

the greetings from Manjorie Reed

SOPHIA

RASSEGNA CRITICA DI FILOSOFIA E STORIA DELLA FILOSOFIA

35-4-222(-Bs 99999-1

ZSU2a005547

VOLUME XIX, N. 3-4

LUGLIO-DICEMBRE 1951

EDITORE - EDITEUR - VERLEGER - PUBLISHER - EDITOR
CEDAM - CASA EDITRICE DOTT. A. MILANI
Via Jappelli, 5 - PADOVA (Italia)

MONUMENTA GERMANIAE
HISTORICA
Bibliothek

Hajjari e

THE ABBOT JOACHIM'S DISCIPLES AND THE CISTERCIAN ORDER ⁽¹⁾

In 1935 Professor Ottaviano published a note which he found at the end of a manuscript of the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* preserved in the *Biblioteca Casanatense at Roma* (2). This note relates how in 1215 the Archbishop of Cosenza sent his scribe to Curazzo to transcribe Joachim's work on the Apocalypse, how the scribe was troubled at the news of the condemnation of Joachim's book against Peter Lombard in the Lateran Council, and how in two visions — one of the Abbot (*quidam senex habens in digito annulum et baculum in manu*) and the other of Peter Lombard (*quandam umbram omni nigredine nigriorem, que lacertos habens pilosos et digitos ligneos ac virgam ferream in manu...*) — he was reassured in his faith in Joachim. As Professor Ottaviano pointed out, this short passage throws a most interesting light on the state of mind of Joachim's disciples in Calabria in this crucial year 1215. The scribe is thrown into such great confusion by the condemnation, which he believes to be just, that he wonders whether all the Abbot's works are not worthy of condemnation, but so great is the reputation of Joachim that, through the medium of the vision, faith in his orthodoxy is reestablished. By way of compensation, Peter Lombard is represented as a diabolical creature, and, although he prophesies that the chief doctors of the Church will take his side, the first vision culminates in a characteristic Joachimist expectation: « *Set scias quod opus illud [i. e. Joachim's work] adhuc revelabitur tali viro, per quem dolor eorum qui de ipsius operis dampnatione fuere turbati in magnum gaudium convertetur* ». Thus, already at this early date, we see signs of the attitude, so common among later groups of Joachites, that the official hierarchy may be momentarily against them, but that the true spiritual understanding, of which they are the guardians, will be revealed as the real orthodoxy.

The manuscript in which Professor Ottaviano found this note was a fourteenth-century one from S. Maria della Pace di Roma. Recently, I found it also in a collection of material from the monastery of S. Giovanni in Fiore itself. This formed part of an important collection gathered together by the antiquary Camillo Tutini, in the seventeenth century and left to the *Biblioteca Brancacciana*. It was discovered in the *Biblioteca Nazionale at Naples* by Miss Jamison (3), who proposes to publish the whole in collaboration with the present writer, and to

(1) To Dr. B. HIRSCH-REICH I am indebted for invaluable advice and criticism.

(2) Ms. 1411, fo. 191/r. Sec. C. OTTAVIANO, *Un nuovo documento intorno alla condanna di Gioacchino da Fiore nel 1215*, in *Sophia*, III (1935), pp. 476-482. The document itself was republished in *Siculorum Gymnasium, Rassegna Semestrale della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Catania*, luglio-dicembre 1949, pp. 291-293.

(3) Ms. Brancacciana I.F.2. See E. JAMISON, *The Sicilian Kingdom in the mind of Anglo-Norman contemporaries*, in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XXIV (1938), pp. 286 and 284, n. 79.

whose kindness I am indebted for permission to utilise part of it. In view of the fact that the monastic libraries of Calabria have been almost entirely dispersed, so that we only know for certain of one manuscript from S. Giovanni in Fiore (4), this late sixteenth-century collection of material assumes a peculiar importance for the study of Joachimism in Calabria.

The manuscript consists of 150 paper folios, originally numbered 1-150, but now 206-356 in the whole volume. It contains, first, a Liber visitationis of the Cistercian order, made in 1597 by Fr. Cornelius Pelusius, Prior of S. Giovanni in Fiore and Vicar and Visitor of the Cistercian order in the kingdom of Naples. On fo. 64/r (270/r) begins a second section, headed De Abbatia Florensi et eius filiabus Liber IIII, 1598. Into this Pelusius evidently incorporated material at Fiore which is now lost, for fo. 274/r begins: « De regressu Beati Joachimi Abbatis a Hyerusalem et terra sancta, ubi visitavit loca insignia, et de miraculis ipsius paulo diffusius enarrandis, et que quidem cuncta sequentia in quodam vetustissimo Chyrographo bibliotheca florensis monasterii conscripta fideliter sed difficulter exemplavimus ». Then follows a series of anecdotes and miracles, including Luke of Cosenza's account of Joachim (fo. 278/v-280/v), and on fo. 288/r-v the selfsame vision of MS. Casanatense occurs, in a slightly different form. On fo. 297/v quedam epistola Beati Joachimi is transcribed (5), and on fo. 299/v this section ends thus: « Hec sunt que potuimus ex illo prefato chirografo in florense bibliotheca reperto, non minus fideliter quam difficulter exemplare et de verbo ad verbum dictando exarere... ». On the back page (fo. 331/v), perhaps in the hand of Fr. Cornelius himself, is the Casanatense vision once again under this heading: Lector, nota visionem scriptam in codice quodam antiquo in Bibl. Mon. Flor. The text agrees almost exactly with that published by Professor Ottaviano, except that it does not make one grammatical slip. Thus the vision clearly derives from an old source at Fiore — how old, it is impossible to determine until the Tutini manuscript has been critically examined (6). One small detail in the manuscript is worth noting,

(4) Bibl. Corsiniana, Rome, Ms. 41 F. 2, a manuscript of the Liber Concordie which contains on fo. 1/r the following note of the owner: De dono Petri de Albereto monacho monasterii sancti Johannis de Flor., and on fo. 1/v: Liber Fratrum Floris. I am indebted to Prof. H. GRUNDMANN for drawing my attention to this manuscript in the first place.

(5) Inc.: « Universtis Christi fidelibus ad quos littere iste pervenerint frater Joachim..., Loquens Dominus Ezechieli ». See J. BIGNAMI-ODIER, Notes sur deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Vatican, in Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire, vol. LIV (1937), pp. 220-223, who transcribes the whole of this letter from Cod. Vat. Lat. 3822. It is also found in the Vatican, Cod. Borghese 190, fo. 2/v and Cod. Lat. 2034, fo. 195/r, in Florence, Bibl. Laurenz., Cod. Plut. LXXXIX inf. 41, fo. 109/v, in the British Museum, Ms. Royal, 8 F. XVI, fo. 35/v, and the opening words only in Padua, Bibl. Anton., Cod. 322, fo. 166/v. H. GRUNDMANN, Neue Forschungen über Joachim v. Fiore, Marburg 1950, p. 25, n. 1, lists as well: Milan, Bibl. Ambros., Cod. H. 15. inf., fo. 47/a, Paris, Bibl. Nat., Cod. Lat. 8595, fo. 19/v, and Breslau, Stadtbibl., Cod. Rediger 280, fo. 10/b.

(6) It is quite clear from his references to it in Italia Sacra (ed. Coletti, Venice 1721), cols. 195 and 208, that F. UGHELLI had before him this very manuscript of Tutini's: « Porro Florensis Abbatiae originem locumve Cornelius Pelusius, ejusdem Prior, in toto Neapolitano Regno Vicarius et Visitator Ordinis Cisterciensis descripsit, in libro quem de fundationibus caeterorum omnium Monasteriorum ejusdem Ordinis in eodem Regno existentium compilavit, et Acta B. Joachimi ac miracula ab ipso patrata ex vetusto codice Florensis Monasterii exscripsit, ex quo Jacobus Graecus Syllaneus vitam ejusdem Joachimi compilavit, et ex eo Manriques ac nuper Gregorius Laurus Abbas Sagittariensis ex eodem codice in libro, cuius titulus « B. Joachimi Abbatis Florensis mirabilium veritas defensa ». Pelusii vero Ms. liber extat apud amicum nostrum eruditum Ca-

because it reflects the controversy which raged around this subject: the vision on fo. 288/r-v is marked round with a line and the word *delenda* in another hand appears in the margin; two other short passages on fo. 293/r and fo. 296/r, both probably referring to the condemnation, are similarly marked, and on fo. 305/r the quotation from the Super Hieremiam, which is discussed below, is singled out in the same way.

