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The many mnemonic schemes for remembering and classifying the Western Christian scheme of virtues and vices include pairings derived from Prudentius’s Psychomachia, wheels, trees such as the Arbor virtutum et viciorum, and genealogies.1 The seven or eight capital vices and their opposing virtues were a key feature of catechetical activity that grew in importance after the fourth Lateran Council (1215), as can be seen from the many treatises and mnemonic extracts that survive. Some texts were translated into the vernacular, such as the two treatises by the Dominican William Peraldus which were soon amalgamated into a single Summa de vitiis et virtutibus (c. 1236), and the short treatise on the seven vices in Friar Laurent’s Somme le Roi (1279), also a Dominican work, which survives in over ninety manuscripts.2 A further major author (real and fictitious) of texts concerning the vices was the Franciscan Robert Grosseteste (d.1253), who will be discussed below.3 The seven capital virtues and vices were a key feature of catechetical activity that grew in importance after the fourth Lateran Council (1215), as can be seen from the many treatises and mnemonic extracts that survive. Some texts were translated into the vernacular, such as the two treatises by the Dominican William Peraldus which were soon amalgamated into a single Summa de vitiis et virtutibus (c. 1236), and the short treatise on the seven vices in Friar Laurent’s Somme le Roi (1279), also a Dominican work, which survives in over ninety manuscripts.2 A further major author (real and fictitious) of texts concerning the vices was the Franciscan Robert Grosseteste (d.1253), who will be discussed below.3


vices eventually became simplified as the seven deadly sins: Pride, Envy, Anger, Sloth, Avarice, Gluttony and Lust: ‘Les set morteus péchés sunt ces: orguyl, envie, ire, accidie, avarice, glutunie, lecherie’. The varied schemes were condensed by Hostiensis (d.1271) into the acronym SALIGIA (Superbia, Avaritia, Luxuria, Ira, Gula, Invidia, Accidia), and in turn this produced the verb saligiare: to commit a deadly sin. A poem in French teaching ‘Saligia’ survives from the thirteenth century.

Among many examples of the schemes is an allegorical text that imagines a list of vices as the daughters of the Devil, and that assigns a particular group in society to each. It blends a simple didactic device found in at least one vernacular aid to confession with estates satire, a moralising review of all the ranks of society, which flourished from the twelfth century on, in such poems as the Bible Guiot. Several sermon collections of the first half of the thirteenth century contain a short prose exemplum of the Devil’s daughters, and it features in some moralising and satirical poems in Latin. In the later thirteenth-century, the allegory of the Devil’s daughters appeared at length in a poem in Anglo-Norman French, ‘un tretiz coment le deable maria ces IX files a gent du secle et de seinte Eglise, solom Robert Groceteste’ (hereafter, les .ix. files). Around the same time (c.1285-92), another verse version of the allegory was copied into a self-contained compilation of vernacular devotional texts produced in the Artois, Hainaut and Brabant regions, with the title C’est li mariages des filles au diable (hereafter C’est li mariages). It survives with an illustration in Paris Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal ms 3142 (f. 192r) and Paris BNF français 12467 (f.64v), which stresses that the daughters are the wicked mirror-opposites of the Four Daughters of God,
who appear at the start of the series in a short poem entitled *Les Quatre Sœurs*. The image in Arsenal 3142 depicts four ladies whose hands end with cloven hoofs, like those of their father. Their headdresses extend outwards into cow-like horns. The poem makes much of the foolish head-dresses worn by fashionable women, the *cornes*, but otherwise it is not the same allegorical narrative as the Anglo-Norman work. It consists instead of an application of the capital and minor vices to a social hierarchy that is modelled on the traditional Estates satire. This poem will therefore not be studied in detail in this article, but it is important for its visual rendering of the exemplum, and for its clear association of it with the very widespread devotional and penitential tradition, derived from Psalm 84:11 of the four daughters of God (Mercy, Truth, Justice, and Peace).

There are two versions in Occitan prose, both of them in fourteenth-century manuscripts, and both are similar to the Anglo-Norman poem. One is a short exemplum in the second redaction of the *Leys d’Amors* (Toulouse, 1356), and the other, entitled *las .vii. filhas del dyable*, is in a compilation produced in Avignon between 1321 and 1329 (hereafter, L2). The exemplum in the *Leys d’Amors* is short and schematic, but a medieval reader found

---


11 See Hauréau.

12 Vulgate Ps. 84 (85) : 11 : ‘Misericordia et veritas obviaverunt sibi ; iustitia et pax osculatae sunt’. A. Lángfors, *Notice des manuscrits 535 de la bibliothèque municipale de Metz et 10047 des nouvelles acquisitions du fonds français de la Bibliothèque nationale, suivie de cinq poèmes français sur la parabole des ”Quatre filles de Dieu”* (Paris: Académie des inscriptions et des belles-lettres, 1933). For Anglo-Norman examples, see Dean, item 685.

