Reprinted from Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies
Vol. III, 1954

THE *FIGURAE* OF JOACHIM OF FIORE
GENUINE AND SPURIOUS COLLECTIONS

An article in the last number of this journal[1] drew attention to the discovery in Oxford and Reggio of two closely-related manuscripts containing a work now identified as the *Liber Figurarum* of the Abbot Joachim of Fiore. This work consists of tables of concords and mystical figures setting forth the meaning of history and the divine truth of the Trinity. The designs are intricate and beautiful; in the history of mediaeval symbolism they seem to be unique; Dante drew inspiration from them,[2] and even to-day they bring to the mind of the beholder a vivid sense of the poetic imagery that could stir the imaginations of men in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The degree of identity between the Oxford and Reggio copies, in the form and decoration of the figures, in their colouring and in their texts, establishes beyond doubt the existence of a specific figure-collection or *Liber Figurarum*, while a comparison of this work with the genuine writings of Joachim shows that it springs directly from the characteristic ideas of the Abbot and may therefore be regarded as a genuine collection.[3]

For the present writers the discovery of the Oxford manuscript served to focus attention on the whole subject of the *figurae* of Joachim and the extent to which they were copied and imitated by his followers. Once the search was started figures hitherto neglected or unknown came to light in a number of manuscripts. The most important of these is a well-known Joachimist manuscript at Dresden which contains a figure-collection

---

1) M. Reeves, *The Liber Figurarum of Joachim of Fiore*, M.A.R.S. II (1950), 57-81.

2) On Dante and the *Liber Figurarum*, see L. Tondelli, *Il libro delle figure dell' abbate Gioacchino da Fiore*, Turin, 1939, I 185-336.

3) The writers hope to give full reasons for this assertion elsewhere. In this judgment we agree with L. Tondelli (*op. cit.*, I 16-24 and in *Sophia* 9 [1941], 344-357 and *Da Gioachino a Dante*, Turin [1945], pp. 34-61) and H. Grundmann (*Neue Forschungen über Joachim von Fiore*, Marburg [1950], pp. 20-23) as against F. Foberti (in *Sophia*, *loc. cit.*, 332-343, 534-539 and *Gioacchino da Fiore e il Gioacchinismo antico e moderno*, Padua [1942], p. 228 ff.

closely related to those of Oxford and Reggio. So far as we know, these three manuscripts provide the only complete, or nearly complete, copies of the *Liber Figurarum*. But the lively interest which these figures continued to arouse during the two centuries after Joachim's death is attested by the number of manuscripts in which either single figures, or fragments of an original collection, or imitative collections are found. Even as late as the sixteenth century one in particular—the small collection associated with the Joachite work *Super Esaiam*—interested the Venetian editors of the genuine and spurious works of Joachim. The purpose of this article is to describe briefly the groups of figures in various manuscripts and to analyse the relations between them.

The examples to be examined can best be grouped in the following way:

A. COMPLETE OR NEARLY COMPLETE COPIES OF THE LIBER FIGURARUM.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 255A (O) (early 13th century).[1]
Reggio, Libr. of the Seminario Vescovile Urbano (R) (second half of the 13th century; Plates XVIII, XIX,[2] first half of the 14th century).
Dresden, Sächs. Landesbibl., A. 121 (D) (second half of the 13th century).

B. MANUSCRIPTS CONTAINING FRAGMENTS AND EXCERPTS OF THE LIBER FIGURARUM.

(a) *Figures with text*

Vatican, Lat. 4860 (V) (second half of the 13th century).
Paris, Bibl. Nat., Lat. 11864 (P^2) (first half of the 13th century).[3]

(b) *Text without figures*

Vatican, Lat. 3822 (V^2) (13th/14th century).
Paris, Bibl. Nat., Lat. 3595 (P) (14th century).
Milan, Bibl. Ambr., H. 15 inf. Misc. (13th/14th century).
Vatican, Urb. Lat. 8 (15th century).

} Text of one figure only.

---

[1]) The grounds for the dating of manuscripts here given in sections A and B will be fully set out in the second edition of *Il libro delle figure dell' abbate Gioachino da Fiore*, vol. II (ed. L. Tondelli, M. Reeves, B. Hirsch-Reich); those in section C will be dealt with in a later article by the writers.

[2]) All references to plates are to Tondelli's first edition, vol. II, followed by the plate number of the second edition.

[3]) See addendum, below, p. 198.

C. SMALL PSEUDO-JOACHIMIST COLLECTION.

(a) *Eleven Figures*[1]

Vatican, Rossianus 552 (S) (second half of the 13th century).
London, British Museum, Additional 11439 (B) (14th century).
Vienna, Staatsbibl., 1400 (Theol. 71) (W) (14th century).
Raudnitz (Roudnice), Bibl. Lobkowicz, Membr. VI Fc. 25 (14th century).

(b) *Nine Figures*

Vatican, Lat. 4959 (V^3) (second half of the 13th century).

(c) *Eight Figures*

i. Görlitz, Bibl. Milich, Membr. fol. N. 8 (13th/14th century) (lost).
Venice, Bibl. Marc., Lat. I. LXXIV (Valentinelli, cod. 72) (M) (14th century).
London, British Museum, Cotton Tib. B. V., Pars II. (C) (14th century).

ii. Venetian printed editions (Ed.).
Super Esaiam, 1517.
Super Hieremiam, 2nd edition, 1525.
Expositio in Apocalypsim } one volume
Psalterium decem chordarum } 1527.

(d) One additional figure (the dragon) stitched into V^2.

Of the manuscripts in the first group, that of Oxford was briefly described in the previous article,[2] while Mgr. Tondelli, who discovered the Reggio copy, published it with a full description in 1939.[3] Two common characteristics set these two manuscripts in a class by themselves: they are remarkably free from later Joachite additions or alterations; the Oxford manuscript certainly and the Reggio one probably formed part of a volume containing the three main genuine works of Joachim.[4] Detailed comparison has proved that O is earlier by about half a century and much more correct than R, being very nearly perfect. It appears to be close to the archetype, while R, which is clearly dependent on an intermediate

---

1) Three small figures which appear together on one page are here counted separately.
2) M. Reeves, *loc. cit.*, 58-59.
3) See p. 170, n. 2.
4) See M. Reeves, *loc. cit.*, 58, n. 7 and L. Tondelli, *op. cit.*, I 5.

manuscript and contains a number of mistakes, would seem to be a clumsier copy.[1] But, as we have already noticed, there is a remarkable degree of identity between the two and this faithfulness with which the *Liber Figurarum* was copied, without appreciable alteration or addition, affords clear testimony to the continuing interest in Joachim's figures.[2]