The monks at Fiore, then, still preserved in the sixteenth century the tradition of that first reaction to the condemnation of Joachim. We can see very clearly from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writings that the Abbot's reputation was still a live issue, exciting men to violent opinion, whether they held him to be heretic or saint (7). That the monks of Fiore were sensitive on this subject is shown by the fact that Pelusius' account of Fiore contains a specific defence of Joachim's reputation, for from fo. 300/r-306/v there is a series of sections defending him against various charges, and one of these (fo 300/r-305/r) is headed *De errore eorum qui dicunt beatum virum Joachimum tenuisse quaternitatem* (8).

millum Tutinum ... (col. 195). Ad calcem libelli extat mirabilis visio et admonitio Joachimi, facta cuidam Rogerio Luce, Archiepiscopi scribae, dum mense Aprilis 1215 jussu ipsius in monasterio Curatii exscriberet ejus Commentaria in Apocalypsim B. Joannis Evangelistae » (col. 208). UGHELLI, it will be noted, is aware of the existence of an anonymous book of the miracles of Joachim at Fiore and states that this was used as a basis by Jacobus Graecus, Angelo Manriquez and Gregorio de Lauro (see below). From the *Acta Sanctorum* (May, tom. VII, pp. 90, 91, 112) we learn that Fr. Jacobus Graecus transcribed this book of miracles («... horum narrationem ex Ms. quodam Florentis monasterii libello, usuque et vetustate pene evanito transcripsit Fr. Jacobus Graecus et paulo post annum MDCXII in archivium reposuit») and put together a selection of material from it, which he published as his *Chronologia Joachimi Abbatis et Ordinis Florentis* in 1612. He appears also to have left a Ms. of unpublished miracles in the archives at Fiore (p. 112). This is cited by A. MANRIQUEZ, *Annales Cistercienses*, Lyon 1642, tom. II, anno 1211: «Jacobus Graecus in speciali quodam tractatu de Joachimi miraculis, quem ex archivio Florentis monasterii bona fide excerptum, atque ab urbe transmissum apud me habeo». Copies of both the *Chronologia* and the unpublished *Miracula* came into the hands of Papebroch, but he was unable to find the original anonymous book of miracles, which he conjectured to have been compiled in 1346, when a deputation went from the Order of Fiore to Rome to bear witness to the miracles of their founder. For the contents of this lost Ms., which includes the priceless contemporary account of Joachim by Luke of Cosenza, we have long had to rely on the material of Graecus, as incorporated into the *Acta Sanctorum* by Papebroch, supplemented by De Lauro and Manriquez. Now, the discovery of the Tutini Ms. enables us to go behind Jacobus Graecus to another compilation made from the lost Ms. at Fiore.

(7) Compare, for example, the eulogies of A. WION, *Lignum Vitae*, Venice 1595, II, pp. 790-793, C. HENRIQUEZ, *Fasciculus Sanctorum Ordinis Cisterciensis*, Brussels 1623, pp. 135-140, G. BUCELINUS, *Menologium Benedictinum*, Feldkirch 1655, p. 388, and A. MANRIQUEZ, *op. cit.*, tom. II, anno 1186, 1188, 1189, 1191, 1200, 1211. with the condemnations of BERNARD OF LUXEMBURG, *Catalogus Haereticorum*, Cologne 1529, Lib. II, under *Litera I*, ALPHONSO DI CASTRO, *Adversus omnes hereses*, Antwerp 1565, fo. 62/v-63/r and fo. 162/v, G. DU PÉREAU [Prateolus], *De vitis, sectis et dogmatibus omnium haereticorum*, Cologne 1569, p. 224, T. PETREJO, *Catalogus Haereticorum*, Cologne 1629, p. 97, and C. BARONIUS, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, Lucca 1746, tom. XIX, pp. 617-619. PAGRUS, in his notes to Baronius (*loc. cit.*) sums up the controversy thus: «*Is a quibusdam Sanctus, Doctor ac Propheta, a quibusdam vero illusor, hypocrita et pseudo-propheta dictus, adeo de eo variae fuere sententiae*». He himself takes the opposite side from Baronius, believing that Joachim was a true prophet. The controversy is even reflected in the *Acta Sanctorum*, where PAPEBROCH ranges himself cautiously on the side of Joachim's supporters and makes a judicious pronouncement on the dispute (*vol. cit.*), p. 134.

(8) The other headings are: fo. 305/v, *De errore eorum qui dicunt B. virum Joachim fuisse in subtilibus fidei dogmatibus rudem*; fo. 306/r, *De errore eorum qui dicunt B. virum Joachim Astrologie concordia futura prenunciassse*; fo. 306/v, *De errore eorum qui dicunt B. virum Joachim presumpsisse et non prenunciassse cum attentaverit determinare tempus futuri iudicii universalis*.

Perhaps this compilation of Pelusius' was the starting-point of a campaign for the rehabilitation of Joachim, for shortly after, in 1612, Fr. Jacobus Graecus publishes his *Chronologia Joachimi Abbatis* (9), in 1627 Franciscus de Bivar, a Cistercian, goes out of his way to defend the Abbot's orthodoxy (10), and in 1642 Angelo Manriquez, in the *Annales Cistercienses*, gives him considerable prominence and brings out the striking contrast between his reputation as saint and heretic (11). Finally, in 1660, Gregorio de Lauro, Abbot of the Cistercian house at Sagittario, publishes in Naples his large work « Magni Divinique Prophetae B. Jo. Joachimi Abb. Sacri Cist. Ord. Monasterii Floris, et Florensis Ord. Institutoris Hergasiarum Alethia Apologetica, sive Mirabilium Veritas Defensa », in which he expands the defence of Joachim's orthodoxy into several considerable chapters (12).

These late expressions of devotion to Joachim, of Fiore and the arguments which they use deserve attention in themselves (13), but the question here is whether they throw any further light on thirteenth-century attitudes. At one point I think they do. In reading the Joachimist work *Super Hieremiam* one is struck by a passage which appears to be a veiled description of the condemnation of 1215. This impression is confirmed by the Tutini manuscript where, on fo. 305/r, this very passage is quoted as a prophecy of the condemnation. The monks of Fiore in the sixteenth century believed, of course, that this work had been written by Joachim himself and that the passage in question provided yet another example of his prophetic power. For us, the important thing is that they knew and had preserved the real inner meaning of these enigmatic words. From Fiore Jacobus Graecus, and thence Gregorio de Lauro and other seventeenth-century champions of Joachim learnt this tradition (14).

The passage quoted from the *Super Hieremiam* in the Tutini manuscript is as follows:

Spiritualiter, quia idolum doctrina heretica est, posita ante templum ecclesie, quam adorant omnes et tenent vani ceterique magistri in sanam doctrinam et fidelem: ut eam extinguant, et nomen doctoris, cui revelabitur sententia Daniellis, evertant, Futurum est enim ut Caiphas summus Pontifex veritatem insinuet, ut unus damnetur, idest moriatur doctor pro populo, ut non tota gens pereat in errore. Sic Sedechias contra Hieremiam insurgit, damnat librum, scindit trini-

(9) Published in Cosenza. See above, n. 6.