13 Respectively, the *Leys d’Amors* redaction of 1356, now Toulouse Bibliothèque Municipale MS 2883, f.32v, col.b, and British Library Add. MS 17920, hereafter L2. Meyer, p.58, n.2. The extract from the *Leys d’Amors* manuscript, then known as Académie des Jeux Floraux ms. 500 006, was published as ‘extrait d’un ms. inédit du XIVe siècle’ by C. Chabaneau as an addition to his article, ‘Sur quelques manuscrits provençaux perdus ou égarés (Suite),’ *Revue des langues Romanes*, 26 (1884) 209-18, p.218. Chabaneau had made initial transcriptions of parts of book I of the *Leys d’Amors* and his secretive approach to his publication must be ascribed to long-forgotten academic politics. Chabaneau’s edition of the Devil’s daughters is reproduced with a different layout by Ricketts (who did not identify its provenance) in, ‘Deux textes,’ p. 332. The text was edited and published in context in *Las Leys d’Amors: Manuscrit de l’Académie des Jeux Floraux*, ed. J. Anglade, 4 vols (Toulouse: Privat, 1919-1920), I, pp.112-13. Anglade suggests that Chabaneau worked only from a seventeenth-century copy of the manuscript, *ibid.*, I, p.1, wrongly in my view, see nn.15, 16 below.
it sufficiently interesting to draw a large cruciform sword by its side, and to draw a line down the side of the list of daughters’ marriages.\textsuperscript{14}

Diverses estatz de gens trobam en aquest mon; e si en aquestz de que havem parlat hom troba fautas atertantas e mays en los autres ;\textsuperscript{15} e per so legem que l demonis esposet iniquitat. De laqual hac nou filhas :\textsuperscript{16} symonia, ypocrizia, rapina, uzura, deceptio, erguelh, fals servezi, sacrilegi, luxuria; e quar a son avis no poc trobar mas .VIII. manieras d’ome, non maridec mas .VIII ; symonia donec a clerç, ypocrizia als religiozes, rapina als cavaliers et als homes de parage, uzura als ricz, cobes et avars, deceptio als baratayres e falces mercadiers, erguelh als senhorejans, fals servesi als obriers, sacrilegi als lavradors, luxuria remas comuna a totz.

\textit{We find different estates of people in this world, and if faults are to be found in those that we have discussed, then there are even more to be found in the others. That is why we read that the Devil married Injustice/Unfairness, from whom he had nine daughters: Simony, Hypocrisy, Plunder, Usury, Deceit, Pride, False Service, Sacrilege, and Lust. Because, in his opinion, he could not find more than eight types of men, he married off no more than eight of them. He gave Simony to clerics, Hypocrisy to the religious, Plunder to knights and men of noble birth, Usury to the covetous, the avaricious and the rich, Deceit to the cheats and the false merchants, Pride to the powerful lords, False Service to workers, and Sacrilege to labourers. Lust remains common to everyone.}

The exemplum in the \textit{Leys d’Amors} is very close in both its length and its structure to the Latin exempla on which it is based. It is also sufficiently different from the text in L\textsuperscript{2} to make it possible to conclude that the two texts are not connected. The two versions of the \textit{.vij. filhas} were copied in the same period as several Occitan versions circulated of Friar Laurent’s \textit{Somme le Roi}, with the title \textit{Lo Libre de vicis e de vertutz}. One of the earliest of these is

\textsuperscript{14} Anglade, I, pp.112-13, checked against the manuscript online: <http://numerique.bibliotheque.toulouse.fr/collect/general/index/assoc//ark:/74899/B315556101_MS2883.dir/images/B315556101_MS2883_039.jpg>.

\textsuperscript{15} The word is unclear. Anglade suggests \textit{o} or even \textit{.m}. (for one thousand). Chabaneau transcribes it \textit{a}.

\textsuperscript{16} Anglade emends \textit{.ix.} to \textit{nou}. Chabaneau preserves \textit{.ix.} Chabaneau also respects the paraph markers in this column and renders the list of the daughters’ marriages as a set of eight lines.
datable to shortly after the year 1343, and was owned by a notary of Aix-en-Provence (Paris BNF fr. 1049). In this manuscript, the Vices are depicted visually as the Tree of Pride that features in the Somme le Roi (‘lalbre derguelh de que nayson li .vii. pecatz mortals’) (f.18r).17

In an article published in 1895, C. Boser noted that it was likely that the Occitan redaction common to three of the five surviving manuscripts was later translated back into French in the fifteenth century (Paris BNF fr. 959).18 Out of the Occitan translations, Paris BNF fr. 1745 is a compilation destined for private devotion and instruction.