The Dresden manuscript stands somewhat apart. On the one hand, it contains the genuine figures and their texts more completely than any other copy except O, adding besides two unique Trinitarian figures which appear to be genuine;[3] on the other hand, it contains, among several genuine, one spurious work attributed to Joachim—the *Interpretatio super Hieremiam*—and throughout we see traces of a Joachite hand. Thus on fol. 36r, at the end of the *Liber Concordie*, occurs the following: *Explicit primus liber evangelii spiritus sancti*, corrected to *Expl. quintus liber Concordie*. On fol. 83v there is an illegible erased line which contained an *Explicit*, but on fol. 100v occurs an *Explicit* in a less obvious place which has escaped alteration: *Explicit prologus in secundum librum evangelii eterni spiritus sancti. Incipit liber secundus evangelii eterni abreviatus*. Lastly, on fol. 131r we find: *Explicit apocalipsis nova i.e. liber* (*evangelii* erased) *spiritualis, qui tamen non est integer, sed abreviatus*.[4] In nearly all the figures, too, there are additions or alterations. One very suggestive Joachite addition occurs in two trees which represent the true succession of spiritual inheritance in the old Dispensation and the new. In O[5] the topmost sections of the trees are labelled *Effraym* and *Ordo Cisterciensium* respectively; D[6] adds yet another

---

[1]) A full analysis of the relation between O and R will be given in the second edition of *Il Libro delle figure*, see above, p. 171, n. 1.

[2]) The only instance in which it seems that attempts were made to bring a figure up-to-date is in the case of one of the tables of concords (Pl. IV). These tables (of which there are two pairs) are calculated in periods of thirty years and in all MSS. the one in question ends thus: *XXX Celestinus cum duobus MCC.* (blank) *MCCXXX.* (blank) *MCCLX.* Thus all have the curious feature of Celestine III in the place of Innocent III, but in O the name *Celestinus* has been written over an erasure and may be a slightly later addition, though this is not certain, while the words *cum duobus* may be a later addition still. D preserves these words, but inserts *Innocentius* faintly as well; furthermore, it adds the *Celestinus cum duobus* in the appropriate place in the other pair of tables (Pl. X). We are indebted to Dr. Minio for the suggestion that these words are a later addition in O; cf. Riv. Stor. Ital. 63 [1951], 256 f.

[3]) See Tondelli, I 57, 59 ff. and Pl. XXIIa (XXVIa).

[4]) We are indebted for these notes to Professor Grundmann.

[5]) Fol. 13r. See M. Reeves, *loc. cit.*, 73 and Pl. III facing (Pl. XXIII).

[6]) Tondelli, *op. cit.*, II Pl. XXI b (XXV b).

section with blanks for names, thus obviously hinting at another spiritual order to come in the new Dispensation. According to Professor Grundmann, D must have been written by an Italian Joachite since, he says, there could hardly have been Joachites in Germany at this time. It is, however, striking that, according to Dr. Pächt,[1] the faces in the figures of the Tree-Circles and the Wheels[2] in D seem to be of western German origin; furthermore, the style of the manuscript throughout is late Romanesque, although belonging to the late thirteenth century,[3] which again suggests Germany rather than Italy. There are, in fact, already some strands of evidence to suggest that Joachimist ideas and works, including figures, were penetrating into northern Europe in the first half of the thirteenth century[4] and it is, therefore, surely not impossible that before the end of the century a German Joachite was drawing the figures of the Dresden manuscript. Thus we may have here further evidence of the dissemination of these ideas north of the Alps, but the interpretation of the evidence is, as yet, doubtful.[5]

It is to south Italy that we must turn for most of our evidence of Joachites who in the thirteenth century were copying, adapting and imitating their master's figures. Thus it is to south Italy and to the second half of the thirteenth century that J. Bignami-Odier assigns the first manuscript in our second group, Vat. Lat. 4860 (V).[6] This consists of extracts

---

[1]) We are indebted to Dr. O. Pächt for giving his expert opinion on several artistic points in connection with this article.

[2]) Fol. 93v, 92v.

[3]) F. Schnorr v. Carolsfeld, *Katalog der Hss. der Kön. Bibl. zu Dresden*, I 157, judged it to belong to the 14th century, but in the view of Dr. Bischoff (Munich), Dr. E. Jaffé (Cambridge) and Prof. Grundmann, who have kindly given their opinions by letter, it must be put back to the late 13th century.

[4]) For a probable reference to the tables of concords as early as 1213, see Reeves, *loc. cit.*, 61, n. 1. In 1220/22 the Cistercian Prior Gebeno von Eberbach in his *Speculum futurorum temporum vel Pentacron Hildegardis* describes the visit of a certain Abbot John from Calabria whom Grundmann believes to have been one of Joachim's disciples (*Kleine Beiträge über Joachim v. Fiore* in Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 48 [1929], 164-5). We may note, too, that before the mid-century Alexander of Bremen is quoting extensively from the spurious work *Super Hieremiam* (see A. Wachtel, *Die weltgeschichtliche Apocalypse-Auslegung des Minoriten Alexander v. Bremen* in Franziskanische Studien, 24 [1937], 223-4).

[5]) Dr. Bischoff notes some German peculiarities in the handwriting but thinks, nonetheless, that t was written in Italy.

[6]) *Notes sur deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Vatican contenant des traités inédits de Joachim de Fiore* in Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire, 54 [1937], 211-41.

from various writers, together with sermon notes, written throughout in a single hand. Mme. Bignami-Odier suggests that it was compiled by a Franciscan, since twice the text from the Apocalypse *Vidi alterum angelum ascendentem ab ortu solis* (ch. 7, v. 2) is applied prophetically to St. Francis.[1] The compiler gives fragments from the three main works of Joachim, two minor works which may be authentic[2] and part of the spurious commentary on Jeremiah. The figures occur in a group towards the end (fol. 198r-204v). They are carefully drawn, though greatly inferior in artistic quality to O and R, with the genuine text of the *Liber Figurarum* faithfully reproduced, though with some mistakes and one real distortion. First come tables of concords, corresponding to the later tables in the *Liber*,[3] in which it is notable that the author has not tried to bring the list of popes any further up to date than in O and R.[4] This is followed by the text of the dragon figure from the *Liber*[5] but here accompanied by a quite different reptile, a unique, bird-like creature with two feet, seven heads and yet another in the tail.[6]

In the next figure we come upon the first stage in the most remarkable metamorphosis or process of debasement which any of these figures under-

---

[1]) This identification of St. Francis appears to have first been openly made by Gerard of Borgo San Donnino (Archiv für Litt.-u-Kirchengesch., I 101-2), but Ubertino da Casale later declared that he had heard John of Parma assert that the sixth seal was fulfilled in St. Francis (*Arbor Vitae Crucifixae* [1485], lib. V, c. 3). St. Bonaventura incorporated it into the official legend (*Legenda maior*, *Opera Omnia* [Quaracchi] VIII, 545 and *Legenda minor*, VIII, 577). For a survey of works in which this identification occurs, see S. Bihel, *S. Franciscus fuitne angelus sexti sigilli* (*Apoc.* 7, 2)? in Antonianum, II, 59 ff.

