

Tutivillus: The Literary Career of the Recording Demon

Author(s): Margaret Jennings

Source: *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 74, No. 5, Texts and Studies, 1977. Tutivillus: The Literary Career of the Recording Demon (Dec., 1977), pp. 1-83+85-87+89-91+93+95

Published by: University of North Carolina Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4173953>

Accessed: 25-08-2018 03:52 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

University of North Carolina Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Studies in Philology*

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Volume LXXIV

DECEMBER, 1977

Number 5

Texts and Studies, 1977

TUTIVILLUS

The Literary Career of the Recording Demon

BY

Margaret Jennings, C.S.J.

For Siegfried Wenzel

CONTENTS

I	From Demon to Tutivillus	1
II	The Recording Demon	10
III	Literary Expansion	35
IV	Tutivillus in the Drama	51
V	The End and the Beginning	71
	Appendix I: Recording Demon— Named and Unnamed	85
	Appendix II: Recording Demon— Principal Appearances	89
	Register of Manuscripts Cited	93
	Index: Selected Subjects	95



MS Douce 373, f. 5^r. By permission of the Bodleian Library.

Tutivillus



I



From Demon to Tutivillus

Among the most ubiquitous preoccupations of medieval literature is an insistent concern to detail the activities of the devil. In popular and theological belief alike, demons were everywhere ready to pounce upon the souls and bodies of the unwary, to deceive and trick even the most saintly. Indeed, the least deviation from the "right path," or even from faithful thoughts, cleared the way for their crafty attacks. Dogging men's steps from the cradle to the grave, the evil ones achieved a record of conquest and near-conquest awesome enough to inspire reform in any believer's heart. Alas, this reform, according to medieval churchmen, was too often short-lived and thus called forth their constantly more strident warnings about the insidious father of lies and his "legions." So ever-present were these latter-day demons in the medieval mind that an ordinary medieval man's concept of the devil and his wiles may well have been more real to him than the concept of God.¹

Of course, belief in the existence of evil spirits is neither original in nor peculiar to the Middle Ages. Although among some primitive peoples it took the form of fear of departed men, in most early societies the close association between animal and human worlds gave rise to the terror of possible attack or even possession by the spirits of animals of prey like the serpent and the wolf.² In his more creative moments man also attributed various physical and moral catastrophes to creatures endowed with hybrid animal-human shapes. To such imaginative constructs current among the Arabs, Babylonians, and Assyrians can be traced various Old Testament demonic types: the Se'irim or hairy satyrs; Lilith, the night demon; the Shedim; the other evil serpents which populated the ever-present and ever-encroaching Middle Eastern desert.³

Persian dualism and the Greek influence in the Septuagint made further contributions to incipient Judeo-Christian demonology.

¹ G.G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, Vol. I (London, 1923), p. 95.

² Edward Langton, *Essentials of Demonology* (London, 1949), p. 219.

³ Henry Ansgar Kelly, *The Devil, Demonology and Witchcraft* (New York, 1974), p. 12.

Though the Hebrew religion's strong monotheism relegated the Persian Ahriman or principle of evil to the place of "inveterate enemy of God and man,"⁴ rabbinic commentators did not hesitate to develop the conception of a "Satan" who was assisted by other disembodied spirits of evil. Greek teachings allowed further amplification by supplying many important terms relating to the nature, operations, and abode of demons; the names "demon" and "diabolus" are obvious transliterations of δαίμων and διάβολος.⁵ Greek philosophical attitudes and certainties about the connection among demons, divination, and possession are also observable in both Old and New Testament Apocalyptic literature.⁶ There, multitudes of evil spirits are represented as operating continually against men—in order to afflict, torment, and ultimately destroy them.

Although it has been debated whether the scriptures show evidence of any systematic demonology—and many scholars claim that such a system can be extricated only at the cost of distorting Biblical data—the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels does correspond essentially with the belief in demons as exhibited by the Jews *and* by their heathen neighbors in the first century, A.D.⁷ In any event, it is demonstrable that the kinds of essentially literary development—personification and the borrowing of names and concepts from surrounding cults⁸—which gave rise to pre-Christian demonic imagery are also at work in the canonical and non-canonical scripture of the early church. Given impetus by the efforts of a new religion to define and consolidate the essentially non-dogmatic teaching of its Gospels, the Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen showed how completely under the influence of the devil the earthly lives of men might be.⁹ Only prayer and fasting in the desert could serve to extirpate the spirit of evil from man's heart.

Unfortunately, it was a well-vouched-for Old Testament tradition (*vide* Leviticus' scapegoat and Tobias 8:3) that evil spirits preferred to prowl in that very same desert.¹⁰ Jesus himself encountered the demon of pride there and maintained later that when the devil goes out

⁴ Langton, pp. 220–21.

⁵ *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV (New York, 1967), pp. 828–29.

⁶ *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. III (New York, 1971), pp. 180–81.

⁷ Langton, pp. 222–23.

⁸ Kelly, p. 11.

⁹ The more significant demonological statements of these early Churchmen are summarized in Langton, pp. 45–55.

¹⁰ *The Dictionnaire de Spiritualité Ascétique et Mystique*, Vol. II (Paris, 1957), p. 205 counsels: "il faut s'attendre à trouver dans ces documents une démonologie que, sur la

of a man he goes off—doubtless in high dudgeon—into a wasteland (cf. Matt. 12:43). Following in their Master's footsteps, the hermits and cenobites of succeeding ages continued the desert struggle with the tempters. The "Lives" of the Egyptian ascetics (predominantly fourth century) personify temptations and evil thoughts as demons and attest to the manifold forms devils assumed in their attacks on solitaries. Their tricks, like themselves, were legion, and, although they were invisible to some of their victims, they always managed to subject them to severe trials. One of the more celebrated of these victims was the hermit Anthony. Since he did have the "gift" of seeing his tormentors, he often amazed people by speaking of the devil as of someone he knew very well.¹¹ (This might not be as remarkable as it sounds if the traditions that the whole of the saint's life was a struggle with the evil one and that he lived to be 105 are correct.) In any case, Anthony's biographer, Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria,¹² gives the devil's temptations equal time with the saint's victories. Sometimes the father of lies appeared as a seductive female, conjuring up lascivious visions; sometimes he would make such a din that the walls seemed to be caving in; sometimes devils on all sides would rise up masquerading as wild beasts and reptiles; sometimes the hermit found himself surrounded by marauding spectres. But Anthony, we are assured, saw through all these wiles—though the devils smote him with blows until there was not a breath left in his body.¹³

Anthony's triumphs, particularly those over demonic distractions in prayer, were shared by many of the early Christian saints. Pope Gregory has related how one of St. Benedict's monks persisted, despite all types of admonition, in going out wandering at periods prescribed for spiritual exercises. With the divining instinct born of sanctity, Benedict discovered that the problem was caused by a demon in the form of a little black boy who pulled the monk by his robe. By striking the religious with his rod, Benedict freed him from that devil and the monk manifested no further desire to avoid his prayers.¹⁴

plupart des points, fera echo à celle qui s'exprime dans la littérature monastique antérieure et qui, telle qu'elle se formule notamment dans Evagre, devient traditionnelle au désert."

¹¹ Nicolas Corte, *Who Is the Devil?*, tr. D.K. Price (New York, 1958), p. 76.

¹² Anthony died in 355 or 356 and Athanasius wrote in 357—so close to the actual event as to insure widespread credibility. See Corte, pp. 77–86.

¹³ A Latin version of Anthony's life appears in *PL* LXXIII, 125–70 under the title "Vita Beati Antonii Abbatis"; the Greek original is in *PG* XXVI, 837–977.

¹⁴ Myra Uhlfelder, tr., *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great*, The Library of the Liberal Arts 216 (Indianapolis, 1967), Book II, pp. 57–61.

In the fifth-century *Historia Monachorum*, Rufinus records at length the encounters of St. Macarius and the demons. On one occasion, having responded to the devil's taunts by going to observe his brethren at a vigil service, Macarius perceived the evil ones hovering like flies around the monks at prayer—distracting, seducing, lulling to sleep not only the more ordinary members of the group but even those acknowledged to be saintly. Thus made aware of the many shapes and "offices" of the demon, Macarius resorted to prayer, which action alone had the power to thwart the demon's sinister designs.¹⁵

Although a few saints gained renown because, like St. Martin of Tours, they were able to play tricks on the devil,¹⁶ for most of the holy people who battled demons the result was generally a draw. In the *De vitis patrum* it was recorded how angels and demons hovered near monks or nuns at moments of relaxation in order to eavesdrop on their talk. When they spoke of holy matters, the angels rejoiced; when of things far from spiritual, the demons exulted and showed their glee.¹⁷ Frequently, these demons manifested themselves to the elder monks as dirty pigs spreading excrement amidst the brethren who, when they finally turned from secular to edifying conversation, would have to be cleansed by attendant heavenly spirits.¹⁸ The life of the saintly Abbot Aicardrius (d. ?627), which was written at least three hundred years after its subject's death, presented an appropriately diabolic parallel. While that most assiduous shepherd of holy souls gave himself unreservedly to the *sanctum studium*, "that teller of evils and mocker of mankind—the devil—concealed in a corner of the house performed his *studium* by writing quickly on some sort of parchment."¹⁹

One of Aicardrius' later counterparts, Hermannus, Abbot of Marienstatt, saw demons entering the choir under various shapes, causing the monks to make mistakes in the Psalter, producing general confusion in the singing, or malevolently placing themselves beside those who were lazy, drunken, and given to other forms of *acedia*.²⁰ Perhaps the most complete "handbook" of monastic demonology was the *Liber revelationum de insidiis et versutiis daemonum adversus homines* by Abbot Richalm of Schöntal, compiled c. 1270. Claiming that he

¹⁵ PL XXI, 454.

¹⁶ Sulpicius Severus, *Vita sancti Martini*, ed. Jacques Fontaine, Sources chrétiennes 133–35, (Paris, 1967).

¹⁷ *De vitis patrum*, Liber III, PL LXXIII, 762.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Liber VI, "Verba Seniorum," col. 993.

¹⁹ Jean Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum ordinis Benedicti*, Saec. II, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1935), p. 964.

²⁰ From Pex, I, 2, 376 cited in Lea, III, 381 ff. in J.A. MacCulloch, *Medieval Faith and Fable* (Boston, n.d.), p. 67.

could see demons riding like motes in sunbeams and coming down with the rain, Richalm was certain that holiness of life afforded little protection from the attacks of devils. He traced every hindrance along the route of monastic devotion, even coughing, snorting and spitting, to the activity of demons and averred that he had one day seen the evil one plastering up the ears of a lay brother who was thereby prevented from hearing an exposition of the Rule; but more often and more realistically, Richalm found that the devil overwhelmed his victims simply with weariness.²¹ Truly most alarming in the vast array of monastic exposés of demonic power was the warning that this power might prevail over the souls of the dying; all too frequently, we are told, did those at the deathbed experience a vision of hordes of demons just waiting to bind the departing soul with burning chains.²²

In rather direct contrast with the lurid accounts of demonic activities which were proliferating in the monasteries, Church dogma is remarkably brief in its discussion of the evil one. At the Second Council of Braga in 561, the devil was defined as a creation of God.²³ Nearly seven centuries of doctrinal silence ensued. Only in 1215 did a further statement seem necessary, and the members of the Fourth Council of the Lateran, in their initial canon, declared that demons, having originally been created good, became bad through their own fault: *Diabolus enim et alii daemones a deo quidem natura creati sunt boni, sed ipsi per se facti sunt mali*.²⁴ Perhaps this definition was intended to correct a widespread contemporary attitude that the devil represented a principle of evil and could, therefore, believably perform all the tricks ascribed to him and perpetrate all the anti-religious plots so blithely attested to by medieval churchmen. For indeed, the sparseness of dogmatic definition was ably countered by the preponderance of theological speculation. Reported authoritatively by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine, and further specified by the commentaries of Gregory the Great and the definitions of Isidore of Seville, the activities of malign spirits extended from the mental and spiritual worlds into that of material creation.²⁵ And so one is not surprised to find that, from the elev-

²¹ Richalm's "Dissertatio" is treated extensively in Gustav Roskoff, *Geschichte des Teufels*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1869), pp. 335 ff.

²² The story has many analogues; see Arturo Graf, *The Story of the Devil* (New York, 1931).

²³ Heinrich Joseph Dominik Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, 32nd ed. (Freiburg, 1963), no. 237.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 428. The *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, II, 233, suggests that the 1215 decree "est due à la réaction contre le catharisme."

²⁵ Langton, pp. 56–64.

enth century onwards, demonology came to assume those vast proportions which are clearly reflected in countless legends, saints' lives, ascetic and mystical treatises, ecclesiastical and judicial records, primers for preachers, and the great compendia of the Catholic faith.

Especially in the voluminous treatises of the medieval schoolmen did the devil demonstrate his ability to become the second most significant figure in the history of Christian culture and the single most-portrayed character in Western literature.²⁶ Anselm's skillful argumentation concerning demonic powers receives much more elaborate treatment in the *Libri quattuor sententiarum* of Peter Lombard; Albertus Magnus, in turn, bases his discussion of demons on the speculative profundity of the "Master of the Sentences."²⁷ The most thorough investigation was, of course, that of Thomas Aquinas (1225–74). Impelled by malice to urge man to sin, demons, according to Thomas, are relegated to the "darksome atmosphere" where their wills are obstinate in evil and their salvation is impossible.²⁸ But because they are able to do things which exceed human power and experience, devils could make use of the flesh and the world as instruments of temptation. Thomas even extended Augustine's efforts to account for sexual fantasizing by describing how the "sons of God" in Gen. 6:1–4, if understood as demons, could beget giants on the daughters of men.²⁹

With such philosophical/theological underpinnings, it could be expected that in the popular mind devils would become associated with every conceivable kind of malevolence, with sin, witchcraft, magic, conjuring, with every inexplicable mishap, insanity, plot, murder, with every evil thought.³⁰ It was probably the very familiarity of this everyday demon which bred the contempt in which he was eventually held. While the incorporeal adversary of God and man remained a being of great importance to Churchmen throughout the medieval period, the devil of popular imagining became merely the petty persecutor of men.³¹ Despite his supernatural character, he acquired the tone and habits of a village ruffian or buffoon, and from the thirteenth century onward devil portraits began to be parodic and derisive, exhibiting the characteristics of the grotesque as well as those of the

²⁶ Frank S. Kastor, *Milton and the Literary Satan* (Amsterdam, 1974), p. 7.

²⁷ *Cur Deus Homo*, Liber I, cap. xvi ff., PL CXCII, 662–64.

²⁸ ST II, qq. lxiii, lxix, cix, cxiv.

²⁹ ST I, q. li, 3 ad 6; and *De potentia* 6,8 ad 5,7.

³⁰ Kastor, p. 9.

³¹ A. C. Champeys, "The Character of the Devil in the Middle Ages," *The National Review*, XI (1888), 176.

ludicrous.³² By the end of the Middle Ages, the great majority of demons “are droll but not frightful; they provoke laughter or at least incite a smile, but they create no horror.”³³

Thus, in their heyday, especially thanks to the medieval preacher, demons were omnipresent. They rode on ladies’ trains, perched menacingly on pieces of lettuce, hid under beds, immersed themselves in fermented liquids, masqueraded as Don Juans or femmes fatales, and remained consistently and perversely attracted to churches and churchpeople.³⁴ This attraction and its concomitant influence on the prayer life of both clergy and laity was extensively developed in medieval exempla—short narratives generally recounted to convey or support religious or moral truth and sometimes serving to illustrate theological doctrine.³⁵ *Exempla* have been analyzed into at least twelve different species,³⁶ their narrative stances largely dependent upon whether their source was external to the teller or his personal experience. Whatever syntactical variations resulted from diverse attitudes toward the material, exempla continued to be told with the greatest possible economy and were laced with concrete illustrations of the moral; as such they functioned in somewhat the same manner as the punch line in a good joke—appropriate, satisfying, memorable. In general, exemplary narratives focused upon a central character who was often named and with whom those addressed could identify.³⁷ Also, by buttressing his story with relevant geographical or physical details, the teller could insure its credibility and the effective pointing of its moral. It was indeed largely as a result of the prodigious development of the exemplum tradition that pre-medieval depictions of the devil, which tended toward a flat, almost photographic image, were replaced by three-dimensional, active figures who emerged not from Thomas Aquinas’ “darksome atmosphere” but in very human guise and with human characteristics.

³² Champfleury [Jules Fleury], *Histoire de la caricature au moyen âge* (Paris, 1875), p. 89.

³³ Thomas Wright, *A History of Caricature and Grotesque in Literature and Art* (London, 1875), p. 73.

³⁴ The vast array of exempla topics is apparent in the manuscript analyses of J. A. Herbert’s *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum* (London, 1910); the most popular and pervasive of these topics are organized with their appropriate bibliographical citations in F. C. Tubach, *Index Exemplorum*, F. F. Communications 204 (Helsinki, 1969).

³⁵ Medieval forms of the exempla differ from classical, rhetorical *paradeigma*. See Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature in the Latin Middle Ages*, tr. Willard Trask (New York, 1953), pp. 57–61.

³⁶ J. Th. Welter, *L'exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge* (Paris, 1927), pp. 79–107.

³⁷ Stanley J. Kahrl, “Allegory in Practice: A Study of Narrative Styles in Medieval Exempla,” *MP*, LXIII (1965), 106.

One of the more specific functions accorded to the devil in medieval exempla was that of registering *vaniloquia*. But through the peculiar genius of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century preachers, the demonic “Hellegrave”³⁸ achieved a definite place in the system of sin and repentance. Depending on the congregation to be exhorted, the preacher could concentrate on the inattention expressed through idle talking or through careless recitation of the prayers of the Office. In one version, therefore, when some of the faithful were chattering during the Mass, a demon might be seen recording misdeeds of this nature. In another version, a religious might espy a devil carrying a heavy sack which, as the evil one would explain, was full of the syllables cut off, syncopated, or skipped over by clerics in reciting or chanting the psalms. Of course such stories could be altered at the preacher’s will to suit any special time or place.

It is with the last-described devils that this essay is primarily concerned, for, by an unusually complicated system of reference and cross-reference, change and addition, elaboration and omission, the rather diligent but dull “recording devil in church” and his sack-carrying partner became known by a single name—the well-known one of Tutivillus, the young, infernal humorist of the Towneley Cycle and the motivating force of the later *Mankind*.³⁹ Though his description may be partially rooted in Apocalypse 20:12 (“Libri aperti sunt . . . et iudicati sunt mortui ex his quae scripta erant in libris secundum opera tenebrarum”) and in the material gleaned from folk tales and monastic fears, Tutivillus’ development is a literary one. Like the Grail quest, Langland’s visions, the Wyf of Bathe, and other medieval “unforgettables,” he came to life in the imaginative constructs of contemporary storytellers, and his characterization stayed alive only as long as they and their world could support it. Though he is best known for his appearances in mystery and morality plays, those are not the scenes of his greatest development, the dramatist being essentially more restricted than the narrative writer in the actual fabrication of a character.⁴⁰ Since the latter is able to conjure up myriad possibilities in but a few words, the recording demon’s literary growth occurs most strikingly in those exempla, previously discussed, which became the delightful trimmings of the medieval sermon and the purple passages of longer didactic and moral treatises.

³⁸ Wilhelm Wackernagel, “Hellegrave,” *ZDA*, VI (1848), 149–51.

³⁹ A.P. Rossiter, *English Drama from Early Times to the Elizabethans* (London, 1950), p. 68.

⁴⁰ Kastor, p. 16.

At a time when many texts have been lost⁴¹ and many others have been scattered among various libraries, it is difficult to detail comprehensively the literary history of a most popular devil. Nevertheless, a survey of many and varied “relics” of the story reveals that Tutivillus, like Milton’s Satan and Blake’s demon, emerges according to the paradigm for all characterization. An understanding of his role and usual mode of action is essential to all further explication; it sets the stage not only for the literary amplification of more rudimentary forms but also for the kind of cultural conditioning which is exemplified in the graphic and plastic arts and in the burgeoning of folklore. But much more important to the delineation of a literary character are the facets of motivation, authorial attitude, setting, and naming which give concrete particular existence to what would otherwise be but an ethereal essence. The creation thus formed—the devil Tutivillus—can then be observed in his appearances in dramatic works and can be traced, often sadly in decline, in a great variety of materials from the fourteenth through the twentieth centuries. Lastly, some indication as to initial sources and the probable impetus towards characterization can be given.

For the convenience of those readers who may wish to make note of materials available for this kind of study without distinguishing the structural and literary variants in the development of exempla depicting the recording demon, I have appended two charts of the Tutivilian appearances in sources available to me. The first shows the frequency of the Tutivillus story, its general date and type, and, as far as is possible in such short space, the activity of the devil. The second tabulates the presence or absence of the demon’s name in a particular work.

⁴¹ Professor Bernhard Bischoff has informed me of Tutivillus’ appearance in MS Münster UB 560 which was destroyed during World War II, a circumstance which, I am certain, has numerous parallels.

II



The Recording Demon

At the core of any character's development is the establishment of a sense of his role or accustomed action. In the case of a devil, however, such definition seems a literary triumph in itself because both scripturally and speculatively the evil ones possessed a multifarious nature: angelic, anthropomorphic, mythic, theological, philosophic. Formed, transformed, and reformed through centuries of literary and non-literary imaginings, the medieval demon evades the neat generalizations implied in the Satanic trimorph of fallen angel, prince of hell, and tempter of men which can be applied to the Renaissance devil.¹ Yet, the medieval demon profits from the "rage to order" of these middle centuries which was expressed so palpably in several theological/philosophical systems, in the codification of canon law, and in the numerous pastoral handbooks which detailed every species of religious practice, every possible mode of fall and repentance. As a direct consequence of this pastoral emphasis, expository schemata like the *septenaries* became quite popular, and therefore the seven petitions of the Our Father, the seven sacraments, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, and above all the seven deadly sins were near the top of any preacher's list of possible sermon topics.² Devils—those excuses for theologians to demonstrate their ingenuity, those convenient explanations for any mysterious adversity—assumed a definite place in the economy of salvation. They might inculcate pride, suggest covetousness, incite anger, delight in gluttony, inspire envy, conjure up lascivious visions, and record slothful deeds.

A survey of both manuscript and printed evidence indicates that two originally distinct and short narratives are ultimately responsible for the characterization of the recording demon. The more prevalent story concerns a demon who records in writing the idle words of churchgoers. The other version develops the tale of a sack-carrying devil who also concerns himself with unprofitable speech—this time by depositing in his bag omitted or skimmed-over syllables from the

¹ Kastor, p. 15.

² Siegfried Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth* (Chapel Hill, 1967), pp. 56–7 and 74.

carelessly recited prayers of the religious in order that these peccadilloes might be a witness to their lack of fervor in performing ecclesiastical duties. Retold and refurbished at various phases in their long literary history, the increasingly popular accounts of a sack-carrying and writing devil throw a clear light upon the fascinating devil of the Towneley cycle's *Judicium* play, the wily Tutivillus.

Although he is vaguely discernible in earlier material, the sack carrier's first known appearance as a distinct character occurs in the justly famous collection of exempla garnered from the *Sermones Vulgares* of Jacques de Vitry.³ Born about 1180, Cardinal de Vitry died before May 12, 1240, at which date Gregory XI referred to him as "bonae memoriae."⁴ Most scholars would accept a date in the 1220's for the composition of his sermons. Whatever the scholarly quibbles about which part of this decade is the more accurate, the story, in its early rendition, had already assumed a concise, narratively dense format:

Audivi quod quidam sanctus homo, dum esset in choro, vidit diabolum quasi sacco pleno valde oneratum. Dum autem adjuraret dyabolum ut diceret ei quid portaret ait: "Hec sunt sillabe et dictiones syncopate et versus psalmodie, que isti clerici in hiis matutinis furati sunt Deo; hec utique ad eorum accusationem diligenter reservo." Excubate igitur diligenter in mysterio altaris ne super populum oriatur indignatio.⁵

The text, with its monastic setting and its typically sermon-like warning, describes some of the main lines of the exemplum's later development.

I have heard that a certain holy man, while he was in choir, saw a devil truly weighed down with a full sack. When, however, he commanded the demon to tell what he carried, the evil one said: "These are the syllables and syncopated words and verses of the psalms which these very clerics in their (Matins) morning prayers stole from God; you can be sure I am keeping these diligently for their accusation." Keep watch carefully, therefore, over the mystery of the altar lest indignation arise over the people.

Although it is not defined here, the "accusation" which de Vitry's devil threatens would have been reasonably familiar to the thirteenth-century churchgoing public and certainly well-known to the members

³ Thomas F. Crane, ed., *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry* (London, 1890).

⁴ Crane, p. xxxiv. A comprehensive biography of Jacques de Vitry appears in John F. Hinnebusch, *The Historia Occidentalis of Jacques de Vitry*, *Spicilegium Friburgense*, vol. XVII (Friburg, 1972), pp. 6ff.

⁵ Crane, p. 6.

of any canonical order. A recognized evil in classical antiquity, and one exacerbated by the monastic problem of maintaining fervor in religious observance, the vice sometimes called in Latin *taedium*, or sometimes *acedia*, and in English sloth, was the focal point of a large gathering of exemplary and explanatory matter.⁶ Like the “devil concept,” it received numerous definitions and refinements during the scholastic period—especially with regard to its interior operations on man’s spiritual nature. The formulations of the schoolmen and the great pastoral renewal which was attendant upon the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council also provided the backdrop for *acedia*’s more popular development, a development which can be traced in two general forms.⁷ The first, which elaborated the “branches” of sloth, analyzed how the sin’s ramifications caused a man to begin on the road to perdition, hindered him from amending his bad life, and ultimately brought him to an evil end. The other—the enumeration of the specific faults for which sloth was responsible—was adumbrated in a variety of “questionnaires” on the vice obviously intended for use in confession, in the actual outlines of confessional formulae, and in the descriptions of this vice’s effect. The last-named category was particularly memorable since it generally received the most extended treatment in the penitential handbooks and, therefore, provided a wealth of detail. Consequently, it was acknowledged that among the laity, sloth could be a cause of disturbance at church services: the slothful, it was said, “jangle” and engage in “harlotry” (idle talk).⁸ Among the clergy the vice caused the speeding up or abbreviating of the obligatory prayers (either Mass or Office), and a general negligence in recitation: mumbling *sotto voce* at one end of the continuum, and making loud noises rather than intelligible words at the other. DeVitry’s culprits fall quite easily within these parameters since they “syncopate” or skip various syllables and psalm verses during the morning hour of Matins, thereby “stealing them from God.”⁹

⁶ Wenzel traces the origins of the medieval sin of sloth to Evagrius Ponticus (b. 346) and details thenceforward its lengthy scholastic, popular, and iconographical history; see pp. 3 ff.