This article will focus on the longer text in L2 ( .vii. filhas) and aims to investigate further Meyer’s suggestion that the .vii. filhas derives from an insular source, either Latin or Anglo-Norman. The enquiry developed from the need to explore the case made elsewhere that this Occitan compilation of the early 1320s was produced partly using sources from an Anglo-Norman environment.19 Investigating the .vii. filhas in the context of the whole manuscript (L1-L2) where it is combined with a compilation of thirteen Marian miracles, also furthers the investigation into the context and possible milieu of the Occitan compilation, which includes identified works by mendicant authors, the Franciscan Paolino Veneto (d. 1343), then Apostolic Penitentiary at Avignon, and the Dominican Philip of Slane, then Bishop of Cork (d. c. 1326), who spent the year 1324-25 in Avignon representing the interests of King Edward II of England.20

As was suggested by Wüstefeld, and established in detail recently by Federico Botana and Alexander Ibarz, \( \text{L}^1 \)-\( \text{L}^2 \) was originally a single codex. It was begun probably shortly after the year 1321 by three scribes and two illustrators, who produced the Occitan version of an illustrated universal chronicle by Paolino Veneto. The third scribal hand took charge of the rest of the codex. This hand copied a collection of Marian miracles, the .\textit{vii. filhas}, a Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle (the C tradition, which is strongly associated with England), and Philip of Slane’s abridged version of Gerald of Wales’ \textit{Description of Ireland}, which he had presented to Pope John XXII during his visit of 1324-25. The manuscript ended with a \textit{Provinciale Romanum}. This third hand added some annotations for an unidentified male reader whom it addresses as ‘vos senher’ (your lordship).

**British Library Eg. MS 1500 (ms. \( \text{L}^1 \)), ff. 1-63:**

\textit{L’Abreujamen de las estorias} (Paolino Veneto, OFM)

Some notes on the \textit{Abreujamen} (now ff.1r-2v and 63v-65r)

---

**British Library Add. MS 17920 (ms. \( \text{L}^2 \)) :**

\textit{Dels miracles de Sainhta Maria Vergena} (Marian miracles)

\textit{De las \textit{vii. filhas del dyable}.}

Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle.

\textit{The Marvels of Ireland} (Philip of Slane, OP).\(^{21}\)

**British Library Egerton MS 1500 (\( \text{L}^1 \)), ff. 61-65:**

\textit{Provinciale romanum}

---

Table 1: Reconstruction of \( \text{L}^1 \)-\( \text{L}^2 \).

The Occitan tradition concerning the Devil’s daughters is therefore quite strong, compared to the \textit{langue d’oïl}. Oxford Bodleian Rawlinson Poetry MS 241, studied and partly edited by Paul Meyer, contains one of the two surviving copies of an Anglo-Norman poem on the Devil’s daughters as well as a collection of three Marian miracles with prologue, attributed to

Everard of Gateley, a monk of Bury-St Edmunds. The Marian miracle collection that immediately precedes the .vi. filhas in L² was linked, mistakenly in my view, to Anglo-Norman French sources by Ulrich in his edition of 1879. The miracles are of uneven length, and the last tale (XIII) is not only much longer than its predecessors, but it is subdivided by two rubrics. It features the Devil, and appears to provide a logical transition between the series of miracles and the Devil’s Daughters. The annotator to L² (who is also its lone scribe), points out to vos senher in his marginal notes that he already owns two of the miracles (VI and VIII) in another book that he terms ‘the book of Saint Mary’. However, none of the miracles in Rawl. Poetry 241 coincide with the thirteen miracles in L². Furthermore, the proliferation of Marian miracle collections in twelfth-century England makes it impossible to establish a credible single source either there or on the continent. Although Ulrich maintained as his working hypothesis a possible translation from the thirteenth-century French compilations associated with Gautier de Coincy, he turned to the manuscripts of the British Library for his sources, because it is there that he worked on his edition of L². As a result, his hypothesis about an Anglo-Norman origin is purely the product of the limited sources he had to hand in 1879. The investigation into the Marian texts of L² will be the matter of a separate study, but in terms of their relationship with the tradition of the Devil’s daughters, the presence of Marian miracles in both compilations must be dismissed as a coincidence.

The poem on the Devil’s daughters is attributed in the Rawl. Poetry MS alone to Robert Grosseteste, the Franciscan scholar and bishop of Lincoln (d. 1253). The poem itself designates a certain ‘Saint Robert’ as the translator of an original work in Latin:

Saynt Robert le translata

---

22 The .ix. filles is also preserved in Oxford Bodleian Fairfax MS 24 (c.1290-1300), a compilation that includes a tenson datable to circa 1270 between Walter of Bibbesworth and Henry of Lacy, Earl of Lincoln. Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln, was either seneschal or viceroy of Gascony in 1296-97. See G. J. Brault, ‘Gascon Coat [sic] in the Rolls of Arms of Edward I (1272-1307),’ in De l’aventure épique à l’aventure romanesque: Hommage à André de Mandach, ed. J. Chocheyras (Bern : Peter Lang, 1997), pp.147-157, p.154. For the contents of Fairfax 24, see Dean, items 66, 143, 392, 634, 686.
24 ‘Aquest mi… semblan v… aves el l… de sta ma…’, rendered by Ulrich as ‘Aquest miracles semblan vos aves el libre de Sta Maria’, Ulrich, p.19, n.4.
26 Ulrich, p.12.
27 J. C. Jennings ‘The Writings of Prior Dominic of Evesham,’ The English Historical Review, 77, No. 303 (1962) 298-304 (pp.299-300).
En romanç cum orretz ja;
Hors de latym le fist atrere
Pur ceux qui ne sevent guere
De la force de clergye;
Pur ceo le fyst, ne dutez mye,
Pur les layes meuth encenser
C’il le voilent escoter. (ll.13-20).