[2]) *Tractatus in expositione vite et regule beati Benedicti* (H. Grundmann in Zeitschrift f. Kirchengesch., 48 [1928], 141) and *Liber de ultimis tribulationibus* (see E. Donckel, *Die Prophezeiung des Telesforus* in Arch. Francisc. Hist., 26 [1933], 53).

[3]) Plates III and IV.

[4]) See above, p. 173, n. 2.

[5]) Pl. XIV.

[6]) The dragon in D is very similar. V² has another design of a bird-like, footed creature, with the heads spreading fan-wise from the body, and akin to this is the dragon figure in the *Chronica Imperatorum* of Alberto Milioli (Bibl. Estense, MS. M. I. 7, fol. 121r, reproduced in *Arch. Muratoriano*, I fasc. 8, Pl. I by A. Cerlini, cf. L. Tondelli, *op. cit.*, I 19). On the other hand, the OR class of the *Lib. Fig.* and the pseudo-Joachimist collection have serpent forms. In O and R this is a reptile body, curved in a semi-circle, with seven heads at one end, a tail at the other and no feet; in the pseudo-collection the reptile has a twice-knotted body stretching down vertically, with the tail curving leftwards. One feature common to all designs is that the sixth head, Saladin, is crowned; the dragon of Milioli, however, has all the seven heads and that in the tail crowned.

went. Joachim saw the annual cycle of the Church's liturgical year as a figure symbolizing the whole sweep of history. In the *Liber* he drew this as a spiral, called the *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, beginning in the centre with Septuagesima and sweeping out to Pentecost in the 'tail'.[1] In order to work out his required symbolism he did not go straight through the Church's year but broke off at the end of Lent, returning to Advent and so round again to Lent and thence to Easter and Pentecost which symbolizes the culmination of history. His thought was entirely of the ages of history in relation to the seasons of the Church and the Scriptures appointed to be read at each season, but his spiral certainly has a serpentine appearance and the compiler of V (or his source), failing to understand its significance, has added a dragon's head in the centre and elongated the tail which now points sharply downwards. Surprisingly enough, he has kept the genuine text—even the unusual arrangement of the Church's seasons—so that the 'tail of the dragon' still represents the seventh age of history, the great Sabbath Age, followed by the *Dies Pentecostes*, i.e. the great day of eternity. The result is a puzzling, hybrid figure which represents the first stage in a process of debasement and illustrates strikingly the Joachite predilection for the dragon theme. Beside the last column of text belonging to this figure is a simpler version of a figure which in O is one of the most beautiful, the Trinitarian Tree-Circles.[2] Next comes a well-drawn reproduction of the *Dispositio novi ordinis pertinentis ad tercium statum* in which Joachim endeavoured to set out a pattern of the religious life in the Age of the Holy Ghost.[3] Last of the figures from the *Liber* is the second of a pair of 'tree-ladders' both of which are found in O and D.[4] The original designs express vividly the idea of the three *status* of mankind, but in V the clarity of the conception has been lost and the real point obscured.[5] On the *verso* of this figure are circles taken from the *Liber Concordie*,[6] whilst further on

---

1) Pl. XIX.

2) O fol. 12v (Pl. XXII).

3) Pl. XII.

4) O fol. 11v and 12r; D fol. 88v. The figure from V is reproduced by Tondelli, II, Pl. XXa. (XXIVa). See also I 94-7.

5) It should be noted that three sentences which in O and D accompany the first tree-ladder are here inserted beside the second.

6) *Lib. Conc.*, Lib. II, Tract. II, cap. 5, fol. 21v. All folio references are to the 1519 edition.

the writer reproduces what seems to be the original of a debased tree-figure in the printed edition of the *Liber Concordie*.[1] This suggests that various sketches of Joachim's figures were in circulation besides those in the *Liber Figurarum*.

Taken altogether, the compiler of V has made a fairly representative selection of the figures which express the essential ideas of Joachim: the tables of concords show his treatment of the double sweep of history; the dragon, with his seven heads marking the persecutions of the Church, stands for another, most popular, aspect of the Abbot's thought; the figure of the Trinitarian tree-circles, forming the three *status* of history, represents one of Joachim's characteristic metaphors; the *Dispositio novi ordinis* looks forward to the third *status*; the tree-ladder again expounds the three *status* in characteristic form. In one figure only, the *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, there is a serious and surprising perversion of Joachim's ideas, either perpetrated by the compiler of V himself, or derived from his source. This one exception apart, he remains close to the genuine thought of his master, though he includes in his selection of writings the spurious commentary on Jeremiah. Apart from the two textual figures, he derives all of them from the *Liber Figurarum* and he never departs significantly from its texts, even in the case of the perverted figure. An interesting point is that, in spite of the indications elsewhere of a Franciscan view-point, he has not tried to use Joachim's ideas or figures for the glorification of the Minorites.

In MSS. 3822 of the Vatican (V^2) and 3595 of Paris (P) we have two closely-related examples of another selection from the figures of Joachim. The former was described by O. Holder-Egger[2] and has more recently been analysed by Mme. Bignami-Odier;[3] the latter will be fully described by Mlle. d'Alverny in vol. iii of P. Lauer's *Catalogue général des MSS. de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*. V^2 is, in the words of Prof. Grundmann, a typical Joachite text-book, containing genuine and spurious writings of Joachim or extracts from them, written in a variety of hands. The oldest entries go back to the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century and it probably emanates from south Italy. The diagrammatic

---

[1]) In V fol. 289r. *Cf. Lib. Conc.*, fol. 14r. This figure has hitherto passed unnoticed.
[2]) *Neues Archiv*, 33 [1903], 97-105.
[3]) *Loc. cit.*, 214 ff., 219 ff.

arrangements which have to do service for figures occur in the first part and are associated with two letters and a short work, all written in the same hand: *Epistola abbatis Joachim: Universis Christi fidelibus* (fol. 1r-1v);[1] *Septem tempora Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (fol. 1v-2r);[2] *Epistola subsequentium figurarum* (fol. 3v-4r). To the last of these we shall return shortly. On two pages confronting each other are tables of concords corresponding to the earlier pair in the *Liber Figurarum*.[3] The outstanding feature here is that, though an attempt is made to preserve the generations of mankind in columnar form, all trace of the original design has been lost. The copyist has, however, grasped the basic meaning: he realizes that the notes on either side relate to specific generations and tries to connect them by spidery lines, but clearly he was hampered by the small size of his page and he was probably incapable of the feats of intricate draughtsmanship and delicate ornamentation displayed in the Oxford and Reggio versions of this figure. The same characteristics appear in the next figure. Here he sets out to reproduce what in O and R is a magnificent tree of the whole of history, with two sets of branches representing Old Testament Tribes and New Testament Churches. The scribe of V^2 gives a mere parody of this. He copies the top half first (fol. 4v) and then the bottom (fol. 7r),[4] with the first generations, which ought to form the base of the tree, squeezed in horizontally at right-angles to the rest. The branches are indicated in the most primitive way and there is no trace of the tree-form. Moreover, the text proves to be a conflation of two tree-figures which confront each other in the *Liber Figurarum*,[5] one culminating in the *Spiritus Sanctus* and the other in *Jesus Christus* and the *Secundus Adventus*.