(10) *Fl. Lucii Dextri Barcinonensis ... Chronicon omnimodae historiae ... nunc demum opera et studio FR. FRANCISCI BIVARI ... commentariis apodicticis illustratum*, Lyon 1627. A defence of the authenticity of this chronicle brings De Bivar into conflict with a writer Pennottus who has also attacked Joachim, so he turns aside to champion the Abbot in a vehement and interesting chapter: *Defenditur B. Abbas Joachimus a calumniis Pennotti et aliorum* (pp. 481-489). In this he shows knowledge of the book of miracles which Jacobus Graecus transcribed, and says that Graecus' manuscript is preserved at Fiore and a copy of it is to be found in the Bibl. Aniciana Collegii Gregoriani de Urbe.

(11) *Loc. cit.*, especially anno 1165, 1188, 1189, 1191, 1197, 1211.

(12) Chapters LXIII to LXVII, pp. 267-300.

(13) I hope to study them at a later date.

(14) For Jacobus Graecus, see *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., p. 104. For other seventeenth-century references to this « prophecy » of the *Super Hieremiam* see F. DE BIVAR, *op. cit.*, p. 487, A. MANRIQUEZ, *op. cit.*, anno 1197 and PAGUS' notes to Baronius, *op. cit.*, pp. 606-607. So far as I am aware, no writer before Jacobus Graecus makes use of this « prophecy » in defending Joachim; it is significant, therefore, that it should appear in the Tutini manuscript just prior to Graecus' work.

tatem ab unitate. Scalpello sententiam scribe Doctoris. Nescio autem, Deus scit, utrum in nobis complenda sint, vel in sequuturo ordine consumanda (15).

De Lauro carries on the quotation, commenting as he goes (16):

Designat Herodes summum pontificem post Celestinum futurum, quicumque sit ille [De Lauro: hic est Innocentius III], a quo, quia stella disparuit [De Lauro: id est, quia auctore libri anno Domini, ut infra probabitur, 1202 e vivis sublato, claritas, sensus et veritas scripturae suae disparuit], spiritualis intelligentia extinguetur in dolo: et per invidiam tradetur et perimere cogitabit. Quia autem congregaverunt pontifices ecclesiarum pharisei, scilicet abbates, priores, religiosi Cistercienses, concilium forsitan generale, invidentes Christo [De Lauro: i.e. Sacerdoti Abbati Joachimi, ex eo quod novam reformationem induxerat in Cisterciensem Ordinem, tunc mira observantia celeberrimum, Florensem nuncupatum], totum ad illum doctorem veritatis referendum est quod sextus describit angelus: immo sub quo in manu alterius angeli liber demonstratur veritatis apertus... Sequitur: « Ad viros anathot qui querunt animam tuam ». A quibusdam Cisterciensium egredietur iniquitas hec: ut doctor ille « non prophetet in nomine domini et in eorum manibus », i.e. operibus et consiliis « moriatur », scilicet reprobetur. Sed quid inde sequitur « Juvenes eorum morientur gladio, filii eorum et filie in fame, et reliquae non erunt ex eis », juvenes sunt priores, filii monaci, filiae monasteria vel obediencie eorum. . . « Inducam enim malum super viros anathot », scilicet super prelatos maiores Cisterciensium... » (17).

De Lauro interprets these evils which befell the Cistercian order at some length and, in order that there may be no doubt in the matter, drives home the point thus:

Caeterum dati vaticinii sensus clarus est, scilicet fore ut filii Anathoth, nempe Cistercienses, doctrinam Joachimi Doctoris depravarent, et taliter depravatam praedicarent eam fuisse Abbatibus Joachimi, et hoc scandalum positum in sanam doctrinam et fidelem referrent coram coetu Patrum Oecumenici Concilii, quod scandalum ut sedaret, Pontificem pronuntiaturum oportere, ut libellus ille unus damnaretur ...; eum vero Pontificem non alium futurum esse quam eum qui Celestino succederet. Et hic fuit Innocentius III, qui Concilium generale indixit, et Laterani celebravit, in quo convenere inter caeteros duodecim Abbates et octogenti Priores Conventuales magna ex parte Cisterciensis Ordinis, et in quo Libellum Joachimi, quem ediderat contra Magistrum Sententiarum, ab aliis depravatam, quibusdam Abbatibus Cisterciensibus etiam suggerentibus, condemnavit (18).

The Super Hieremiam was, of course, written many years after the vision of 1215 (19). It represents a second phase in the attitude of

(15) Cf. the edition of the *Super Hieremiam* printed in Venice in 1516, fo. 23/r. The two versions differ only slightly. Unless otherwise stated, all quotations from this work are given from the 1516 edition.

(16) *Op. cit.*, pp. 293-294. I quote only the most important parts.

(17) Jeremiah, 11, 22-23.

(18) DE LAURO, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

(19) W. FRIDERICH, *Kritische Untersuchung der dem Abt Joachim von Floris zugeschriebenen Commentare zu Jesajas und Jeremias*, in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Jena 1859, p. 450, dated this work as before 1255, when it is quoted by William of St. Amour. F. KAMPERS, *Kaiserprophetien und Kaisersagen*, München 1895, pp. 96, 240, assigned it to the years 1244-1247, and this date was accepted by H. GRUNDMANN, *Studien über Joachim von Floris*, Leipzig 1927, p. 16, n. 1, who pointed out that it was first mentioned by Salimbene in 1248 and Albert of Stade in 1250. It was also cited by Alexander of Bremen. This fact led G. BONDATTI, *Gioachinismo e Francescanesimo nel dugento*, S. Maria degli Angeli 1924, p. 16, to argue that the *Super Hieremiam* must have been written c. 1230, since, according to one note in the text, Alexander's work was written in 1235. GRUNDMANN, however, writing again in 1928 (*Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, vol. 45, pp. 718-719) noted that there were different redactions both of Alexander's work and of the *Super Hieremiam*, and concluded that at the latest in 1248 there existed a version of the *Super Hieremiam*, older than that of the printed editions, which was used by Alexander of Bremen in the latest version of his work. Finally, A.

Joachim's disciples to his condemnation. Whereas the 1215 vision starts from the assumption that the book had been justly condemned (20), in the *Super Hieremiam* the idea is already fully developed that the condemnation had been the result of an unjust conspiracy engineered mainly by Cistercians. In the utterance of Caiaphas, the High Priest (21), and the action of Zedekiah the King, who slashes Jeremiah's book with a penknife and burns it (22), the writer sees the condemnation of the Abbot. As Christ lay three days in the tomb, so must spiritual intelligence be entombed in the letter, guarded by doctors and masters. For, using another figure, Herod designates the future supreme pontiff after Celestine, under whom the star will disappear and spiritual intelligence be extinguished in grief, whilst the priests of the Church and the Pharisees, i. e. the leaders of the Cistercian order, gather together in general council. All this refers to « illum doctorem veritalis » against whom the men of Anathoth, i. e. certain Cistercians, have conspired, saying « Prophecy not in the name of the Lord that thou die not by our hand », i. e. suffer condemnation through our works and counsels. For this the Cistercian order will suffer the doom, which Jeremiah pronounced against the men of Anathoth. And again, in the next chapter, the commentary makes the same identification of the men of Anathoth, who seek the death of true doctrine, with the Cistercians (23).

Much of this thirteenth-century prophecy is written in an enigmatic style, which only hints at meanings and then shoots off to another point. The passage which we have just quoted is more explicit than most in the *Super Hieremiam*. It provides certain identifications, which give us clues to other elusive passages and phrases. The most important of these is the commentary on chapter 36, in which Baruch writes down the prophecy of Jeremiah and it is brought to the king, who cuts the roll with his penknife and burns it. From the clue in the passage quoted above we now see that this, too, contains a veiled reference to Joachim's condemnation:

Sed quia principes populi, pontifices atque scribe velut utres veteres, non valentes capere eloquia nove vite, « ad destruendum volumen » totis fraudibus convertuntur: et quasi non plene de trinitate edisserant, sed potius quantitate confundant. « Et scalpello scribe »: sententia allculus doctoris in oculis suis scioli vilipendendo rescindant. « Rex quidem sedebat in domo hyemali: et posita erat arula coram eo plena prunis ». Locus hic, cum completus fuerit, tunc mellus exponetur. Quia futurum est ut Petrus summus pontifex ad prunas sedeat propter frigus hyemis imminenti, in quo et zelus dei deferveat secundum scientiam, et

WACHTEL, *Die weltgeschichtliche Apokalypse-Auslegung des Minoriten Alexander von Bremen*, in *Franziskanische Studien*, vol. 24 (1937), p. 223, n. 60, refuted Bondatti's argument and suggested that Alexander took to his pen again in 1249, when the *Super Hieremiam* became known in Germany, and added excerpts from it to his work. If an early version of the *Super Hieremiam* was being disseminated in Germany in 1248 or 1249, the date of its composition must surely be thrown back to the mid-forties, with the recognition, of course, that later additions were made to it.