The attribution to Grosseteste (who was never canonised) is not as outlandish as it may seem, given the similar attribution to a ‘Saint Robert’ of an Anglo-Norman treatise on house stewardship that survives in ten copies, and his authorship of treatises on the four daughters of God as well as on the vices, notably the *Templum Dei*. An extremely prolific writer and translator, Grosseteste’s name was a preferred attribution for basic confessors’ aids, implying that he had a hand in the early dissemination of catechetical materials. Evelyn Mackie has noted that the poem is in keeping with the spirit if not the style of his allegorical, vernacular poem, the *Chasteau d’Amour*. Furthermore, several manuscripts ascribe a Latin treatise on the capital vices to Grosseteste. One of these was copied in England in the mid-thirteenth century and had made its way to Northern Italy by *circa* 1300 (Pavia, University MS 69).

28 ‘Ici comence le tretiz coment le deable maria ces .ix. files a gent du secle et de seinte Eglise, solom Robert Groceteste,’ and ‘Ataunt finist le marriage des .ix. files au Deable, solom Robert Groceteste’. Meyer identifies the first twelve lines of the poem as the prologue of a *computus* poem by Ralph of Lenham, dated 1256. For this and for the Latin rubric in MS Fairfax, see Meyer, pp.54-55, 61 n.1.


where a scribe rubricated a text on Luxuria as ‘Sermo beati episcopi Lincolniensis’. A further treatise on the virtues was accepted by Thomson as an authentic work by Grosseteste.

Comparison of content between the Occitan and Anglo-Norman texts

Meyer identified similarities between the .vii. filhas and the Anglo-Norman poem and concluded that both derived from a single Latin exemplar (he did not analyse C’est li mariages, which is in any case a markedly different text). Maria Elisa Lage Cotos accepted Meyer’s hypothesis after analysing twenty-nine other versions of the exemplum in poetry and prose. The vernacular treatments of the tale emerge at the same time as lengthier treatments of the sermon exemplum in the Franciscan Dieta salutis (by Pseudo-Bonaventure or Guillaume de Lancia), and in the satirical poems Visio Petri de statu mundi (by Petrus Presbyter) and the Lamentationes Matheoluli. The Visio Petri dramatizes the story engagingly but the text is not directly related to the Occitan or Anglo-Norman versions: The Devil hands out orders affectionately to his seven daughters, who are the seven capital vices. The following table sets out the genealogy as it appears in sermons, compared to the .vii. filhas and the Leys d’Amors. I have maintained Lage Cotos’s distinction between two different versions by Jacques de Vitry (I and II):  

---

33 Thomson, p.236, cited by Newhauser, p.46.
34 ‘…il existe, dans un manuscrit provençal du XIVe siècle, un récit du mariage des filles du diable, qui est visiblement traduit ou abrégé du latin, et qui offre avec le poème anglo-normand des coïncidences qui ne sont certainement pas accidentelles,’ Meyer, p.58.
36 Lage Cotos, pp.299-301.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devil m. <em>Concupiscentia</em></td>
<td>Devil m. <em>Iniquitas</em></td>
<td>Devil m. <em>Iniquitas</em></td>
<td>Devil m. <em>Mauvaisté</em></td>
<td>Devil m. <em>Mauvaisté</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simony – prelates and clergy</td>
<td>Simony – clergy</td>
<td>Simony – clergy</td>
<td>Simony – prelates and secular lords</td>
<td>Simony – prelates and secular lords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypocrisy – monks and false religious</td>
<td>Hypocrisy – religious</td>
<td>Hypocrisy – religious orders</td>
<td>Hypocrisy – religious</td>
<td>Hypocrisy – mendicant religious orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usury – bourgeois</td>
<td>Usury – bourgeois, peasants and the rich</td>
<td>Usury – bourgeois</td>
<td>Usury – greedy rich people</td>
<td>Usury – bourgeois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guile – merchants</td>
<td>Guile – merchants and sellers of all things</td>
<td>Treachery/Swindling merchants</td>
<td><em>Deceptio</em> – dishonest merchants</td>
<td><em>Tricherie</em> (i.e. swindling) – merchants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 Lage Cotos, p.297.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>False service – operariis</th>
<th>False service – male and female famulis</th>
<th>Theft/False service - serfs, servants</th>
<th>Falsa servitia – obriers (translates the Latin operariis)</th>
<th>False Service – provosts, bailiffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pride and superfluity – women</td>
<td>Pride – ladies (dominabus)</td>
<td>Pride/ False Arrogance/ Superfluity - women</td>
<td>Sacrilege – labourers</td>
<td>Pride – women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lust is not a wife but a prostitute.</td>
<td>Lust – no spouse.</td>
<td>Lust - all manner of people</td>
<td>Lust – common to all</td>
<td>Lust – common to all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The exemplum of the Devil’s Daughters in thirteenth-century sources, compared to both versions in Occitan.