---

1) Edited J. Bignami-Odier, *loc. cit.*, 220-223, who regards it as apocryphal, as also does Tondelli, *op. cit.*, I 41. H. Grundmann, *Neue Forschungen über Joachim v. Fiore*, p. 25, thinks it genuine and the writers agree with him.

2) This short text, which we may call *De septem sigillis*, occurs at the beginning of O (fol. 6v), in D (fol. 221v-222v) and P (fol. 25v-28r), and also, without a title, in MS. 322 (fol. 166r-v) of the Bibl. Antoniana, Padua. At the end of the 15th century it was still known to Trithemius who gives it in his list of Joachim's writings (*Liber de eccles. scriptoribus* [1494], fol. 59r). We believe it to be genuine and hope to publish it shortly. In all but the last MS. it appears in conjunction with figures: for this reason and also because of its diagrammatic character and association of ideas we regard it as standing in close relation to the *Lib. Fig.* See Reeves, *loc. cit.*, 71.

3) Pl. IX and X.

4) They originally confronted each other, but folios 5 and 6 were later stitched in between.

5) Plates I and II. See also Reeves, *loc. cit.*, Pl. I and II.

The scribe follows neither in his crowning text, inserting instead *Christus Judex*. He further adds notes on Seals and Persecutions derived from another figure,[1] and in these one already detects a Joachimist addition: *Alexander, Lucius, Urbanus pape et alii successores eorum usque ad pseudo papam*. Folios 5 and 6 do not belong to the quaternion but were stitched in later, being written in a different thirteenth-century hand. Fol. 5r contains a dragon figure which is completely different from that of O and R, and with it is a text which, as we shall see, occurs in the pseudo-Joachite collection associated with the *Super Esaiam*. On fol. 7v-8r we find the genuine dragon text from the *Liber Figurarum* without the figure.[2] Finally, on fol. 18v and 19r another scribe has drawn geometrical figures from the *Psalterium decem chordarum*[3] and the great eagle from the same work of which we shall speak later,[4] and on fol. 20v the same figure of three circles from the *Liber Concordie* as in V.[5]

Leaving aside the additions made by other hands, we have here a small collection of figures which derive from the *Liber Figurarum* (or its source) and are associated with certain texts. The copyist has not attempted any elaborate designs, but he has made an effort, within the exigencies of his space, to preserve the proper relation of notes and captions. He has taken liberties with his source by conflation and by additions. Some additions strike a distinctly pseudo-Joachimist note. Besides the one already quoted, there occur in the New Testament table of concords (fol. 3r) the words *Passio domini nostri Jesu Christi a qua usque ad pseudo-papam seu Antichristum anni MCCLX*. Here the computation of *anni a passione* shifts the critical year from 1260 to 1290 and suggests that V^2, or its source, was written after 1260. It is noteworthy that this is the only manuscript with genuine texts from the *Liber Figurarum* in which these have been tampered with by Joachites.

---

1) Pl. III and IV.

2) But the names of five Heads and Persecutions from the figure are written in short columns. The Heads are: Herodes, Nero, Constantinus, Machometus, Muselemuthus. This corresponds to MSS. O, R, D where they are: Herodes, Nero, Constantius (R Constantinus), Mahometh (O Maometh), Mesemothus (O Mesemot, D Masimuth), together with Saladinus (OR Salahadinus) and the unnamed seventh head.

3) Fols 256r, 257r, 260v, 261r, 268v. All references are to the 1527 edition.

4) See below, p. 187.

5) See above, p. 176.

MS. P, a fourteenth-century production, contains from fol. 19v to 35v a collection of material almost exactly similar to that in V^2 which we have examined, though in a different order.[1] Clearly this derives from a source similar to V^2, for it reproduces many of its peculiarities. Yet it is not a direct copy: not only does the order differ, but in P there are many small omissions and mistakes as well as some additions. The scribe here does not in the least understand the nature of the figures he is copying and, owing to the exigencies of space, the result is often a wildly-jumbled text in which the various notes to the figures are squeezed in anywhere at random.[2] On the other hand, P does not contain the pseudo-Joachimist additions to the notes which occur in V^2, and in this connection it is important to notice that various pseudo-Joachimist additions to the *Epistola subsequentium figurarum* in V^2 are also absent from P.[3] Thus, whilst the date of V^2, or its immediate source, must be placed after 1260, P's source is probably prior to that date. Their common elements prove conclusively, however, that ultimately they derive from a common source. Thus we have to postulate an anthology of Joachimist material, made before 1260 and containing, besides certain texts, material drawn from the *Liber Figurarum* which suffered conflation and probably rearrangement, owing to the exigencies of space, but which had not yet received the distinctive pseudo-Joachimist additions of V^2.[4]

We must now turn for a moment to the *Epistola subsequentium figurarum* which occurs in V^2 and P. The fact that it is found only in these two manuscripts,[5] which show so many marks of addition and alteration, at once arouses suspicion. In any case it would be difficult to regard this as

---

1) The contents is as follows: fol. 19r-21v *Epistola. Inc. Universis Christi fidelibus*; fol. 22r-25v Tables of Concords; fol. 25v-28r *De Septem Sigillis*; fol. 28v-29r *Epistola subsequentium figurarum*; fol. 29v-31r Text of the Tree; fol. 31r-34r Text of the Dragon figure; fol. 34r-35r *Epistola ... Valdonum monasterii abbati ... frater Joachim*. This last also occurs in V^2 on fol. 4r but in a different hand.

2) For example, the text of the Tree is given backwards (i.e. the top half first), with its bottom section squeezed into a margin, the 'branches' are scribbled in at random, and the only recognizable features are the nodal points of the tree.

3) See below, p. 181.

4) The two texts of single figures mentioned in the table on p. 171 do not call for detailed comment. That at Milan is a good text of the Dragon figure. Cod. Urb. Lat. 8 in the Vatican is a beautiful Renaissance MS. of the *Liber Concordie* in which the greater part of the text of the Seven *Etates* has been inserted between chapters 77 and 78 of Book V, with a space left for the figure.