⁷ Wenzel, pp. 78–84.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁹ According to de Vitry’s exemplum in the *Historia Occidentalis*, p. 168, this “stealing” might also be an evening affair: “Audivimus autem quibusdam referentibus, quod, cum inimicus noster, accusator fratrum et humani generis calumpniator impius, cuidam viro spirituali in choro monachorum psallentium quasi graviter honeratus appareret, fratri querenti quid portaret, quasi sacco pleno super humeros eius imposito, respondit sathan: ‘Hee sunt syllabe in psalmodia monachis istis sincopate, dictiones etiam et

A comparable ecclesiastical setting accompanied by dire predictions about failure to extirpate faults in oral prayer is found, but in an embellished form and without reference to the French prelate, in a nearly contemporary Cistercian writer, Caesarius of Heisterbach. The entry from the "first homily" in Caesarius' *Dialogus Miraculorum* (c. 1230), however, seems ultimately intended not as a warning against slovenly observance but to expose forms of *inanis gloria*—a type of pride.¹⁰ The story of a sack-carrying devil who salts away evidence of self-glorification rather than the praise of God is recounted on the authority of a Cistercian abbot, a "vir summae gravitatis." But the application is not just monastic, since Caesarius states that the devils will exult, filling their sacks the whole time, if psalms are chanted inside or outside "regular" religious life, not with "devotus clamor" but with unrighteousness and lack of humility. The extra-monastic extension of the exemplum's applicability is much more obvious in the *Liber de septem donis* of Etienne de Bourbon.¹¹ On the authority of Geoffrey de Blevel (or Bleveaux) who died in approximately 1250, Etienne adds suitably dreadful sections on the retribution visited upon those priests who "truncant versus, a suo intellectu eviscerant, dictiones sinco-pant, litteras obliterant, et obliquant."¹² Having cited Jacques de Vitry, Etienne continues in a rather Dantesque fashion to tell of a recently buried priest who had returned to inform Geoffrey that he saw huge numbers of his colleagues hefting heavy sacks and pleading for succor; asking the cause of their misery, he discovered that they were burdened with the syllables and words of the psalms which they had

versus psalmodum quos hac nocte tamquam fures a dei servitio subtraxerunt, de quibus reddituri sunt rationem."

¹⁰ *Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, 1851), p. 181: "Tempore quodam clericis quibusdam in ecclesia quadam saeculari fortiter, id est, clamose, non devote, cantantibus, et voces tumultuosas in sublimi tollentibus, vidit homo quidam religiosus, qui forte tunc affuit, quendam daemonem in loco eminentiori stantem, saccum magnum et longum in sinistra manu tenere, qui cantantium voces dextera latius extensa capiebat, atque in eundam saccum mittebat. Illis expleto cantu inter se gloriantibus, tanquam qui bene et fortiter Deum laudassent, respondit ille, qui viderat visionem: 'Bene quidem cantastis, sed saccum plenum cantastis.' Mirantibus illis, et interrogantibus cur hoc diceret, visionem eis exposuit. Haec mihi retulit Abbas ordinis Cisterciensis, vir summae gravitatis. His exemplis non reprehenditur devotus clamor, quo Deus laudatur in cantu et psalmodia, sed tantum inanis gloria. . . . Ibidem invenies, quantum ex hoc daemones laetentur, si sine humilitate in psalmodia voces exaltentur."

¹¹ A. Lecoy de la Marche, ed., *Anecdotes Historiques de Etienne de Bourbon* (Paris, 1877), p. 184: ". . . ad hoc facit exemplum magistri Jacobi, dicentis quod cuidam sancto viro apparuit dyabolus portans saccum plenum, et, adjuratus quid ferret, dixit quod veniebat de quadam ecclesia secularium, ubi collegerat illum plenum saccum de sillabis et dictionibus detruncatis a psalmodiis de quibus in iudicio accuserat."

¹² *Ibid.*; cf. p. 185.

either omitted or said indistinctly during the recitation of the Office, thus creating the very opposite of the *voces tumultuosas . . . clamose non devote* which so exercised Caesarius. Composed probably between Etienne's retirement to a cloister in 1249 and his death in 1261, this development of the deVitry narrative, and the application of it to "pride" by Caesarius, represent the principal modes in which the sack carrier would be viewed throughout the centuries.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, for instance, both the *Promptuarium Exemplorum* of Johannes Herolt and the *Scala Coeli* of Johannes Gobius follow Caesarius fairly closely up to the devil's exultant and ironic "Indeed, you have sung well, because I have a full sack," but they do not include commentary on the demise of *devotus clamor* so ably lamented by Caesarius' Cistercian abbot.¹³ Herolt does mention that devotion of this sort might have a place among the many ways of praising God; Gobius, however, omits the reference entirely. Yet, the major change in the exemplum which occurred during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries was a development, not of Caesarius' version, but of deVitry's, and in this development the sack carrier almost universally acquired the name Tutivillus.

Several texts have been nominated for the honor of being the first to use the name. Wilhelm Wackernagel inclined toward the "quendam demonem nomine tytivillum" who appeared among the *Sermones Quadragesimali Thesauri Novi* and posited as its author Petrus de Palude, a native of Burgundy and student at Paris who became Patriarch of Jerusalem and died in 1342.¹⁴ Although the triplicate arrangement of the *Thesaurus* does appear in some of Petrus's compositions, the *Thesaurus* is almost certainly a fifteenth-century text and Petrus must be rejected.¹⁵ Much more attractive as originator of the name is Gerald Owst's candidate: an unknown Franciscan writing in the first quarter of the fourteenth century.¹⁶ Transcribed between 1313 and 1326, his substantial collection of exempla is contained in Additional MS 33956.¹⁷ The exemplum in question, "de officio divino male dicto,"

¹³ Johannes Herolt, *Sermones Venerabilis et Promptuarium Exemplorum* (Lyons?, 1514?), cap. C, iii; Johannes Gobius, *Scala Celi* (Westfalia, 1485), fol. C4^v-C5^r.

¹⁴ Wilhelm Wackernagel, *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur* (Basel, 1879), p. 465.

¹⁵ Johann Baptist Schneyer, *Geschichte der katholischen Predigt* (Freiburg, 1969), p. 226.

¹⁶ Gerald R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1961), p. 513.

¹⁷ Additional MS 33956, fol. 26^r: "De officio diuino male dicto: Narratur de quodam demone cui nomen Tituillus in tractatu de universo. Quod apparuit cuidam abbati cum quodam cophino in choro psallencium et colligebat sub specie micharum in cophino dictiones et syllabas et sincopas ommissas et factas et sompnolencias et interpellationes et distractiones quas habebant et faciebant psallentes in officio divino et psalmo-

immediately demonstrates the medieval love for the sanction of "auctoritas" by beginning: "Narratur de quodam demone cui nomen titivillus in tractatu de universo." The literary ascription seems to be spurious; although William of Auvergne's *De universo*, Pars III, does discuss at length the demonic presence in the world (as, incidentally, does his "De temptationibus et resistenciis"), Tutivillus the sack carrier makes no appearance.¹⁸ Rather tellingly, reference to the *De universo* is not repeated in later recountings of the exemplum. Its presence in the Additional MS, however, is typical of other accretions in this rendition of the story: syllables are collected "sub specie micharum"; the catalogue of offenses is expanded to include "sompnolencias," "interpellationes," and "distractiones"; the abbot effects monkish reform; the example of St. Francis is extolled. Like the ending of the *Thesaurus* exemplum, the Franciscan version appends to its narrative the verses which were to achieve such great popularity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries:

Fragmina verborum Titivillus colligit horum
Quibus die mille vicibus se sarcinat ille.

But the usage of "verborum" here contrasts with that of "psalmorum" in the *Thesaurus*. Given the original monastic setting of the deVitry exemplum and its limited audience appeal, it would seem that the later *Thesaurus* preserves, paradoxically, an earlier and less universal application for the verses. This phenomenon accords nicely with the fact that the Additional MS exemplum exhibits the highly developed narrative format and the skillful textual weaving illustrative of a more sophisticated composition.

Thomas Wright's preference of Arundel MS 506, fol. 46^v as the first text in which the name Tutivillus appears is also worthy of consideration since this occurrence seems to exemplify a rather primitive stage.¹⁹ There, almost verbatim, is repeated the initial section of the deVitry text in the *Sermones Vulgares*, although the time, as in deVitry's *Historia Occidentalis*, is switched from morning to night: "quos isti clerici furati sunt hac nocte." The "sanctus pater's" earlier question:

dia unde versus. Fragmina verborum Tituillus colligit horum. Sic que mille vicibus se sarcinat ille. Et intrans abbas capitulum reuelauit que uiderat et ex tunc facti sunt monachi cautiore. Beatus franciscus licet aliquando egritudine laboraret nolebat muro vel parieti herere dum psalleret horas set orabat semper erectus et sine caputio in capite, non girouagis oculis, non cum aliqua scincopa horas canonicas persolvebat. Psalmus stantes erant pedes nostri, etc."

¹⁸ Guilielmi Alverni, *Opera Omnia*, Vol. I (Paris, 1674), pp. 1036 ff.

¹⁹ Thomas Wright, ed., *A Selection of Latin Stories* (London, 1842), p. xlvii.

"What are you carrying?" makes very natural the subsequent "Quale nomen habes?" to which the demon responds "Tityvillus vocor." A smooth transition to the "fragmina" verse is provided in that the same holy man is credited with its composition: "Ille autem fecit inde versum: Fragmina psalmodum, Tytyvillus colligit horum." The Arundel version ends abruptly here without any reference to the "Quoque die mille vicibus se sarcinat ille" which succeeds "horum" in both *Thesaurus* and Additional.

But Arundel MS 506 is certainly a fourteenth-century text, and a demon called Tutivillus has recently been discovered as a collector of negligently-uttered prayers in John of Wales's *Tractatus de Penitentia*, c. 1285.²⁰ There, in section eight "on prayer in church," John informs us that "quidam doctor in suo scripto" told of a demon who called himself "titivillum" and who appeared in a choir collecting "minucias et particulas psalmodum"—direful consequences of the cavalier attitude of those who ought indeed to be aware that

Fragmina verborum titivillus colligit horum
Quibus die mille vicibus se sarcinat ille.²¹

John concludes by briefly urging careful recitation and avoidance of such execrable behavior.

In addition to its early date, the *Tractatus de Penitentia* raises some interesting questions since it seems to be telling a story about a story. Could the "quidam doctor" be Jacobus Januensis, Archbishop of Genoa between 1292 and 1298, to whom an *Opus Quadragesimale*, complete with the "demonem nomine titivillum" and the "fragmina" verse, is ascribed?²² Can this compilation's reference to "Brother James" rather than "Bishop James" indicate its *terminus a quo* as several years prior to his assumption of the episcopal office? Such speculations would make the *Opus* a chronologically acceptable source for the Welsh author. They are tempting but must be viewed with caution because James of Genoa's Lenten Sermon seems to exhibit a more developed narrative style than that of Arundel and, therefore, no conclusions from internal evidence can be advanced.²³ At the moment, then,

²⁰ Siegfried Wenzel called my attention to B.M. MS Royal 4, D. IV, fol. 257^r; it was catalogued as the *Tractatus de Penitentia* of Johannes Walensis, fl. 1283. Practically identical versions of the Tutivillus exemplum occur in other manuscripts of the John of Wales *Tractatus* or *Summa*, notably B.M. Royal 10, A, IX, fol. 40^{vb}; Paris Maz. 295, fol. 86^v; Bodley 402, fol. 336^{va}.

²¹ MS Royal 10, A, IX, fol. 40^{vb}.

²² MS Royal 8, C, XII, fol. 24^{rb}, from a collection of Lenten Sermons "fratris Jacobi Januensis." The manuscript was called to my attention by Siegfried Wenzel.

²³ The *Opus Quadragesimale* uses third person narration and a flowing Latin prose

John of Wales's treatise on penance has the distinction of being the first text known to use the name Tutivillus although, by its own admission, it depends on an earlier source. The monastic wit, holy man or no, who coined the name and/or the verse tag remains in all versions unidentified.

The popularity and widespread diffusion of these "fragmina" lines makes it almost impossible to pinpoint the geographical area where the name Tutivillus originated. The verses, usually with their attendant assurance that such burdensome peccadilloes are practically legion, has been traced to Frankfurt, Cambrai, Eichstätt, Lüneburg, Prague, and Munich,²⁴ and has been found in many manuscripts now housed in the British and the Bodleian Library.²⁵ In the hands of the medieval preacher it became not only an ornament to the exemplum of the sack-carrier but also a way of warning any congregation how dangerous it was to rush through obligatory prayers, thinking not about what one was saying but caring only how quickly one might discharge one's burden and depart. The "fragmina" verses, acting as an ancillary admonition and removed from the circumstances of the original exemplum, are also found in other texts which treat idle speech. Two rather striking examples come from the fourteenth century. First, Bromyard, in his section on "Ferie," maintains that there are three reasons why people do not sanctify the Sabbath: "dyaboli diligentia," "subditi accidia," and "domini negligentia."²⁶ Under the first heading he recounts the story of a person who, when praying in church at night, saw demons coming to boast about the gains they had made during the day:

Inter quos tres videbantur se iactare quod festum illius diei impediissent. Vnus vidilicet faciendo clerum in choro male officium dicere discurrendo. Alius faciendo populum in ecclesia garrulare. Tertius faciendo alios extra laborare. De duobus primis nomina audiens: sequentes composuit. Versus: Fragmina psalorum / titiullus colligit horum. Grisillus orantes / laycos facit altitonantes.²⁷

Second, John Waldeby, O.S.A., "sacre pagine professor," in a sermon for the days within the octave of Epiphany, portrays a somewhat

style for this exemplum; e.g. "qui a sancto viro admiratus dixit se colligere omissiones psalorum et quolibet die mille vicibus sacculum adimplevit . . ."

²⁴ Hans Walther, *Proverbia Sententiaeque Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (Göttingen, 1963), No. 9908 and No. 24214

²⁵ MSS Add. 15833, fol. 98^v, and 21147, fol. 11^b and 130^v; MS Harley 755, fol. 15^{rb}.

²⁶ Johannes Bromyard, *Summa Predicantium* (Basel, 1484), Art. VII, xxi.

²⁷ Bromyard apparently splits the responsibility for "idle speaking" between Tutivillus and Grisillus, the former for the clerics, the latter for the lay folk.

magisterial Jesus castigating useless chatter by means of the “fragmina” verses.²⁸

Tales of the sack-carrying devil must also be responsible for the kind of oblique development which Bromyard mentions in his “Ordo Clericalis.” Maintaining that

Ecclesie tres sunt qui servitium male soluunt
Forschippers, momelers, overlepers, non bene psallunt,

he goes on to counsel assiduous diction and attention lest “Titiuillus” be about his collections.²⁹ Bromyard’s example seems to have been followed, though sometimes with changes in the versification, throughout the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. A couplet from the *Massa Compoti* (probably written about 1400) is memorable not only for its preservation of the epithets bestowed on those who either mumbled, skipped or leaped over the psalms in choral recitation but also for its usage of Bromyard’s verse patterning.³⁰ The relationship of this and similar couplets to Tutivillus becomes immediately apparent when we compare them with MS Lansdowne 763, a treatise on music, from c. 1460. Here, under the general heading “Speculum cantantium sive psallentium scil. de affectu musice moralis secundum traditiones antiquorum et sanctorum patrum” (fol. 58^b), we read:

Detestacio contra perverse psallentes
Qui psalmos resecant, qui verba rescisa volutant,
Non magis illi ferent quam si male lingue tacerant,

²⁸ MS Laud Misc. 77, fol. 45^v; reference from Siegfried Wenzel.

²⁹ Bromyard, II, xxvi. The printed text’s “Tintinillo” is corrected from the Rochester Priory MS (Royal 7, E, IV, fol. 394^{ra}) which reads “titiuillo”.

³⁰ “Ecclesiae tres sunt, qui servitium male fallunt; / Momylers, forscypers, overlepers, non bene psallunt.” The couplet has been edited with useful notes and commentary in Wright and Halliwell, *Reliquiae Antiquae*, p. 90. Similar verses occur in C. Horstman’s edition of a Latin treatise on the Hours (“Dolenter Refero”), Camb. Univ., MS F-fol. 1, 14, in *Yorkshire Writers*, II (London, 1896), p. xxxiii. “Hi sunt qui psalmos corruptunt nequiter almos: / Ouerlepers, forskypers, bebbers, momelers, quoque stutters.” And similar renditions from MS Sloane 1584, fol. 13^b and Lansdowne 762, fol. 101^b have been noted in Robbins, R.H. and John Cutler, *Supplement to the Index of Middle English Verse* (Lexington, 1965), p. 142. An interesting variation is contained in Balliol MS 354, fol. 201^b (ed. by Roman Dyboski in *Songs, Carols, and Miscellaneous Poems from Balliol MS 354* (London, EETS, 1907), p. 137. Here is a verse “for a syngar” that runs: “Versus posterior non prius incipiatur / Quam suus anterior perfecto fine fruatur. / Tres sunt qui psalmos corruptunt nequiter almos / Quos sacra scriptura dampnat, vetant quoque iura: / ‘Momelers, foreskippers, overskippers’ sunt tria mala.” Of course, the offenders find a niche in Langland’s *Piers Plowman*, B, XI, ll. 306–11, ed. George Kane and E. Talbot Donaldson (London, 1975).

Hi sunt qui psalmos corrumpunt nequitur almos:
Quos sacra scriptura dampnat, reprobant quoque jura;
Ionglers cum Jappers, Nappers, Galpers, quoque Drawers,
Momlers, Fforskippers, Over(r)enners, sic Overhippers.
Fragmina verborum TUTIVILLUS colligit horum.³¹

And in Lansdowne MS 762 ("at the time of Henry VII") fol. 99^r, we find a strikingly similar rendition:

Psallite devote, distincte metra tenete,
Vocibus estote concordēs, vana cavete;
Nunquam posterior versus prius incipiatur,
Quam finis anterior perfecto fine fruatur.
Hii sunt qui psalmos corrumpunt nequitur almos,
Dangler, cum jasper, lepar, galper quoque draggar,
Momelar, forskyppe, forereynner, sic overleper;
Fragmina verborum Tutivillus colligit horum.³²

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the preceding references is the intermixture of Latin and English epithets concerning those slothful in word during divine services. Whether this is an indication of the influence of vernacular mystery plays or of the vibrancy of English pulpit oratory—to which Bromyard's *Summa Praedicatorum* is a prime witness—is impossible to determine; but we can conclude with confidence that it points to a very widespread acquaintance with the actions of Tutivillus which allows his name to be attached, through a Latin verse, to an English listing of those who corrupt the psalms.

A situation analogous to that in the Lansdowne manuscripts may be found in MS A-I, 20 of the Öffentliche Bibliothek of Basel, dated 1435, which contains the account book of Jacob of Cessole along with a sermon text beginning "In nomine."³³ The sermon incorporates both Latin and German verse prescriptions, including a widely known series of questions to be asked by monks "who wish to attain understanding." Following these inquiries and at the end of the regulations for the seven canonical hours, we read this admonition: "De hiis autem, qui pro tedio, somnolencia, et animi cruditate preces et alia

³¹ John Hawkins, *History of Music*, II, 218 transcribes and annotates fully this passage. For manuscript data, see *Catalogue of the Lansdowne MS in the British Museum*, 1819, p. 170.

³² So Wright and Halliwell designate the dating in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, p. 287. However, both the verse and the MS itself indicate that a date no later than the end of the fifteenth century is accurate. Transcription is from pp. 290 and 291.

³³ Ferdinand Vetter, "Lateinische und deutsche Verse und Formeln aus einer Basler Handschrift," *Germania*, XX (1887), 72 and 75.

divina balbuciendo in ecclesia imperfecte dicunt, notantur isti versus:

Qui psalmos resecat et verba davitica curtat
 Nil plus inde feret, quam si sua lingua taceret.
 Item iste:
 Fragmina verborum, Tytiuillus colligit horum
 Quaque die mille vicibus se sarcinat ille.³⁴

and immediately following:

NOTA versus. Lege bene et melius fac
 Canonicas horas si devote legis, oras;
 Tunc orantur hore, cum corde leguntur et ore.
 Littera neglecta vel sillaba murmure tecta,
 Dictio non recta, si sit male lectio lecta;
 Colligit hec sathanas, si non cum corde laboras.
 Fragmina verborum tytiuillus colligit horum;
 Quaque die mille vicibus se sarcinat ille
 Quid facis extra chorum, qui debitor officiorum
 Es divinorum? cur induis acta vagorum?
 Desine stare foras, quia Cristus ponderat horas
 Et murmurando moras distinguit, qualiter oras.³⁵

Most notable in the above text is the use of Latin equivalents for the English sobriquets: "momlers," "overskypers," "jangers." But the narrative interest and appeal of the exemplum are largely lost in the verse development and do not ultimately extend the characterization of the sack-carrier.

Predictably, most fifteenth-century Latin and vernacular *sermonalia* do not depart radically from the fourteenth-century depiction of the burdened devil. The Spanish *Recull de Eximplis* claims to be following deVitry, a claim which is substantially true up to the holy man's question "Con has nom?" to which the devil answers: "Titelino" — a vagary somewhat reinforced two lines later with the familiar tag: "Fragmina psalorum Titulinus colligit horum."³⁶ The Italian *Corona*

³⁴ Fol. 150^b, quoted *ibid.*, p. 76.

³⁵ The verses continue for 19 lines further and emphasize the points touched upon briefly in the lines concerned specifically with Tutivillus, e.g., "Qui psalmos resecat et verba davitica curtat, / Displicet ille deo, dum placuisse putat. / Nil plus inde feret, quam si sua lingua taceret. / Cum domino psalles, psallendo tu tria serves: / Dirige cor sursum, profer bene, respice sensum." *Ibid.*, p. 77.

³⁶ "Miracle e eximpli con es al diable molt placent con los clergues no dien lo offici en la sgleya axi con deuen sergons que recompte Jacme de Uitiaco. CLERICI in ecclesia deuote debent dicere officium diuinum. Un religios e sant hom estand en lo cor de la sgleya viu un diable que leuaua a la esquena un gran sach. E lo sant religios li demana que portaua les sillabes e les diccions sincopades e les letres quels clergues menten en

Monaci of uncertain date but probably no earlier than the middle of the fifteenth century repeats Etienne de Bourbon's dire warnings about priests and tonsured monks who must repent their idle deeds by bearing huge sacks on their backs and by suffering great torments.³⁷ But Etienne's narrative is given a quite different orientation in this text since the resuscitated cleric's story of the incredible affliction of his brothers permits a diatribe on unworthy ecclesiastics. St. Francis, we are assured, used to say that if St. Lawrence and St. Vincent came down to earth and met him in a street while on another path he saw a priest pass, he would rather run to kiss the priest's hand since it was privileged to touch the body of Christ. But vile are those priests who accept the honor accorded to their position and yet fail to advance in sanctity.³⁸ From the earnestness of the *Corona's* indictment we may conclude that the fear inspired by the sack-carrying devil and his unhappy "imitators" should not be discounted.

An entry in the *Speculum Exemplorum*, previously attributed to Aegidius Aurifaber and printed in several editions between 1480 and 1500,³⁹ follows in the tradition begun by Caesarius and continued by Herolt and Gobius, but like the latter two it does not emphasize the *inanis gloria* which Caesarius was trying to excise from the observance of his brethren. Another variant among the narratives is found among the exempla in Additional MS 21147, fol. 11^b (probably written before 1461) where a devil is seen going around the choir collecting the

les ores. Lo sant hom li dix: Con has nom? E lo diable li respos. A mi dien Titelino. E tentost lo dit sant hom feu aquest vers. *Fragmina psalorum, Titulinus colligit horum.* " *Recull de Eximplis* (Barcelona, 1881), p. 117.

³⁷ "Nel contrado di siena dovendosi seppellire un sacerdote morto di poco, subito risucitò, e tra l'altre cose terribile le quali e' narrava, disse: sè avere veduto grande moltitudine di sacerdoti, e di cherici, e di monaci incredibilmente afflitti e permuti sotto grandissimi pesi. E domandando quello ch'eglino avevono adosso, fugli risposto: che portavano le sillabe, le parole, l'orazioni, ch'egli aveano lasciato de' salmi, e dell'ufficio che sono tenuti; donde e' ne pativano grande tormento, Dice l'Ecclesiastico: "Fa onore a' sacerdoti." Diceva santo Francesco: che se santo Lorenzo e santo Vincenzo discendessino in terra e venissingli incontro per una via, e per un'altra via vedessi passare un sacerdote, che piuttosto correrebbe a baciare la mano a quello sacerdote, colla quale e'tocca 'l corpo di Cristo, che a que' Santi. Dice santo Gregorio: vilissimo è da essere riputato 'l sacerdote, il quale non avanza gli altri in santità, come é gli avanza in onore. Amen." *Corona de' Monaci* ed. Casimiro Stolfi, (Prato, 1862), p. 113.

³⁸ I am indebted to Norma Mallia who verified this text and translation for me.