It is likely that Jacques de Vitry developed the allegorical exemplum from other descriptions of the Devil, in line with the then-fashionable attribution of family lines to Wisdom and Philosophy. In a sermon collection associated with the University of Paris, Adam de la Vacherie or Adam Picard (c.1282) described a slightly different version of this marriage between infernal and human realms. The Devil, whose wife is unnamed, begets Plunder (knights), Usury (bourgeois), Fraud (merchants), Pride (clergy), Hypocrisy and Envy (the clergy) and Lust (everyone). His list stands out for his inclusion of Envy among the Vices, as well as for his statement that Luxuria enters households like pestilence. This echoes the version by Odo of Cheriton (d. c. 1247), who views the genealogy of the Devil in terms of the transmission of leprosy. The Devil and his leprous wife Nequitiam marry off their sick

---

39 Paris BnF ms. latin 14947, f. 209d .
41 Lage Cotos, p.301.
daughters Simony, Hypocrisy, Plunder, Usury, *Fraus* (‘fraud’, another term for *Dolus*), Sacrilege, and *Fictionem servientibus*. He adds two unmarried, prostitute daughters: *Gula* (Greed) and *Luxuria*.

The Occitan text in the *Leys d’Amors* (cited above) resembles the second Jacques de Vitry exemplum, and it is similar also in its short length. The only significant divergence from Jacques de Vitry II lies in its allocation of Pride to powerful lords (*senhorejans*) rather than to women.42 This exemplum is more than an illustration inside the long and learned prologue to the *Leys d’Amors*. It reflects its overarching genealogical conceit, in that Rhetoric is depicted in the text and in a visual scheme as one of the offshoots of Philosophy, ‘the mother of all the sciences’, who is herself the daughter of Love.43 The exemplum of the Devil’s daughters is followed immediately by an allegory, ascribed to Isidore of Seville, of the seven daughters of Avarice.44

The text of L2 does not part ways with the core genealogical scheme of the thirteenth century. It proposes *Iniquitas* as the wife of the Devil. The order of the daughters is consistent with four out of the five versions tabulated: Simony, Ypocrisis, Rapina, Usura, Dolus (rendered as ‘Perfidia ho Barat’), Sacrilegi, Fals servisi (with the addition of Furt), a compounded ‘Erguol ho Superbia falsa ho Superfluitat’ which brings together the mismatched *Superbia* and *Superfluitas* of Jacques de Vitry I, and finally, unmarried *Luxuria*. ‘Furt, ho Fals servisi,’ provides a vernacular gloss on ‘False service’, as does ‘Erguol’ for ‘Superbia falsa’. However, none of the versions tabulated above feature a personification called ‘Superbia falsa’. Simony also is treated in a way that appears to be unique as the property not only of the clergy, but also of the laity.45

The *vii. filhas* as a translation of *les .ix. files*

---

42 Anglade, I, pp.112-13; Chabaneau, p.218.
43 Anglade, I, pp. 71-73. The illustration is on f.19r, reproduced in Anglade, I, facing page 74.
44 Anglade, I, p.113. Avarice has seven daughters: Inhumanity, *Violensa/Raubaria* (violence or robbery), ‘trelbalh ses repaus’ or *Inquietudo* (unceasing suffering, or lack of peace of mind), Perjury, and three forms of deception: Fallacy, Fraud and Betrayal.
45 ‘La prumeira filha es Symonia, e aquesta lo diable donet als prelatz, e no tan solamen als prelatz, mas atressi als laics’.
The Occitan texts in L₁-L₂ often betray their status as a translation from the Latin through their use of what Helen Wüstefeld terms ‘binômes’, the juxtaposition of two alternative versions of a single word in an attempt to clarify the meaning of the original term. Thus, the Devil ‘donet ho atribuic’ (gave or attributed) *Iniquitas* to his wife (L₂, f.6r, col.a), and Theft is ‘Furt, ho Fals servisi’ (f.6v, col.a). Ladies go around ‘amb pompa ho amb erguol’ (with pomp or pride, f.6v, col.a). Sometimes this takes the form of retrospective glossing. For example, in two miracles of the Virgin relating to the mouth and lips, the lips are rendered consistently as *lauras* in the main text, but glossed once in the margin ‘ho.ls potz’ (L₂, f.3r col.a). Both *lauras* and *potz* are common nouns designating the lips.