5) See addendum, below, p. 198.

genuine, for the characteristic of the genuine figures in the *Liber Figurarum* is that they were so designed as to be complete in themselves, each with its own text attached, where necessary. As they are conceived, the genuine figures need no further explanation, apart from the background of Joachim's writings, and it is difficult to understand why he should have written such an unnecessary and fragmentary one. The main part of the *Epistola* describes a single tree in language which brings it close to the figure of the tree in the *Liber Figurarum* which culminates in the Second Advent.[1] But the description does not correspond exactly to the tree of the *Liber*. The most obvious difference is that the tree of the *Epistola* culminates in *Christus Judex*, suggesting at once a connection with the skeleton tree in V^2 and P. Furthermore, it follows V^2 and P in incorporating certain elements which in the *Liber* belong to other figures.[2] The main part of the *Epistola* is, in fact, a description of a tree which is a composite one, combining elements from three genuine figures and clearly connected with the hybrid 'tree' of V^2 and P. The last part of the *Epistola* consists of notes which have no clear reference to specific figures. They relate to the subject-matter of several figures in the *Liber* but give the impression of notes on Joachim's schemes of thought rather than descriptions of figures.

In V^2 the *Epistola* contains two obviously later elements: in four places the New Testament generations are calculated from the Passion instead of the Nativity, thus pushing on the fateful year to 1290,[3] and furthermore it contains an interpolated verse:

> Cum fuerint anni transacti mille ducenti
> Seni decies post partum Virginis alme
> Tunc Antichristus nascetur demone plenus.

---

1) See above, p. 178.

2) On either side of the tree described in the *Epistola* are notes on parallel events reminiscent of the tables of concords. The next sentence describes a detail which in the *Lib. Fig.* is found only in the tree of the *Spiritus Sanctus*: *Numero terdenarii ab utroque latere linea protenditur in quibus numerus apostolicorum, ab alia parte imperatorum esse monstratur* (Bignami-Odier, *loc. cit.*, 225; Tondelli, I 43).

3) We quote one of these passages: *Cum vero a nativitate vel melius a passione Christi complete sint hoc nostro tempore XL generationes id est MCC nec restant nisi due generationes complende id est anni LX a passione vel LXXXX a nativitate quasi duo ternarii in quo impleri oportet quidquid de Antichristo dicitur et de consummatione seculi.* (Bignami-Odier, *loc. cit.*, 224; Tondelli, I 43.)

This was one of a number of oracular verses which were flying about in the mid-thirteenth century.[1] It was popular then and later—with suitable modifications of date—but its earliest appearance is only in the mid-century and there is no trace of it in the genuine writings of Joachim.[2] It is quite foreign to the Abbot's thought to put the emphasis thus on the appearance of a single Antichrist and nothing else; the verse, in fact, has the ring of a thirteenth-century Joachite who has taken the old standard expectation of Antichrist and attached it to the Abbot's date. These Joachite additions are not in P, but even when we remove them we are left with a text which does not belong to the *Liber Figurarum* but, in its main part, relates to the composite tree-figure which was in the source used by the copyists of V^2 and P. Whilst these latter have almost completely lost the tree form, the *Epistola* presupposes an actual figure before the eye.[3] Thus we are brought to the conclusion that the *Epistola* was written for the purpose of interpreting a small collection of figures put together by a Joachite before the year 1260. We see, too, that this little picture-book continued to interest people, not only to the point of copying it, but also to the point of making additions sometime between 1260 and 1290.

---

[1]) In Mathew Paris's *Book of Additamenta* (Rolls Series, VI 80) it appears under the year 1242, applied to the year 1250. Shortly after, Albert of Stade echoes it for the year 1260 (MGH, SS XVI 341). Versions occur in the British Museum, Royal and King's MSS., 10 B. XII, fol. 43 (13th century, applied to 1260); 8 D. II, fol. 70^{v} (14th century, applied to 1300); Harleian MSS., 1280, fol. 427 (14th century, applied to 1260). See also Oxford, Oriel Coll. MS. 76, fol. 147^{rb} (14th century, applied to 1260). Another version appears in the appendix to the Chronicle of Peter Langtoft (Rolls Series, II 449). O. Holder-Egger, *Neues Archiv*, 15 (1889) 175, quotes the 1260 version from the Bibl. Vitt. Emanuele (Rome), MS. 14 S. Pantaleone 31, fol. 57^{v}, and again in 33 (1907) 100, from MS. Vat. Lat. 3822, fol. 14^{v}. A version applied to 1310 was printed in the 1525 edition of the *Interpretatio in Hieremiam*, fol. 62^{r}. For further references see H. Grundmann, *Neue Forschungen über J. von Fiore*, p. 24, n. 1.

[2]) John of Paris mentions in his tract on Antichrist (ed. Venice, Lazarus de Soardis, 1516) fol. 47^{a} that he failed to find it in Joachim's works in this form; both he and Henry of Harclay, chancellor of Oxford University who critically examines the calculation of these verses in his Quaestio, written in 1313: *Utrum astrologi vel quicumque calculatores possint probare 2^{m} adventum Christi* (MS. Worcester, Library of the Cathedral, F. 3, f. 186^{r}) have the additional verse: *Hec Florensis* (*Floretensis* Pelster; *Hic synthesis* John of Paris) *Ioachim predixit in anno / quo Saladinus armis sanctam cepit urbem*; cf. Fr. Pelster, *Die Quaestio Heinrichs von Harclay über die zweite Ankunft Christi und die Erwartung des baldigen Weltendes zu Anfang des XIV. Jahrhunderts, Arch. ital. per la stor. d. pietà* I (1950), pp. 38 and 74.

[3]) Tondelli, *op. cit.*, I 42: *. . . et hec stipes arboris dicitur. A Jacob ramos incipit diffundere XII . . . Ab Ozia usque ad Christum extenduntur duo rami . . . A Christo vero hec secunda et inserta arbor tot ramos fecit quot principia, XII scilicet ecclesias . . .*