³⁹ The *Speculum Exemplorum's* compiler cannot be definitively identified although Aurifaber's name has long been associated with the text; without question its author was a Hollander. The *editio princeps* was published by Richard Paefroed in 1480-1. See Rainer Alsheimer, *Das Magnum Speculum Exemplorum als Ausgangspunkt populärer Erzähltraditionen* (Bern, 1971), pp. 17-18. An identical version appears in Johannes Major's *Magnum Speculum Exemplorum* (Douay, 1624), p. 104.

syllables slurred by the monks in chanting. Suddenly, however, “the precentor strikes to make the brethren sing more slowly, and the devil flies in dismay, dropping the wallet which he had filled.”⁴⁰

Tutivillus’ appearance in religious, moral, and didactic literature is likewise akin, despite the variations caused by vernacular usage, to the deVitry and Caesarius versions of the narrative. The *Sele Trost*, a kind of pre-Tridentine catechism, cautions children to watch their idle words and to correct their deportment in church lest they be made accountable for their misbehavior at Judgment Day. The lesson is reinforced by an “example” in the deVitry tradition which incorporates the interchange naming the devil and tacks the “fragmina” text on at the end.⁴¹ Upon being asked his name, however, the demon obliges by calling himself “Tutenillus,” and a comparable change in the verse is immediately made. The brethren seem to take the warning completely to heart so they must have needed no further introduction to the sack-carrying devil. (Interestingly, this exemplum is not repeated in the recension of the *Sele Trost* published by Anton Sorg in Augsburg in 1483.⁴²) DeVitry’s exemplum is also translated, almost verbatim, in the English *Jacob’s Well* (no later than 1450 but in all probability composed between 1410–20⁴³). Likewise, the originally

⁴⁰ J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*, vol. III (London, 1910), p. 19. Except where specifically noted otherwise, British Museum manuscript references have been culled from Herbert’s catalogue.

⁴¹ “Dass das Gebet nicht ein schnelles Plappern sein dürfe, sondern ein andächtiges sein müsse, wird sinnreich in folgender Weise eingeschärft: Lybe kint, so du dyne geizide liesest, so saltu langsam sprechen, und die worte gantz. Nutzer ist eyn pater langsam gesprochen, dann zehen jagende. Wann alle die wort, die du uberslehest in dyme gebete, die wil der bose geyste behalden, wan er sie beheldet, und wil sie dir vorwysen an dyme lesten ende. Hie von wil ich dir sagen.”

Von eyne Closter.

“Is geschach in eyne closter, do was eyn heiliger bruder ynne, der was zu eyner zijt an syme (? synne, ausser sich, entzückt). Do sach er eynen bosen geiste geen in dem Closter, der trug eynen groszen sagk uff syme halse. Der bruder beswure yne, das er yme sagete, was er truge in dem sagke. Der antwort yme der bose geiste und sprach: Ich samen (sammle) yn diesen sagk alle zubrochen wortter, die diese bruder sprechent, so sie ire gebet und ire geizide halden, und dartzu alle die worte und buchstaben die sie uberhuppen ader vergessen. Da sprach der heilige man: Wie heyszestu? Er sprach: Ich heyszen: Tytinillus. Do machte der heilige man diesen versze: ‘fragmina verborum tytinillus colligit horum.’ Dit sagete er den brudern, uff das sie sich dar vor hutten.” Edited by Johannes Geffcken in *Der Bildercatechismus des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1855), p. 65.

⁴² The most recent edition, Margarete Schmitt’s *Der Grosse Seelentrost* (Köln, 1959), p. 80, preserves the exemplum but with extensive variations in spelling.

⁴³ Arthur Brandeis, ed., *Jacob’s Well*, EETS, OS 115 (London, 1900), p. 114: “Exaump. Jacobus de vitriaco tellyth þat an holy man stood in cherch in a qwere & sey^l a feend beryng a gret sachell full of thyng. þe feend, as þe man askyd þe feend what he bare, þe feend seyde: “I bere in my sacche sylablys & woordys, ouerskyppyd and syn-

Latin *Alphabetum Narrationum* in its anonymous English translation of the fifteenth century manages to repeat both the Caesarius version ("Cantus clamorosus Deus parum reputat et demon approbat") and the deVitry sack-carrier, adding, however, the name of the devil. An interesting variant occurs, however, at the end of the *Fragmina* verses, where the second line is given as

Et fert ad forum quo premia reddat eorum.⁴⁴

One notable exception to a demonstrable consistency in the depiction of the sack-carrier occurs in the *Myoure of Oure Ladye*, c. 1415–50.⁴⁵ Here the context is surprisingly political:

For lyke as slyppers or falsers of the kynges money are punysshed by deth: Ryght so they that slyppe away from the money of goddes seruyce, eny wordes or letters or syllables, & so false yt from the trew sentence, or from the trewe maner of sayng therof; deserue to be greuously punysshed agenste god.

Although the exemplum which follows this introduction is modelled on that of Caesarius, it departs radically from the Cistercian narrative when it has the Abbot ask "What art thou?" The naming of the devil, as in many of the deVitry versions, subsequently occurs. The overall discursiveness of the *Myoure's* text is reiterated in its "Doomeday" conclusion:

Thus ye maye se, that though suche faylynges be sone forgotten of them that make them; yet the fende forgetteth them not, but he kepeth them full bysely in sure store to accuse the soule therewith at our lordes dome, wherfore yt is good to know the cause of suche hast and neglygence, and to put remedy thereto.⁴⁶

The conflation of the versions of Caesarius and deVitry here is paralleled by the contiguity of both the sack-carrier and the writing devil exempla in other texts. The Last Judgment reference may bear some relationship to the Iudicium plays in which a comparable devil will play so large a role. Whether it does or not, we seem to have reached

kopyd, & verse & psalmys þe whiche þese clerkys han stolyne in þe qwere, & haue fayled in here seruyse."

⁴⁴ Mary MacLeod Banks, ed., *An Alphabet of Tales*, EETS, OS 126–7 (London, 1904), p. 104; cf. pp. 86 and 388 for the Caesarius version and another recounting of deVitry's. The "Et fert ad forum" variant is not to be found in the Latin originals, MS Harley 268, fol. 82^v and MS Arundel 378, fol. 23^{rb}, although the latter is notable for its "*fragmina psalmorum*."

⁴⁵ John Henry Blunt, ed., *Myroure of oure Ladye*, EETS, ES 19 (London, 1898).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

a terminal stage in the separate consideration of the sack-carrier and must now examine his counterpart, the writing demon.

Unlike that of the sack-carrier, whose developing characterization is mainly a medieval phenomenon, the writing demon's function and the traditional elements surrounding it may be as old as the Babylonian civilization.⁴⁷ Even if one more conservatively begins consideration of a recorder of sins at the judgment scene in the Apocalypse,⁴⁸ there is still the vast array of monastic literature to contend with, where demons were not only the instigators but also the recorders of evil deeds. Diabolic infestations of religious houses seem to have been commonplace among the experiences of the Egyptian ascetics. A monk who recited his office carelessly discovered that no place, not even his person, was sacred since by demonic power he could be lifted to the choir roof at the beginning of a psalm verse and dropped with a resounding thump at its conclusion.⁴⁹ Other devils watched monasteries constantly, ready to swarm into them for the slightest offense.⁵⁰ Such offenses, according to the testimony of the desert fathers, were frequently written down and tallied at appropriate intervals. One dismayed monk saw a devil on the pinnacle of his abbey, diligently inscribing the sins of his brethren; but even worse, in the opinion of this monk, was the fact that he espied the same devil in the marketplace, writing nothing, because all the people there had already been possessed.⁵¹ Another monk who came upon a devil scribbling assiduously asked innocently, "What are you writing?," and he was answered smartly: "peccata tua."⁵² Recording devils often served in more specific capacities and concerned themselves exclusively with "peccata negligentie." A surely insecure and sensitive preacher-compiler observed that a certain blessed man whose congregation frequently slept during sermon time was granted a vision in which a writing devil busily took note of every snore. Having apprised them

⁴⁷ Robert Wildhaber, "Das Sündenregister auf der Kuhhaut," *FF Communications*, No. 163 (Helsinki, 1955), p. 31.

⁴⁸ Apocalypse 20:12: "Libri aperti sunt . . . et iudicati sunt mortui ex hiis quae scripta erant in libris secundum opera ipsorum." Lutz Röhrich, *Erzählungen des späten Mittelalters*, Vol. I (Berlin, 1962), 269, proposes Matt. 12: 36 as another scriptural source. There idle words will have to be justified on Judgment Day.

⁴⁹ ". . . sacerdos, qui corruptissime dicebat suum officium, fuit a dyabolo sursum pluries in cancello levatus et fortissime ad terram collisus." J. Th. Welter, ed., *La Tabula Exemplorum secundum Ordinem Alphabeti* (Paris, 1926), p. 72.

⁵⁰ MS Add. 32678, fol. 90^b.

⁵¹ MS Egerton 1117, fol. 179^b.

⁵² MS Laud Misc. 315, fol. 91^r; cf. Walther, No. 10837: "Hic ego sum missus cum penna scribere iussus / Absentes, non orantes, tarde venientes."

of their perilous state, this good, albeit boring, shepherd received the congregation's confessions, granted absolution "a peccato negligentie," and happily reported that the notes were erased.⁵³ But incessant chatterers seem to have been more disturbing to churchmen than "dormientes," and one of the earliest instances of a writing devil's distinct characterization occurs, like that of the sack-carrier, among the exempla of Jacques deVitry:

Quidam autem in sermone et in ecclesia inania meditantur et ociosa loquuntur, cum deberent hiis qui dicuntur cor apponere. Unde quidam sanctus sacerdos, cum videret in quadam magna sollempnitate dyabolum dentibus extendere pergamenum, adjuravit eum ut diceret ei cur istud faceret. Cui demon respondit: "Scribo ociosa verba que dicuntur in hac ecclesia et quia hodie plus solito talia multiplicantur, propter sollempnitatem diei festi, videns quod non sufficeret cedula quam attuli, dentibus meis extendere conatus sum pergamenum." Quod audiens sacerdos cepit ea referre populo et omnes hoc audientes dolere et conteri ceperunt. Quibus dolentibus et penitentibus, dyabolus qui scripserat delere cepit, ita quod cedula vacua remansit. Debitis ergo cum omni diligentia et devotione divino officio et sane doctrine intendere et non manducare uvam acerbam sed cibum spiritualem.⁵⁴

The narrative is anonymous as to time, place, and characters, but its prominent features—festive occasion, holy discoverer, scribbling devil—are abundantly clear:

Certain people, however, think idle things during sermons and speak idle words in church when they should be putting their hearts to those things being said. Wherefore at a great solemnity, when a certain holy priest saw a devil stretching parchment with his teeth, he demanded of him why he was doing so. To whom the devil answered: "I am writing down the idle words said in this church which because of the solemn feast today have been remarkably increased, and seeing that the piece which I brought was not sufficient, I have attempted to stretch that parchment with my teeth. Hearing this, the priest began to tell what was happening to the people who listened with fear and trepidation. While they were thus lamenting and feeling penitent, the devil began to erase what he had written and the parchment was left empty. You ought, therefore, with all diligence and devotion to give your attention to the divine office and to sound teaching and eat not a bitter grape but only spiritual food.

De Vitry's text may represent a step beyond that of MS Laud. Misc. 315, fol. 91^r where the *sacerdos* is specified as a *monachus*, but such a

⁵³ MS Canon Misc. 532, fol. 104^r.

⁵⁴ Wright, ed., *Sermones Vulgares*, p. 10.

distinction is infrequent among the *sermonalia* repetitions of this exemplum during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁵⁵ The story, nevertheless, seems to have been particularly susceptible to agglutination and very soon the cast of one devil and priest was increased. Consequently, three major variations in the narrative are traceable even among thirteenth-century texts.

Probably most immediately remarkable is a version which incorporates the Virgin Mary's patronage. About the year 1248 John of Garland composed a metrical rendition of the tale "De demone scribente peccata mulierum"; the story relates the adventures of a devil espied in a Toledo church by a cleric, who saw him recording the sins of certain women attending a service. Because the devil was obviously having trouble with his parchment (it broke, he hit his head), the cleric burst into laughter and was reproved by an ecclesiastical dignitary on the scene. The delinquent, having subsequently fallen asleep, was restored to favor through the intercession of the Virgin, who laid on his breast the devil's scroll of accusations; this scroll validated his "vision" and effected the confession of the women.⁵⁶ Thus the *Liber metricus Johannis de Garlandia qui vocatur Stella Maris* appears to preserve the first recounting of Mary's assistance to "the cleric who laughs." Comparable in importance to the portrait of him, however, is the addition of female *personae*. Of these the Virgin seems least significant, since she elsewhere appears only in a similar version of the tale contained in Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale*⁵⁷ and (without Vincent's glaring illogicalities and with several original variations) in the *Scala Coeli*.⁵⁸ Mary's presence in these three versions may

⁵⁵ The usual designations are "quidam sanctus" as in MS Canon Misc. 528, fol. 62^r; "quidam sacerdos" as in MS Laud Misc. 471, fol. 120^r; "vir quidam sanctissimus" as in MS Laud 471, fol. 122^r; "quidam sanctus sacerdos" as in MS Harley 463, fol. 19^v, and variations on these.

⁵⁶ Evelyn Faye Wilson, ed. *The Stella Maris of John of Garland* (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 129–30. (In a note on page 193, Miss Wilson comments that the form of the Virgin's intervention is probably borrowed from the Theophilus legend).

Templo demon Tholetano / Verba scripsit in vesano
Quasi vultu simie. / Ungue, dente dum trahebat
Scripti cartam, hic ruebat / a murali serie.

Clerus ista videns risit / Set deflevit quod commisit
Culpatus a presule. / Supra pectus dormientis
Manus stella miserentis / Prorupsit scriptum cedule.

Clericus evigilavit / Et prelato demonstravit
Scriptum hostis invidi. / Mulieres advocantur
Quarum voces comprobantur / Et sermones stolidi.

⁵⁷ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale* (Douay, 1624), VII, 118.

⁵⁸ Gobius, fol. m.

simply be an incidental reflection of the many "Miracles of the Virgin"⁵⁹ which abounded in the thirteenth century and which did not have an enduring effect on what were already very pronounced components in the narrative tradition of a recording devil's activities. The other non-male personages, merely "mulieres" in John but quite definitely "jangling women" in Vincent, are consistently distinguishable in the second major strand of writing devil exempla—that which specifies a female presence while keeping all figures unnamed.

Although there is but a single woman in MS Arundel 506, fol. 20, a lady with a train (obviously borrowed from another exemplum in which the devil tumbles from her trailing garment), most thirteenth- and fourteenth-century recensions of the writing devil story speak of ladies in the plural. In fact, even when there is only one deacon or one priest to do the observing, there are always women. Perhaps the most complete early version of the story which retains the anonymity of both male and female characters is that recounted in Robert of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne*, composed in English in 1303 and based largely on the earlier French *Manuel de Pechez*⁶⁰—in which, however, the writing devil narrative does not appear. The characters' functions are much more fully specified here than in John of Garland and Vincent of Beauvais: a "holy man hys messe songe" and the deacon, when he was reading the Gospel, "logh a grete laghter an hy." The celebrant thought the deacon a fool and, in a lengthy colloquy at the end of Mass, asked the reason for his laughter. The deacon explained that when he glanced out over the congregation he saw two women engrossed in gossip, while between them a fiend, suitably equipped for his task, surreptitiously noted their every word. Eventually needing more writing space, the demon decided to extend his "rolle" by tugging at one end and gnawing at the other. But the parchment, stretched to its limit, burst asunder, causing the scribbler's head to bump resoundingly against a nearby wall. The deacon, highly amused at the obvious discomfiture of the devil by his loss of the tally of sins, broke into laughter. The recording demon, according to this cleric's

⁵⁹ Some examples of this tradition are *Les Miracles de Nostre Dame*, the narratives in rhymed French verse made by Gautier de Coincy, and later Chaucer's Prioress' Tale and Jean Mielot's *Collection*. Herolt's *Promptuarium Discipuli de Miraculis Beate Marie Virginis* (1435–40) gathers together the many strands of earlier sermon exempla related to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Of course, the vogue had begun in the second half of the 12th century. See C. Swinton Bland, *The Miracles of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (London, 1928), p. 4 and the Introduction by Eileen Power on pp. xx ff.

⁶⁰ Robert of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne*, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall, EETS, OS 123, Part 2 (London, 1902), pp. 290–2. MS Add. 33956, fol. 26^r bows to Vincent in having a monkey-like devil, but omits the Virgin while including the head-hitting section.

account, perceiving that he was the subject of such merriment, smashed the now-fragmentary roll with his fist

And went a-wey, alle for shame;
þarfore y logh and hadde gode game.⁶¹

Having successfully defended himself against the charge of indiscriminate laughter, the deacon is asked, slightly further into the narrative, if he had been able to observe other fiends in the church. He assures his questioner that, indeed, he had seen many evil ones writing down offending words, but none of them so clearly as the one between the two women. With this testimony to a more universal presence of recording demons, testimony reflected in Bromyard,⁶² Robert concludes his story: "For Ianglers þis tale y tolde."

Contemporary with the recountings of the original deVitry exemplum, and with the embellished forms such as that in *Handlyng Synne*, is a third major development in the recording devil narrative: the naming of the principals. Although some provide a specific name for only the most significant character/priest/Archbishop, most, where applicable in the progress of the text, also identify the observer/cleric/acolyte. The names in many cases represent what appears to be a deference to local saints and customs and, in line with the established patterns of exempla, with appropriate geographical or physical settings. Even if in some texts (*Mariu Saga*, *Thesaurus Novus*, *Opus Quadragesimale*, Gorran's *Sermones*⁶³) Anselm of Toledo and Ciro of Genoa alone perceive the evil one (very much in the manner of Jacques de Vitry's "quidam sacerdos"), paired observers like Saint Martin/Saint Brice and Saint Austin/Saint Gregory predominate in texts in which characters are named from the thirteenth century onward. Austin and Gregory are featured in the Vernon MS appendage to an English translation of the Norman-French *Lay Folks Mass Book*.⁶⁴ The prescriptions set down there on "how to hear Mass" probably date from 1275, since scholars have inferred from the text that the Holy See was vacant at the time of their composition.⁶⁵ As one might have guessed,

⁶¹ P. 292, lines 9297–8.

⁶² Bromyard mentions a "demon . . . ad hoc deputatus cum ministris suis" in "Ordo clericalis," *ibid.*

⁶³ Carl Richard Ungar, ed., *Mariu Saga* (Christiania, 1871), p. 469; see Johannes Bolte, "Der Teufel in der Kirche," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, N.F., XI (1897), 255, for the *Thesaurus* text; the *Opus* can be found in MS Royal, 8, C, XII, fol. 24^{rb}; the *Sermones* in MS Harley 755, fol. 15^{rb}.

⁶⁴ Thomas F. Simmons, ed., *Lay Folks Mass Book*, EETS, OS 71 (London, 1879), p. 361.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. liii.

the Austin/Gregory tale has no patristic foundation, nor can it be documented from any of the early extant lives of either Augustine of Canterbury or Gregory the Great. The versifier describes how Austin, when in Rome, was summoned to minister as deacon to Pope Gregory and was assigned, according to usual practice, the task of reading the Gospel. Distracted by two “wyves” who were tale-telling, the server glanced in their direction, and there, in a window on the wall, he saw a “foul fend.”⁶⁶ Austin, of course, laughed at the devil’s antics, and when, after Mass, Gregory “meekly” complained to his deacon about such behavior, Austin led the Pope to the spot in which he had observed the evil one—where, indeed, proof of his presence was found.

Although there is at least one instance in which the principals are Gregory and Peter,⁶⁷ the pair named most often were Saint Martin of Tours and his deacon and successor in that episcopate, Saint Brice. Considering Martin’s tremendous English popularity, it is not surprising that he should appear in such varying types of *sermonalia* as the *Speculum Laicorum*⁶⁸ (a preaching handbook of the later thirteenth century), the *Liber Exemplorum*⁶⁹ (c. 1275), in similar collections of exemplary material, as well as in the more devotionally oriented *Book of the Knight of La Tour Landry*. In this last-mentioned lengthy and famous work, composed in 1371–2 and Englished during the reign of Henry IV, Geoffrey de la Tour gives much good advice to his daughters, including one example that showed “how no man thorough his clateringe shulde desturbe the devine service of God.” The “ensaumple” begins:

Yet will y tell you what befell atte the masse of the holy man, seint Martin of Towres. And as he saide masse there halpe hym seint Brice, the whiche was hys clerke and godson, that after seint Martin was Ershbisshope of Towres, the whiche Brice toke up a gret laughinge, and asked hym whi he laughed, and he ansuered, that he saw the fende write all the laughinges that were betwene the women atte the masse, and it happed that the parchemyn that he wrote in was shorte, and he plucked harde to haue made it lengger with his tethe, and it scaped oute of hys mouthe, and hys hede had a gret stroke

⁶⁶ Pp. 136–8, lines 308 ff.

⁶⁷ As in the Breslau manuscript of the fourteenth century transcribed by Röhrich, p. 114.

⁶⁸ J. Th. Welter, ed., *Speculum Laicorum* (Paris, 1905), p. vii. This compilation enjoyed the favor of many preachers during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; see p. iii.

⁶⁹ A. G. Little, ed., *Liber Exemplorum* (Aberdeen, 1907), p. 67. Sources currently in manuscript include Add. 15833, fol. 174^v, Add. 18349, fol. 62^r, and Harley 268, fol. 34^r. K.A. Barack has transcribed a piece called *Geistliche Gedichte*, featuring a “sand Mer-tein,” in *Germania*, XXV(1880), 186 ff; Herolt, cap. E, xvi, castigates “fabulis otiosis.”

ayenst the wall, "and that made me to laugh." And whan seint Martin herde hym, he knewe that seint Brice was an holy man. And he preched this to the women, and how it was a gret perill and synne to speke and counsaile of worldly materes atte the masse or atte Goddes seruice, and that it were beter not to be there thanne to haue suche langage and clatoringe. And yet sum clerkes susteinthe that none shulde not speke no manere thing whiles they bene atte masse, and in especial atte the gospell, nor atte the per omnia and therfor, doughtres, here is an ensuample how ye shall holde you humble and deuoute in the chirche, and for no thinge haue no iangelynge with nobody while ye are atte the masse, nor while ye serue God.⁷⁰

Before we look briefly at the writing devil's career in the fifteenth and later centuries, it might be well to note two unique appearances in the fourteenth. The first is Bromyard's rather oblique and synthetic reference in his discussion of "Consilium." There we find the statement that as those who proffer evil counsel perpetrate the same by means of rolls and sacks, so shall their injustices be recorded not in the book of the house of Israel "sed in nigro sacco dyaboli."⁷¹ Such a conflation of the attributes of both sack-carrier and writing devil would certainly have provided food for any congregation's thought. But the reference probably more significant in light of later character development is printed in Wright's *Reliquiae Antiquae* from MS Douce 104, "on the last page of a fine copy of *Piers Plowman*."⁷² Its importance must be underscored because, although the sack-carrier and the scribbler were often accorded special and sometimes contiguous places among the *sermonalia* of the period, the Douce text identifies the writing devil as Tutivillus, the name so frequently bestowed upon the sack-carrier:

Tutiullus, þe deuyl of hell,
He wryteþ har names soþe to tel,
ad missam garulantes.

Better wer be at tome for ay,
þan her to serue þe deuil to pay,
sic vana famulantes.

þe[s] women þat sitteþ þe church about,
þai beþ al of þe deuelis rowte
diuina impediētes.

⁷⁰ William Caxton, *The Book of the Knight of the Tower*, ed. M. Y. Offord, EETS, SS 2 (London, 1971), pp. 49–50.

⁷¹ Bromyard, "Consilium," XI, ix.

⁷² Thomas Wright and James Orchard Halliwell, eds., *Reliquiae Antiquae* (London, 1845), p. 257.

But þai be stil, he wil ham quell,
Wiþ kene crokes draw hem to hell,
ad puteum autem flentes.

ffor his loue þat zou der bo3th
Hold zou stil & Iangel no3th,
sed prece deponentes.

þe blis of heuen þan may 3e wyn;
god bryng vs all to his In,
amen! amen! dicentes.⁷³

Several features of this poem are noteworthy: its macaronic verse structure is both effective and sophisticated; it reinforces earlier inferences that “jangling” will put a person at the top of the Doomsday lists of sinners; and it presupposes a knowledge of more standard versions of the recording devil story. The threatening postures associated with Tutivillus’ drawing idle, chattering women to hell could be a reflection of what happened during the Iudicium play or could even be paradigmatic for the Wakefield Master’s creation.

The writing devil’s career in the fifteenth and later centuries, excluding the drama, corresponds to thirteenth-century patterns. Many texts, among them the *Magnum Speculum Exemplorum*, the *Alphabetum Narrationem*, the *Speculum Spiritualium*, and several exempla collections,⁷⁴ preserve the one holy man/one demon format of the deVitry narrative. But there is little compositional development in any of these versions and the story gradually loses its didactic power and becomes oriented toward entertainment. The same might also be said for the extended version in which the writing demon’s work is made

⁷³ I am quoting from Carleton Brown’s transcription printed in *Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century* (Oxford, 1939), p. 277. MS. Bod. S.C. 21678, fol. 112^v (Douce 104).

⁷⁴ Major, p. 340; *Alphabetum*, p. 388; Henry of Balnea, *Speculum Spiritualium* (Paris, 1510), VII, fol. ccviii; *Recull*, DXII; *Corona*, p. 61. The *Sele Trost*’s version is paradigmatic:

“Iyebe kint, so du zu der kirchen komest, so soltu nicht runen noch kosen, wanne alle unnütze worte und afftersprache, die do in der kirchen gescheen und gesprochen wirt von den Luden, die schribet der bose geist und wil sie dir vorwysen an dem uingsten tage oder gerichte. Do von wil ich dir ein bilde sagen.

Von eyne heiligen Bischoffe.