There are comparatively fewer such explanatory doublings in the .vii. *filhas*. The .vii. *filhas* ends with a translation of a Latin sentence that it attributes to Saint Bernard: ‘Luxuria es secreta dilectio, pauc durable, e es amareja totz tems durablal, la qual la lutz e degira escurdat e demanda cobrimen a vacua lo cen.’ While the initial statements are both clear and grammatically coherent (‘Luxuria es secreta dilectio, pauc durable’, Lust is a secret pleasure, not long-lasting), the same cannot quite be said for ‘…e es amareja totz tems durablal’ (and it is a bitterness that is always long-lasting). It is followed by a confused, literal translation: ‘[L]a lutz e degira escurdat’ (Light is called Obscurity), notable for its peculiar rendering of the commonplace Occitan spelling of the past participle *dicha as degira*. The sentence continues erroneously to state about Light, ‘e demanda cobrimen e vacua lo cen,’ (and it requests to be covered, and it empties the intellect). *Vacua* looks suspiciously like a calque of the Latin *vacuit*, but the noun *lo cen* must be understood as *lo sen* (the intellect).

Another example seems to reflect a struggle to render the meaning of the original: ‘Donc s’endevenc que un sainh home vi rire un dyable, lo qual aquest sainh home va enterroguar de que resia’ (f.6v, col.b). *Donc* is a gallicism, L₁-L₂ tend to use the Occitan *aisi/aissi*. The translators of L₁-L₂ tend on occasion to substitute the infinitive for the present tense, as can be seen here with the Latinism ‘va enterroguar’, and they are not consistent with their use of tenses (here, the past historic *vi* is followed by the present tense), but tense-switching is not unusual in this period. However, it seems inaccurate to ask ‘de que resia’.

---


Unlike *enterroguar*, this spelling of the imperfect third-person singular of the verb *rire* has no evident relationship with its Latin stem, *ridere*. The devil’s laughter is due to the fact that one of his diabolical friends has been shaken off the train of a lady’s dress and fallen into the mud: ‘e.I dyable es cazutz e lla fangua e es se totz errojatz’.

As with other parts of L², the translator-adapter of the .vii. filhas is assumed to be identical with its scribe (he was the third scribe of the entire codex and he may have completed the compilation alone).⁴⁹ He was a native speaker of Occitan, albeit one who had developed a hybrid of two distant regional varieties of the language. According to Max Pfister and more recently Jean-Pierre Chambon, the scribe/translator combined the lexis of northernmost parts of Occitania (the Velay, in the Auvergne) with grammatical and spelling habits of the Rouergue, a region just north of Provence.⁵⁰ The lexical eccentricities of this scribe are not identical with those of the two scribes who wrote the bulk of L¹, implying that he worked on the texts of L² alone rather than in a team. However, the three hands share a preference for offering alternatives for tricky words, although it is not evident if the words were perceived to be difficult for them, or for their intended readers (this scribe is also the one who penned the marginal notes to ‘vos senher’).

*Iniquitas* is left in its Latinate form despite its multiple meanings of Injustice, Inequality, and Unfairness. To compare, the Anglo-Norman poem renders her name as *Mauveisté* (l.22), which Meyer glosses as an appropriate translation for both *Iniquitas* and *Nequitia*.⁵¹ The clerical vices of *Simonia* and *Hypocrisis* are also left in their Latin forms, as is *Luxuria*. However, the Devil ‘donet ho atribuic’ *iniquitas* to his wife: he ‘granted or attributed’ the vice to her. Meyer emended this sentence to state that the Devil gave his wife the name *Iniquitas* (‘a la qual donet ho atribuic <nom> Iniquitat’). ‘Perfidia, ho Barat’ implies either that the Latinism *Perfidia* (Faithlessness, Treachery) was felt to carry a different meaning to the common Occitan term for a swindle, *barat*, or possibly an instance of the text teaching the correct Latin term (*perfidia*) by dint of a vernacular gloss. The Anglo-

---

⁴⁹ See the studies by Botana and Ibarz.
⁵¹ Meyer, p.56.
Norman poem associates the merchants with *Tricherie*.52 ‘Furt, ho Fals servisi’ is different, because both terms are commonplace in Occitan. *Furt* has a legal as well as a colloquial connotation as it describes the crime of theft, whereas *Fals servisi* might have carried a hint of courtliness, but that cannot be proven. More problematic still is the eighth daughter, named ‘Erguol, ho Superbia falsa, ho Superfluitat’. Pride and Superfluity are not coterminous, and neither sits easily as a gloss on ‘Superbia falsa’. Rather, the eighth daughter betrays that the text was based on not one but several versions of exemplum of the Devil’s daughters. The Anglo-Norman poem names this daughter *Orgueil*, Jacques de Vitry names her *Superbia*, and *Superfluitas*.53