FIGURE	CONTENT OF MANUSCRIPTS[1] V²	S	B	W	M	C	Ed	RELATION TO GENUINE WORKS AND FIGURES	RELATION TO THE *SUPER ESAIAM*
1. Eagle	—	1r	99v	21r	—	—	—	Simpler version of *Psalt.* 268r; figure and text related to *Lib. Fig.* Pl. V, VI; *Expos.* 17r ff., 28r, 49v ff., 62r ff.; *Psalt.* 267r, but text an independent composition with spurious elements.	Pattern of 5 +7=12 worked out in tribes and churches and senses of Scripture: 4v, 44r, 50r-51r.
2. Two Trees of Orders	—	1v	100r	21v	—	—	—	Figure similar to *Lib. Fig.*, MS. O fol. 13r (Pl. XXIII), but much debased.	Manasseh and Ephraim, Reuben, Judah, Gad, St. Bernard, the Cistercian Order: 5r, 8r, 16v, 30v, 37v, 44r.
3. Three Interlaced Circles	1r	2r	100v	22r	2r	1r (89r)	ar	Figure and text derived from *Lib. Conc.* 21v, but badly adapted to express a simpler idea with spurious elements. See also *Expos.* 7r, 62r.	Entry into Promised Land, sequence of twos: 5r. Two *testes passim.*
Text following								Close in phrases to *Lib. Conc.* 8r, 21r-22r, 125v; *Expos.* 5r-10r, 146r-168v, but goes beyond sources in stating that the second *status* ends in 1260 and in naming the second Antichrist Frederick II.	3rd *status*, 7 *tempora*, 7th age=Sabbath Age, conflict of twos, 3 worst kings: Prologue, 1v, 6v, 14r, 19r, 27r-v, 29v-30v, 35r, 50v-52v, 56r-v. Two *testes passim.*
4. Mysterium Ecclesiae	1v	2v	99r[2]	22v	2v	1v (89v)	av	Figure similar to *Lib. Fig.* Pl. XIX, with dragon head added and a partly new text substituted for the original one within the figure. The long, accompanying text is absent.	
5. Three Circles side by side								Akin to, but differing from, *Lib. Fig.* Pl. XI (top right-hand), text from *Expos.* 5r, 14v, 38v; see also *Lib. Conc.* 65v, 72r, 111r-112r.	Obscurity of the Letter, veil of Moses, blindness of clergy, 6th and 7th angels: 1r, 5r, 6r, 56v-58v.
6. Trumpet	2r	3r	101r	23r	3r	2r (90r)	br	Derived from *Expos.* 40v, 127v.	Significance of Isaiah, Trumpet, Two Testaments: Prologue, 3r, 6r, 50r.
7. Seven Seals and Openings								Similar but more complicated patterns in *Lib. Conc.* 26r-42r; *Expos.* 6v, 116r. No source for opening of last three seals.	Opening of the Seals: 3v, 4v, 6v, 29r, 50r-52v.
8. Seven-headed Dragon[3]	2v	3v	101v	23v	3v	2v (90v)	bv	Figure identical in subject with *Lib. Fig.* Pl. XIV, but different in form; 4th to 7th heads differ, making Frederick II the seventh. Text differs from that of *Lib. Fig.*, being partly drawn from such passages as *Lib. Conc.* 38v-42r, *Expos.* 6v, 10r-v, 156r-v, 196r-v, partly independent. It is much shorter than the *Lib. Fig.*	Dragon, series of conflicts, *Statua Babylonis*, Gog= dragon's tail: 3r, 4v, 29v, 35r, 37r, 42v, 47r-v, 50v-52v 57v, 59r. Anti-German attitude *passim.*
9. Babylon-Rome Figure	3r	4r	102r	24r	—	—	—	Similar to *Lib. Fig.* Pl. XVI, XVII in shape. Text drawn from ideas in *Lib. Conc.* 17v, 39r, 92r-v, 134r-v; *Expos.* 4r ff., 23v, but with spurious elements.	Babylon / Rome, David / Silvester, *Urbs Romulea*, Devil has his seat like God, Israel's ascent from Babylon, persecutions: 4r, 5v, 9r, 10r, 52v.
10. Psaltery with Ten Strings	3v	4v	102v	24v	4r	3r (91r)	cr	Similar to figure inserted in *Psalt.* 228r, but with more text, and also to *Lib. Fig.* Pl. XIII, but with less text; closely related to *Psalt. decem chordarum* in conception.	
11. Wheels of Ezechiel	4r	5r	103r	25r	4v	3v (91v)	cv	Figure identical with *Lib. Fig.* Pl. XV; text partly different; innumerable references in all works.	The Wheels, Four Animals, Four Senses of Scripture, Four Orders: Prologue, 5v-6v, 34r, 57r-v.

[1]) For the full designation of each MS., see the table on p. 171. In addition to the MSS. analysed here, the first table shows two MSS. (at Roudnice and Görlitz) which we have been unable to study.
[2]) The only variation in order is that B. places this figure first.
[3]) The text of this, together with a quite different dragon figure, occur also in V² (fol. 5r).

Fig. 1

There is yet another, and this, the most popular of these post-Joachim collections of figures, is also the most obviously spurious, in that the figures are debased and the text almost wholly different from that in the *Liber Figurarum*.[1] This is the collection preceding the *Super Esaiam*, later printed by the Venetian editors of the sixteenth century, and for convenience we shall adopt their name for it—the *Praemissiones*.[2] There are three main points of interest here: the content of the manuscripts, the relation of the figures to genuine sources and their relation to the *Super Esaiam*. For the sake of clarity in the discussion below, we set out some of the relevant detail in the accompanying table (Fig. 1):

All these manuscripts obviously go back to a common source. In spite of the varying number of figures, the same order is preserved in all[3] and this roughly follows that of the three main works of Joachim—the *Liber Concordie*, the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* and the *Psalterium decem chordarum*. The last figure of the Wheels belongs to them all. The earliest and best manuscript is V^3 which seems to be closely related to the next in date—S. In these two manuscripts the figures are almost identical, apart from the important fact that the Eagle and the Two Trees of Orders are missing from V^3. In the other manuscripts there is a large amount of similarity between the figures, except in the case of B where they differ considerably. It is noteworthy that the Dragon—perhaps the most popular of all the figures—is exactly the same in all copies both in shape and in position of the texts, and the other texts, too, vary little in content and position. Both V^3 and S have finely-drawn figures, of which the first of

---

1) In the lively controversy between the late F. Foberti and L. Tondelli on the *Liber Figurarum* in *Sophia* 9 [1941], Foberti (p. 336) took the figures which appear in the 'printed works (of Joachim) in the Venetian editions' as the norm both as regards the number and the appearance of the figures and their texts. Though he noticed some misplacements and alterations in the Venetian texts, he did not draw the proper conclusion that the figures and texts of the Reggio and other manuscripts of the *Liber Figurarum* represent the authentic tradition much more closely. Furthermore, neither Tondelli nor Foberti clearly distinguished the figures within Joachim's genuine works from those of the pseudo-collection prefacing the *Super Esaiam* (*loc. cit.*, pp. 346 and 534).

2) See the heading to the Venetian edition of the *Super Esaiam*, 1517. The editors did not invent this title: one MS., now in the Bibl. Marc. at Venice (M) gives the heading *Premissiones Ab. Joachim in Esaiam prophetam*. This was probably the MS. used by the editors; it was then in the monastery of the Austin Canons of S. Joannes in Viridario, Padua.

3) Except that in B the *Mysterium Ecclesie* is placed first.

the two Trees of Orders in S is notable in design. The dragon's head added to the *Mysterium Ecclesiae* is almost identical in these two manuscripts and, significantly, resembles closely that of the debased figure in V.[1] It will be observed from the table that the three manuscripts, S, W and B all have the extra figures of the eagle and the two trees. W, which in some respects stands related to B, is the worst manuscript, with bad misreadings and misplacements.[2] The last two manuscripts, M and C, which are both later ones, lack not only the eagle and the trees but also one figure—Babylon/Rome—from V^3.