(20) Because of this emphasis at the beginning on the just condemnation of Joachim's book, F. FOBERTI (*Sophia*, V [1937], p. 357) tried to argue that the vision itself was a Cistercian fabrication. This seems a far-fetched argument in any case, but the fact that the vision occurs in the Tutini manuscript from Fiore and is drawn from an old source in the monastery itself, makes this hypothesis even more unlikely.

(21) The reference is to S. John, 13. 50.

(22) Jeremiah, 36, 23. Note that the writer of the commentary is mistaken in naming the king Zedekiah; it should be Jehoiakim. See below, p. 10, for the commentary on this chapter.

(23) Fo. 23/v.

spiritus veritatis in viris spiritualibus extinguitur. Sed quid si ob turbationem Herodis alterius summi pontificis et superbi Jesus fugit: stella disparet: Magus eludit (24).

In these passages the attack, partly concealed, is directed against Innocent III and the Cistercians. The Pope is discovered under the figures both of Zēdekiah and Herod, the Cistercians in the men of Anathoth and the Pharisees. When thirteenth-century Joachites met these names in other passages, they would probably carry the overtones of this hidden meaning. Thus there is an obscure passage from fo. 43/v to 44/v which ought, perhaps, to be read in conjunction with the passages already quoted. It begins with an attack on the vanity of secular learning, which pertains to the letter rather than the spirit. This vain learning is contrasted with that of the future spiritual men, who will dissipate carnal studies (25). But they will be forced to flee from the face of Herod the King and remain hidden in Egypt, until they can go into Galilee (26). They cannot, however, wholly escape from the face of the proud cardinals — « et forte summi pontificis anni illius » —, but « audientes forsitan cardinales et alios adhuc tumide praesidentes super ecclesiam, secedent in Galileam, idest, in paupertate spiritus conversantes et forsitan religioni se Cisterciensi conformantes, quousque tempus veniat perfectionis eorum ». Then, referring to S. Matthew, 2, 22, the writer sees in Archelaus a future successor of the supreme pontiff: « Quia licet ipsi filii sint summi pontificis, poterit tamen fieri ut de progenie summi pontificis alius surgat in sedem, qui predicatorum exterrcat ». Once again, he hints at the opposition of prelates and pope to the new spiritual men. They have escaped the first Herod, but will not the second. Then comes a most enigmatic statement: « Summus pontifex prioris ordinis caput diminet doctrinam magistrorum subtrahendo, et alteri ordini addet prioris officium ». After this he returns to the second Herod and foresees under the figure of the trial of Christ by Herod and Pilate the persecutions of spiritual men under the pseudo papa futurus Herodes, followed by their figurative death, burial, resurrection and ascension into the contemplative life. A little later another hint is thrown out: « Dissipabo consilium iude, scilicet, decretalium generalis ecclesie consultores »; in the next chapter the persecution of Jeremiah is equated with the persecution of the predicatorum veritatis by the pope and cardinals, who impose silence on them, especially on certain among the monastic orders: « quia forte in uno illorum ordine multi silebuntur ». This persecution takes place under Zedekiah, and on fo. 48/v we get, perhaps, a hint of the same events: « Rex Sedechias », summus pontifex futurus, « sedens super solium David ipse et servi eius », scilicet prelati et cardinales, « et populus », i. e. clerus. « Porte » dignitates sunt et potestates ecclesiastice, quas hortatur Dominus per scripturas et evangelistas novos, ut « iudicium faciant iustum », quia perverse iudicant (27). As the first Zedekiah sent two priests to Jeremiah who were rebuffed, so the second will send

(24) Fo. 59/r. See verses 11-23 of Jeremiah, 36.

(25) This is part of the commentary on Jeremiah, 19, in which doom is pronounced on the valley of Hinnom (v. 6); in an interesting passage this is identified with Bologna.

(26) See S. Matthew, 2, 13-23.

(27) See Jeremiah, 22, 2-3.

« quosdam magistros tam in clero quam in religioso collegio monachorum. Sed quia summus pontifex superbie nititur, ab exauditione repellitur » (28).

In this passage there is no certain clue to indicate the events intended. Friderich thought it referred to the beginnings of the persecution of the Spiritual party in the Franciscan order under the generalships of Elias (1236-1239) and Crescentius (1244-1247) (29), and, indeed, some parts do suggest this. But Friderich actually interpreted most of this passage as referring to the events of 1244-47, whereas the work may already have been written by 1244 or soon after (30). The early date of the Super Hieremiam, in fact, hardly allows time for the persecutions of the Spiritual Franciscans to appear in it, unless these passages belong to a later recension. The whole problem must wait for a critical study of the text of the Super Hieremiam, but with regard to the passage under consideration I would suggest, very tentatively, that, in so far as it refers to actual events at all, the writer here has in mind, as in the other passages quoted, the condemnation of 1215, the silencing of the true doctor, the persecution of the Joachimite group of disciples, or at least their retirement into obscurity. It is difficult to make sense out of some of these enigmatic statements, but the reference to the order which is diminished perhaps indicates the Order of Fiore itself. The clearest hint (31) that the spiritual men whom the writer has in mind are not the Spiritual Franciscans, but Joachim's disciples in the Order of Fiore and in those Cistercian houses associated with him, is that during the period of persecution they will retreat to Galilee, which is tentatively identified with the Cistercian religion (32). Surely the writer here is hinting at a fact, the possibility of which we have neglected too much in our study of Joachimism, namely, the presence in Calabrian monasteries of Joachim's immediate disciples, driven in upon themselves after the condemnation of 1215, but studying, copying and imitating the writings and figures of their master, whilst waiting for the vindication of his ideas. At any rate, the notable thing here is that it is to the Cistercian religion that they retire, « quousque tempus veniat perfectionis eorum ».

(28) Fo. 47/r.

(29) *Op. cit.*, pp. 503-4.

(30) See above, n. 19.

(31) Two further hints supporting the interpretation here put forward are: 1) When the trial of Christ before Herod and Pilate is used to symbolise the persecution of spiritual men, the words « *vestitum albis illum despectum pariter et derisum* » occur (fo. 43/v); 2) The prophecy that in one order many will be silenced, distinctly speaks in terms of an order of monks.

(32) On the group of Cistercian house in Calabria associated with Joachim, see H. GRUNDMANN, *Neue Forschungen über Joachim v. Fiore*, pp. 40, 51. Prof. GRUNDMANN has emphasised the fact of the continued close connection between Fiore and the Calabrian houses of the parent order; Joachim's new foundation, he believes, was in no sense set up in opposition to them (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* XLVIII (1929), p. 160). His view strengthens the hypothesis of a group of disciples distributed among Cistercian houses as well as those of Fiore. In this connection we may note that GRAECUS preserves the tradition of three Cistercian abbots who hastened to the deathbed of Joachim, all his disciples - Luke of Cosenza, then Abbot of Sambucina, John, Abbot of Curazzo, and Alexander, Abbot of Sanctus Spiritus de Panormo (*Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., p. 110). F. Russo (*Miscellanea Franciscana*, XXXI [1941], pp. 71-73) points to the evidence for the dissemination of Joachimist ideas among Franciscans in southern Italy before 1250. This presupposes, I think, a strong Joachimist group already present among the religious houses there. He also notices the curious fact that there is no evidence of Joachimism among the Franciscans of Calabria itself. Did the authorities keep a special watch there, knowing that it was the centre of the movement?