Given the evidence that the Occitan text is a translation, possibly based on multiple sources in another language, it is necessary to re-examine the case that was made by Paul Meyer for identifying a connection with the Anglo-Norman poem. The content of the two texts is similar, but there are major differences in its illustrative content, and most significantly, Sacrilege and False Service are assigned to different social groups. The following table places the marriages and social groups alongside the Artois-Hainaut poem, which exhibits some significant differences in order and content, and which provides this list only in a small section of the text:54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devil - <em>Iniquitas</em></td>
<td>Devil – <em>Mauvaisté</em></td>
<td>No wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simony - prelates</td>
<td>Simony – prelates and secular lords</td>
<td>Simony – priests and prelates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 Meyer, p.57.
53 Meyer, p.57.
Hypocrisy – religious orders

Hypocrisy – mendicant religious orders

Desloiautez - lawyers

Plunder – knights and provosts

Plunder – knights, provosts, and sergeants

Hypocrisy – ‘enceaus qui vestent les vier dras’

Usury – bourgeois

Usury – bourgeois

Roberie – knights

Fraus - merchants

Tricherie (i.e. swindling) – merchants

Tricherie – merchants

Sacrilege - agricultural labourers

Sacrilege – many people

Pride/ False Arrogance/ Superfluity - women

Pride – women

Usury – bourgeois

Lust – all manner of people

Lust – common to all

Pride - ladies

Lust – common to all

Table 3: Comparison of .vii. filhas, les .ix. files and C’est li mariages.

The Occitan and anglo-Norman texts both apply the bestiary exemplum of the ape clinging to its burden to Usury, and both develop the theme of women’s pride by dwelling on dresses with long trains (‘tails’). However, the Anglo-Norman poem develops the personification
allegory more significantly. The daughters are allotted the honorific ‘Dame’. Dame Tricherie (Swindling) contrasts with Dame Lealté, and Dame Sacrilege is linked to Dame Avarice. Pride, the root of all evils, is illustrated by a long digression about ladies’ trains and coifs that moves into an “ubi sunt” and memento mori. The Rawl. Poetry MS section devoted to Lust states that her father’s love for her leads him to make her ‘commune a trestouz/ clerks, lays et religious’ (ll.629-630). She is therefore both held in common, and a fille commune, alluding to an Old French term for a prostitute. The Fairfax MS has lost its digression that promised further offspring of Lust, ‘Ceste fille ad tant des fillettes,/ Tant des braunches et des braunchettes…’ (This daughter had so many little daughters, so many branches and little branches…).55

The Anglo-Norman and Occitan texts are far from identical, but Meyer notes similarities on a micro-level. Hypocrisy is associated with false preachers in both texts:

La seguonda filha es Ypocrisis, e aquesta el donet als religios, e aisso so aquels que porto vestidura d’oylhas defora, e dejotz so lops raubadors. (.vii. filhas)

La secunde, ceo est Ypocrisye;
Moltz ad ycele grant baillye.
Ceste file que bien veom
Est marié en religion
De ky en escrit trovom
Que il vynt de religion,
Gentz an habyth neyrs et blauns,
Et dedens sunt lows rapisauns. (.ix. files, ll.99-106)

This looks promising indeed, but the association between Hypocrisy and the Gospel warning against false preachers who are wolves in sheep’s clothing (Matth. 7: 15) is too commonplace

to be taken as a convincing sign of intertextual dialogue. Moreover, the Anglo-Norman poem devotes another forty lines to mendicant hypocrisy, but the Occitan text does not develop this theme at all.

The Anglo-Norman poem and the Occitan prose also converge in another of the sections cited by Meyer as witnesses to a common source, that of the third daughter, 
*Ravine/Rapina* (Plunder), who is married to the knights. In illustration, the *vii. filhas* recounts the exemplum of a grasping officer who steals a poor woman’s cow and dies when he eats its meat. The Anglo-Norman poem depicts Ravine as a suitable wife for the *chivalers*, who attend church in body but not in spirit, and who pillage for pleasure (ll.148-216). Despite their very different content, Meyer suggests that the Plunder sections have one minor passage in common. He notes that the Occitan ‘…coma si pren per vestiduras preciosas’ is similar to the Anglo-Norman French line ‘Mès si il le fet pur riche vesture’ (line 190), and suggests that lines 196-97 of the French poem, ‘Uncore ele pase plus avaunt/ A provost e a serjaunt’, are linked to the Occitan ‘E aquesta filha lo dyable estendet als preotz’.56 His suggestion stands up to scrutiny (italics mine):

E devo saber los cavalhers que si prendo alquna causa de lor subjetz, si no drechuriers servisis, ho per causa rajonabla de sustansa, coma per guarnimen de vila ho contra sos enemics, que el peca mortalmen, *coma si pren per vestiduras preciosas*, ho per comprar cavals < o autras cauzas >.57 *E aquesta filha lo dyable estendet als preotz* que amonesto lors senhors a far talhas per so que en puesco alcuna causa detraire.