Is was ein heilger bischoff, der stunt und sang messe. Do stunt syn diacon und sach den bosen geist sitzen in eyne fynster und schriben eynen brieff, und schreip darinne alle die lude, die waren in der kirchen. Do der brieff volle was, da wolte er yne mit den zene wyder usz eyne ziehen. Do reysz der brieff und der bose geiste slug das heupt wieder die want. Das begunde der dyacken zu lachen, und darumb so schalt yn der bischoff und fragete yne, was er lachte? Do sagete er yme, was er gesehen hatte, und wijsete yne, wo der fijnt sas. Do beswore der bischoff den dufel, des er yme sagen solde, was er schriebe. Er sprach: Ich schriben all die worte, die die lude runen yn der kirchen und sprechen, die sal ich alle rugen an dem jungsten tage. Herumb rune nicht in der kirchen.” (Geffcken, *op. cit.*, pp. 64–5)

more specific because of the obvious jangling of women churchgoers, and where the evil one is observed in the performance of this task. As indicated earlier, the naming of the principals is irregular: several texts preserve the anonymous holy man and two women; others leave both the holy man and his deacon unnamed; in at least one instance "a certain deacon" assists Austin—a variation of the Gregory/celebrant, Austin/deacon of the Vernon manuscript and of Audelay's *De Meritis Misse*. Saint Batt is the major figure in the *Helvetia Sancta* recension⁷⁵, and Martin and Brice are favored by Caxton in his *Doctrinal of Sapience*.⁷⁶ While a few of these narrations were intended to be serious accounts of the demonic presence in the world, there is an obvious decline in both the moral force and in the theological underpinnings of earlier texts; under critical examination, most sixteenth-century versions seem to be missing both.

Nevertheless, on the Continent towards the end of the sixteenth century, some remnants of the writing-devil story could still be found; for example, in France, about 1585, Noël du Fail reiterated the traditional account of "Comme le diable escrit le caquet des femmes derrière Saint Martin."⁷⁷ But the oft-told exemplum was fast losing ground. The fact that certain German monks kept a small picture of a devil (called "Titinille") in their prayer books until the nineteenth century shows only the vaguest reminiscence of that active scribbler whom we know as Tutivillus.

Conversely, the beginning of the end of serious moral intent in recording demon stories—both sack-carrier and writing varieties—seems to correspond to the rise of their popularity in folklore and the graphic and plastic arts. Although the writing devil does emerge as the dominant partner in these latter arts, both he and the sack-carrier may be observed in numerous sculptures, especially in England.⁷⁸ Allegedly, the oldest incontestable example of Tutivillus' visible pres-

⁷⁵ The *Helvetia Sancta* (Lucern, 1648) was compiled by H. Murer from sixteenth-century materials and edited by J. R. Wyss in *Idyllen* (Leipzig, 1815); see p. 202.

⁷⁶ William Caxton, *Doctrinal of Sapience* (London, 1489), cap. 35; John Audelay's *Poems* (Ella Whiting, ed. [London, 1931], EETS, O.S. 184, pp. 75–6) for Austin and Gregory; Felix and Cyril are featured in *Biblioteca de autores espanoles*, Vol. 51 (Madrid, 1861), cap. 326.

⁷⁷ J. Assézat, ed., *Oeuvres facétieuses du Noël du Fail* (Paris, 1874) p. 279, is similar to the comment of Rabelais in P. Jourda, ed., *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. I (Paris, 1962), pp. 30–1. The characters are anonymous in citations by Pierre de Grossnet, Hieronymous Rauscher, and Fischart (Bolte p. 250).

⁷⁸ M.D. Anderson, *Drama and Imagery in English Medieval Churches* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 173–7, offers numerous illustrations. Also of interest are plates 16b, 21–2, and 25 in Ernst Lehner, *Demons, Death and Damnation* (New York, 1971).

ence in the medieval world is the so-called Reichenau fresco, a wall painting in St. Gregory's church on the *insula felix* dated about the mid-fourteenth century.⁷⁹ Featuring two gossiping women and four writing devils who share a parchment, the fresco carries a legend indicating that a goodly volume of chatter was in progress—which may in turn account for the presence of four scribes. The Reichenau “Wandbild” and many other Continental representations of a writing devil seem to reflect the popularity of Geoffrey de la Tour's *Book* whose influence on these artistic conceptions is tantamount to being their source.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, even where a legend accompanies the drawing or fresco, the principals, as in many exempla, remain unnamed. One notable exception to this occurs in the wallpainting of the *Pfarrkirche zu Steeg* in the Rhineland, where a rather clear depiction of the sack-carrier is conjoined with a version of the familiar text: “Fragmina verborum Titufillu collegit horum.”⁸¹ But such precision is as rare as the portrait of the sack-carrier himself; it is ordinarily the scribbler who inhabits bosses, capitals, niches, bench ends, manuscript margins, and even tapestries, across the Continent.⁸²

In folklore, as in art, the recording demon is found throughout Europe, again with greater emphasis on writing than on sack carrying. Perhaps the most delightful example of the latter's function occurs in England, where the formation of any isolated hill was said to be a spot where such a devil emptied out his pouch.⁸³ Although about as widely told as the stories of devil's seats and devil's leaps, this alleged activity falls far from the Doomsday occupations of our diligent col-

⁷⁹ Franz Beyerle, “Seelenwage und Sündenregister,” *ZDA*, LX (1923), 230–2. The inscription reads:

Ich wil hie scriben / Von diesen tumben wiben
Was hie wirt plapa gesprochen / Uppigs in der wochen,
Das wirt alles vol geraht, / So es wirt fur den rihter braht.

⁸⁰ See the “Buch des Ritters vom Thurm von den Exempeln der Gottesfurcht und Ehrbarkeit” in R. Muther, *Die deutsche Bücherillustration der Gothik und Frührenaissance*, vol. I (München und Leipzig, 1884), pp. 65ff.

⁸¹ Peter Halm, “Der Schreibende Teufel,” in *L'Umanesimo e il Demoniaci nell'Arte*, Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Studi Umanistici, ed. Enrico Castelli (Rome, 1952), p. 238.

⁸² Charles Samaran, in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat* (Paris, 1946), p. 310, notes that at Mayence towards the middle of the seventeenth century, Papebroeck recalled having seen a representation of Tutivillus with identifying inscription at the entrance to the choir. George Coulton, *Life in the Middle Ages*, vol. I (Cambridge, 1928), 190, notes that there is a representation of the Martin/Brice/devil story on the carved screen at St. Fiacre in Brittany.

⁸³ Suggested by Mrs. Newall, Secretary of the Folklore Society, University College, London.

lector of idle words. It is typical, however, of the tremendous range of the writing devil's folkloric development which has been admirably unravelled elsewhere.⁸⁴ Embracing the whole continuum—from the recorder of evil *per se*, to the recorder of evil words, to the recorder of feminine gossip—the number of folk tales about the scribbler was prodigious. Doubtless, the simple peasant knew a good bit about the demon who made a cleric laugh, even if he did not know that this same evil one, slightly altered, was the famous Tutivillus. One might also contend that the beholder's mirth became a favorite theme in folklore because ordinary people were certain that laughter was able to cow the father of lies and his legions even more effectively than imprecations.⁸⁵

The popularity of a writing demon in folklore can probably account for several derivative narratives like the one retold by Maximilian Rudwin⁸⁶ in which Satan, determined to be a writer, is reported to have incurred God's anger and shortly thereafter to have been banished from heaven; consequently, Satan now dictates to human authors those questionable works which he would have wished to write himself. Can such a tale underlie some of Faust's difficulties, since he cannot seem to write until he has sold his soul to the devil? Or could it be the origin of assertions that "Satan is the patron of all publications"? Or is it the *raison d'être* for the sobriquet "printer's devils" which is applied to the apprentices in that trade?⁸⁷ But we would go too far afield were we to dwell on the abundant corollaries of the stories of a writing devil which have developed during the past four centuries. Yet who could think that the Icelandic goblin who perches in a window, bone pen in hand, recording on his cowhide boots the idle words said by numerous persons around him,⁸⁸ is anyone other than "Tutivillus, þe deuyll of hell," who "wryteþ har names soþe to tel"?

⁸⁴ Wildhaber's work is by far the most comprehensive to date.

⁸⁵ Bolte, pp. 249–51.

⁸⁶ Maximilian Rudwin, *The Devil in Legend and Literature* (Chicago, 1931), p. 85.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 260–3.

⁸⁸ Jacqueline Simpson, *Icelandic Folktales and Legends* (London, 1972), pp. 192–4.

III



Literary Expansion

The development of “quendam demonem” into the personality whom the Wakefield Master used as the major devil of his *Iudicium* play is a prime example of literary expansion. In some instances it assumes the properties of a *tour de force*, encompassing both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of characterization while continually drawing upon the cultural milieu of the period. As demonstrated earlier, the agglutinative stories about a sack-carrying and writing devil reached an acme in narrative form from the end of the fourteenth through the middle of the fifteenth centuries and were available throughout this period for incorporation into the drama. There, the recording demon’s “synthetic” life became extended beyond what might otherwise have become a natural, imaginative attrition. But before considering how the Tutivillus of Towneley and of *Mankind* maintained the rapt attention of his audience, we must pause to investigate what actually happened to “quendam demonem.”

Several surprises await us. Some can, no doubt, be traced to the composite nature of the Tutivillus character in later texts; others are more nearly the result of general cultural phenomena. Probably as a direct consequence of the latter, an obvious and expected mode of character development—the elaboration of physical attributes—remained almost entirely unexploited. If one is aware of the forms which demonic popularization took in later medieval society, especially those which modeled demons after village ruffian or buffoon,¹ one might expect that a genuinely distinctive “effictio” would be rare—as indeed it is. Those few texts which record the intercession of the Virgin—John of Garland’s *Stella Maris*, Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum Historiale*, Gobius’ *Scala Coeli*—present a writing devil in the form of a monkey. John, however, gives him only a monkey’s face while Vincent notes that he is horrible and deformed; Gobius is content with

¹ T. McAlindon, “The Emergence of a Comic Type in Middle-English Narrative: The Devil and Giant as Buffoon,” *Anglia*, LXXXI (1963), 365: “he acquired the tone and habits of a village ruffian and buffoon.”

"in specie symee."² One might perhaps wish to relate the Vernon manuscript's "foul fend"³ to Vincent of Beauvais' depiction, but the adjective seems as much dictated by the exigencies of meter as by other literary considerations. In English redactions, only a single occurrence of the sack carrier's "foulness" and "mysshape"⁴ can be termed significant, and this text, *Myroure of Oure Ladye*, obviously expends its descriptive efforts in order to direct attention, not towards the specific characterization of the demon, but towards the extremely fearful abbot who beholds him. Bromyard, with his customary originality, calls his recorder a giant,⁵ an epithet ignored by later compilers. Thus the ugliness with which the plastic and graphic artisans endowed Tutivillus finds little support in the exempla and must proceed from traditional devil portraiture or from the costuming skill of dramatic production.

Despite the paucity of physical details, numerous other aspects of characterization derive clearly from certain emphases of the sack-carrier and writing-devil stories. For instance, the sack carrier, understandably unlike the writing devil, is mobile. Though Jacques de Vitry had pictured him merely as "very burdened with a full sack," Caesarius' nearly contemporary account features a "certain devil" standing in a high place catching "voces tumultuosas" with his right hand and slipping them deftly into the receptacle held by his left.⁶ Such manual dexterity is further emphasized when we learn that the words thus deposited have the appearance, as our unknown Franciscan contends, of grains of salt. That the sack-carrying fiend would also be able to make the rounds of the place in which words are being skipped or chanted clamorously is a logical deduction. Very early in his development, he is seen scurrying "per sedes monachorum" or, in calmer fashion, proceeding rather deliberately from one monk to another, intent on his collections. Etienne de Bourbon had shown him in transit from the parish church, where he had such success in filling his sack, to the local depository for "sillabis et dictionibus detruncatis"⁷ where storage space for these omissions would be provided until the

² John of Garland: "quasi vultu simie," Wilson, ed., p. 129; Vincent of Beauvais: "demonem in specie simie horrida et deformi," *Speculum*, VII, 118; Gobius, *Scala Celi*, fol. m. Cf. Add. MS 33956, fol. 26r: "demonem unum in specie symie."

³ Simmons, ed., p. 136.

⁴ Blunt, ed., p. 54: "the abbot was astoned and aferde of the fouleness and mysshape of hym . . ."

⁵ "Ordo clericalis," II, xxvi: "apparuit quasi gigas sacco pleno onustus."

⁶ Strange, ed., p. 181.

⁷ Lecoy de la Marche, ed., p. 184.

accusations of Judgment Day. Also of interest to the sermonizer was the actual container. DeVitry's "sack" becomes, in Caesarius, a long, capacious pouch; it has the appearance of a basket in several exempla collections, is black according to Bromyard, could probably be described as a wallet in other sources, and seems brimful and running over with idle words in most.⁸ This detail is nicely pointed by the rather consistent usage of *onustus* ("burdened") to characterize the demon's reaction to the sack-bearing. Although at least one bench end exhibits a receptacle slung behind the devil's back,⁹ exactly how it is carried is narrated at length only in one of Tutivillus' more spectacular appearances in the *Myroure of Oure Ladye*. There he goes "bysely" about a Cistercian choir gathering diligently all the words, syllables, and "faylynges that eny made," and he waits about so that some that had escaped him might still be put in his bag. "I am a poure dyuel," claims this carrier of "a longe and a greate poke hangynge about hys necke," and "my name is Tytyuyllus & I do myne offyce that is commytted vnto me." Having been questioned by the astonished Abbot as to the nature of his "office,"

he answeryd. I muste eche day he sayde brynge my master a thousande pokes full of faylynges, & of neglygences in syllables and wordes, that ar done in youre order in redynge and in syngynge & else I must be sore beten.¹⁰

Whether the specification of a "thousand" has any relationship to the huge numbers of priests who were weighted down with great sacks of missaid words in Etienne's version of the story is difficult to determine. What is patent, however, is that the *Myroure's* compiler has achieved a literary triumph in transforming the commonplace conception of fiend as a creature without pity for others and, indeed, without feelings at all into a rather pitiable and persecuted drudge—a true forerunner of the modern Screwtape.

But perhaps the most notable and most characteristic attribute of the devil who carries the sack is his name—a name whose meaning and origin have been much debated, and to which we must give some consideration. Plautus seems to have been the first to use a

⁸ DeVitry's "saccum plenum" becomes a "saccum magnum et longum" in Caesarius; other designations for this receptacle run the gamut from "cophinus" (Add. MS 33956, fol. 26^r) to "sacculum nigrum" (Bromyard, I, xl), "sachell" (*Jacob's Well*, Brandeis, ed., p. 114), "poke" (*Myroure of oure Ladye*, Blunt, ed., p. 54), "vasculum" (*Thesaurus Novus*, in Bolte, p. 255).

⁹ Anderson, p. 174.

¹⁰ Blunt, ed. p. 54.

word similar to "tutivillus," and its appearance in context in the *Cassinae*, II, 5 has a definite denotation and an obvious connotation:

Non ergo istuc verbum emissim titivillitio
Nam omnes mortales Diis sunt freti: sed tamen
Vidi ego Deis fretos saepe multos decipi.¹¹

Gronovius' gloss confirms the negative emphasis by equating "titivillitio" with "futilia" and declaring "Est sermo impius, dignus Olympione, homine agresti, rudi religionis, scleribus operto."¹² Further damaging associations were inevitable. The definition in Festus' *De Verborum Significatione*, cited from Paulus Diaconus—"titibilicium—nullius significationis est, ut apud Graecos βλιτυρι et σινυδαφος"¹³—follows directly in the line of Plautus' use of the word. A discussion of an almost identical term, occurring in the "De Abstrusis sermonibus" of Fabius Planciades Fulgentius (No. 20), concretizes the rather nebulous meaning of earlier usage: "Textiulicium dici voluerunt fila putrida quae telis cadunt."¹⁴ Forcellini defines rather explicitly: "Titivillitium quasi textivillitium, a texto et villus. Doderlein vero putat esse vocem hybridam a τῆθος—parvus, et villus"; he goes on to cite the Plautian reference quoted above.¹⁵ His subsequent statements deserve mention: "*Gronovius* compositam vocem putat ex *Titi*, nomine proprio pastoris vel caprarii, qui ex ovibus vel capris male curatis *villitium*, b.e. villos, pro lana colligere solitus esset: mos apud *M. Cornutum* legit *Titi villos* pro *Titivilles*."

These dual-word glosses and the interpretation "insignificant" became guidelines for future lexicographers down to our own day, but their definitions have necessarily been colored by the application of the name to the "infernal humorist" who collected overskipped syllables.¹⁶ Hence Diefenbach lists an impressive number of late medieval and early Renaissance "dictionaries" which classify the words "titrullus, titrillus, tintinulus" as synonyms for "duel or teuffel" and

¹¹ J. F. Gronovius, *M. Aclii Plautus Comoediae*, vol. I (London, 1829), 508.

¹² Note, *loc. cit.*

¹³ Cf. C. O. Müller's edition, 1880, p. 366; Bolte, p. 266.

¹⁴ Cf. Lersch, *De Abstrusis sermonibus*, 1844, p. xiv; Bolte, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵ Aegidio Forcellini, *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*, 4th ed. rev. by Francisco Corradine and Josepho Perin (Padua, 1940), IV, 738.

¹⁶ A. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1954), p. 686, records both. Alexander Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford, 1957), p. 421, limits his definition to Fulgentius' use of the word and ignores that of Plautus. A. Ernout and A. Meillet, in their *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (Paris, 1960), affirm that the word is a "forme peu sûre" and cite only Plautus and the sense "nullius significationis est."

only one that concerns itself with the decaying threads of cloth which seems to stem from Fulgentius.¹⁷ None of these impressive lexicons appears to have been particularly interested in the meaning “of no significance” so clearly stated in both Plautus and Paulus Diaconus, but the person to have first applied the name to the recording devil must have been aware of this initial meaning. Its originator might have had access to the definition of Paul the Deacon, or might merely have been exercising the prerogatives of monastic wit, which though sometimes not terribly apparent in later centuries seems not to have been wanting in the high middle ages. Whatever might have been the occasion which triggered the usage of the word as a proper name, the choice was fortunate from almost every point of view—and has incidentally provided scholars, early and late, with endless opportunities for conjecture and imaginative reconstruction.

Of the medieval attempts to interpret the name, one of the most interesting is the entry in the mid-fifteenth century *Promptorium Parvulorum* under the heading “Faytowrys gresse or tytymal” (variants “Tytymalle” or “tytuvalle”) which is explained thus: “A Faytowre was, as it seems, a conjuror, or a quack-salver, so called from the French faiteor or faiturier, a sorcerer; and thence the name was applied to itinerant pretenders to such skill, to mendicants, and generally to idle livers.”¹⁸ A more unusual method of arriving at the general implication of idleness and sloth in one form or another, or uselessness stemming from either of these or both, can hardly be imagined.

Other etymologies and early attempts at definition provide a context, albeit anachronistic, in which fourteenth-century usage of “Tutivillus” can be appreciated. In 1583, Cooper’s *Thesaurus* combined “An vgle thing of no value” and “A rotten thread” within its gloss;¹⁹ a bit later Cotgrave defined *coquette* as “a prattling or proud gossip, a fisking or flipperous minx, a cocket, or a tattling houswife; a titifill, flebergebit.”²⁰ But this was in 1611; by 1808 a much more scientific spirit was afoot, and the linguistic studies of Schelling and Grimm

¹⁷ Lawrence Diefenbach, *Glossarium latino-germanicum* (Frankfurt, 1857), p. 586, cites Th. Golii, *Onomasticon* (Strassburg, 1582) with reference to decaying threads. The Plautine signification seems supported by the MS “Lateinischniederdeutscher Vocabularius,” p. XIV, and by three early printed works: *Vocabularius theutonicus* (Nuremberg, c. 1482); the *Vocabularius incipiens teutonicum ante latinum* (no date given); and the *Vocabularius primo ponens dictiones theutonicas* (Strassburg, 1515).

¹⁸ Albert Way, ed., *Promptorium parvulorum sive clericorum* (London, 1843), p. 146.

¹⁹ Cooper had described “Titivilitium” as “an vgle thing of no value—a rotten thread.” Cited in Aurelia Henry’s note to Ben Jonson, *The Epicoene, or The Silent Woman* (New York, 1906), p. 230.

²⁰ Randle Cotgrave, *A Dictionaire of the French and English Tongues* (London, 1611).

had already deeply impressed the lexicographical world. Hence Jamieson found traces of the Near East in the word by connecting it with Iranian "tuatamhail, tuatavail," meaning "rustic" from "Tuata, tuath," country.²¹ Of course, the derivation provides a striking footnote to Gronovius' assertion that Plautus might have been referring to rustic men—the only confirmation of this hypothesis that I have been able to find, and one which, I suspect, was made without any adversion to the Latin context of the *Casinae*. Gronovius adverts to the possible meaning "rotten threads," but concludes that the word's use in many texts reflects a personal designation, and probably an evil spirit.²²

Other scholars through the centuries present variant views about the word, most rather prosaic, but two so original as to cause either immediate agreement or immediate laughter. On the duller side is the translation given in Lhuyd's *Archaeologia Britannica* which runs: "Titi-vilitium, Edai + hodr peth heb daly dim"²³—"a rotten thread of no value," or possibly a clownish fellow—from which inference of "boor-dom" Francis Douce concluded that the name was highly significant since all barbarous and uncouth words are the Devil's language and of his collecting.²⁴ A more exacting form of the controversy aimed to get at the roots of the word and define it on these premises. Collier objected strongly to Dyce's reference to the Latin "titivilitium—a thing of no worth" and proposed the simpler "totius" and "vilis"—an interesting conjecture, surely, although it ignores both the earliest usage of the word and later references to it.²⁵ But the most original (and amusing) of the derivators, F. Bücheler, was convinced that grammatical constructs really offered nothing toward the etymology of this term. He took it to be painfully evident that the first part of Plautus' "titivillicio" referred to a species of bird and the last just as obviously denoted some kind of tuft or bunch; consequently, the whole should be understood as a feather pen.²⁶

Twentieth-century etymologies generally follow those detailed above. The only recent, original derivation for Tutivillus was proposed

²¹ John Jamieson, *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language, Abridged* (Edinburgh, 1818), art. cit.

²² Unabridged edition (Paisley, 1887), pp. 646–7, and a note on p. 254.

²³ Edward Lhuyd, *Archaeologia Britannica*, vol. I (Oxford, 1707), 142. Ir.: "Logh-snaithae snaithe loghtha."

²⁴ Francis Douce, *Judicium* (London, 1822), p. 26.

²⁵ John Payne Collier, *op. cit.*, p. 223. Collier believes that the citation of the name as "tuta vilus" in the "New Interlude" of *Godly Queene Hester* (1561), p. 255, strongly confirms his derivation.

²⁶ F. Bücheler, "Zu Plautus, Seneca, und Persius," *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, II (1885), 119.

by Charles Samarin, who suggested that the name might be taken from *vitiligare* (by haplology *vitiligare*) “vétiller, chicaner” or better perhaps, an onomatopoetic suggestion from “titillare,” to tempt, “et de tintement, (*tinnire, tininnare*), ce qui, par un joli détour philologique, nous ramènerait à la sonnette éperdue du petit clerc Garigou, dans le *Trois messes basses*.”²⁷

Although no definite conclusions about the name can be advanced on the evidence presented here, some possibilities do emerge. Recent scholarship has indicated that Plautus’ plays might well have been among later medieval school texts, and therefore transmission of the term from Plautus might have been direct. Paulus Diaconus’ work might have been known to a monastic originator and compiler of preaching matter, but since we cannot positively cite the first writer to use the name, nor even be absolutely definite about the earliest text containing it, this possibility remains only a conjecture. Bücheler’s derivation, while interesting, seems hardly possible in the light of the medieval love for “auctoritee” and for imitation. Collier’s “totium villus” appears even less credible for the same reasons, and so I can only conclude that whoever chose to name the recording demon, wherever someone in the late thirteenth century penned “Tutivillus colligit horum,” showed an unerring sense of its appropriateness to this particular devil and a large measure of the imaginative wit which characterizes Western literature during the whole course of its history.

We have so far been considering the characterization of the devil who recorded faults by gathering them into his sack—a characterization which, along with his name of Tutivillus, would become available elements for the final, composite portrait of the recording demon. Despite the greater length of the early exempla which described his counterpart, the writing demon who recorded sins on parchment, the latter’s characterization is only slightly more developed than that of the sack carrier. A worthy man of some sort sees an evil one stretching parchment and questions his actions; the demon responds by delineating in almost syllogistic fashion the cause-effect relationship of what has been observed: idle words occasion a crowded ledger which must be stretched and which consequently breaks; the resulting sequence includes the holy man’s warning, the congregation’s response of lamentation and penitence, and the subsequent erasure of the scroll. Prior, therefore, to any individuating details is the specification of the writing materials and the placement of the infernal

²⁷ “Tutivillus, démon des copistes,” in *Mélanges*, pp. 309–10.

inscriber in a particular physical context. The former gave the medieval storyteller several delightful options, one of the earliest being surprisingly akin to the description accorded to Caesarius' sack-carrying outfielder: inkhorn over his shoulder, parchment in his left hand and pen in his right, maintains Vincent of Beauvais, the devil was listening to two gossiping women and making notes to be used in accusations against the members of the church.²⁸ Such clarity of detail was rare in Latin recountings which most frequently settled for "diabolus scribens," but specific details became the rule in vernacular renditions where the scribbler is pictured "wiþ penne and enke and parchemin,"²⁹ or holding "penne and parchemen yn honde"³⁰ or "ein Bocksfell ausgespannt / Eine Feder in der Hand."³¹

The specific details of the writing demon's immediate physical context are determined by the person who happened to see him. If he was viewed only by a "holy man in a church," then he made his abode usually in or near the sanctuary; but if he was spotted by an altar server and if, indeed, women were involved in the action, then the writing devil's position might be affected by the placement of any member of this "cast." A deacon proclaiming the Good News would be facing the congregation; a celebrant, whose gaze was arrested during Mass itself, would probably be looking, in those days of unturned altars, toward the reredos or beyond it into the shadowy East end of the church. Consequently, the scribbler is spied "retro altare" most often when only a single *sacerdos* or *sanctus homo* is granted the vision. When the narrative includes other characters, the writing devil achieves something like his sack-carrying counterpart's mobility. He could be seated at the church portal, or wedged into the lower section of a pulpit, or perched snugly on top of a pillar.³² Several raconteurs, taking a cue from Vincent of Beauvais, put him in, above, or next to "a wyndow-on þe walle,"³³ generally towards the church's front so that his actions would be quite unequivocal. But the more enjoyable *excursus* on the writing devil's position occur when he has taken up a berth near the women whose words occasion his demonic activity.