The part played by the Cistercian order in the Super Hieremiam is altogether rather interesting. As we have seen, the Cistercians are the men of Anathoth who conspire against Jeremiah; they are the Pharisees in the Church's councils. Yet in a number of passages the writer hints at the greatness of their role in the growth of the Ecclesia Spiritualis. Thus, at the very outset, in the dedication to Henry VI (33), he describes the precursors of the third status in a sequence of threes, instead of the more common twos. The first three to whom Christ appeared at the Sepulchre were Mary, S. Peter and S. John: « Maria Cisterciensium religionem, Simon praedicantes de evangelio, Joannes laudantes Deum de resurgente Christo significat; tandem Maria ingressa est sepulchrum, quia et si in ordine illo revelata est et apparuit stella magna, tamen ultima noscet quid debeat percipere veritatis ». The modification of the usual Joachimist prophecy of two orders to three, to include the Cistercian order, is significant; significant, too, is the symbolism of the fact that Christ appears first to Mary, but that she enters the tomb last. The magna stella, surely, is the Abbot Joachim himself; if it were S. Bernard, he would probably be named, as elsewhere in this work (34). If Joachim is the star, then the thirteenth-century reader would surely read the hidden meaning into the statement, which twice occurs later, that under Herod (i. e. the supreme pontiff after Celestine) the star will disappear (35).

There are other indications that the writer believes the life of the third status to be hidden, in part at least, within the Cistercian order. On fo. 14/r there is a very clear claim made for it: « In tertio [statu] vero retorquendum est totum ad Cistercienses et alios futuros religiosos, qui post antichristi ruinam multiplicandi sunt ». There is the passage which we have already quoted from fo. 43/v on the spiritual men, who will take refuge in the Galilee of the Cistercian religion (36). Again, on fo. 58/r the Cistercian order is associated with the two future orders, and on fo. 59/r Jonadab, the son of Rechab, is interpreted as S. Bernard and the Cistercians are the Rechabites, to whom the promise of the Lord to Jonadab is applied: « Non deesse de semine Jonadab, sed stare semper in conspectu Domini », videtur quod Cisterciensis religio sit usque in finem seculi processura (37). Finally, the Cistercian order is the City of the Sun, which shines as the sun in relation to the other four churches: « Civitas autem solis, que est in terra Egypti, una vocabitur Cisterciensis religio, que et in Claravalle claruit, et respectu aliarum quattuor ecclesiarum, canonicorum nigrorum, et aliorum ordinum more solis refulsit (38).

A comparison of the Super Esaiam — a Joachimist work probably written some twenty years later (39) — with the Super Hieremiam reveals echoes of the same phraseology and identifications, which suggest that by the thirteenth-century reader the same underlying interpretations might

(33) *Prefatio*, unnumbered folio verso. See S. John, 20, 1-12.

(34) See fo. 8/r, 59/r.

(35) Fo. 23/r, 59/r.

(36) See above, p. 11.

(37) See Jeremiah, 35, 19. On Franciscus de Bivar's comment on this passage, see below, n. 62

(38) Fo. 60/v. See Isaiah, 19, 18.

(39) FRIDERICH (*op. cit.*, p. 495) concludes that the author stands on the eve of the struggle between Manfred and Charles of Anjou. KAMPERS (*op. cit.*, pp. 96, 240) dates the work as shortly before 1266.

be understood. Thus, at the outset, in the commentary on the first verse, the judgment of the Lord is directed against Pharisees as well as priests, and the writer adds: « Tangunt enim hi quosdam cenobitas Cistercii, mentam et olus quoque redolens decimantes » (40). In what is probably the earliest manuscript of this work this point is picked out and emphasised in a bold red marginal note: « Nota de monachis ordinis cisterciensis » (41), which disappears from later manuscripts. On fo. 42/v the same identification of the Cistercians with the Pharisees is made in a note: Genimina viperae Pharisei et Saducei, pro quibus nonnulli religiosi Cistercij et seculares clerici successerunt. On fo. 33/v Herod appears and shortly after (fo. 34/r) there occurs this identification, which echoes the words of the « Super Hieremiam »: « Tempus Sedechie regis tangit concorditer presentem generationem inceptam anno MCCI a Christo sub pontifice Romano post obitum Celestini ». Herod also appears in an interesting note on Cosenza, which occurs in the geographical section of the work (42) This likens Cosenza to Jezrael in Carmel, an identification which would carry the suggestion of Elijah, prototype in the Old Testament of the new spiritual men (43). Thither, as to another Bethlehem, the angel will guide, leading her sons into the life of solitude, while another Herod rages in the kingdom. There seems no reason for this sudden allusion to Bethlehem and Herod, unless at the back there lies the idea of the magna stella and its disappearance under Herod's condemnation. The whole passage suggests that the region of Cosenza holds a special significance for the writer: whether Jezrael or Bethlehem, it is the place of retreat for the new spiritual men, and to this idea we may join that of the « Super Hieremiam », — the retreat into the Galilee of the Cistercian religion (44).

In the Super Esaiam, too, the Cistercians hold a special place in the scheme of things. There is an important passage on fo. 8/r, in which the Cluniac and Cistercian orders are equated with Manassen and Ephraim respectively, carrying the hidden meaning, which would be known to Joachites, that in the true spiritual succession the greater and more enduring inheritance goes to Ephraim (45). Shortly after, a note on the famous words « Egredietur virga de radice Iesse et flos de radice eius ascendet » (Isaiuh, 11, 1) runs thus: « Nota Esaiam oraculum texere de

(40) *Super Esaiam* (1517 edition), fo. 1/r and v. All further references are to this edition.

(41) Cod. Vat. Lat. 4959, fo. 4/v.

(42) Fo. 14/r.: *Licet enim opprimi habeat in futurum ecclesia cusentina, que cum Jezrael carmelo 3. Reg. 18. vicina concordat in spiritu, post Henricum germanicum a reliquiis aquilonis, qui situm regni tam in sicilia quam in leporea calabria et apulia concutient et confundent, ad eam tamen ac si alteram Bethleem angelus sani consilij diriget: qui et filios eius ad interiora solitudinis transferat et seculares egyptios tyrannorum furijis derelinquet. Futurum enim est ut secundum genus, non speciem, in cunctis regni finibus Herodes alter Matth. 2 non solum [sic] abiectos exactionibus opprimat, sed et conterat malleationibus gloriosos (?) quemadmodum vetus Pharaos.*

(43) For the significance of Elijah in the writings of Joachim, see *Liber Concordie*, fo. 20/r, 48/r 63/r, 67/r et seq., 76/v, 97/r et seq.

(44) See above. It is significant that in Cod. Vat. Lat. 4959 Cosenza, with its attendant bishoprics, is represented in the geographical section by a diagram which is distinct from all the others (fo. 15/r). This is repeated in Cod. Vat. Rossiano, 552, fo. 15/r and Bibl. Marciana, Venice, Cod. Lat. I, LXXIV, fo. 16/v. In the printed edition there is still a slight difference, but much less noticeable.

(45) For this idea in the writings of Joachim, see *Lib. Conc.*, fo. 27/r-29/v. and *Expos. in Apoc.*, fo. 32/v, 49/v. For two tree-figures expressing in part the same idea, see below.

flore et de virga, Paulum de Christo et ecclesia, Gabrielem de Filio Dei et Matre Virgine, Bernardum de Cisterciensi ecclesia et ordine » (46). On the words « Ascendet Dominus nubem levem » (*Isaiah*, 19, 1), the comment is: Nubes levis religio, Bernardus est mons moris (47): and this gains added meaning when one notices that in another passage the clouds are the new spiritual men (48). The Valley of Vision (*Isaiah*, 22) is the Cistercian Church (49), whilst the fifth angel of the Apocalypse is S. Bernard (50). Finally, there is a passage on the three angels of the Apocalypse, which are three testes or ordines to be revealed within the Church: « Quod autem de tribus angelis pressuram sexti temporis inchoati facit Joannis visio mentionem [sic], ad tres testes vel ordines in generali ecclesia revelandos dicimus referendum. Quorum primus evolabit per medium celum eternum evangelium' habiturus » (51). Here there is no explicit identification, but the emphasis on three orders certainly echoes the passage in the Super Hieremiam which specifically names the Cistercian order (52), and the Angel with the Eternal Evangel would naturally suggest the Abbot Joachim.