*(And knights should know that if they take anything from their subjects, if it is neither in rightful service nor in the reasonable interests of sustenance – such as the protection of a town, or action against its enemies – they are committing a mortal sin, as when they take it as precious clothing or to buy expensive horses (or other things). And this daughter of the Devil extends to the provosts who urge their seigneurs to raise tithes so that they can hold back something from them.)*

*Mès si il le fet pur riche vesture*

*Ou terre achater ou grant mounture,*

56 Meyer, op. cit., p.59, nn.4 and 5.
57 ‘o autras causas’ is added in the margin.
Il ad mortelement pecché ;

Si ad cele file espousé

Que avaunt fu nomé Ravyne.

Maudyt soit cele meschine!

Uncore ele pase plus avaunt

A provost e a serjaunt

Que abettent lever taillage

Pur lur prou et autri damage. (ll.190-199)

(...but if he does so on account of precious clothing, or to buy land or a nice horse, then he has committed a mortal sin. He has indeed married the daughter that was named beforehand as Plunder. Cursed be that girl! Again, she moves on to provosts and to sergeants who scheme to have tithes raised for their own profit, and for others’ loss.)

Comparing the two passages clarifies why the Occitan text jumps from the plural (‘los cavalhers’) to the singular (‘que el peca mortalmen’). Meyer notes that the scribe (or presumably the translator) struggles to maintain the subject ‘los cavalhers’ in the singular, referring to ‘sos enemics’ (his enemies). The Anglo-Norman poem is more consistent in its syntax in this respect: ‘il’ designates the knight (singular) until it mentions the provosts. Similarly, the Anglo-Norman poem does not have the muddled grammar of ‘coma si pren per vestiduras preciosas, ho per comprar cavals < o autras cauzas >’. Instead, it uses the single verb ‘achater’ to cover the purchase of lands and a horse. Meyer is therefore correct in identifying that the Occitan text is struggling to render accurately the same series of ideas as the Anglo-Norman poem. However, it is very uncertain that such small gleanings amount to proof that they share a specific (rather than generic) source.

The two descriptions of Plunder and her chivalric spouses also share the idea that this vice deafens the sinner to the divine Word, but their treatment of it is very different. In L2, the

58 Meyer, op. cit., p.59, n.3.
daughter passes her ‘deafness’ onto her spouses (this is reminiscent of the exempla cited above that treat sin as a contagious disease):

La tersa filha es Rapina, e aquesta el donet als cavalhers. Aquetz no volo ausir neguna causa de Dieu, jaciaisso que la fes sia d’ausir e d’entendre.

The third daughter is Plunder, and he gave her to the knights. They [masc. plural] do not want to hear anything about God, for he made her [the daughter] deaf both in hearing and in understanding.

In .ix. files, the conceit is treated in a way that contrasts sharply with that of .vii. filhas:

Quant le chivaler voit al muster,
Le corps vynt tut sanz le coer.
De Dieux voet oyer akune chose,
Més le coer aillours repose.
Poit se delyt en le oyer
Car aillours est tut son desir. (ll. 156-161)

Far from being deaf, the knight enjoys what he hears because he is distracted by thoughts of worldly desires. Under the influence of Ravine, whose senses are not affected either, the knight makes appropriate use of his hearing. Given the strong contrast between the two anecdotes, it is logical to suggest that far from being drawn from a single identifiable literary work, the two poems have played slightly different variations on a standard and far more truncated criticism of the military class.

Conclusion
The Old French poem on the Devil’s daughters, *C’est li mariages*, was mentioned briefly in the Introduction. In this poem, which does not develop the allegorical series of marriages, the ladies’ horned headdresses are the target, not their long trains, and the description of the daughters’ ‘marriages’ is quite confused. *C’est li mariages* does prove, however, that versions of the exemplum of the Devil’s daughters were circulating in the northernmost regions of the *langue d’oil*, and that they inspired both a poetic and a visual interpretation.

The existence of *C’est li mariages* and its illustration supports the conclusion that despite their common origin in exempla of the thirteenth century, the .vii. filhas and .ix. files do not derive from a single, identifiable French or Latin source. Rather, this handful of vernacular texts points instead to a common basis in those sermon collections where the Devil’s daughters originated. Taking into account also the lack of support for a specific common origin for the two collections of Marian miracles in L² and Rawl. Poetry 241, it is not possible to conclude that there was an identifiable French or Anglo-Norman influence over the Occitan prose text. Rather, it seems clear that the exemplum of the Devil’s daughters circulated from the mid-thirteenth to the mid-fourteenth century as one of many engaging and vivid tools for teaching the laity about the seven deadly sins, and that it was the springboard for at least three lengthy variations on it.
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