently committed to promoting the Cistercian Order (Cistercians are rarely mentioned, and a roundel on fol. 1 includes a Cistercian among those who ‘hook’ or ‘pawn’ the Holy Church), identifying Elijah and the Israelites as, respectively, black and white monks would have the benefit of allowing for a clear and powerful visual contrast, while also appealing to Blanche’s (or her female relatives’) fondness for the Cistercians.

Although the makers of the companion Latin manuscript (probably commissioned either simultaneously with or shortly after ÖNB cod. 2554) were presumably working from the same commentary compilation that inspired the French-language caption, they had slightly different priorities. This team evidently favoured complexity over clear, contrasting compositions; and with a different readership there was less reason to exalt Cistercians. They consequently decided (or were instructed) to portray the ‘monachos albos alte religionis’ as Augustinians (who wear white tunics under their black robes and who, like Cistercians, claim to live artius) in recognition of Louis’s partiality for that Order. Either because the Augustinians had no traditional monastic rivalry analogous to the Benedictine-Cistercian feud, or because the redactor preferred to avoid intra-monastic criticism, the commentary text was altered to censure the very people whom monks accused each other of emulating in either luxury or legalism:

88 Tachau, ‘The King in the Manuscript’ suggests two possible sieges in which Vienna, ÖNB cod. 1179 might have been taken from Waldemar by its subsequent owners — one in 1226, and one in 1249, arguing therefore that the manuscript came into the Danish king’s possession before one of those two dates. I confess I do not fully understand why she opts for the earlier date rather than the latter; both her own evidence and the apparent influence of the manuscript on Parisian artworks from the later 1220s and 1230s seem to me to point toward the latter date as the more likely terminus ante quem for Waldemar’s possession. All my suggestions regarding the patronage/readership of the two earliest manuscripts are naturally provisional, pending Tachau’s full study.
the Jews. This had the added benefit of using Louis’s known spiritual preferences (for Augustinians) to inculcate or strengthen in him particular spiritual antipathies (toward Jews): I have argued elsewhere that the manuscript offers a pointed critique of Capetian Jewish policies in order to promote more anti-Jewish measures.

In suggesting that the two Vienna Bible moralisée III Kings commentaries catered to the inclinations of Blanche and Louis, I am not claiming that the manuscripts embody or echo a fierce intra-monastic rivalry playing out at court. Though Blanche and Louis each has their preferred order, neither was hostile to the other order. At least during her husband’s life, Blanche accepted and promised to honour her husband’s favouring of the Victorines. Nor did any hostility between Victorines and Cistercians appear in royal circles after Louis’s death: the executors of his will, one of whom was the abbot of St-Victor, explicitly agreed to the foundation of the Cistercian Royaumont. The Victorines do not seem to have harboured any lasting resentment about Blanche for passing them over; as mentioned above, she remained close to Abbot John of St-Victor throughout his life, and was warmly remembered in the necrology of the Victorine Order. It could be that the makers of the two manuscripts simply wanted to be sure to cover both the Capetians’ preferred spiritual bases. It is also possible that the duelling orders in the Bible moralisée roundels could have been a kind of inside joke: I am very taken with Lindy Grant’s remark that the manuscripts display an earthy humour, and make fun of Louis and Blanche’s intellectual interests; a bit of banter about their spiritual favouritism does not seem out of character. But the fact remains that Augustinians were consciously and conspicuously substituted for Cistercians in ÖNB cod. 1179, and that Cistercians were consciously and conspicuously substituted for Augustinians in the execution of Louis VIII’s will. The conversation that led to the first of these substitutions may have been the precursor to other, more consequential conversations that happened elsewhere, even continuing at a king’s deathbed and over his bier, with real world effects.

It is more difficult still to explain the visual renderings of the ‘monachos albos et alios fideles’ and the ‘monachos alte religionis’ in the two later, three-volume versions. Blanche’s son Louis IX, for whom the Toledo Biblia de San Luis was almost certainly made at Blanche’s behest, showed little favouritism toward either the Cistercians or the
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89 John Lowden has suggested that the same person directed both 1179 and 2554: ‘Les rois et les reines de France en tant que “public” des Bibles moralisées’, p. 347. Comparison of the III Kings 19. 18 commentaries does not necessarily contradict this suggestion; the same redactor may have modified his text for different audiences.

90 Lipton, Images of Intolerance, where I suggest that the manuscripts present arguments to, rather solely reflecting preferences of patrons.

91 The foundation charter for Royaumont is included in the Royaumont Cartulary, Archives Départementales du Val d’Oise, 43H3, ff. 1–5, cited in Grant, ‘Blanche and the Abbots’.

92 Where she is called ‘sororis nostre qui […] nostram ecclesiam mirabilis affectus sincere dilectionis complencens, multa et magna ei benicia conferens […]’. Quod in ecclesiae nostre negociis diligenter promovendis. Obituaires de la Province de Sens, ed. by Molinier and Longnon, i, 603; see Grant, ‘Blanche and the Abbots’.