MS. B—British Museum Additional 11439—calls for a little further description, since it has hitherto been unnoticed by students of Joachimism and it possesses some interesting features. It is a fourteenth-century compilation of Joachim's works, or extracts from them, both genuine and spurious. We propose to give a full analysis of it and of another Joachimist compilation in the British Museum, Royal 8 F. XVI, elsewhere. For our purpose here the most interesting feature of this manuscript is the writer's predilection for figures. Anyone studying the Abbot's intricate pattern of ideas must feel the need to set these out diagrammatically—where Joachim does not do it himself—and this urge probably inspired the construction of five unique figures on fol. 73^v to 75^r. These do not form part of the collection we are studying but it is worth while glancing at them a moment, for they show clearly how Joachim's followers, playing with the same stock of ideas, could produce their own designs to illustrate the main themes. The first (fol. 73^v) expresses in different form the rise-and-fall movement of exaltation and deposition embodied in the Babylon-Rome figure;[3] the second (fol. 74^r) sets out the two parallel sequences of seven *bella* or persecutions so often found in the *Liber Figurarum*;[4] the third (fol. 74^v) is another version of the Wheels of Ezechiel; the fourth (fol. 75^r)

---

[1]) See above, p. 176.

[2]) See H. Hermann, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Hss. Österreichs*, N.F.V. (VIII, 5), Leipzig, 1928, p. 16 ff., who concludes that it is a 14th-century MS. based on an early 13th-century, south-Italian source.

[3]) See below, p. 188.

[4]) Here the sequences are: in the Old Testament—*Bellum Egyptiorum, Philistinorum, Syrorum, Assyriorum, Chaldeorum, Assyriorum, Grecorum*; in the New Testament—*Bellum Judeorum, Paganorum, Arrianorum, Turchorum, Alamanorum, Sarracenorum, Patarenorum*. Cf. *Liber Figurarum*, Pl. III and IV VIII; IX and X.

plays on the senses of Scripture, using the same number symbolism of 3, 5 and 7 as Joachim does in connection with the Eagle.[1] The last (fol. 75r) gives us an illuminating example of how Joachites completed their master's system of thought. Joachim discerned in the fact that five tribes in the Old Testament received their inheritance first and seven afterwards a symbol of two stages in spiritual growth—a former, outer, literal, and latter, inner, spiritual. In the New Testament he found five churches first established by St. Peter and then the seven churches of Asia associated with St. John. Thus the 5/7 (=12) idea became for him a powerful symbol of that spiritual inheritance in the Age of the Holy Ghost for which he waited. He clearly hints that such a spiritual succession from the former to the latter will take place in the orders of the Church, but he never ventures on a complete 5/7 sequence of orders. The Joachite author of this manuscript (or its source), however, works out a clear diagram to his own satisfaction: Tribes of the Old Testament on the left, Churches of the New on the right, each grouped in fives and sevens, and in between Orders grouped thus: *Apostoli*, *Martires*, *Confessores*, *Virgines*, *Pastores / Greci*, *Crucesignati*, *Clerici*, *Canonici Nigri*, *Albi*, *Viri futuri*—and in this final order of the seven surely lies the clue to his interest and his hope.[2]

The *Praemissiones* (fol. 99r-103r), as we have already noted, have the same content and order as S and W, except for the misplacement of the *Mysterium Ecclesiae*. Two figures are unfinished—the two trees of orders (fol. 100r) which are only faintly sketched, and the three circles (fol. 100v) which are empty although the textual notes below are complete. On the other hand, the serpent's head in the debased version of the *Mysterium Ecclesiae* is drawn with care and crowned (fol. 99r), the eagle, the dragon with seven heads and the Babylon/Rome figures are also well drawn and the Psaltery has an interesting addition in the form of a representation of God the Father at its head. It is this last feature, as well as the faint sketch for the trees, which links the manuscript with that of Vienna (W).

How and by whom was this figure collection first made? If the table above is studied, it will be seen firstly, that the compiler is familiar with

---

[1]) See below, p. 187.

[2]) The sequence of five here is only a variation of a common sequence of four constantly used by Joachim (see, for example, *Lib. Conc.*, fol. 25v; *Expos. in Apoc.* (ed. 1527), fol. 23v, 106r, 162r; *Lib. Fig.*, Pl. XII, XIV, XV). It is the sequence of seven here which is original.

the three chief works of Joachim from which he draws some figures and a good deal of text; secondly, that he knows and draws on figures which are to be found in the *Liber Figurarum*, but does not reproduce any of its longer texts; thirdly, that, though its sources can easily be traced in Joachim's writings, the text to these figures is original and contains obvious thirteenth-century elements. The impression left by comparison with the genuine works is that the compiler wants a clarification of some of Joachim's main ideas in the form of simple summaries and figures. Perhaps it is a text-book for eager Joachites that he is trying to compose! He prefers the straightforward, geometrical figures and those expressing a single idea; he does not attempt any more elaborate figures, such as those in the *Liber Figurarum*, which bring together a complex of ideas from many parts of Joachim's writings. The *Praemissiones* is clearly more primitive in thought and execution than the *Liber Figurarum*, but the problem is to decide whether this is the primitiveness of an early collection made by Joachim himself, or of a blundering disciple imitating his master. The answer may, perhaps, be a combination of both.

What immediately strikes the eye is that the *form* of most of the figures seems to be the true one: the interlaced circles and those side by side, the eagle, the trumpet and the seven seals, the Babylon-Rome figure and the wheels of Ezechiel all draw their form from genuine sources. Some would seem to represent very early and undeveloped ideas. Thus the three circles side by side embody a conception of three stages—*Tempus ante legem*, *Tempus sub lege*, *Tempus sub gratia*—which was certainly used by Joachim, but which seems to precede the more famous system of three *status* in which the third is that of the Holy Ghost.[1] On the same page are simple figures of the trumpet and the seven seals with disconnected notes grouped round the three figures. There is no unity of idea in this page, but all the designs bear the character of textual illustrations which someone has copied and put together in this form. The three interlaced circles exhibit a peculiar arrangement which does not occur elsewhere in Joachim's works yet seems closest to the mystical diagram which inspired all the Joachimist

---

[1]) See *Expos. in Apoc.*, fol 5^{v}, where Joachim shows that this sequence of three can be extended to five by the addition of *Tempus sub spiritali intellectu* and *Tempus in manifesta visione dei*. See also fol. 14^{v}, 35^{v}.

combinations of circles.[1] Once more, we seem to catch a glimpse of an early and fundamental sketch by Joachim; it has, however, as we shall see, suffered the superimposition of a completely wrong and muddled text. The wheels of Ezechiel, too, seem to preserve a genuine and early version of Joachim's favourite symbol for the *Concordia Novi et Veteris Testamenti* —the wheel within the wheel. It shares important details with the corresponding figure in the *Liber Figurarum* [Pl. XV] (the four living creatures, the four *opera Christi*, the four orders of saints and the four senses of Scripture) but is clearly an alternative version which is only marred by misplacements perpetrated by the blundering scribe of the common source of all known manuscripts.