²⁸ *Speculum Historiale*, VII, 118.

²⁹ John Audelay, "De Meritis Misse," Whiting, ed., p. 75.

³⁰ Robert of Brunne, *Handlyng Synne*, Furnivall, ed., p. 290.

³¹ *Helvetia sancta*, in Wyss, ed., p. 202.

³² Gobius, fol. m: "in porta ecclesie"; *Helvetia sancta*, Wyss, ed., p. 202: "Unter Justus Kanzel sass / In der Ecke Satanas"; Röhrich, p. 114: "in pertica sedentem."

³³ Audelay: "through"; *Lay Folks Mass Book*: "in a wyndow"; *Speculum Historiale*: "supra fenestram in fronte ecclesie"; Add. MS 15833, fol. 174v: "in quadam fenestra sedentem"; *Sele trost*, p. 65: "in eyne fynster."

Though some texts claim that he is situated “super eas,”³⁴ Robert Mannyng found such language too imprecise and commented that the scribbler was “betwyn hem to, Pryvyly be-hynde here bake.”³⁵ Myrk endows the scene with even greater interest by placing his devil “on hor [the women’s] schuldrys.”³⁶ But such a post makes the wonderful head-hitting incident well-nigh impossible and is not repeated by other storytellers.

The person granted the vision is invariably not on the guilty list; but those who are, and what the devil writes about them, also has some bearing on his characterization. DeVitry had confined the scribbler’s province mainly to *verba ociosa* and this phrase, periodically supplemented by a list of perpetrators, characterizes most of his activity. But depending on the group to be exhorted, some exempla elaborated on this. The *Liber Exemplorum* gives a specific content to the devil’s scroll: “peccata que fiebant in ecclesia, ridendo, loquendo, servicium dei impediendo”;³⁷ to this catalog Herolt adds “verba dissolutiones.”³⁸ A certain Justus, whose problem was that he preached his congregation to sleep, revealed to his nodding flock that the writing devil took special note of such slothful slumbers and dreams.³⁹ But the elaboration of the implications contained in “idle and inane speech” is especially apparent when the principal sinners are female. In several texts the recording demon is busily occupied with the laughing, jangling, and “rownings” of distaff members of the congregation.⁴⁰ Eventually, though, the writing devil’s victims embraced a group more disparate than chattering women and his function superseded the recording of *acedia*. Caxton was probably the last author to declare categorically through a recording demon: “It is slouth whan thou art in chyrch and

³⁴ As in MS Add. 33956, fol. 26^r.

³⁵ Robert of Brunne, ed. Furnivall, p. 290.

³⁶ *Mirk’s Festial*, ed. Theodor Erbe EETS, ES 96 (London, 1905), pp. 279–80.

³⁷ A. G. Little, ed., p. 67.

³⁸ *Promptuarium Exemplorum*, Exemplum XVI, E.

³⁹ Wyss, *ibid.*:

Und verzeichnet al zu’ Hauf
In ein lang Register auf
Was da schlummert; was da träumt,
Und der Seele Heil versäumt;
Denkt, dass er am jüngsten tag
Sammethaft sie sischen mag,
Wenn er schwarz auf weiss es hätt’
Wer zur Predigt schlafen thät.

⁴⁰ *Jacob’s Well*, ed. Brandeis, p. 115; *The Book of the Knight of the Tower*, ed. Offord, p. 49.

oughtest to praye God & thou troublest and lettest other";⁴¹ the recorder of slothful deeds found his province quickly extending to "omnia peccata." Following Gobius, Major's *Magnum Speculum Exemplorum* is a concrete illustration of the conflation of deadly sins characteristic of later texts: the devil that Major's *sacerdos devotus* saw was inscribing "mendacia, detractioes, aspectus inpudicos, cogitationes immundas, vanitates, & omnia peccata populi tui quae hodie in ista Ecclesia commiserunt."⁴²

The tablet or parchment or scroll, over which the recording demon labors, is the occasion for the most memorable developments in his characterization. In several of the versions which closely follow deVitry, the "pergamentum" remains quite whole and is cleansed through penance, confession, the congregation's tears, or some other salutary action.⁴³ In these exempla the writing devil merely sits in a high place and continues his task until, discovered and exposed, his notations suitably erased, he too disappears with as little fuss as did his scribblings. But the lofty perch near the church's roof or near a non-yielding wall, and the easily imagined necessity for the parchment's stretching were compelling goads to most storytellers. Quite early in the narrative's development, the writing material—one end in the devil's hand and the other, stretched to its limit, in his mouth—rips asunder and "tunc capud graviter ad parietem allisit,"⁴⁴ an irresistible force and an immovable object clash "cum magno impetu."⁴⁵ Although most narrators contend that the devil's efforts were expended to make a long parchment longer, the Knight of La Tour Landry assures his daughters that the skin was originally short and consequently the devil "plucked harde to haue it made lenger with his tethe and it scaped out of hys mouthe and his hede had a gret stroke ayenst the

⁴¹ *Doctrinal of Sapyence*, p. 35.

⁴² Major, p. 340.

⁴³ Gobius and Major emphasize that the congregation, having been admonished by the priest, "perfecte fuissent confessi"; Herolt says that Martin, "predicans verbum dei et omnibus exhortatis ad confessionem, coegit diabolus delere quod scripserat"; Harley MS 463, fol. 19^v (and several others) repeat deVitry: "Quod audiens sacerdos cepit ea referre populo et omnes hoc audientes ceperunt dolere et conteri quibus dolentibus et poenitentibus dyabolus quae scripserat delere cepit; ita quod cedula vacua remansit"; MS Arundel 506, fol. 22^r comments: "Cum autem populus audiret peccata sua scripta a dyabolo, fleuerunt amare omnes audientes et ita deleta fuerunt eorum peccata"; Harley MS 268, fol. 34^r also gives the laurels to Martin: "Beatus autem martinus populo predicavit et contriti sunt omnes et confessi ita quod diabolus coactus est delere quicquid in pergamento scripserat." cf. MSS Canon Misc. 532, fol. 104^r, and Laud 471, fol. 122^r.

⁴⁴ MS Add. 33956, fol. 26^r.

⁴⁵ MS Arundel 506, fol. 20^r.

wall."⁴⁶ Probably the most dramatic presentation of this action occurs in the Vernon manuscript:

He wrot so faste til þat he want,
For his parchemyn skin was so scant,
To speken þei hadde such space.
Wiþ his teeþ he gon hit togge,
And so radli he gon hit Rogge,
þat al þe Rolle gon race.

So harde raced he þat Rolle,
þat he chopped his Cholle,
A-zeyn þe Marbel-ston.
Al þe folk I þe chirche A-bout
Was a-stoneid of þat clout,
And herden hit euerichone.⁴⁷

The aftermath of the parchment's tearing provided another golden opportunity for narrative development. Though the *Jacob's Well* homilies studiously avoid detailing such undignified behavior,⁴⁸ the most immediate and perhaps the most universal result was the observer's laughter—a reaction which had a variety of effects on the devil in question. For instance, according to Vincent of Beauvais, the scroll's splitting apart caused the devil to lose his balance and tumble to the ground, thereby shaking the very foundations of the church.⁴⁹ It was only as a consequence of this shaking that the clerk, in Vincent's telling, burst into laughter. Some versions merely remark on the sound of the collision and solemnly aver that the devil suffered a wound to his head.⁵⁰ One of the more clever variations in the writing-devil tales—that which incorporates the lady-with-the-train exemplum—shows how she, perceiving the great concussion which resulted from the devil's making contact with the wall, was filled with fear and, upon asking what caused the shock, was informed that it was directly related to her train's crossing the threshold of the church "quod audiens mulier caudam illam super limen ecclesie resecari fecit dicens se vele illam vestem portare ad confusionem diaboli quam diu dura-

⁴⁶ Offord, ed., p. 50.

⁴⁷ Simmons, ed., p. 137.

⁴⁸ Brandeis, ed., p. 115: "& whan his scrowe was to lytel, he drewe it out wyth his teeth broddere; and in his drawyng he smote his heuyd azens þe walle. An holy man sey3 þis, & askyd þe feend why he dyde so."

⁴⁹ *Speculum Historiale*, VII, 118.

⁵⁰ As in MS Royal 8, C, XII, fol. 24^{rb} and MS Harley 755, fol. 15^{rb}.

ret."⁵¹ The *Scala Coeli*'s earnest recorder, positioned unsteadily near the church door (the better to take note of early escapees), saw the Blessed Virgin herself sitting "retro altare." Anxious to finish his work and in process of stretching his "rotulum," this monkey-like devil fell "cum magno strepitu," dropping his demonic ledger practically into the lap of the local subdeacon who then descended into *levitas*.⁵² Such is the outcome in most of the tales which preserve the delightfully comic effect of the devil's banging his pate to the distraction of the server below. The only effect more universal than laughter is the repentance which follows upon the head-hitting revelation of the devil's presence.

Laughter, however, while it is a spontaneous reaction to diabolic misfortune, tended to be unacceptable behavior during divine services and often got the observer into trouble. Versions of the narrative which are developed to this point frequently offer some proof of the devil's actual presence. The Blessed Virgin intercedes efficaciously for a cleric in trouble in both John of Garland and Vincent of Beauvais, but she explains herself most thoroughly in Gobius: the *symea* was the devil; the *scriptura* were sins; the *fumus* (a unique detail) was the ornamentation of the women. The subdeacon is counselled to reveal all the sins inscribed on the roll "et etiam alia que sunt secuta ex ornamentis vanis," while the Virgin proceeds to make acceptable explanations to the irate Bishop.⁵³ In other cases, however, tangible evidence of the scribbler's accident remains, thus obviating the necessity for Mary's assistance to clerics who might be harshly treated for laughter or similar lapses in discipline. The acolyte Austin in the Vernon manuscript's "How to Hear Mass" is reproved by celebrant Gregory, and Austin explains at some length the fiend's foul face as he wrote and the "dasch" of his head "a3eyn þe marbel stone":

Lord greue 3e not for þat dunt
 He stoneyd me and made me stunt
 Stille out of my steuene.
 I wol sigge as I se3e
 For a word wol I not ly3e
 By mihtful kyng of heuene.⁵⁴

⁵¹ MS Arundel 506, fol. 20^r.

⁵² Gobius, fol. m.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Simmons, ed., p. 138.

Leading the Pope to the window, Austin shows him the spot where
the fiend was seen, and, sure enough, the devil's blood

Foul þei find þer I-sched
As blac as pich was I-spred
Uppon þe Aschelers euene.⁵⁵

This was doubtless a miracle, the text assures us, because devils do not really have blood; but it was nevertheless marvelously visible in order that all might learn that they must keep quiet during the Mass. A similar proof of diabolic presence occurs in John Audelay's *De meritis misse*. Maintaining that he saw a "sathanas" whom he identifies as "Roffyn" with bleeding head, Augustine leads the Pope to the window:

þo Saynt Gregore was adred
Fore blak blood he se e-spred.⁵⁶

Gregory, suitably impressed, ordered that the tale be told at every Mass "fore þer is ne word þat 3e speke / Bot 3e don syn."⁵⁷

Though exempla compilers do not seem concerned to make us visualize the writing devil as a creature of flesh and blood, they often endow him with personal characteristics which make it impossible to imagine him in any other way. Quite frequently he displays rather developed human consciousness and feelings. The *Mariu Saga's* demon, when recording the failings of the congregation before him, begins to calculate, in a manner typical of one who "counts his chickens," the rich harvest he will reap for the infernal regions.⁵⁸ Equally memorable is Bromyard's outlining of Tutivillus' administrative activities.⁵⁹ Other recorders turn toward their subjects with nods that speak volumes or seem possessed of the proverbial roving eye.⁶⁰ But

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ Whiting, ed., p. 76. Ruffin(us) was a rather common name for the evil one; see Mabel Day, ed., *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwele*, EETS, O S 225 (London, 1952), p. 109.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Ungar, ed., pp. 469-70.

⁵⁹ In the "Ordo Clericalis," II, xxvi.

⁶⁰ Gobius, fol. m: "qui oculos reuolens ad omnes exeuntes de ecclesia rotulum scripturis impleuit." The demon of MS Laud. Misc. 471, fol. 120^r answers his priestly questioner: "'omnes cincopas scribebat et etiam omnia verba ociosa tamen a viris quam a mulieribus prolata.' His autem dictis, propicit demon versus mulieres, risit. Item interrogavit causam risionis sue, ad hec ait: 'Vidi alium demonem, socium meum, duas feminas colloquentes amplexari . . .'"

perhaps the most extensive development of the writing devil's feelings is contained in Mannyng's *Handlyng Synne*. In a lengthy colloquy with the "holy" celebrant at the end of Mass, the deacon explains his laughing at the scribbler:

whan hys rolle was wryte alle ful,
 To drawe hyt out he gan to pul;
 with hys teþe he gan to drawe,
 And harde for to tugge and gnawe,
 þat hys rolle to-braste and rofe;
 And hys hede azens þe walle drofe
 So hard, and so ferly sore,
 Whan hys parchemen was no more.

whan y say þat, y lete so gode,
 Y brast on laghter þere y stode,
 þat he so moche sorow hadde,
 As hys wrytyng was alle to-fade;
 And whan he parceyued þat y wyste,
 He al to-drofe hyt with hys fyste,
 And went a-wey, alle for shame;
 þarfore y logh and hadde gode game.⁶¹

Certainly, if one were tabulating the high points in the recording demon's personality development, one would unhesitatingly choose for the sack carrier the *Myroure of Oure Ladye's* "poor deuul" who elicits our sympathy in the face of his constant fear of beating and Mannyng's overanxious scrivener who, in something like *Piers Plowman's* "pure teene," smashes what is left of the broken parchment with his fist and slinks away.

Thus far our attention has been focused on describing the character of Tutivillus as it emerges from the "quidam demon" of simpler tales. It is also worth observing briefly the coloration given this characterization by the purpose motivating various tellers of the story. In general, both the sack-carrier and writing-devil exempla direct their commentary to a rather universal audience. True, the sack carrier's early clientele seemed to encompass only those in religious houses, but such exclusively monastic overtones were eliminated very early in the tradition and from then on, even if a burdened demon were observed going busily about a choir, his actions and the concomitant warning against careless prayer were to be heeded by all the faithful, even children. The writing devil's antics have a more complicated relation-

⁶¹ Furnivall, ed., p. 292.

ship to their audience since they seem contrived to frighten women for a goodly portion of their literary history but eventually come full circle to include, as they did in the deVitry version, "all idle talkers." Ultimately it might be said that the creators of both recorders aim their barbs at "jangers"—the first group jangles while at prayer, the second jangles during the prayer of others.

The kinds of incentive presented for taking to heart these admonitory narratives do not permit such easy generalization, although the writing devil's significance is fairly uniform. Even when his interest extends to include snoring, he still retains his original charge of recording slothful action and each exemplum's warning against this type of sin rings loud and clear. The object of such counsel could vary widely: the most proximate result might be the erasure of the scroll;⁶² the most simplistic, the avoidance of disturbance during any divine service;⁶³ the most ecclesial, doubtless, the impetus towards efficacious confession and repentance;⁶⁴ the most eschatological, that doomsday might reveal no blot on one's name.⁶⁵ Doomsday recriminations are also evident in those versions of the sack-carrier tale initiated by Etienne de Bourbon in which the receptacles are preserved either as witnesses to ecclesiastical laxity or as instruments of torment in the afterlife. But the widespread tradition which stems from Caesarius' castigation of *indeuotus clamor* and *inanis gloria* renders imprecise the specific moral target of tales of the sack carrier. Because the

⁶² Forms of the verb "delere" appear in almost every recounting of the story from Jacques deVitry onward.

⁶³ Audelay (Whiting, ed., p. 76) recapitulates nicely the prescriptions of Robert Mannyng and the Knight of the Tower:

þerfore serys with good wyl
 Loke þat 3e hold 3ou styl
 þe cherche when 3e bene in
 A prest to stone in his masse
 Al a lond may fare þe worse
 Out of wo to wyn.

⁶⁴ See note 43. Mirk summarizes the syndrome well, ed. Erbe, p. 280: "Then aftyr masse, by byddyng of þys deken, þe byschop send aftyr þes woymen and asket hom how þay had occupyet þe masse tyme, þen sayd þay how þay haddyn sayde hor 'Pater Noster.' Then þe bischop commawndet þe fende forto rede þat he had wrytton and when he had red all þat þay hadden talked of, þay fellen downe to þe grownde and asked mercy."

⁶⁵ Röhrich, p. 114, transcribes a fourteenth-century manuscript with a timely warning: "Cavete ergo vobis et locum domini in reverentia habeatis, quia ibi deus presens est cum suis angelis et sanctis"; but the caveat is oriented more toward doomsday in *Jacob's Well* (ed. Brandeis, p. 115) where the fiend answers his clerical inquisitor: "I wryte þise talys of þe peple in þis cherche, to recordyn hem a-fore god at þe doom for here dampnacyoun."

words that provoke Caesarius' ire are not clipped or overskipped but rather shouted and discordant, and because the vice to be extirpated is a form of pride or excessive self-determination, no one fault can be isolated as various versions merge. If one wishes to indicate the strongest moral of the sack-carrier redactions, outside of Caesarius, it would probably be the avoidance of punishment.

For the development of his characterization, Tutivillus owed much to each strain of the recording demon exemplum. Facets of his personality can be discerned in both, for both evolve to the point where the demon takes on human traits and feelings. His diabolic antics might also be said to come from either recension: the sack carrier races around choirs; the writer stretches, bangs, falls, erases, causes laughter, slinks away—all or some of these depending on which version one consults. Tutivillus' name, quite obviously, is a contribution of the sack-carrier stories, as is his connection with the portents of eternal punishment. To the writing-devil narratives must be traced the recorder's concern with the evils of idle gossip, since admonitions against that vice are infrequent in the sack-carrier tradition and those that exist there may be present only by reason of their association with the scribbler strain. However, the sack carrier's consistent link with pride might well be responsible for the ease with which the Towneley catalogue of Tutivillus' diabolic activities includes a host of sins other than sloth, a catalogue which seems at several points rather to concentrate on the chief of the capital faults.

The early fifteenth-century recording demon had, nevertheless, just about reached the acme of his career in the exempla narratives. Balanced precariously on the didactic summit of sermon development and on the figurative pinnacle of a church whose discipline and interior strength were quickly eroding, his only possible movement seemed to be the downward one forecast by Vincent of Beauvais. But then, one of the marvelous vagaries of literary history occurred: the Wakefield Master incorporated Tutivillus into the Towneley Cycle. And so, the steep slopes which threatened to follow those narrative peaks were converted into a flat stage from which the recording demon would maintain his literary importance for almost a hundred years.

IV



Tutivillus in the Drama

It is no accident of literary history that Tutivillus' career should have taken him from book and pulpit to the stage. Entertaining, absorbing, and often enlightening, the mysteries, miracles, and moralities of the later Middle Ages must have had an effect on towns and hamlets comparable to that of television in the mid-twentieth century. Their popularity was inevitable, their expansion a foregone conclusion. In order to continue their growth, however, it was necessary that they continually capture the imaginations of their audience, that their stage settings become more intricate, their costumes more remarkable, their plots more sophisticated, their characterizations more appealing. Having observed the literary development of the recording demon in the exempla of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries and the concomitant shaping of Tutivillus' personality, we recognize a figure ripe for the playwright's picking. But remarkably, what we have noted in the narrative burgeoning of the story—an ever-increasing tendency to detail and concretize this devil's person and activities—is not continued in the dramatic mode where images are more fixed.¹ What is apparent, and this may reflect a decline in fear of the spirit world, is the shift in emphasis and focus which is a corollary of satire. In fact, satiric elements in the presentation of Tutivillus become ever more important in the plays and slowly overshadow the theological and didactic intentions of the earlier sack-carrying and writing devil stories. Despite his well-known name and intermittent allusion to sermon backgrounds, the Tutivillus of the drama gradually assumes a new literary identity.

Although the high points of Tutivillus' dramatic career are his appearances in the Towneley *Judicium* and in the Macro morality *Man-kind*, his popular appeal is also traceable through the German and French fifteenth-century plays in which he functions as a *dramatis persona*. Usually, he is placed among the most trusted henchmen of the infernal emperor. In the *Redentiner Osterspiel*, composed about the

¹ Kastor, p. 16.

middle of the fifteenth century, Tutivillus is a member of a quasi-parliament of devils who lament (in great detail) the salvation of the world. To the dismay of the nether regions, Tutivillus' account of his demonic activities is neither long nor impressive.² His rather poor showing in the Redentin play is only partially remedied in *Das Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel* of approximately the same date. Reflecting the fifteenth century's freedom in criticizing religious affairs, the author(s) manage to make fun of several saints as well as of church practice. The devil Thittwil, for instance, seizes a recalcitrant damned soul by the "Maria-Magdalenscene," where the salvific process is the diametrical opposite of his activity.³ Thittwil, however, although he exults in the catch as much as Lucifer's other trusted henchmen, really occupies a subordinate position. What is important in this play is Tutivillus' obvious function at Doomsday. Tutivillus is again marginally connected with Mary Magdalene in the Fourth Erlauer Spiel, the *Ludus Mariae Magdalene in gaudio*. Here he must defend his actions and his work because Lucifer demands, in no uncertain terms, an immediate accounting. Styled the "third devil," a position he also occupies in the Towneley *Judicium*, "Tutivill" justifies his diabolic status by referring to his skill in catching the ladies.⁴

² *Redentiner Osterspiel*, ed. Carl Schroder (Norden, 1893), p. 64:

Here, des wes van my bericht:
Ik en was vorgheves ute nicht,
Tutevillus bun ik ghenant
Den schomaker bringe ik an myner hant.
Dar mede bun ik dy underdan. (ll. 1893–7)

Schroder proposes 1464 as a likely date of composition; see p. 5.

³ As Teiel Mansholt describes it, "Hat er dann einen guten Fang gemacht so kommt er wie ein guter Jagdhund zu seinem Herrn gelaufen und verkündigt ihm frohlockend den Erfolg seines Wirkens; einige Male vertritt 'unus dyabolus' seine Stelle. Der Teufel Thittwil greift nur bei der Maria-Magdalenscene ein und ist von ganz untergeordneter Bedeutung." See *Das Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel* (Marburg Dissertation, 1892), p. 38.

⁴ *Erlauer Spiele*, ed. Karl F. Kummer (Wien, 1882), p. 97:

(Lucifer:) Tutivill, Tutivill,
wie leist du so still,
wo pist do so lange?
du must werden erhangen.

Tutivill dicit:
Waffen, her waffen,
wi ubel han ich das verslaffen!
ich het ein frau gar betrogen,
das ich sei in di hell het schir gezogen;
di ist mir nu entrunden
und ist warden zu einer nunnen.

In the *Pfarrkircher* and *Haller Passionsspiele*, which antedate by a few years the three plays discussed above, a devil called "Titinil" has a much more extensive role than that found in the slightly later texts. He does take part in a devils' parliament but he details his activities with aplomb. Also, the familiar connection of our devil with prattling ladies in church leads the author of this *Passion* into a minor tirade against ecclesiastical abuses—and Tutivillus becomes sponsor of them all.⁵ The loss of the exempla tradition's focus on sloth is quite obvious here—as is a shift in characteristic attitude. Tutivillus is primarily a devil, not a "recorder" and "bagger," and the emphasis on his diabolic importance rather than on his unique personality may explain aspects of his presence in other late-medieval plays where merely the name Tutivillus was sufficient to establish a series of relationships in

das si uns mit warden ist,
des mus ich in di hell zu diser frist. (ll. 68–79)

Kummer dates this play no more precisely than "fifteenth century," but I judge from the contents that mid-fifteenth might be more accurate.

⁵ *Altdeutsche Passionsspiele aus Tirol*, ed. Joseph Wackernell (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 265–6:

Decimus diabolus Titinil:

Ich pin genant der furst Titinil.
Das ist mein kunst, auch wil,
Das ich mug alzeit gefleissen
Und andacht von den lewten reyssen:
Ich mach si in der kirch gin und gaffen
Und dy frawen von ieren nachparen klaffen. (ll. 1276–81)

Thus far the quotation is from the main text, the *Pfarrkircher Passion*; in the *Haller Passion*, after line 1281, occurs the following passage which is sometimes assigned to Titinil:

Sunst mit meinem namen hayss ich Seltnfrum
Und mach die leut in der peicht zu stum,
Das kains im herczn woll vergebn
Und gleich nach der peicht als vor streben.
Ich lass auch niemantz gern vasten.
Aber an suntag mach ich die leut rasten,
Das sy lang luntschn in irem pett,
Bis das die sun allenthalbn auf gett.
Und wan man darnack zu kirchn ist gangen,
So ton die leut auf dem freithoff umber prangen,
Bis das man das wandl glock leut:
So dringens und sechn von verren weit
Und thuen also umb sy plickhen,
Sam wellens das sacrament selber schlicken.
So pald aber das selb ain ende hat,
So eilns aus der kirchn dratt
Und kumen dan zu dem pesten wein,
Dapey sy dan den gancz tag sein.

the minds of the audience and to insure at the same time both acceptance and comprehension.

This latter phenomenon is especially obvious in certain French fifteenth-century texts where Tutivillus makes a brief appearance. The play entitled *L'Assomption de la Vierge* has a "Tithinilus," who unfortunately remains offstage and is, therefore, never seen performing his scribal duties. The Angel Gabriel arrives from heaven in order to announce to Mary that the end of her earthly life is fast approaching. Mary falls sick and the apostles are miraculously transported by angels to her bedside, despite the great distances occasioned by their preaching missions. They join in prayer as she dies and immediately a great battle ensues as the demons vie to get possession of her soul. Lucifer sends Satan to earth, armed with his full powers and with a procurator signed "TITHINILUS notaire et greffier des Enfers."⁶ The devils are shortly proved to have been overconfident; Michael terrifies Satan while Jesus descends from heaven in order to carry thither the soul of his mother. Despite the diabolic machinations and the supposed power of attorney the evil ones possess through the signature of Tutivillus, their enterprise is doomed to failure. Not only is there no justice in their cause but, as we have observed previously in sermon literature, Tutivillus also possessed no power over the Virgin, nor could he outwit her. The play's description of him as "notaire" and "greffier" further points to a popular knowledge of his traditional activities.