93 Grant, Blanche of Castile, p. 242.
Augustinians, turning instead to the mendicant orders. But although mendicants, particularly but not exclusively Franciscans, appear in dozens of roundels throughout both the Toledo and Oxford manuscripts, the righteous Israelites of III Kings 19. 18 are not visually glossed as mendicants, but as, respectively, black and brown monks, and black monks only. Why would this be? Perhaps the artists felt constrained by the words *monachos* and *artiora* — not epithets typically assigned to mendicants. Such a narrow, text-based explanation for two intriguing and perplexing examples of visual exegesis may be unexciting or unsatisfactory, but textual concision seems a fitting quality with which to close an otherwise highly (perhaps overly) speculative study inspired by and dedicated to Peggy Brown. I hope Peggy will forgive me, however, if I offer one final, impossible-to-substantiate suggestion. It also seems possible that by the time the third and fourth *Bible moralisée* manuscripts were created, whatever friendly rivalries, inside jokes, or gentle attempts at persuasion that underlay the duelling spiritual hierarchies enshrined in the two Vienna *Bible moralisée* III Kings 19. 18 commentaries had been long since forgotten, buried with Louis VIII or pushed aside by the urgencies of politics. Among the most urgent of the new King Louis IX’s concerns were the unifying of his Christian subjects and the combatting of non-Christians. It is fitting, then, that the *Bible moralisée* manuscripts made during his reign show us only indeterminate monks, but all too recognizable, knife-wielding Jews.

Table 4.1. Side-by-side comparison of the III Kings 19. 18 biblical and commentary texts in the four thirteenth-century exemplars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Commentary text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ici vient Dex a Helye: ‘tu te glorefies en ta bontei et dis qe tuit li proudome sunt mort fors toi mes ancore ai ie mil homes qi unques ne me renoerent et n’aorent unques les ydles et lor mostre a doi.</td>
<td>Here God comes to Elijah: ‘You glorify yourself in your goodness and say that all the upright men are dead except you, but still I have a thousand men who have never renounced me nor ever adored idols’, and he points to them.</td>
<td>Ce qe Dex dist a Helye: ‘tu te glorefies en ta bontei et dis qe tuit li proudome sunt mort fors toi’, et Dex li mostra ausi boens senefie iesu crist qi dist as genz de noire religion, ‘vos vos glorefiez molt en vostre bontei et dites qe vos estes molt boen et qe vos soffrez molt, mes ancore ai ie tel gent de blanc ordene qi sont aus boen ou millor qe vos n’estes, et qi plus soffrent de poine qe vos.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparuit Deus Helye et dixit: ‘tu glorificatus es in bono tuo et dicis quod omnes probi mortui sunt praeter te, sed ego habeo adhuc mille homines qui me numquam negaverunt nec ydolis fuierunt et tantam quantam habes possident bonitatem’.</td>
<td>God appeared to Elias and said: ‘You have glorified yourself in your goodness and you say that all honorable men are dead besides you, but still I have a thousand men who have never denied me, nor sworn oaths to idols and as much goodness as you have, so much do they possess’.</td>
<td>Hoc significat iuesum christum qui dixit iudeis: ‘vos estis in vestra religione et vestris operibus bonis glorificati, et dicitis quod vos estis multum boni, sed habeo tales, scilicet monachos albos et alios fideles alte religionis qui pro me artiora faciunt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparuit Deus Helye et dixit ei: ‘tu in bono tuo glorius dixisti quod omnes boni mortui sunt praeter te, sed ego habeo adhuc mille homines qui me numquam negaverunt nec ydolis servierunt’</td>
<td>God appeared to Elias and said to him: ‘You, having gloried in your own goodness, said that all good men are dead besides you, but still I have a thousand men who have never denied me, nor served idols’.</td>
<td>Hoc significat quod Ihesus Christus dixit iudeis: ‘In vestra religione et operibus legis glorificatis sed habeo tales, scilicet monachos alte religionis, qui pro me artiora quam vos faciunt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparuit Deus Helye et dixit ei: ‘tu glorificatus es in bono tuo et dicis quod omnes probi mortui sunt praeter te, sed ego habeo adhuc vii. m. homines qui me numquam negaverunt’.</td>
<td>God appeared to Elias and said to him: ‘You have glorified yourself in your goodness and you say that all honorable men are dead besides you, but still I have 7000 men who have never denied me’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 2554, fol. 54vAa</td>
<td>Vienna, ÖNB, cod. 1179, fol. 122Cc</td>
<td>Toledo, fol. 138Cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That God said to Elijah, ‘You glorify yourself in your goodness and say that all the upright men are dead except for you’ and God shows him some good men signifies Jesus Christ who says to the people of the black religion, ‘You glorify yourselves much in your goodness and say that you are very good and that you endure much, but still I have such people of the white order who are just as good as or better than you are and who endure more pain than you.’</td>
<td>This signifies Jesus Christ who said to the Jews: ‘You have glorified yourselves in your religion and in your good works, and you say that you are very good, but I have such ones, that is, white monks of deep [or: lofty] religion, who for me act more strictly than you.’</td>
<td>This signifies that Jesus Christ said to the Jews: ‘you glorify yourselves in works of the law, but I have such ones, that is white monks and other faithful of deep [or: lofty] religion, who for me act more strictly.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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