Thus we have indications in both these works, but more clearly in the Super Hieremiam, of a peculiar attitude towards the Cistercian order which, on the one hand, is denounced for the machinations of its conspiring Pharisees, and, on the other, is viewed as the repository of true spiritual religion and the root from which springs one of the orders of the future third status. In the other instances I have met echoes of this thirteenth-century view-point. The first occurs in manuscripts of the Liber Concordie. In the 1519 printed edition of this work there is a diagram of the generations of history (fo. 11/r-v), which contains the marginal notes Ordo phariseorum and Ordo cisterciensium. These do not apparently bear any special relation to each other, as the diagram is set out; while the second caption clearly refers to the text at fo. 11/r, there is no reference in the text to the first, which is rendered all the more suspicious by the fact that two other marginal notes to this diagram are obviously later additions (53). An examination of some manuscripte reveals an interesting variety in this small detail. Two early copies omit these captions altogether (54); two manuscripts so arrange the diagram as to bring the Order of Pharisees and the Order of Cistercians opposite each other, one in the thirty-seventh generation of the Old Dispensation and the other in the thirty-seventh generation of the New (55); in three others the notes

(46) Fo. 8/r.

(47) Fo. 16/v.

(48) Fo. 33/v.

(49) Fo. 37/v.

(50) Fo. 54/v.

(51) Fo. 58/v. See the Apocalypse, 14, 6-9.

(52) See above.

(53) At generation XL there is the caption *Joachim abbas ordinis florensis* and at generation XLIII (the last) the caption *Tertius status sub evangelica perfectione incipit*. Joachim would certainly never have inserted his own name, and the phraseology of the second caption belongs to the thirteenth century. That marginal notes were added by later copyists is clear from another note (fo. 21/r): « *Nota quod libertas spiritu est vita apostolica que in beato Francisco renovata est* ». A closer study of marginal notes in Joachimist manuscripts might be rewarding.

(54) Padua, Bibl. Anton., 328, fo. 14/v-15/r and Vat. Lat. 4861, fo. 20/v-21/r.

(55) Florence, Bibl. Laurenz., Plut. VIII dextr. X, unnumbered folio following fo. 16 and Vat. Lat. 4860, fo. 286/r.

are placed against the corresponding generations, but without juxtaposing them obviously (56). This evidence suggests that the captions were not Joachim's, but were added later by someone who wished, at the same time, to emphasise the place of the Cistercian Order in the Abbot's scheme of history and to bring out its correspondence to the Pharisees.

One half of this view-point, the glorification of the Cistercian order, is clearly the intention of a Joachimist figure, which echoes the words of the *Super Esaiam* and occurs in three of the manuscripts of a small figure-collection designed, probably, to precede this work (57). It consists of two trees springing from the *Ordo Patriarcharum* and the *Ordo Apostolorum* respectively, with branches of Tribes and Orders on both sides. The figure is not at all clearly conceived, for the designations of the 'branches' are muddled, but the main point stands out plainly: the crown of the Old Testament tree bears the caption *Tribus Effraym in Joseph*, and that of the New has the corresponding caption *Ecclesia Clarevallensis* in Bernardo. Here, once again, we find the Cistercian order equated with the tribe which received the chief inheritance, and the meaning of the figure — with its fine-flowering tree-tops — is clearly, I think, that the flowering of the *Ecclesia Spiritualis* will be embodied in the Cistercian order.

This expectation of a great spiritual future for the Cistercians is not without basis in Joachim's own writings. He had refrained, being most humble, from assigning any great role to his own followers in the third status, but he had hinted more than once at the importance of the Cistercian order (58). Furthermore, the figure just described, which belongs to a spurious thirteenth-century figure collection, derives, I believe, from a figure in the Oxford manuscript of the *Liber Figurarum* (59), which I should regard as genuine, in the sense that it stands close to the thought of Joachim, if not actually designed by him. This is much more logically conceived than the spurious figure. It represents the true line of spiritual succession in two trees, which do not have branches on either side, but a main trunk with offshoots on one side only. In the first tree, which springs from Abraam, the sap flows up the trunk through Ysaac, Jacob, Joseph and Effraym, while the offshoots are Ysmahel, Esau, Ruben and Manasses; in the second, springing from the *Ordo Patriarcharum*, the true line of succession flows through the *Populus Gentilis*, the *Populus Latinus*, the *Ordo Monachorum* and the *Ordo Cisterciensium*, while the offshoots are the *Populus Judaicus*, the *Populus Grecorum*, the *Ordo Clericorum* and the *Ordo Cluniacensium*. Here the Cistercians do not crown the spiritual tree of the future, but they do occupy the highest place

(56) Rome, Bibl. Corsin., 41 F. 2, fo. 12/v., Rome, Bibl. Casanatense, 1412, fo. 10/r and Vat. Lat. 3821, fo. 13/r.

(57) This figure-collection, which we may call the *Praemissiones* (following the sixteenth-century editors of the *Super Esaiam*) will be studied with others, in a forthcoming article by the present writer in collaboration with Dr. Hirsch-Reich. The figure in question occurs in the Vatican, Cod. Rossiano 552, fo. 1/v, in the Staatsbibliothek, Vienna, Cod. 1400 (Theol. 71), fo. 21/v and in the British Museum, Ms. Additional 11439, fo. 100/r (only faintly sketched). It does not occur in what is probably the oldest manuscript, Cod. Vat. Lat. 4959.

(58) See *Lib. Conc.*, fo. 11/r, 23/r, 57/v-60/r.

(59) Ms. Corpus Christi College, 255/A, fo. 13/r (olim 5/r). This manuscript will be fully described in the forthcoming second edition of the *Liber Figurarum* (ed. L. Ton-delli, M. Reeves and B. Hirsch-Reich).

on the trunk, and the equation of Citeaux and Cluny with Ephraim and Manasseh, found in the *Super Esaiam*, is here too.

We have, then, these traces of an attitude in the mid-thirteenth century which regarded the Cistercian leaders as Pharisees, villainous instigators of the « unjust » condemnation of 1215, and yet expected the Ecclesia Spiritualis to grow out of the Cistercian Order. Where would such a curious double attitude be more likely to be found than among the Calabrian disciples of Joachim, in the Order of Fiore and in the friendly Cistercian houses associated with it? It is in such a group that indignation against the Abbot's condemnation would be most cherished and the idea of a 'conspiracy' of leading Cistercians most likely to be worked out. Here there would be reason for the marked hostility to Innocent III shown in the *Super Hieremiam*, such as no Franciscan would be likely to nourish (60). Yet such a group would inevitably wish to glorify its own position by finding a place in the expectations of the third status for the Order of Fiore and its parent order. This line of argument raises, of course, the question of the authorship of the *Super Hieremiam* and the *Super Esaiam*, and the figure-collection preceding the latter. Did these, after all, emanate, not from the kind of group in which Salimbene moved, but from a Joachite circle in Calabria? Their preoccupation with south Italian politics, their concern to represent Joachim as « persecuted » by his 1215 judges and the expectations attached to the Cistercian Order — these characteristics, common in the main to both works, would suggest so. But this question needs a much more detailed examination than can be given here (61).