Tutivillus assumes a dramatic role quite similar to that of the *Haller Passionsspiel* in the *Mystère de Saint Louis*, composed about 1470. Here, in the section detailing the "Second Day" of the devilish plot to cause the saintly Louis to commit sin, Tutivillus returns from a demonic

Resuming now with line 1282 of the *Pfarrkircher* text:

Ich lasz dy gotz gab nit geren frey:
 Ich vermisch dar unter simoney
 Mit münichen, pärtling und pfaffen.
 Ich hat auch gar vil zw schaffen
 Mit witben, nunnan und petschwestern,
 Die peger ich andacht an get,
 Ye pas mier der sin zw in stet:
 Ich mach sy hoffertig und gayl,
 Also pring ich sy an mein sayl.

The *Haller* version also adds, after line 1283, the following couplet:

Oder almuesn gebn zu ruem und gesicht,
 Das selbig von reichen gar oft geschicht . . .

⁶ Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, vol. II (Paris, 1880), 471.

mission and reports to a curious Lucifer the success of his endeavors. On his "papier groz," however, he has inscribed offenses much more specific than those of the German play: not only are forgotten syllables recorded but also the name of poor Dan Jaque, who forgot "le jour de Pasque." The list of those corrupted by sins of omission encompasses almost every type of clerical person from Cathedral canons to recluses, from cloistered monks and nuns to parish clergy. Diligently, our devil did some of his accustomed "work" in monastic choirs, but he seems to have relished more his conquest of those who, for various delightful reasons, conveniently absented themselves from prescribed prayers.⁷ Though this Titynullus is a personable addition to the French

⁷ *Le Mystère de Saint Louis*, ed. Francisque Michel (London, 1871), p. 170:

Titynullus: Hau, hau! Lucifer, je reviens;
 Vous ay-je point trop fait attendre?
 Lucifer: Faux mastin, je te feray pendre;
 Pourquoi as-tu tant demouré?
 Titynullus: Lucifer, je le vous diré.
 J'ay esté par tous ces monstiers,
 Comme aux Carmez, au Cordeliers,
 Aux Augustines, aux Jacobinz,
 Aux Bernadinz, aux XV^{xx},
 Aux Blans-Manteaux et aux Billettez,
 Aux Filles-Dieu et au Nonnettez,
 Aux Recluses, aux Corcelierez,
 Et puis j'ay adressé mes alez
 En cez eglisez cathedralez,
 Où il y a sy gras chanoineez.
 J'ay esté après sur ces moyennez
 Blans et noîrz et sur ces hermitez,
 Qui contrefont lez ypocritez,
 Et ay mis en j. papier groz
 En escript lez vers et lez mos
 Qu'ilz ont laissé choir en disant
 Leur heurez: g'y estoye duisant,
 Qui m'eust laissé jusqu'à demain,
 Ves-en cy j. grant sac tout plain:
 Il y a au feillet premier
 Les matinez d'un cordelier,
 Qui laissa j'en suis souvenant,
 Le jour de karesme-prenant
 Pour aler boire du meilleur.
 Vezcy la prime d'un prescheur
 Qui estoit appelé *dan Jaque*,
 Qu'il oublia le jour de Pasque
 Derrainez, j'en suis asseuré.
 Vecy lez vesprez d'un curé,
 Qu'il laissa, et lez kirielez,
 Pour aler souffler lez chandellez
 Qui ardoient trop longuement.

dramatic portrayal of the recording demon, he still falls far short of the Towneley devil's more inclusive activity. Nevertheless, Tithynillus' gleeful assertion that his sack contains a variety of omitted "hours" and even a whole Lenten day makes this French demon very much the counterpart of the English Tutivillus.

The accoutrements of the recording demon's traditional functions can also be found in several French dramas in which the name Tutivillus does not appear at all. Most striking of these is the *Miracles de Sainte Genviève*: Satan directs his cohorts to check their records, whereupon they all study their rolls.⁸ The connection of the roll with the recording demon must have been commonplace at the time of composition of this early fifteenth-century play,⁹ but its application to all the demons onstage without differentiation remains unique. More remote from Tutivillus' traditional role but still noteworthy are two other dramatic associations of a devil with writing. In the late fourteenth-century *Mystère de Saint Jean Chrysostome et sa Mere* occur two separate conflicts between the saint and the devil. In the first, when Jean wishes to record a miracle with which he has been favored, "le diable vient qui le raille et renverse son encrier; alors il écrit avec sa salive, et les lettres qu'il trace se detachent en or."¹⁰ Later in the mystery, when Jean is a Bishop, the devil again conspires against him by writing a letter injurious to the king in a hand similar to that of Jean himself. The King, quite furious, removes Jean from his See and the holy man retires to a monastery. However, through the help of the Virgin the wiles of the evil one are later revealed and Jean is restored to all his former dignities. In the early fifteenth century we again find the devil connected with written matter, but this time he takes an apostle as opponent. In the mystery *Les Actes des Apôtres*, Book Three, Lucifer asks one of his devils, apparently an authority on the subject, if it would be possible to re-convert Paul from his zealous Christianity. The devil, wishing to be as thorough as possible, investigates the contents of his notebook carefully and answers that all the powers of hell would not be sufficient for the undertaking.¹¹ Clearly, the devil consulted was a dependable "recorder" and his "book" is easily recognized as the recording demon's scroll.

Much more worthy of extended consideration is a play entitled *Le*

⁸ A. Jubinal, ed., *Mystères Inédits du xv^e Siècle*, vol. I (Paris, 1837), 232. The play is dated as early fifteenth century.

⁹ Cf. Bolte, *op. cit.*, p. 258, note 8.

¹⁰ Julleville, p. 240.

¹¹ Heinrich Wieck, *Die Teufel auf der Mysterienbühne Frankreichs* (Leipzig, 1887), p. 23.

Mystère de la vraie hystoire de monseigneur saint Martin. The text proceeds through the early events of Martin's life and recounts his various generousities to the poor, arriving eventually at the occasion when he gives his tunic to a naked man despite the protestations of his deacon and the imminence of his celebration of the Mass. Clad only in a scanty chasuble, which reveals his bare arms, Martin begins the liturgy; almost immediately an Angel arrives and places golden coverings on the bare members. The miracle causes two women in the church to exclaim in wonder to each other and shortly their conversation turns to more worldly things:

Blondine: Alyson sen est elle allee
 Grand piece a que ie ne la vy.
 Polye: Elle est allee veoir son amy
 Le Joliuet de la barelle.
 Blondine: Le dyable y soit la macquerelle
 Froncline luy est venu dire.
 Sathan: Je ne puis plus icy escrire,
 Mon roolle est tout plein de langage.
 Je lalongeray comme sage.

(Lors il tire son parchemin avecq les dentz, tant que il le rompt
 et se frappe la teste contre la paroy)

Bricet (en riant): Ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha.
 Sathan: Je nen feray plus, cest assez.¹²

Brice's laughter at the devil's discomfiture causes the evil one to slink away; nevertheless, the deacon must make an accounting of his laughter to the Bishop after the celebration. Fortunately, Brice easily convinces Martin of the truth, since the Bishop himself was a frequent victim of demonic attack.

Though named Sathan in this text, the devil cast in the role of recorder of idle words can be none other than the scribe Tutivillus who, generally unnamed, had been jotting down the idle chatter of churchgoing folk for centuries. The dramatic context also captures the familiar celebrant/acolyte theme which was a constant in the exemplum tradition since John of Garland and Vincent of Beauvais. We have also seen that the principals Martin and Brice can be found in this story as early as the *Liber Exemplorum* (1275) and were the most consistently-named of all the ecclesial pairs in the writing-devil nar-

¹² *Le mystère de la vie hystoire de monseigneur saint Martin* (Paris, 1841), fol. R, 4^b. Cf. Julleville, pp. 535 ff.

ratives. Polly and Blondine are, of course, the imaginative creation of the anonymous playwright and Satan's rather unceremonious retreat lacks the dramatic effectiveness of several later sermon narratives. It must be said of this presentation of Tutivillus in particular, and in general of his various roles in both French and German late medieval drama, that they are inevitably overshadowed by this devil's English development—a development which marks the real climax of his literary career.

The Towneley Tutivillus—the only specifically named evil spirit in the English *Judicium* plays—is the Wakefield Master's creation. We have observed above that, in the various Latin and Vernacular narratives in which he had appeared prior to his debut at N-Towne, Tutivillus' literary personality exhibited a growing attractiveness. His original role as recorder of slothful words—it made little difference whether these belonged to idle women in church, or to “jangers, overhippers and momelers,” or whether they proceeded from the mouths of careless monks in the recitation of the Divine Office—was undergoing expansion. His accoutrements, parchment or sack or both, were widely known; his name conjured up a series of appropriate responses as well as the familiar verse: “Fragmina verborum/Tutivillus colligit horum.”

The Wakefield Master gets the utmost out of each of these narrative characteristics and then adds the satiric touch which is drama's contribution to Tutivillus' development. The result is neither unnerving nor sadistic,¹³ neither comic *diablerie* nor chuckling terror,¹⁴ but *com-media* in the fullest sense, demonstrating justice, truth, and propriety.¹⁵ Especially in the Wakefield pageant (considerably more so than in any of the other Corpus Christi *Judicium* plays), two great cycle themes come full circle: “evil men, satanic figures in medieval terms, go to the court of their true prince Satan, and good men, who by their nature partake in the nature of Christ either typologically or symbolically, go to their reward in Heaven.”¹⁶ Because God is in this heaven all will be right with the Towneley world—even when the Last Judg-

¹³ Rossiter, p. 68, maintains that Tutivillus is “a sadistic comedian giving a foretaste of the chuckling, jocular, fiends-incarnate of the Elizabethans.”

¹⁴ T. McAlindon, “Comedy and Terror in Middle English Literature: The Diabolical Game,” *MLR*, LX (1965), 324. cf. T. McAlindon, “The Emergence of a Comic Type in Middle English Narrative: The Devil and Giant as Buffoon,” *Anglia*, LXXXI (1963), 365.

¹⁵ V. A. Kolve, *The Play Called Corpus Christi* (Palo Alto, 1966), pp. 140–2.

¹⁶ John Gardner, *The Construction of the Wakefield Cycle* (Carbondale, 1974), p. 131. Similar conclusions were reached earlier by Walter E. Meyers in *A Figure Given: Typology in the Wakefield Plays* (Pittsburgh, 1969), p. 107.

ment comes to Wakefield. The diligent, laugh-provoking, sometimes pitiable, and now satirized Tutivillus is a perfect instrument of this ultimate didacticism.

His entrance into the *Judicium* play is nicely framed through the words and actions of demons Primus and Secundus who burst onto the scene bearing sacks and scrolls—the Tutivillian attributes:

primus demon. how so the gam crokys,
Examyn oure bokys.
secundus demon. here is a bag full, lokys
of pride and of lust . . . ¹⁷

Although most of the sinners in his bag have fallen through their mouths, the more comprehensive nature of Tutivillus' recording in this play is also prepared for by the demon's introductory description of additional sinful actions:

Of Wraggers and wears . . .
Of carpers and cryers, of mychers and thefes
Of lurdans and lyars that no man lefys
Of flytars, of flyars and renderars of reffys; (ll. 144–8)

In addition to indicating the potential magnitude of Tutivillus' catalogue of sins and sinners, the demons indicate the seriousness of the charges and the ancillary slothful sins which give rise to them: ire and ill will.¹⁸

primus demon. Is oght ire in thi bill and then shall thou
drynke.
secundus demon. sir, so mekill ill will that thai wold
synke
Thare foes in a fyere still . . . (ll. 153–5)

Also foreshadowed is the diatribe against the "femynyn genere" which will occupy Tutivillus at length a few stanzas later. Indeed, *secundus demon* assures his companion that there are more rolls describing the evils of womankind than he is able to carry. With such suitable preparation, neither the audience nor Tutivillus himself should wonder at his unquestioning acceptance as the devil's own officer who stands at his "tristur when othere men shones" (l. 208).

¹⁷ Lines 139–43. All citations of the text of the Towneley *Judicium* are from the edition of Alfred W. Pollard and George England, *The Towneley Plays*, EETS, ES 71 (London, 1897), pp. 367–87. Slashes dividing the long lines have been omitted.

¹⁸ Siegfried Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth: Acedia in Medieval Thought and Literature* (Chapel Hill, 1967), p. 165.

But lest the spectators miss this foreshadowing, Tutivillus announces himself in time-honored fashion:

Tutiullus. Mi name is Tutiullus,
my horne is blawen;
ffragmina verborum tutiullus colligit horum (ll. 249–51)

Appended to the well-known verse are a few suitably “idle” epithets in senseless Latin: “Belzabub alorum, beliel belium doliorum.”

The entrance of Tutivillus, the recorder of slothful insouciance, is particularly appropriate to the whole tenor of this *Corpus Christi* play. “Carelessness in religious observance breaks unity, inattentiveness places a person in the same category as Cain, the archetypal careless sacrificer.”¹⁹ The mention of recording and tolling in the first two lines immediately suggests that the third line’s “lollare” is not solely the reference to Lollardry which some critics credit without question. Even if we are to accept any part of this interpretation, the word in all probability does not refer principally to the sect. The primary meaning of “lollare” here seems to be that given second in the *OED*: “idler”—which ultimately derives from “lollen”: mutter or mumble. Tutivillus considers himself the master of this group; the analogical historical reference seems a result of the actions of the Lollards themselves rather than of the actions of Tutivillus. In support of this view I offer the evidence of the text. Though political and social satire is abundantly present in the following remarks of the devil,²⁰ there is never once a reference to the religious group known as the Lollards, nor do their many and well-known peculiarities become targets for the Tutivillian tongue. The topical spectator at the *Doomsday* play is brought face to face with the future when his spiritual carelessness might literally condemn him; when the apocalyptic trumpets sound, will he not be confronted with his bad deeds as recorded in the rolls of the devils and in his own conscience? To reinforce the lesson and to sharpen it by means of a satiric twist, Tutivillus’ duties as a collector of mumbled, skipped or vainly uttered words are enumerated the instant he appears:

Tutiullus. I was youre chefe tollare,
And sithen courte rollar,
Now am I master lollar,
And of sich men I mell me. (ll. 211–14)

¹⁹ Clifford Davidson, “An Interpretation of the Wakefield *Judicium*,” *AnM* (1969), 112.

²⁰ John Walter Scott, *Notable Aspects of Satire in the Towneley Cycle*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis: University of North Carolina, 1932, p. 30.

Such satire as does exist in this play seems more obviously directed, not against the Lollard sect, but against the Roman church and its various questionable ecclesiastical practices. Somewhat later Tutivillus does indeed castigate “fals swerars” that “shall hider com mo then a thowsand skore” (l. 279), “barganars and okerars and lufars of symonee” (l. 297), and “ffals lurars and vsurars to symony that clevys / To-tell” (ll. 362–3)—references which may cast aspersions on the clerical-ecclesiastical courts and “quaestors” just as easily as they may hint of corruption in the secular arm of juridical power. Some critics do not accept even the latter possibility and insist on using as a backdrop to these lines the petty tyranny of church lawyers, and the peremptory behavior and bold importunity of the omnipresent pardoners or “quest gangers.”²¹ No doubt a species of legalized extortion was also common to the secular branch of government, as the citations of “rasers of the fals tax, / And gederars of greyn wax” (ll. 283–4) testify.²² Most likely the green wax venders were supererogatory representatives of local or national authority sent to collect additional taxes and tribute from the peasants. As such they should certainly take their place in hell along with others responsible for oppressive measures.

The references to spoilers, extortioners, false jurors, usurers, and especially forgers of false deeds is further proof that a good deal of

²¹ “In the Towneley plays, the ecclesiastical Courts and the Quaestors are pointed at. Ecclesiastical Courts exercised a general control over the morals and manners of both clergy and laity. They had the power of citing people before them for breaches of church discipline and morality. The ecclesiastical lawyers turned their power into a means of exercising a petty tyranny of a galling and inquisitorial character. The lawyers who studied ecclesiastical law were paid by fees from the suitors, of which the bishop received a share; so it was to the interest of the lawyers to increase the fees as much as possible, and of the bishop to wink at the irregularity.

“The Quaestors, pardoners, or ‘quest gangars’ as they are called in the Towneley plays, seem to have been deservedly unpopular. They were licensed collectors who, armed with preemptory papal bulls, collected money for hospitals and churches. In the 14th century, complaints were rife among the clergy about the bold importunity with which they thrust their claims upon the public. They appeared suddenly in parish churches on some feast day when people came to make their offerings, reading aloud their notices, making their collections and disturbing the ordinary service, to the disarrangement and loss of the parish priest.” C. Van der Spek, *The Church and the Churchman in English Dramatic Literature Before 1642* (Amsterdam, 1930), p. 6. Dr. Van der Spek finds reference to these abuses in the *Judicium* when Tutivillus says to his demon henchmen: “yit a poynt have I fon/ I tell you before/ That fals swearers shall hider com/ mo then a thowsand skore” and later when he is enumerating the various classes of people he is dragging to hell: “Yit of these kyrchayerars here ate a menee/ Of barganars and okerars and lufars of symonee.” (lines 278–86) Tutivillus also addresses the lost souls as “ffals lurars and usurars to symony that clevys to-tell.” See pages 7 and 8.

²² Scott, p. 89.

extra-legal “collecting” went hand in hand with the assessment of the king’s taxes. On his ragman’s roll Tutivillus had kept track of all this thievery just as in the exemplum narratives he had kept careful note of all the occurrences of sloth in the recitation of the Divine Office—words and syllables, we remember, which were “stolen” from God. What is particularly delightful about Tutivillus’ self-portrait is his boast that more than ten thousand souls per hour are damned through his diligent recording.²³ It would seem that such an assertion is rather directly related to the “poore” devil’s job in the *Myroure of Oure Ladye* which put him under the onus of producing a myriad of scribbled parchments each day on pain of being beaten by his master Satan. Now at the Judgment, the hour of demonic triumph over so many souls, Tutivillus reflects on his successful career and is finally complimented for his hard work:

Thou art the hest sawgeoure that ever I had any . . .
Abide if ye are abill to take wage. (ll. 222 and 227)

Tutivillus’ long and vituperative satire on women (ll. 255–77) may also be traced to earlier versions of the writing devil narratives. From John of Garland onward a large majority of the exempla in this vein contain at least a passing reference to the fact that the recording demon was concerned with the idle jangling and vain remarks of women. As in the invective against political and social transgressors of the Lord’s command, we find here the triggering mechanism for a host of other railleries against the “femynyn gender.”²⁴ The Wakefield Master’s handling of these women, who are literally on their way down, is conventional in the best sense of that word and bears a strong resemblance to that found in other medieval tracts, generally satiric, against the weaker sex. Surely it is not too brash to suppose that the dramatic genius who interpolated the Tutivillus scenes into the Towneley *Judicium* would have been sufficiently familiar with the

²³ Lines 215–16: “I haue broght to youre hande of saules, dar I say, / Mo than ten thowsand in an howre of a day.”

²⁴ Lines 260–4:

If she be neuer so fowll a dowde with hir kelles and hir pynnes,
The shrew hir self can shrowde both hir chekys and hir chynnes;
she can make it full prowde with iapes and with gynnes,
hir hede as hy as a clowde bot no shame of hir synnes
Thai fele.

Tutivillus takes it upon himself to indicate all the possible failures of women, and especially of those whom he finds on his roll. The treatment in most instances is, of course, thoroughly conventional, as Scott notes, pp. 104–6.

spirit of his age to have deliberately associated Tutivillus with these vain ladies.

But the overdressed, overstuffed women Tutivillus castigates are also victims of the vice of sloth which was frequently associated with sins of the world and the flesh in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In fact, the various connotations of slothfulness, especially in word, become an underlying theme of Tutivillus' accusations against both sexes throughout the play. Vain women break their word, "fals swerars" are everywhere as are "kyrchchaterars." Even *primus demon* acknowledges the thematic importance of this emphasis when he comments that Tutivillus will fill both himself and his companions not with food and drink but with words—a paradoxically empty and idle filling.²⁵ And while I do not maintain that the economic and social malpractices mentioned in the text are specific examples of sloth, I would unhesitatingly contend that their inclusion among Tutivillus' catalogue of evil reveals how vital was the medieval tradition which linked together the vices of the Seven Deadly Sins.²⁶ Of course, it is possible to see in these sins enough justification for their mention by the recording devil; more probably, though, his enumerating them can be traced to the many treatises on sin which attributed to sloth the initial impetus toward the other vices described in the sweeping array of the Towneley *Judicium*.

Scornfully, then, Tutivillus surveys the names of the damned on his scroll and reviews the list of the Seven Deadly Sins, beginning as was usual with Pride which urged "laddys" to dress "as lordys riall" and to be "picturde in pall / As kyngys" (ll. 307–9). As Lucifer had imagined himself God's rival, so now human beings imagine themselves practically self-sufficient in this world. With Tutivillus' mocking of their foolishness, their self-aggrandizement seems to melt away; prideful social climbing, too, is headed for a bad end when the position-seekers of either sex "shall clym on hell crokkys / With a halpeny heltere."²⁷ The Deadly Sins which follow Pride—Wrath, Envy, Covetousness, Gluttony—are reduced in Tutivillus' jibe to "howndys of hell" (l. 339). Sloth, though it comes in sixth place, "is extremely important in the scheme of the cycle for those who have given themselves up to this

²⁵ Lines 245–7:

primus demon. Thou are best on thi wax that euer was clekyt,
or knawen;
with wordes thou fill us . . .

²⁶ Wenzel, pp. 25, 39–40.

²⁷ Lines 321–2. See Davidson, p. 118.

sin refuse to do 'goddys warkys' and hate the clatter of church bells which call them to the celebration of the Eucharist."²⁸ The catalogue ends with a brief mention of Lechery, the triumph of man's carnal desires. Certain of his "catch," Tutivillus satirically welcomes these sinners to his "see."

The importance of sloth in the Towneley scheme is further underscored in Jesus' welcome to the saved. If their entry to heaven is assured by the diligent performance of good deeds (here the corporal works of mercy), how much more damned are they whose sloth made the performance of such mercies unpalatable and finally impossible? The Wakefield Master's final satiric comment on the significance of sloth is achieved—as was his first—not by Tutivillus, but by his henchmen. As their "caytifs" are rudely seized, as they who came to damnation through all that medieval sloth could imply, as those who fell through idle speech disappear into hellmouth, ultimate dumbness is their portion. *Secundus demon* remarks sarcastically: "Thai will tell no tales" (l. 589).

The opposition of slothfulness and idle speech to works of mercy (defined in the Middle Ages as acts of forbearance and compassion towards suffering fellow creatures) which is apparent at the end of the Towneley *Judicium* may partially underlie the conflict of the moral play *Mankind* where Tutivillus and Mercy are chief antagonists.²⁹ In a post-Judgment world, where moral worth has been weighed and is in *stasis*, *Mankind* would inevitably be damned; with Mercy and with life he can be forgiven and be saved.³⁰ But while it has been demonstrated in general that the "eschatological allegory of the Last Judgment as performed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries held within itself the conditions for the development of a full-fledged morality play,"³¹ a consideration of the actions of Tutivillus allows us to offer a more specific explication of *Mankind*, a play which "differs in technique from the pure type of medieval allegory and uses the idea of spiritual sloth much more originally than the genuinely allegorical drama."³²

Nevertheless, in this, the high tide of his dramatic development, Tutivillus bears little external resemblance to the recording demon of

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

²⁹ All quotations from *Mankind* are taken from *The Macro Plays*, ed. Mark Eccles, EETS, OS 262 (London, 1969).

³⁰ Robert Potter, *The English Morality Play* (London, 1975), p. 56.

³¹ David J. Leigh, "The Doomsday Mystery Play: An Eschatological Morality," in Jerome Taylor and Alan Nelson, eds., *Medieval English Drama* (Chicago, 1972), p. 274.

³² Wenzel, p. 148.

earlier medieval narrative. He carries no sack, nor is he ever seen jotting down Mankind's faults; though he is fond of quoting Latin texts both appropriately and inappropriately, he makes no mention of the "fragmina" verse which identified him in so many other contexts; though he is alert to discourage Mankind from his prayers, he is not concerned with the "kyrchchaterars" and the "femynyn gendere" any more than he is with monastic *vaniloquia*. Perhaps the most striking change from previous characterizations of him is the geographical position he occupies: he who appropriated the tops of pillars and traversed choirs and chancels at breakneck speed now hides quietly underneath the support of a "castle" and blocks any exit from the *platea* until a collection has been made.³³ Just possibly, Tutivillus may have found his way into the Macro morality through a kind of back door—the *Jacob's Well* homilies—which are the source for many of the sermon speeches in the play³⁴ and which contain imaginatively developed versions of both sack-carrier and writing-devil narratives. Nevertheless, what persists from earlier tradition and what is developed most superbly in *Mankind* are some aspects of Tutivillus' personality as a demon and what Siegfried Wenzel perceptively terms the "psychology of sloth" as manifested in popular catechetical literature.³⁵ For Tutivillus is no longer a minor devil as in the Towneley *Judicium*; he is the fiend of hell. He no longer merely collects idle words for the day of final reckoning but is a whisperer and a backbiter himself and the prime mover in a temptation so devastating that, in the play at least, it almost succeeds in destroying Mankind.

That aspect of his narrative personality which shows to such good effect in the moral play is the comic. It is not of the same kind as that which pervades earlier stories but is in keeping with the action's emphasis on the humorous degeneracy of Mankind's tempters and of the idiocy of their plots to undo him. Typical of this comic depravity is the scene in which Tutivillus and his fellows shorten Mankind's coat by degrees—on the pretext of making it more fashionable—until the coat has almost disappeared, along with most of its usefulness (ll. 673–725). Presented in satiric terms, such humor was aided by the captivating stage spectacle of minstrels and mimes with their magical tricks, songs, dances, puppet shows, and animal imitations.³⁶ In

³³ Merle Fifield, *The Castle in the Circle*, Ball State Monograph No. 6 (Muncie, 1967), p. 32.