One thing seems clear: during the thirteenth century there developed in two phases a definite Joachite point of view on the 1215 condemnation. In the vision of 1215 the condemnation is accepted as just; in the *Super Hieremiam* it is unjust — a conspiracy of Pope, prelates and heads of the Cistercian Order. Even so, there is no real suggestion that the Cistercians wrote the offending book on the Trinity themselves, or even falsified a work of Joachim's — for the theory of deliberate falsification we have to wait till the seventeenth-century, till the defence of the Abbot by Graecus, De Bivar, Manriquez and De Lauro (62), and for the hypothesis

(60) Is it possible that here, too, lies the clue to the curious omission of Innocent III from the Tables of Concords in the *Liber Figurarum*, so that Celestine III appears as pope in 1200? Alternatively, it can be argued that the tables were composed in this form just before 1198. See L. TONDELLI, *Il Libro delle Figure*, Turin 1940, II, tav. IV. Note that in one manuscript only (Dresden, A. 121, fo. 92/r) the name *Innocentius* is added faintly.

(61) I hope to take up this question with regard to the *Super Esaiam* in a forthcoming article. A strong presumption that the author is not a Franciscan arises from the fact that the Angel of the Sixth Seal in the Apoc., so commonly applied to S. Francis, is here interpreted as Christ or S. Paul (fo. 57/r). On the identification of S. Francis with this angel, see S. BEHEL, *S. Franciscus fuitne Angelus Sexti Sigilli (Apoc., 7, 2)?*, in *Antonianum*, Annus II (1927), pp. 59 et seq.

(62) The Tutini manuscript contains the first hint of this kind (fo. 204/v) and GRAECUS follows its suggestion: « An vero aliquid fuisset appositum in opere illo, antequam Concilio praesentaretur, Dei iudicio examinandum relinquatur » (*Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., p. 104). This cautious question is taken up by DE BIVAR: « Caeterum quantum ex lectura operum Joachimi conticio, quorundam sui Ordinis Monachorum astu, quos zelus imprudens urebat, apud Innocentium et Concilium accusatus est, et verba libri de unitate Trinitatis in alienum a mente Authoris sensum distorta fuere, ut ita in pleno Patrum consensu erroris insimularetur: aut forsitan aliquid suis libris dolo malo additum fuit. Ita certe ante nos suspicatus est Jacobus Graecus » (*op. cit.*, p. 486). DE BIVAR finds

that the Cistercians actually wrote the offending book themselves, to the best of my knowledge, till the twentieth-century (63). It is hard to say from the enigmatic language of the *Super Hieremiam* just wherein the 'conspiracy' was held to consist. The accusation seems to be rather that they had dealt a deadly blow at his reputation, had caused the star to disappear and had extinguished spiritual intelligence, than that they had used some specific piece of forgery. This certainly suggests a point of view within the order.

We may, perhaps, trace out these changing attitudes of the Joachites a little further. The disciples of 1215, in the true spirit of their master, humbly accept authority, but hope that the future will reveal the true orthodoxy of their founder. The vision suggests that some might be greatly shocked by the condemnation. If, perhaps, some weaker brethren left, fearing for their orthodoxy, the stauncher ones, it would seem, fortified themselves (64) by working out the conspiracy theory, and, finally, by descending to forged prophecy to disseminate their view. In this they departed from their true discipleship, yet something of their master's expectation clung to them. They saw the Abbot's « persecution » as part of the tribulation to be looked for — the true spiritual intelligence must be sepulchred, before it could rise again — and, above all, they expected the new spiritual men foretold by Joachim. Here, in assigning roles for the future, it would seem that they accepted the current identification of Joachim's two new orders with the Dominicans and Franciscans: we have Gerard de Fracheto's story of how the monks of Fiore went out to salute the first Dominicans who approached them (65), whilst the *Super Hieremiam* and *Super Esaiam* both contain obvious passages identifying the two new orders thus (66). Yet, for them, there

the reason for this attack in the hatred which he believed Joachim had incurred for his « new reformation » of the Cistercian order. DE BIVAR's line is developed and expanded by MANRIQUEZ and DE LAURO. It is noteworthy that three out of four of these stout defenders of Joachim are themselves Cistercians. It would seem that they still hold the double attitude we have been studying: they are willing to bring odium on their own order in defence of the prophet who had, they believed, foretold for it a great future. Thus DE BIVAR, quoting from the *Super Hieremiam* the promise that the Cistercian order would endure *in finem seculi* (fo. 59/r, see above), adds the marginal note: *Ordo S. Bernardi semper duraturus* (op. cit., p. 487).

(63) F. FOBERTI, *Gioacchino da Fiore, nuovi studi critici sulla mistica e la religiosità in Calabria*, Bibl. stor. Sansoni, vol. 9, Florence 1934, pp. 108 et seq.

(64) Dr. Hirsch-Reich has pointed out to me the unusual character of the Antiphon to Vespers used by the monks of Fiore in commemorating their founder: ... *errore procul haeretico* (*Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., p. 90). When and from whom did they receive permission to defend their founder's orthodoxy thus? Does it not suggest a felt need to fortify their own sense of orthodoxy? See H. GRUNDMANN, *Deutsches Dante Jahrbuch*, N.F.V. (1932), p. 212 and F. FOBERTI, op. cit., p. 112. As to monks leaving Fiore, we have the evidence of Gregory IX's prohibition to the Cistercians to receive back such monks into their houses (*Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., p. 125). The reason given for their desertion is the too great severity of their way of life, but may it not also have been fear for orthodoxy?

(65) *Vitae Fratrum, Monumenta Ord. Fr. Praedic. Historica*, vol. I, p. 13.

(66) That the writers did accept the current belief that the two Mendicant orders fulfilled Joachim's prophecies is, I think, clear from references in the following passages: *Super Hieremiam*, fo. 12/v et seq.; *Super Esaiam*, fo. 7/r, 11/v, but when we remember that Joachim himself used the symbolism of « twos » for his future orders, and, moreover, with a clear differentiation of function between the two, it is not easy to decide when these thirteenth-century writers are specifically, describing the Mendicants and when they are simply drawing on Joachim's ideas. The former has often been assumed because marginal captions such as *Ordo Predicatorum* and *Ordo Minorum* are

is still another expectation which centres in the Cistercian order and for which they have the authority of their master. Joachim's promises of new orders were, indeed, so varied in phraseology and so rich in conception as to allow ample scope for a variety of claimants. Their expectation in their own order was not, alas, fulfilled. In view of the dynamic conception of new spiritual men which Joachim presented, it is curious that his order made so little effort to embody it or to express the contemplative life of the third status more fully than those around them (67). Perhaps they retained from their master too much of the attitude of those who stand merely on the threshold of great things — it is significant in this connection to discover that S. Giovanni in Fiore is dedicated to S. John Baptist, not S. John the Evangelist. Certainly one can detect in them little of that passionate sense of guarding the treasure of the future, which so illuminates the Spiritual Franciscans.

If the Order of Fiore failed to fulfill its own expectations, nonetheless we need, I believe, to pay more attention to the possibility of a Joachimite circle in thirteenth-century Calabria and to look for traces of it. Of Joachim's circle of friends and disciples, Luke of Cosenza is the best known. Luke mentions Fr. Raynerius, the Abbot's intimate friend, and Abbot John of Curazzo (68), while Graecus adds another Cistercian Abbot, Alexander of Sanctus Spiritus de Panormo, to the group (69). Graecus also mentions, among other disciples, Bonatius and a young man from Aquitaine named John (70). But here an interesting problem rears its head. De Lauro, writing in the mid-seventeenth century, quotes from a work written in his old age by Joannes Bonatius, the disciple of Joachim, entitled *Opusculum de prophetis sui temporis* (71). From De Lauro Papebroch drew his references to this same work in the *Acta Sanctorum* (72), and thus the tradition of a lost work by Bonatius has come down to the present day. Professor Grundmann, writing in 1929 on the subject of *Joannes de Aquitania and Joannes Bonatius*, remarked that there was still hope of finding this lost opusculum (73). Now there exists in the British Museum a copy of what is, I believe, a rare work, the *Historia de' Suevi nel conquisto de' regni di Napoli e di Sicilia per l'Imperadore Enrico Sesto, con la vita del Beato Giovanni Calà capitano generale che fù di detto imperadore*, written by Don Carlo Calà and published in Naples in 1660. One of the author's purposes was to laud his reputed ancestor, Joannes Calà or Kalà, who, after a military career under the Hohenstaufen, was supposed to have become a hermit in Calabria

so liberally scattered about. If, however, these are removed as later additions, the emphasis of these two thirteenth-century works is considerably altered. The use made by early disciples of Joachim's own descriptions of the two new orders of spiritual men needs a closer study which I hope to make elsewhere. BONDATTI (*op. cit.*, p. 16) notices that in the case of the *Super Hieremiam* one cannot prove that the bias is in favour of the Minorites; the author might be a Dominican. Equally, I think, he might be neither.