³⁴ S. M. Philippa Coogan, *An Interpretation of the Moral Play, Mankind* (Washington, D.C., 1947), p. 94.

³⁵ Wenzel, p. 150.

³⁶ David Bevington, *From Mankind to Marlowe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), p. 17.

such a setting Tutivillus could maintain a consistently comic character at the same time that the overriding moral nature of the play would prevent descent into mere farce. So, the engaging impudence that Tutivillus displays when he prefaces his temptation of Mankind with "Qwyst, peese! þe Deull ys dede!" (l. 593) does not detract from the seriousness of the situation, nor does the cheerful ease with which he goes about bringing Mankind to mischief and shame.³⁷ Doubtless these wiles were dramatically effective, particularly in the eyes of the Cambridgeshire village audience for whom the play was apparently written.³⁸ Whether the predominance of the comic note is traceable at least in part to the author's attempt to bridge the gap between the gaiety of the Shrovetide season (during which men romped the streets dressed in devils' costumes or other strange attire) and the subdued and recollected spirit proper to Lent it is difficult to say.³⁹ What is certain is that the writer is recognizing human frailty and providing for it.

Unlike the fears generated by the irreversibility of the Towneley demonic triumph, the effect of Mankind's temptation was correspondingly uplifting, for its late medieval audience still believed that the formidable tempters of Mankind could be easily routed if the forces of good made a determined assault on them. The spectators, then, could enjoy Tutivillus' easy overpowering of Mankind because they were assured, both through faith and through their familiarity with the conventions of the moral play, that his victory would not be permanent.⁴⁰

Whether or not Tutivillus' comic development was actually aided by particularly striking elements of costume is difficult to determine. He seems to have worn a mask similar to that of the "big head" character in the mummers' play, since he is described as "a man wyth a hede þat ys of grett omnipotens."⁴¹ He certainly did carry a net which was supposed to act like the magic ring of European folklore and make him invisible. Given the rather extended earlier narrative development of his character and the very insignificant number of texts which make him "horrible," "apelike," and "terrifying," I would

³⁷ Lines 591 and 602–4.

³⁸ Bevington, *ibid.*

³⁹ Coogan, p. 74.

⁴⁰ Coogan, p. 95. Potter comments (p. 55): "The author of *Mankind* sees repentance as a kind of natural regeneration, in a world which is abundant with divine mercy—little emphasis is given to contrition, confession, or satisfaction."

⁴¹ Line 461. Cf. W. K. Smart, "*Mankind* and the Mummer's Play," *MLN*, XXXII (1917), 21.

presume that only the most conventional and non-threatening costume would have been his. A familiar devil and a familiar temptation seem more appropriate to the play than the spectacular and the titillating.

Far more important, however, is the manner in which the psychology of sloth, the vice (especially in the form of idle speech) against which many of the earlier exempla were aimed, is developed in the play. Here, though, its ramifications are extended far beyond the implications of any previous exposé. Mankind appears with the spade which is common to post-lapsarian human beings, announcing that his purpose is "To eschew ydullness" (l. 329). As long as he maintains this purpose—both materially and spiritually—he is able to ward off the attacks of New Gyse, Nowadays, and Nought, according to the promise of anti-vice literature which proposed work as one of the chief remedies for and defenses against *acedia*.⁴² But Tutivillus buries a plank in the ground so that the spade will be ineffectual and thereby tempts Mankind to forsake his good purpose. Tutivillus' success in this endeavor exemplifies a gradual recession from God which follows, in its progress, the path outlined in the many treatises which warned against the evils of slothfulness. Mankind feels the tedium of work, and, finding that his grain has been purloined (again by Tutivillus), gives up laboring altogether. Although he does not formally abandon religion, he does heed Tutivillus' whisper that he is holier than his kin and can therefore shorten his prayers; eventually, he ceases prayer "For drede of þe colyke and eke of þe ston" (l. 562), finds evensong too long, and falls asleep, leaving his mind open to the slander of Tutivillus against Mercy. Believing that slander, and also that his spiritual father is dead, Mankind joins the company of the demonic rogues.

Tutivillus' rejoicing at his diverting Mankind from being "besy in his prayere" and from "hys dyvyn seruyce" (ll. 565–6) does indeed reflect some aspects of the exemplum tradition, but the focus is completely different. Throughout the earlier narratives, Tutivillus was the recorder; he rejoiced at the sin but was not himself the cause of it. Even when he sat on the shoulders of chattering women, he was never described as the occasion for their sin. Here, he is the presiding agent of temptation, the instigator of Mankind's fall and consequently of the entire action. The three rogues acknowledge him as such; and indeed, in his role as tempter, the most prevalent function of the evil

⁴² Wenzel, pp. 91–3; *Mankind* is analyzed on pp. 150–5.

one in the Satanic trimorph, Tutivillus is *the* fiend of helle.⁴³ It is also demonstrable that the scope of his tempting is extensive. John Payne Collier's remark that Mercy, at the end of *Mankind*, warns man especially to beware of a Tutivillus who represents merely "the sin of the flesh"⁴⁴ is based on an editorial error. Eccles' edition correctly reads:

The New Gyse, Nowadayis, Nowgth, þe World we may hem call;
And propyrlly Titiuillus syngnyfytth the Fend of helle;

The Flesch, þat ys þe vnclene concupissens of 3our body. (ll. 885–7)

Collier read a comma after "helle" (line 886), and so equated "the Fend of helle" and "The Flesch." Actually, Tutivillus operates on two levels in this play. He obviously takes on the characteristics associated with Satan but he can also, because of his name and his previous history, be said to emphasize here the evils of sloth. Likewise, the theme of sloth is not departed from by the mention of the flesh as "þe vnclene concupissens of 3our body" (l. 887), for shortly after the eleventh century, the carnal character of the vice of sloth came to be recognized and written about. Accepting the whole psychology of sloth as exemplified in this play, and charging Tutivillus as Chief Exemplar, we may surely conclude that the sins of the flesh mentioned here are not those of lust and lechery as our modern mentality conceives them, but rather of the medieval sin of sloth conceived as fleshly—sloth being thought of as the chief of the fleshly sins and therefore the "unclene" desires of our bodies.

After his fifteenth-century heyday, Tutivillus' acting career diminishes both in importance and in dramatic effectiveness. Although he is still a "sloth-seeker" in the *Teufelscomödie*, dated "Von Hall 1514" but probably a relic of an earlier play or series of plays, he is listed as a companion to other devils who also have specific duties and boasts. Satan, Rosencranz, Welczebub, Weliall, Astaroth (Judas' tempter), Ruffo ("Er macht die strassenräuber fro"), Amon, and Belphegor all precede Titinill "der die Leute von der Andacht und guten werken abhält."⁴⁵ Much more oblique is the allusion to Tutivillus which some

⁴³ Stanley Kahrl, *Traditions of Medieval English Drama* (London, 1974), p. 117.

⁴⁴ John Payne Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry* (London, 1885), p. 297.

⁴⁵ The context is by now familiar:

Ich lass auch niemanz gern vasten
Aber am suntag mach ich die leut rasten,
Das sie lang luntschen in irem pett
Bis das die sun allenthalben ufget.

Adolf Pichler, "Eine Teufelscomödie," *Germania*, XI (1886), 97–8.

scholars find in John Heywood's *The Pardoner and the Frere* (c. 1533). Here, the Brother talks of the Pardoner and exclaims: "Mayster parson, I marvayll ye wyll gyve lycence / To this false knave in this audience, / And publysh his ragman rolles with lyes."⁴⁶ The connection is recognizable only to one thoroughly familiar with the many ramifications of the Tutivillian tradition and is indicative of the rapid decline of the effectiveness of this devil's dramatic appearances. In a "New Interlude called Thersites" (1537) we find a "Mater" occupied in charming away worms that had taken up abode in Telemachus' belly with the words:

All the court of conscience in Cuckoldshire;
Tinkers and taborers, tipplers, taverners:
Tittifills, trifflers, turners, & trumpers:
Tenpters, traitors, travellers, and thumpers:
Thriftless, thievish, thick and thereto thin:
The malady of this worms cause for to blin!⁴⁷

Likewise, in "A new enterlude, drawen oute of the holy scripture of godly queene Hester verye necessary, newly made and imprinted . . ." (1561), a character called Hardy-Dardy (or Vice) remarks:

Have ye not rede of Naso Ovide,
That eloquent Poet;
Nor Valery, which telles merely
The proper feates,
How the Smith Perillus, like a *tuta villus*
Made a bull of bras.

⁴⁶ Alfred W. Pollard, ed., *English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes* (Oxford, 1904), p. 122, lines 550 ff. of John Heywood's *The Pardoner and the Frere*. A note on p. 212 pertains to the "ragman rolle" and should be quoted here. "Ragman rolles—a long unintelligible story. Ragman was the name of an old medieval game in which characters of persons, good or bad, were written on a roll and a string with a seal appears to have been attached to each character, so that when it was rolled up the persons engaged in the game might draw characters by chance. Hence the application to any document with many signatures and seals such as the roll offering their allegiance to Edward I, subscribed by the Scots nobility in 1296 and always quoted as the *Ragman's Roll*. But *Ragman* or *Rageman* was also a name for the Devil, and this seems to have given an almost uniformly opprobrious turn to the phrase, which is quite out of keeping with our text." Collier notes (p. 223) that Wynken de Worde published a fragment, "Ragmannes Rolle" (a listing of good and bad women in alternate stanzas) and that Douce says that "It is used by old writers to express any legal instrument, and the etymology has been much disputed. *Rageman* is also a name given to the Devil and in this place it may have that signification."

⁴⁷ W. Carew Hazlitt, ed., *Dodsley's Old English Plays*, 4th ed., rev. and enl. (New York, 1964), p. 424.

Perhaps the most interesting comment that can be made upon this Tutivillian appearance is Collier's claim that it supports his hypothesis concerning the origin of the name.⁴⁸

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the dramatic remnants of the Tutivillus story were quickly vanishing. The Swiss Johannes Kolross, in *Fünferlei Betrachtnisse*, described the appearance of the Doomsday devil "mit einem grossen Rodel an einer Kette" and several other comedies reflect the Apocalyptic Tutivillian tradition.⁴⁹ Tutivillus, however, is not named, and any unqualified application of his tradition to these plays is precarious. Actually, the traces of his name even in English drama after the sixteenth century are extremely vague and corrupted. Although M. D. Anderson believes that Tutivillus and his companions are the true ancestors of Ariel and Puck, she also contends that two specific references to our demon in Shakespeare's plays now fall on uncomprehending ears.⁵⁰ Sir Toby Belch's exclamation "Tillyvally" in *Twelfth Night* (II, 3) is echoed as "Tillyfally" by Mistress Quickly in *2 Henry IV* (II, 4); most probably both are corrupt invocations calling upon Tutivillus to collect a remark silly enough to qualify for his sack. Ben Jonson's use of "Titiulitium" in *The Epicoene or The Silent Woman* has been glossed both as Ainsworth's "paltry, good for nothing" and as Cooper's (1587) "an vgle thing of no value—a rotten threade."⁵¹ In summing up the appearance of Tutivillus in later texts, we must conclude that the intriguing devil of the German and French drama and the wonderful character of the English plays has truly become but an airy nothing, without local habitation, even without a name.

⁴⁸ Collier, *op. cit.*, p. 253. He notes that the only copy ever seen of this performance is in the library of the Duke of Devonshire.

⁴⁹ Bächtold, *Schweizerische Schauspiele des 16 Jahrhunderts*, vol. I, p. 88, line 899. Bolte thinks it was composed about 1532, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

⁵⁰ M. D. Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

⁵¹ Cooper's *Thesaurus* is cited in Aurelia Henry's edition of the play (New York, 1906), p. 73, line 51 and p. 230.

V



The End and the Beginning

The rapid decline of the name and functions of Tutivillus in later dramatic texts is indicative of his general literary fate. His inglorious descent from high points in both sermon and drama, his becoming a mere term of reproach, the "thing of little value" which Tutivillus was eventually to signify was nevertheless predictable, probably even as early as John Gower's *Vox clamantis* (1378–81). Essentially a moral critique of the three estates,¹ in Book IV the poem turns its satirical probing on monastic and mendicant orders. The heading of Chapter 18 says: "Hic loquitur de fratribus illis, qui propter huius mundi famam, et vt ipsi eciam, quasi ab ordinibus sui iugo, exempti, ad confessiones audiendum digniores efficiantur summas in studio scole cathedras affectant." Gower's criticism includes these lines:

Hic est confessor domini non, set dominarum,
Qui magis est blandus quam Tituillus eis;
Hic est confessor in peius qui male vertit,
Sordida namque lauans sordidiora facit.²

Though the context is far from complimentary, Gower's reference to a "Tutuillus" does not seem to correspond with any portion of the sack-carrying or writing devil exempla. It is also impossible to tell from the passage as it stands whether the author is presupposing that his audience is familiar with the name or whether he is simply using an arresting word; the former explanation is surely more likely.

Derogatory references to Tutivillus in the Gower mode were humorously compounded in the *Spielermesse* recounted by Gottschalk Hollen in his *Preceptorium divine legis* published at Nürnberg in 1497. Here, too, the devil "Titivillus" is deprived of his customary machinery of sack or pen and scroll and even of his "recording" activities,

¹ Eric Stockton, *The Major Latin Works of John Gower* (Seattle, 1962), pp. 12–20 provides a lengthy catalogue; J. A. W. Bennett, *Selections from John Gower* (Oxford, 1968), p. xx, calls it "a mordant description of society" in the reign of Richard II.

² G. C. Macaulay, ed., *The Latin Works of John Gower* (Oxford, 1902), p. 190 (lines 864 ff.).

although he does retain connections with written material and with the celebration of the liturgy. As Hollen describes it,

Die Spieler bilden . . . eine Satanskirche. Ihre Kardinäle sind die Spieldämonen und die Kartenhändler. Ihre Kirchen sind die Wirtshäuser, die Spieler die Gemeinde . . . (various other details are explained at length; finally, . . .) Die Epistel beginnt: Tutivillus apostolus, princeps tenebrarum, ad ebrios. Fratres, estote ebrii . . . ³

But the literary decline of Tutivillus, like his ascent, is most apparent in his English career. Practically contemporaneous with the composition of *Jacob's Well* was the publication of *The Assembly of Gods or the Accord of Reason and Sensuality in the Fear of Death* by John Lydgate, who has been erroneously credited with the first English usage of the Tutivillus name.⁴ In a rather lengthy passage, Lydgate offers a description of the Captains of Vice, then of the inferior captains, and finally of the members of their retinues. Following the inferior captains of vice are Sacrilege, Simony and their like, and a host of commons led by Idleness:

Rowners, uagaboundes, forgers of lesynges,
 Robbers, reuers, rauenouse ryfelers,
 Choppers of churches, fynders of tydynges
 Marrers of maters, & money makers,
 Stalkers by nyght, with euesdroppers,
 Fyghters, brawlers, brekers of lofedayes,
 Getters, chyders, causers of frayes,
 Tytyuillys, tyrauntes with turmentoures
 Cursyd apostates, relygyous dyssymulers,
 Closshers, carders, with comon hasardoures,
 Tyburne coloppys, and pursekytters,
 Pylary knyghtes, double tollyng myllers,
 Gay ioly tapsters with hostelers of the stewes,
 Hoores, and baudys—that many bale brewes . . . ⁵

It requires no stretching of the imagination here to make several deductions: Tutivillus, as a minion of Idleness, is still tenuously associated with Sloth; but he is in very bad company, human not demonic, and his name alone is of importance because his function has been eclipsed by the parade of other characters. The text is almost emblem-

³ Fol. 211; cited by Adolf Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg, 1902, rptd. Darmstadt, 1963), p. 29.

⁴ OED, art. cit.

⁵ John Lydgate, *The Assembly of Gods*, ed. Oscar Lovell Triggs, EETS, ES 69 (London, 1896), p. 21.

gradually in the sixteenth century to color somewhat the meaning of a "tutivillus."⁸

Certainly, sixteenth-century English references to Tutivillus far outnumber those from other lands. Though this may reflect the dissemination of various "recording demon" narratives, it is more probably a result of widespread acquaintance with the Towneley and *Man-kind* demonic characters. It seems quite plausible to assume that the drama's Tutivillus, obviously at the height of his literary career, crept unforgettably into the minds of his audiences and eventually became inseparable from certain types of reference to the reprobate. As the century progressed, however, the force of this devil's characterization disappeared and only the opprobrium connected with a "Tutivillus" remained. Consequently, in the "Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie," generally dated about 1508, "tutevillouss" finds himself listed among the damned:

Cleik on thy croce, and fair on in to France,
And cum thow nevir agane but ane mischance
The Feyind fair with the fordwart our the fellis.
Cankerit, cayne, tryd trowane, tutevillouss,
Marmadin. mymmerkin, monstour of all men.
I fall gar bak the to the laird of Hilhouss,
To swelly the in streid of ane pullit hen . . . ⁹

And in Dunbar's "Poem XIV," the "tutivillaris" seems worthy of any and all disdain.¹⁰

By 1523 in England, Tutivillus possessed a mostly nominal importance. Perhaps the most obvious illustration of this phenomenon is John Skelton's *Garlande of Laurell*:

With a pellit of peuisshenes they had suche a stroke,
That all the dayes of ther lyfe shall styck by ther
rybbis:
Foo, foisty bawdias! sum smellis of the smoke;
I saw dyuers that were cariid away thens in cribbis,
Dasyng after dotrellis, lyke drunkardis that dribbis;

⁸ *Bannatyne MS*, vol. II, fol. 67 b, Poem LXXI, pp. 182–3. In context line 25 reads: "Thir teltellaris oft tymes dois grit skaith,/ And raissis mortall seid and discrepance." In John Skelton's *Magnyfycence* (ed., Robert Lee Ramsey, London, 1908), Folly insists that there are two persons who continually bear false tales to the ear of the sovereign and Symkyn Tytyuell is the first-named (line 1268, p. 40). The sixteenth-century references, of course, include scathing remarks on flatterers and persons with lying tongues.

⁹ *Bannatyne MS*, fol. 153 b, lines 515–21. It was compiled by George Bannatyne in 1568 and published by the Hunterian Club in 1896.

¹⁰ Dunbar in *Poems*, XIV, 67, Scottish Text Society, vol. 83, as noted in *OED*, vol. XI, 78.

Theis titiuyllis' with taumpinnis wer towchid and
tappid;
Moche mischefe, I hyght you amonge theem ther happid.¹¹

But this same author, in *Colyn Cloute* (c. 1529), also makes use of "Tytyuelles" as a point of reference to idle speech in the minds of his audience:

Thus the people telles
Rayles lyke rebelles
Redys shrewdly and spelles,
And with foundacyons melles.
And talkys lyke tytyuelles,
Howe ye brake the dedes wylles
Turne monasteris into water milles,
Of an abbay ye make a graunge;
Your workes, they says, are straunge; . . .¹²

When we take into account the fact that the above is only an excerpt from a long section of the poem excoriating the faults of clergymen, we can appreciate the connotations still attached to our devil's name. In 1546 a "titifils" is discovered in John Haywood's *Dialogue of the Effectual Proverbs of the English Tongue Concerning Marriage*:

There is no mo titifils in England's ground,
To hold with the hare and run with the hound.¹³

The editor glosses "titifils" as "a knave, a jade, a generic reproach," and cites as confirmation of his definition a quotation from Edward Hall's *Chronicle of Henry VI*, f. 43 (c. 1542): "The devill hymself . . . did apparell certain catchepoules and parasites, commonly called titivils and tale tellers, to sowe discord and dissencion."¹⁴ In 1548, Hall reinforced his concept of the connection between a Tutivillus and a rumor-spreader when he wrote in the *Chronicle of Edward IV*: "Mistrustyng lest her counsayl should by some tituille bee published and opened to her aduersaries."¹⁵ Much more ambiguous is Nicholas Udall's comment in *Ralph Roister Doister* (?1553) on methods of making merry: "Sometimes Tom Titivile maketh vs a feast."¹⁶

¹¹ Alexander Dyce, ed., *The Poetical Works of John Skelton* (London, 1843), p. 387, lines 637 ff.

¹² Lines 414 ff., *Ibid.*, pp. 326–7.

¹³ John S. Farmer, ed. (London, 1906), p. 24.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 205. Also cited in the OED.

¹⁵ Edward Hall, *The Chronicle of Edward IV*, p. 220, OED, *ibid.*

¹⁶ William Durrant Cooper, ed. (London, 1847), p. 1. The line is contained in Act I, Scene 1 of the play.

The second half of the sixteenth century saw the rise in England of a bantering social criticism aimed at the age's characteristic roguery. One of the earliest prose treatises on this subject was John Awdeley's *The Fraternity of Vagabonds* (composed about 1561). In the "Chapter of the XXV Orders of Knaves" Awdeley, under the epithet "Cole Prophet," offers the following definition:

Cole Prophet is he, that when his Maister sendeth him on his errand, he wyl tel his answer therof to his Maister or he depart hym. This Titiuell knaue commonly maketh the worst of the best between hys Maister and his friends.¹⁷

Although the reference is admittedly oblique, the connection of the adjective "titivell" with harmful speech—a primary ingredient of the original Tutivillus story—makes the above a comparatively strong link in an otherwise rapidly weakening chain. In James Bell's *Walter Hadden Against Osorius* (translated in 1581), the term "titiviller" seems to identify a vociferous critic: "Here our clamorous titiviller taketh occasion to scorne my to to foreward diligence," laments Hadden.¹⁸ Even further slippage was inevitable. Philip Stubbes's *Anatomy of Abuses* (1583) equates "Tutivillers" with mere flatterers. In a section condemning those servants who call everyone "Master" regardless of merit, Stubbes asserts: "But it is certen that no wyse Man will intitle them with any of these names . . . but such Titiuillers, flattering Parasites and glosing *Gnatoes* as flatter them, expecting some pleasure or benefit at their hands."¹⁹

In Stubbes's use of the word, "Titiviller" signified that most untrustworthy type whose words lack foundation in reality. It would be only a short step, therefore, from this epithet to an exclamation of impatience: "Nonsense! fiddlesticks!" When Sir Thomas More's wife, Dame Alice, uttered her oft-repeated "Tillie vallie,"²⁰ or when Mistress Quickly gave vent to the same sentiment (2 *Henry IV*, II.4), might we not suppose that one short step has indeed been taken? The *OED* says of *tilly-vally* "origin unknown," but the possibility that Tutivillus underlies the exclamation was recognized by Sir Walter Scott in 1816:

Mr. Oldbuck: . . . my unlucky and good-for-nothing
womankind—*malae bestiae*, Mr. Lovel.

¹⁷ Edward Viles and F. J. Furnivall, eds., *The Fraternity of Vagabonds* by John Awdeley (London, 1869) EETS, ES 9, p. 15.

¹⁸ James Bell, *Walter Hadden Against Osorius*, tr. 1581, p. 8, in *OED*, *ibid.*

¹⁹ The text was edited by Frederick J. Furnivall (London, 1879); see p. 122.

²⁰ Sometimes the epithet signified annoyance as well as impatience (as on p. 83, l. 14) but most significant is the frequency of its appearance; see Roper's *Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore knyghte*, ed. Elsie V. Hitchcock (London, 1935).

- Mr. Lovel: I shall be disappointed, sir, if I do not find the ladies very undeserving of your satire.
- Mr. Oldbuck: Tilly-valley, Mr. Lovell,—which, by the way, one commentator derives from “tittivillitium” and another from “talley-ho”—but tilley-valley, I say—a truce with your politeness. You will find them but samples of woman-kind . . . ²¹

Scott's association of “tilly-valley” with the foibles of womankind both concludes our consideration of Tutivillus' decline and reminds us of those earlier narratives of the recording demon we have discussed. Having followed that demon to the nadir of his career, we might return once more to its beginnings. Is it possible, at this distance, to pinpoint a single story from which both the sack carrier and the scribbler derive, or are they indeed so diverse in origin that source-hunting is ludicrous? Is it the better part of valor to posit “monastic wit” and, like Tutivillus himself, slink away? In the case of the sack carrier, the latter course of action seems the only one possible. He is a natural outgrowth of the cenobitic preoccupation with demonic possession, infestation, and harassment, and he fits perfectly into the imaginative development of one of the most feared faults of the regular life: spiritual sloth. One need only recall the countless devil stories in the *Lives of the Fathers* to understand how deep-seated this fear was. Unfortunately, as anyone who has ever participated in group recitation knows, the probability of at best inharmonious and at worst slovenly articulation is very great. Given the large number of common, vocal prayers required by monastic observance, the presence of a demon who tormented “corrupters” of the Divine Office or who collected evidence of their defective psalmody would have been almost inevitable in Benedictine, Carthusian, and similar ecclesiastical circles.

The origin of the name “Tutivillus,” which by all present evidence is first applied to the sack carrier, can be as plausibly traced to monastic wit as to any other source.²² Since the term is initially Plautine, and

²¹ Sir Walter Scott, *The Antiquary* (Oxford, 1914), p. 57. A note by F. A. Cavenagh on p. 518 reads simply: “tilley-valley: Nonsense!”

²² PL 73. The “Verba Seniorum” have received recent attention through Thomas Merton's *The Wisdom of the Desert* (New York, 1960). Rather commonplace was the counsel that Merton translates on p. 47: “A certain elder said: Apply yourself to silence, have no vain thoughts, and be intent in your meditation, whether you sit at prayer, or whether you rise up to work in the fear of God. If you do these things, you will not have to fear the attacks of the evil ones.” Cf. Walther, No. 11699: “In choro stantes et murmura confabulantes/ Hos sathanas signat, ut secum postea trahat.”

since recent scholarship finds Plautus rather widely used as a curriculum author in the later Middle Ages,²³ "Tutivillus" may be the direct result of a reading knowledge of Roman comedy. Because, by the late thirteenth century, scholarly pursuits had been undertaken by mendicant as well as monastic groups, no particular order seems more likely to be responsible for the name's creation. But finally, whatever explanation one favors for the origin of our devil's name, and despite the many etymologies it has spawned, the choice must be deemed a fortunate one.