(67) H. GRUNDMANN, *Kleine Beiträge über Joachim v. Fiore*, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Bd. XLVIII (1929), p. 161, n. 1, comments thus on the evidence that the monks of Fiore grumbled about its exposed and remote site: « So wenig hatte Joachim in eigenen Orden eine wahre Nachfolge seines eremitischen Ideals gefunden ».

(68) *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., pp. 93-94.

(69) *Ibid.*, pp. 110, 116.

(70) *Ibid.*, pp. 106-107.

(71) *Op. cit.*, p. 106.

(72) Vol. cit., pp. 91, 107.

(73) *Kleine Beiträge über Joachim v. Fiore*, p. 162.

and a companion of Joachim. Thus, in part two of this *Historia*, Carlo Calà printed five short works relating to the Blessed John and purporting to have been written by his companions (74). The last of these is the so-called opusculum of Bonatius, in which three prophets, Joannes de Aquitania, Joannes Calà and Joachim, prophecy before the Emperor Henry VI. The author adds biographical notes, giving details not to be found elsewhere. This would be an important discovery, were it not that the work of Don Carlo Calà has been shown to rest on a colossal fraud, for which he paid large sums of money. Ferdinando Stocchi of Cosenza, seeing an opportunity to play on Don Carlo's desire for an illustrious ancestry, invented a distinguished career for two brothers named Calà, who were descended from Hohenstaufen and royal British stock and came to south Italy with Henry VI; he then forged the manuscript sources to establish this tale (75). If Carlo Calà's work falls to the ground as forgery, the trustworthiness of other authorities is affected, for it can be shown that the opusculum of Bonatius which De Lauro quotes — and Papebroch after him — is the same as that printed by Calà. Did Bonatius ever write such a work at all? As long as the authenticity of Calà's work is in doubt, this question, too, remains unsettled, for our only evidence of its existence comes from this highly suspicious source. It is noteworthy that Graecus, writing about 1612, does not mention Joannes Calà at all, gives the bare name of Bonatius and uses none of the biographical detail in the so-called opusculum of Bonatius. He does, however, describe Joachim's interview with the Emperor VI, which might easily have inspired a forger to produce this work (76).

The problem of Stocchi's forgery has a further ramification. There is in the Vatican library a most curious manuscript (Rossiano 480) entitled *Prophetiae et Epistolae Joachim Joachim Abbatis Florentis, pertinentes ad res Kalabras, und consisting of eight prophecies and eight epistles* (77). Part of its curiosity lies in its style of handwriting and ornamentation: it is obviously late, but gives the impression of being consciously archaic, of copying or imitating an older document. This manuscript proves to be closely linked with the work of Carlo Calà. On the one hand, Calà possessed a copy of it, of which he gives the title in full exactly as in the manus-

(74) The list as given on an unnumbered page following the preface is as follows:

I. *De rebus fortiter gestis a Ioanne Cala, auctore D. Ioanne D. Bonatio ord. Flor.* Stampata in Hedua, overo Autun, Città di Borgogna, nell'anno 1509.

II. *Processus vitae Ioannis Cala, auctore Martino Schener eius contubernale.* Stampata à Tifer, detto da altri Dautona, 1473.

III. *Vita gestaque B. Ioannis Cala, descripta a D. Angelo Primo Cisterciensi ad Patrem Faustum heremitan.* Ms.

IV. *Tractatus Lucii de Donato de Spiritu Prophetiae quem tradidit Altissimus B. Patri Ioanni Cala.* Ms.

V. *Opusculum D. Ioannis de Bonatio de prophetis sui temporis.* Ms.

(75) See *Catalogo di Mss. della Biblioteca di Camillo Minieri Riccio*, Parte IV, Libreria di Ermanno Loescher, Turin and Florence 1866, pp. 11-12, and D. ZANGARI, *Anonimi, pseudonimi, eteronimi scrittori calabresi o di opere attinenti alla storia letteraria delle Calabrie*, Naples 1930, pp. 112-114. I am indebted to Miss Jamison for drawing my attention to these works.

(76) *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., p. 108. I find that Prof. GRUNDMANN, working independently, has recently arrived at the conclusion that Bonatius never wrote such a work at all. He writes in a letter: «...ich nicht mehr an die Existenz des Bonatius-Opusculum" glaube».

(77) Mgr. Tondelli first called attention to this manuscript and proposes to deal with it more fully.

cript (78), transcribes the epistles 2, 3, and 5 (79), and expounds some of the prophecies (80). On the other hand, one of the epistles refers to the Blessed Joannes Kalà, which at once makes it suspect (81). Suspicion is further aroused by the fact that Graecus makes no reference whatsoever to either prophecies or epistles and, indeed, no other writer appears to know anything of them except Gregorio de Lauro. He transcribes epistles 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8, always with the marginal reference *Ex libro Epistolarum Joachimi Abbatis Florentis* (82) and from him Papebroch takes numbers 1, 2, 3 and 8 (83). It is ominous that in the case of both the opusculum of Bonatius and these Prophecies and Epistles of Calabria the only seventeenth-century writers who know them are Carlo Calà and De Lauro. Can it be that the latter got his material from Calà and, like him, was deceived by Stocchi's forgery? (84) Furthermore, is it possible that MS. Rossiano 480 is actually one of these forged documents of Stocchi's? ~~The whole question needs further investigation, before a judgement as to what is genuine and what forged can be passed.~~

Even if we discount the material used by Calà and quoted from him by De Lauro, there remain other fruitful lines of investigation into the activities of Joachim's disciples in Calabria. On the one hand, the thirteenth-century writings and figure-collections, associated with the name of Joachim, need closer examination. Here it is note-worthy that, of the MSS. containing figures, Cod. Vat. Lat. 4860 and 3822 both probably emanate from south Italy, while Cod. Vindob. 1400 (Theol. 71) appears to derive from a similar source (85). On the other hand, in spite of such traps for the unwary as the activities of F. Stocchi, some clues may be gained from the work of seventeenth-century antiquaries and historians. Above all, the welcome discovery of the Tutini Ms. may enable us to go behind the work of Jacobus Graecus in a study of the traditions preserved at Fiore Itself.

Oxford.

MARJORIE E. REEVES

(78) *Op. cit.*, p. 97: « ... e appresso noi si conserva un'antichissima copia in pergameno d'un suo libro, il cui titolo è *Prophetiae et Epistolae Joachim Ab. Flor. pertinentes ad res Kalabras, quibus accesserunt expositiones tum literales, tum allegoricae veteris et novi testamenti* ».

(79) *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64, 96-97.

(80) *Op. cit.*, pp. 178-179.

(81) *Epistola V*, fo. 5/r.

(82) *Op. cit.*, pp. 90-91, 95-96.

(83) *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. cit., pp. 107, 126, 135.

(84) Or did Calà receive some of his material through De Lauro, as is suggested by Calà's remark with regard to one manuscript: « *fu esibito dal Padre Abbate Don Gregorio di Lauro ... nell'anno 1656* », *op. cit.*, unnumbered page following the *Prefatio*?

(85) For Cod. Vat. Lat. 4860 and 3822, see J. BIGNAMI-ODIER, loc. cit. For Cod. Vindob. 1400 (Theol. 71) see H. J. HERMANN, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Oesterreich*, N.F.V. (VIII, 5), Leipzig 1928, p. 16. These manuscripts will be further studied by M. Reeves and B. Hirsch-Reich in a forthcoming article.