The writing devil, along with the definite contexts in which he functions, is a more tempting and fruitful target for *Quellenforschungen*. Particularly arresting is the company in which the scribbler finds himself. As indicated in Chapter II, he is "discovered" in three distinct groupings: the first involving an anonymous celebrant and/or server; a second specifying these as St. Martin and St. Brice; and a third showing the substitution of local saints for these original principals. The first category is represented predominantly by sermon materials;²⁴ the second by forms as diverse as drama, manuals of instruction, sermon materials, lyric and imaginative narratives, and a saint's life;²⁵ the third shows a wide distribution but in smaller quantity.²⁶ Investigation of all of the above reveals the common presence of a writing devil who is discovered at his task by a person connected with the clerical life, and whose discovery is accompanied by the impulse to laugh and/or the consequent reform of the congregation. The large body of material which specifies the principals as Martin and Brice indicates that a purposeful search for the original version might begin with these saints.

²³ So contends John Norton-Smith, *Geoffrey Chaucer* (London, 1974), pp. 162-4. Rosemary Woolf is more cautious in her commentary on the Towneley Cycle: "It would be imprudent . . . to assume that the Wakefield Master could have known the plays of Plautus." See *The English Mystery Plays* (Berkeley, 1972), p. 130.

²⁴ The story appears in deVitry, de Bourbon, Caesarius Heisterbach, Gobius, Herolt, Bromyard, Major, in *Jacob's Well*, *Handlyng Synne*, the *Myroure of oure Ladye*, the *Sele Trost*, *Recull de Exemplis*, *Corona de Monáci*, *Speculum Spiritualium*, *Papistische Lügen* and *Flöhhaz*, as well as in several manuscript collections of exempla. (Drama excluded here.)

²⁵ e.g., *Speculum Laicorum*, *Liber Exemplorum*, *Geistliche Gedichte*, *Knight of the Tower*, *Promptuarium Exemplorum*, *Mystère de saint martin*, in works by Caxton, Rabelais, Noël de Fail, Pierre de Grossnet, and in numerous manuscript collections.

²⁶ Austin and Gregory in the *Lay Folks Mass Book*, Audelay's "De Meritis Misse," and MS Add. 27336; Anselm and a clerk in the *Mariu Saga*; Cyril in the *Opus Quadragesimale*, the *Sermones* of Gorran, and the *Thesaurus Novus*; Justus and Beatus in the *Helvetia Sancta*; Felix and Cyril in the *Biblioteca de autores espagnoles*; Gregory and Peter in the Breslau codex; Bolte, p. 254, also nominates Briget of Sweden and Anthony.

The life of St. Martin was originally written shortly before the saint's death by his friend and associate in the priesthood, Sulpicius Severus.²⁷ Realizing that he had omitted some details in this first *vita*, Sulpicius supplemented the *Vita* with a series of dialogues initiated by the fictional characters Posthumian and Gallus.²⁸ In both these works, Sulpicius gives a favorable but reasonably sober and accurate account of the saint's life and of his colleagues in the Church's service. He remarks on the many bouts St. Martin engaged in against the devil but does not seem to exaggerate or excessively dramatize them. He records briefly a few of the miracles of St. Martin, including the one which occurred when he offered Mass poorly clad after he had given his robes to the poor. He does not hesitate to mention the association between St. Martin and his successor-to-be, St. Brice, although later writers omitted this portion from their dialogues both because of the rivalry popularly supposed to have existed between the two saints and because St. Brice was eventually driven from his see—for allegedly scandalous behavior and supposedly defamatory remarks concerning St. Martin.

The life of Martin was re-written in 461 by Paulinus of Perigueux and again in 590 by Fortunatus of Poitiers, and both of these accounts deriving from Sulpicius are paralleled by the one in the *Historia Francorum* of St. Gregory of Tours. Gregory records at length the story of St. Martin's informing Brice that he was to be his successor and also tells in detail of St. Brice's exile, later exoneration, and return to his bishopric.²⁹ It is apparent in all these accounts, and even in those of Alcuin and Odo of Clugny,³⁰ that the life of St. Martin, while containing marvelous events of the sort usually found in hagiography, is told with the detached reverence that makes for entertaining reporting and good quasi-historical reading.³¹

Indeed, the widespread tendency toward hagiographic elaboration seems to have come later when, in the late ninth and early tenth centuries, substantial readings from saints' lives were introduced into the Divine Office;³² it was at this time that the "legends" of the saints were

²⁷ Probably in 392 or 393 after an extended visit by the author to the Tours See. The text has been recently edited by Jacques Fontaine, *Vie de Saint Martin* (Paris, 1967), Sources chrétiennes, vols. 133–5.

²⁸ Alban Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Vol. II (New York, 1846), 432.

²⁹ Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, PL 71: 189 ff.

³⁰ Alcuin died in 804 and Odo in c. 942; for commentary on their "lives" of Martin, see S. Baring-Gould, *The Lives of the Saints* (Edinburgh, 1914), p. 312.

³¹ Fontaine, p. 203: "... la valeur historique de la *Vita martini* est beaucoup plus considérable que l'offensive hypercritique n'eût invité à le croire désormais."

³² If a saint's feast occurred on a weekday, "toutes les leçons étaient empruntées à la

composed. The hagiographers, basing their accounts on history yet enlarging upon it in a manner which seems outrageous to twentieth-century readers, expressed quite clearly to the people of 1000 A.D. their belief in the unusual and miraculous. A forerunner of this tradition is the *Libri Miraculorum* (also by Gregory of Tours) in which are recounted without apology more than 200 miracles ascribed to Martin at the time of the book's composition. What would seem a natural outgrowth of Gregory's efforts and one especially relevant to our purpose is the account of Martin's charity to the poor recorded in the *Legenda Aurea*:³³

Once when he was on his way to the church for some solemnity, a naked beggar followed him, and Martin ordered his archdeacon to clothe the poor man. But the archdeacon being in no haste to do this, Martin went into a closet, gave his tunic to the beggar and bade him to be off at once. When the archdeacon admonished him to set out for the solemnity, he said, speaking of himself, that he could not go until the poor man had received a garment. The archdeacon did not understand his meaning because, since the saint was outwardly covered by his cape, the other could not see that he was without a tunic; wherefore he pleaded that the poor man was no longer there. But Martin said to him: "Let a tunic be brought, and the poor man will no longer need to be clothed!" At this, the archdeacon went into the market and bought for five pieces of silver a cheap short tunic called a paenula, an "almost nothing;" and snatching it up he came and threw it angrily at Martin's feet. The saint put it on secretly and found that the sleeves came only to his elbows, and the hem to his knees; and so he went to celebrate the Mass. While he was engaged in the sacrifice, a globe of fire appeared above his head and was seen by many; wherefore, he is said to be equal to the apostles. In recounting this miracle Master John Belet adds that when, as is the custom, he lifted his hands to God, his linen sleeves split back, since his arms were not large or fleshy; and since the sleeves of the aforementioned tunic reached but to the elbows, his arms were left bare. Then, by a miracle, angels brought golden bracelets set with jewels, and covered his arms decently withal.

A scene like the preceding is just the kind of soil which nourishes exempla. And although persistent efforts have not unearthed a text which incorporates chattering women, a recording demon, and an easily-amused deacon into this story of Martin's Mass, the tremendous English popularity of the Bishop of Tours and the frequent in-

biographie ou à la Passio du saint;" Suitbert Baumer, *Histoire du Breviaire*, I (Paris, 1905), 397.

³³ *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*, tr. Granger Ryan and Helmut Ripperger (London, 1941), pp. 669–70. The *Libri Miraculorum* was edited by H. L. Bordier (Paris, 1860); see especially Vol. II: "De virtutibus sancti martini."

clusion of his deacon Brice's name on November liturgical calendars make them readily available actors in a scene easily enlarged upon.³⁴ The Martin tapestry in the church of Montpezat, Tarn-et-Garonne, shows concretely how this might have been accomplished. "The tapestry contains three scenes. The first shows the saint, in episcopal dress, asleep in front of a cottage. On his right is a young man holding a book, and on his left the Devil; in the background, St. Martin kneels in prayer. The centre panel of the tapestry shows the episodes of the beggar and the cloak, and of the angels with the golden sleeves. The third scene shows St. Martin celebrating Mass, attended by an acolyte; on the right side are the two inattentive women, and above them a devil with a scroll in his mouth. The superscription reads: "'Martin chantant brixer seruoit Et se ryoit en ung toucquet/ Voyant que le diable escripuoit De deus comeres le cacquet.'" ³⁵ The date of this particular tapestry is usually given as 1519, long after the story of the writing devil was well-established. But the scenes woven there reflect an embellishment which would have suited the religious taste of the mid-thirteenth century.

By the same date St. Brice would have been sufficiently restored to popular esteem to have been included in the story. Gregory of Tours had pictured him as no more than a very irreverent young man with a sense of humor.³⁶ Sulpicius Severus, however, by recounting his hostile remarks to and about Martin, had been the source of Brice's unsavory reputation.³⁷ Some commentators maintain that it was Brice's attitude toward Martin, as recorded by Sulpicius, that was at least partially responsible for alienating the people of Tours and which forced Brice into a year's exile from his see.³⁸ Though within twenty-

³⁴ Alban Butler, comp., Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater, rev., *The Lives of the Saints*, Vol. XI (New York, 1937), 154.

³⁵ The description was provided by Miss M. W. Evans of the Warburg Institute.

³⁶ Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks*, tr. Ernest Brehaut (New York, 1965), p. 21 (Section 2.1): "Now this Brice, when he was a young man and the saint was yet living in (p. 22) the body, used to lay many traps for him . . ." (to a sick man he said) "If you are seeking for that crazy person, look in the distance; there he is, staring at the sky in his usual fashion as if he were daft" . . . "Furthermore, when he had attained to the rank of priest, he often attacked the blessed man with abuse."

³⁷ *The Chronicles of Sulpicius Severus*, tr. Mary Caroline Watt (London, 1928), p. 52 (Section 3.15): "The leader of those who were opposed to Saint Martin was the priest Brice or Brictio . . . This Brictio was a worldly person and on many occasions forced the saint to draw upon his inexhaustible store of patience! One day on being reproached for his luxurious and imprudent conduct Brictio became amazingly violent and to insults almost added blows." (Martin excused him by blaming the incident on two devils!)

³⁸ For bibliography, see *Analecta Bollandiana*, 24, pp. 95 ff.

five years of his death in 444 Brice's feast was kept at Tours, it was some time before his cult spread throughout Europe and his sanctity became venerated in every diocese north of the Alps.³⁹ In 913 his relics were conveyed to the new Basilica of St. Martin and placed in an urn inscribed with the laudatory "man of virtue, imitator of Martin"; in 1185, the Canons of Tours transferred his remains to a silver tomb.⁴⁰ Since many of the saints' legends were composed on the occasion of their "translatio," the dissemination of a story in which Brice laughs at a writing devil and is, in the process of explaining his "vision," recognized as a holy man might well have accompanied the ecclesiastical ceremonies of 1185.

Such speculation is given a certain amount of substance by references to versions of a Martin-Brice-Devil story no longer extant: it may be read "in vita sancti Bricii," according to a passing remark in the *Speculum Laicorum*; and there is a concise rendition, taken supposedly from a "Gesta Sancti Bricii," by the compiler of the *Liber Exemplorum*. Moreover, Evelyn Faye Wilson believes that if one substituted St. Martin for the Blessed Virgin and St. Brice for the unnamed clerk, one would then possess the original narrative from which the 1250 John of Garland version of the story derives.⁴¹ The lack of any consistent set of characters in what I have termed the third grouping of *personae* confirms Wilson's reasoning and shows that local saints or favorite intercessors often replaced the initial participants.

The hypothesis that the Martin-Brice-devil version was the original form of the writing-demon exemplum might, finally, be judged improbable since the earliest extant versions are the simpler tales with other principals. That these earlier, simpler forms of the story are closer to an "original" could be argued as the "antecedent probability."⁴² But as Loomis has shown with the many and varied strands of the Arthurian tradition,⁴³ and as Hardison has argued concerning the *Quem quaeritis* trope, analogies based on biological evolution (which proceeds from simpler to more complex "mutated" forms) are not

³⁹ F. G. Holweck, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Saints* (St. Louis, 1924), p. 171.

⁴⁰ *Gallia Christiana*, Vol. XIV, Bartholomew Hauréau, comp. (Paris, 1956), p. 11: Certum est S. Bricii corpus anno 913 transvectum fuisse in novam S. Martini basilicam, et conditum in urna . . . Translatum rursus fuit corpus S. Bricii in thecam argenteam a Framaudo, canonico S. Martini, fabricantam, anno 1185.

⁴¹ Wilson, p. 193.

⁴² "The probability of events is one of their objective properties and not the result of our observations of them." M. Rosenthal and P. Yudin, *A Dictionary of Philosophy* (Moscow, 1967), p. 362.

⁴³ Roger Sherman Loomis, *The Development of Arthurian Romance* (New York, 1964), p. 29.

necessarily applicable to literary history. "Complex forms are often simplified or changed radically in the process of being adapted to changed conditions. . . . In all cultures sufficiently sophisticated to have a literary tradition preserved in written form, influences, sources, and conscious manipulation by individual authors are demonstrably more significant than a hypothetical impulse or instinct toward gradually increasing complexity."⁴⁴ The development of the recording demon exemplum could—on a much smaller scale—be another case of "non-evolutionary" development.

Those among the extant versions which appear most highly developed, most "mutated," could nevertheless be more "original" than those which now seem to us simpler, barer, and less "developed." The dates of extant versions—deVitry's version is early, Rabelais' is late, for instance—may well be the result of the vagaries of manuscript survival and do not securely lead to the simple conclusion that the deVitry *type* of the exemplum is more original than the Rabelais *type*. The more detailed, more highly "developed" accounts of the *Mystere de la vraie hystorie de Monseigneur Saint Martin*, of Geoffrey de la Tour, of Rabelais and of Noel de Fail could equally be thought the original story, of which Jacques deVitry's and Jacobus Januensis' versions are more pallid and less energetic derivatives.

Tutivillus' later dramatic roles, and the pejorative function his name exercised at the end of his literary career, can contribute little towards our understanding of this devil's origins. But once evolutionary analogy is put in perspective, and once the preponderance of versions featuring Martin and Brice is given due weight, the attention of one who seeks the source of the exemplum about the scribbling devil is directed almost inexorably toward a once-popular *Vita sancti Bricii*. And despite the necessarily tentative nature of this conclusion, the material which has led to it remains both substantial and fascinating. Through appreciating its scope and tracing its progress one comes to the certain conviction that Tutivillus, this medieval Screwtape, is a richly imagined and memorable literary personality.

⁴⁴ O. B. Hardison, Jr., *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore, 1965), p. 182.

APPENDIX I: Recording Demon—Named and Unnamed

CENTURY:	13th	14th
DEVIL	<i>Historia Occidentalis</i> sc*	<i>Handlyng Synne</i> wd
UNNAMED	<i>Sermones Vulgares</i> sc and wd	<i>Mariu Saga</i> wd
	<i>Liber de septem donis</i> sc	<i>Geistliche Gedichte</i> wd
	<i>Dialogus Miraculorum</i> sc	<i>Book of the Knight of the Tower</i> wd
	<i>Speculum Laicorum</i> wd	<i>Scala Celi</i> wd and sc
	<i>Stella Maris</i> wd	<i>Promptuarium Exemplorum</i>
	<i>Lay Folks Mass Book</i> wd	sc and wd
	<i>Liber Exemplorum</i> wd	<i>Libro de los exemplos</i> wd
	<i>Speculum Historiale</i> wd	<i>Summa Predicantium:</i>
	MSS:	"Consilium" wd
	Add. 27909B, f. 7 ^v wd	MSS:
	Laud Misc. 315, f. 91 ^r wd	Add. 18349, f. 62 ^r wd
		Add. 15833, f. 174 ^v wd
		Add. 26770, f. 78 ^r wd
		Arundel 506, f. 20 ^r and 22 ^r wd
		Breslau 33, f. 258 ^r wd
		Camb. Univ. Lib. F.f.I.17,
		f. 48 ^{ra} sc
		Harley 268, f. 34 ^r , 75 ^v , 163 ^r wd
		Harley 463, f. 19 ^v wd
		Laud Misc. 471, f. 120 ^r , 122 ^r wd
DEVIL	<i>Tractatus de penitentia</i> in	<i>Vox Clamantis</i> n
NAMED	MSS:	<i>Sermones quadragesimales</i>
	Royal 4. D. IV, f. 257 ^r sc	<i>Thesauri Novi</i> sc
	Royal 10. A. IX, f. 40 ^{vb} sc	<i>Summa Predicantium:</i> "Ferie"
	Paris Maz. 295, f. 86 ^v sc	and "Ordo" n and sc
	Bodley 402, f. 336 ^{va} sc	<i>John Waldeby's Sermons</i> in
	<i>Opus Quadragesimale</i> in	MS Laud Misc. 77, f. 45 ^v sc
	MS Royal 8. C. XII,	MSS:
	f. 24 th sc and wd	Add. 15833, f. 98 ^v sc
		Add. 33956, f. 26 ^r sc
		Arundel 506, f. 46 ^v sc
		Douce 104, f. 112 ^v wd
		Harley 268, f. 82 ^v sc
		Harley 755, f. 15 th (Gorran)
		wd and sc
		Munich Staats. 18921, f. 5 ^r n
		Royal 7. E. IV, f. 394 ^r sc

*Demonic activity is indicated as follows:

wd: the writing devil

sc: the sack carrier

n: conflation of stories; hence name only is discernible

15th

Recull de Eximplis No. DXII wd
Magnum Speculum Exemplorum
 wd and sc
Corona de' Monachi wd and sc
Buch des Ritters vom Thurm wd
Alphabetum Narrationum No. 122 sc
Mirk's Festial wd
Caxton's Doctrinal wd
Jacob's Well wd and sc
Miracles de Ste. Genviève
Les Actes des Apôtres wd
Mystère de saint Martin wd
 MSS:
 Add. 21147, f. 11^v sc
 Add. 27336, f. 65^v wd
 Arundel 378, f. 18^v, 87^r
 Canon Misc. 528, f. 62^r wd
 Canon Misc. 532, f. 104^r wd
 Munich Staats. 3131, f. 161^r wd
 Munich Staats. 5015, f. 104^v sc

Recull de Eximplis No. CXXIII sc
Sele Trost wd
Assembly of Gods N
Myroure of oure Ladye sc
Alphabetum Narrationum No. 150 sc
Redentiner Osterspiel N
Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel N
Erlauer Spiele N
Pfarrkircher and Haller
Passionsspiele wd
L'Assomption de la Vierge N
Mystère de Saint Louis wd
Towneley Judicium
Mankind
"Spielermesse" in Hollen's
Preceptorium N
"Cockelbie Sow" N
"Cursing of Sr. John Rowlis" N
**"De Meritis Misse" (Audelay)* wd
 MSS:
 Add. 21147, f. 130^v sc
 Arundel 378, f. 23^{rb} sc
 Lansdowne 762, f. 99^r N
 Lansdowne 763, f. 58^{rb} N

16th and later

Speculum Spiritualium (Henry of
 Balnea) wd
Helvetia Sancta wd
Papistische Lügen wd
Gargantua (Rabelais) wd
Flöhkhaz wd
Mots et sentences dorées de Cathon
 (Pierre de Grosnet) wd
Contes et discours d'Eutrapel (Noël
 du Eail) sc
 Numerous Icelandic (and other)
 Folktales and Legends wd

"Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie" N
 Dunbar's "Poem XV" N
 Skelton's *Garlande of Laurell and*
Colyn Cloute N
 Heywood's *Proverbs* N
 Hall's *Henry VI and Edward IV* N
 Awdeley's *Fraternity of Vagabonds* N
 Stubbes' *Anatomy of Abuses* N
Teufelscomödie N
Thersites N
Ralph Roister Doister N
Godly Queene Hester N
 Jonson's *Epicoene* N
 † Roper's *Syr Thomas Moore* N
 † Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and
2 Henry IV N
 † Scott's *The Antiquary* N
 Bell's *Walter Hadden Against Osorius* N

* The devil is named in this poem but is called "Rofyn."

† The name is corrupted here to "Tillyvalley" or "Tillyfally."

APPENDIX II: Recording Demon—Principal Appearances

CENTURY:

13th

14th

SERMONALIA

(Sermon texts,
Exempla collec-
tions, Sermon
material)

Sermones Vulgares
Liber de septem donis
Liber exemplorum
Speculum Laicorum
Dialogus Miraculorum
Opus Quadragesimale

Sermones quadragesimales
Thesauri Novi
Scala Celi
Promptuarium Exemplorum
Summa Predicantium
Libro de los Exemplos
Sermons of John Waldeby
Sermons of Nicolas de Gorran

DIDACTIC
AND MORAL
TREATISES

Stella Maris
Lay Folks Mass Book
Historia Occidentalis
Tractatus de penitentia
Speculum Historiale

Handlyng Synne
Book of the Knight of the Tower
Mariu Saga
Geistliche Gedichte
Vox clamantis

DRAMA

OTHER

15th

Recull de Eximplis
Magnum Speculum Exemplorum
Corona de' Monaci
Mirk's Festial
Alphabetum Narrationum

16th and later

Sele Trost
Buch des Ritters vom Thurm
Jacob's Well
Assembly of Gods
Myroure of oure Ladye
Caxton's Doctrinal

Redentiner Osterspiel
Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel
Erlauer Spiele
Pfarrkircher and Haller
Passionspiele
Miracles de Ste. Genviève
Les Actes des Apôtres
L'Assomption de la Vierge
Mystère de Saint Louis
Mystère de saint Martin
Towneley Judicium
Mankind

"Spielermesse" in Hollen's
Preceptorium
 Audelay's "De Meritis Misse"
 "Cockelbie Sow"
 "Cursing of Sr John Rowlis"

Speculum Spiritualium (Henry of
 Balnea)
Papistische Lügen
Flöhhaz
Helvetia Sancta
Stubbes' Anatomy of Abuses

Teufelscomödie
Thersites
Ralph Roister Doister
Godly Queene Hester
Jonson's Epicoene

"Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie"
 Dunbar's "Poem XV"
 Skelton's *Garlande of Laurell* and
Colyn Cloute
 Rabelais' *Gargantua*
 Heywood's *Proverbs*
 Hall's *Henry VI* and *Edward IV*
 Awdeley's *Fraternity of Vagabonds*
 Pierre de Grosnet's *Mots*
 Noël du Fail's *Contes*
 James Bell's *Walter Hadden Against*
Osorius

N.B. Numerous Dictionary entries, as well as the many citations of a recording demon in Icelandic and other folktales and legends, have not been included in this listing.

Register of Manuscripts Cited

Additional 15833, f. 98^v and f. 174^v
Additional 18349, f. 62^r
Additional 21147, f. 11^v and f. 130^v
Additional 26770, f. 78^r
Additional 27336, f. 65^v
Additional 27909B, f. 7^v
Additional 32678, f. 90^v
Additional 33956, f. 26^r

Arundel 378, f. 18^{va}, f. 23^{rb}, and f. 87^{ra}
Arundel 506, f. 20^r, f. 22^r, and f. 46^v

Bodley 402, f. 336^{va}

Camb. Univ. Lib. F.f.I.17, f. 48^{ra}

Canon Misc. 528, f. 62^r
Canon Misc. 532, f. 104^r

Douce 104, f. 112^v

Egerton 1117, f. 179^v

Harley 268, f. 34^r, f. 75^v, f. 82^v, and f. 163^r
Harley 463, f. 19^v
Harley 755, f. 15^{rb}

Lansdowne 762, f. 99^r
Lansdowne 763, f. 58^{rb}

Laud Misc. 77, f. 45^v
Laud Misc. 315, f. 91^r
Laud Misc. 471, f. 120^r and f. 122^r

Mazarine 295, f. 86^v

Royal 4. D. IV, f. 257^r
Royal 7. E. IV, f. 394^{ra}
Royal 8. C. XII, f. 24^{rb}
Royal 10. A. IX, f. 40^{vb}

Index: Selected Subjects

- Actes des Apôtres*: 56
Alphabetum Narrationum: 23
Assumption de la Vierge: 54
Book of the Knight of the Tower: 29–30
 Brice, Saint: 81–83
 Bromyard, John: 18–19
 Caesarius of Heisterbach: 13
Corona Monaci: 20–21
 demonic grotesques: 6–7
 Desert Fathers: 2–5
 dogma about demons: 5–6
 exemplum tradition: 7
 Etienne de Bourbon: 13–14, 21
Fragmina verse: 15–20
 Grobuis, Joannes: 14
 Gower, John: 71
Handlyng Synne: 27–28
 Herolt, Joannes: 14
Jacob's Well: 22
 Jacques de Vitry: 11, 12, 25–26
 John of Garland: 26–27
 John of Wales: 16–17
Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel: 52
Lay Folks' Mass Book: 28–29
 laughing cleric: 45–47
Liber Exemplorum: 29
Ludus Mariae Magdalene in gaudio: 52
Mankind: 64–68
 Martin of Tours, Saint: 4, 79–82, 83
Miracles de Ste. Genviève: 56
 MS Douce 104: 30
Myroure of Oure Ladye: 23
Mystère de la vraie hystoire de Monseigneur Sainct Martin: 57
Mystère de Sainct Jean Chrysostome: 56
Mystère de Sainte Louis: 54–56
Passionspiele (Pfarrkircher-Haller): 53
 recording demon: 8, 10; its physical shape: 35–36; in folklore: 33–34; in the visual arts: 32–33
Recull de Eximplis: 20
Redentiner Osterspiel: 51–52
 sack-carrier: 10–11, 13–24; his sack: 37
Scala Coeli: 26
Sele Trost: 22
Septenaries: 10
 sloth, types of: 12
Speculum Historiale: 26
Speculum Laicorum: 29
 Towneley *Judicium*: 58–64
 Tutivillus: 50; first occurrence of name: 14–17; etymology of name: 37–41; in later drama: 68–70; in decline: 72–77
 writing devil: 24–33; his characterization: 47–48; his immediate physical context: 42–43; his writing instruments: 41–42; his parchment: 44–45