Again, the eagle which appears in three manuscripts seems to be a simple figure, with a primitive text, related to two very complex ones. In the *Psalterium decem chordarum* there is an eagle which is closely associated with an intricate exposition in the text of the pattern of $5+7=12$,[2] worked out in relation to the senses of Scripture, the Old Testament tribes and the Churches of the New. The figure of the eagle is built up on this number pattern which, together with the closely connected symbolism of threes, is expounded with much wealth of detail in the captions of the feathers and the surrounding text.[3] This figure does not reappear in the *Liber Figurarum*; its place is taken by two magnificent 'tree-eagles'[4] which show simply the 5/7 division of tribes and churches, out of which (when reversed) there rise two eagles symbolizing the contemplative life. Here the expository figure, cluttered with much text, has given way to two profoundly simple, though enigmatic, figures which yet express the detail they have shed. The eagle in the *Praemissiones* is simple in a different, more primitive way. In form it is related to the eagle of the *Psalterium*, using the same 5/7 division in the feathers, but out of the wealth of ideas there expressed only one is selected for these captions, namely, the different

---

[1]) The source and development of Joachim's circles will be dealt with in our *Studies in the Liber Figurarum*. He adopts from Petrus Alphonsi a mystical diagram of three interlaced circles within a large one in which the Name of God is inserted in Hebrew letters; cf. P. Alphonsi, *Dialogus*, PL 157 col. 611.

[2]) *Psalt.* fol. 268r. For an explanation of the 5/7 pattern, see above, p. 185.

[3]) The printed edition gives most of the expository notes round the figure, but that originally they appeared on the feathers themselves is clear from Cod. Vat. Lat. 5732, fol. 28v.

[4]) For a further description of these, see Reeves, *loc. cit.*, 78-9.

senses of Scripture. That it belongs, however, to the whole complex of ideas concerning the five and seven tribes is clear, for above the eagle appear notes on these. Here its relation to the tree-eagles is seen, for the lists of tribes and churches are given in almost exactly the same order as in the *Liber Figurarum* and where the notes speak of Benjamin joined to Judah and Ephesus to Rome, these pairs are, in the tree-eagles, joined together in the tree-trunks.[1]

Another example of a figure obviously connected with one in the *Liber Figurarum* is the Babylon-Rome figure. In the *Liber* two 'standards'[2] represent the history of the Chosen People in the old Dispensation and the new. Abraham issues forth from Ur (Babylon) and his seed travels upwards through conflicts to the glorification of Jerusalem under David and then downwards again until once more it is led into captivity by the Chaldeans; the new Israel is led out of the new Babylon (Rome) up through persecution to its exaltation under Pope Silvester and then downward to captivity under the Alemanni. It should be noted that this rise-and-fall movement of history is unique among Joachim's figures, but there is no real reason to doubt the genuineness of this figure which in details echoes Joachim's writings at various points. So, too, do the captions and notes of the parallel, though differing, figure in four of the manuscripts of the *Praemissiones*. This is an alternative version, with the emphasis placed not so much on the peregrinations of the Chosen People as on a series of juxtapositions: Babylon/Rome v. Jerusalem/Ecclesia; Cain/Romulus v. Abraham/Pope Cletus; Cain v. Abel; the Devil v. Christ. At first sight, the version in the *Praemissiones* seems to fit Joachim's writings more closely than that in the *Liber*; in particular, it seems to be based on the sequence of thought in the *Liber Concordie*, Bk. V, cap. 118, fol. 134v. Yet closer examination suggests that there is something wrong: an emphasis on the powers of evil set up against the powers of good has been thrust

---

1) Plates V, VI.

2) Plates XVI, XVII. It is difficult to decide how these figures ought to be described. In O and R they spring from the ground but otherwise hardly resemble trees at all. In D they form almost circular figures, suggesting an affinity with the wheel of fortune. In S and V[3] these figures resemble each other closely, looking like formalized trees, W has a design looking still more like a plant, and B gives the figures roots and leaf-shapes.

into a figure meant to portray stages in the spiritual pilgrimage.[1] Moreover, some quite incongruous additional notes on the seven senses of Scripture applied to Babylon suddenly appear. We suggest, therefore, that this figure may be a Joachite composition which draws on genuine sources, composed, perhaps, when the figure collection was made, for it occurs in the earliest manuscripts. The motive which inspired it is not far to seek: nothing excited greater interest than the age-long conflict of 'Babylon' with 'Jerusalem', and Joachim's identification of Rome with Babylon was one of the focal points of interest in his prophecies. Probably we can find here, too, the clue to the disappearance of this figure from later manuscripts and from the printed editions, for such an identification was highly dangerous and to present it in this striking pictorial form would put into the hands of heretical groups, to whom Rome signified the Church, not the Empire, a weapon the use of which might well recoil on orthodox Joachites and the reputation of their master.[2]

Close examination shows, in fact, that embedded deep in nearly all the texts and some of the figures there are spurious elements which reveal the hand of a thirteenth-century Joachite. Even a simple figure such as the seven seals has a topical addition, for in Joachim's works there is no clear statement of where the three last crises of history (or 'openings of the seals') will take place, whilst in the *Praemissiones* they are named as *Teotonia*, *Soldanorum Provincia* and *Italia*. The figure of the eagle seems far removed from current politics, yet suddenly a text closely based on the genuine writings passes into polemics thus: . . . *Similiter Ephesina ecclesia et clericalis multitudo sic unite sunt Romane sedi ut ab invicem nullatenus dissentirent. Inde est quod Paulus adiunctus est Petro. Inde Regnum et Sacerdotium in uno Christo conveniunt. Tu, inquit, es sacerdos in eternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech qui fuit rex et sacerdos, non secundum ordinem Aaron qui solum pontifex et umbratilis extitit, non eternus.* Again, the long text following the three inter-

---

1) Whereas in the two genuine figures the stems spring from *Adam* and *Ozias*, in the *Praemissiones* they spring from the forces of evil, *Cayn* and *Romulus*, suggesting that the whole process of history is rooted in evil, and according ill with the *Exaltatio Jerusalem* and *Exaltatio Ecclesie* in the topmost part of the standards.

2) In this connection it may be noted that in O the Old Testament figure of Babylon has the caption *Mater Fornicationis* (fol. 15^{v}) where in the corresponding figure of Rome (fol. 16^{r}) an erasure has been made.

laced circles goes beyond its sources in two important respects: it declares that the second *status* ends in 1260, a statement to which Joachim never actually committed himself,[1] and it names the second of the three Antichrists, Frederick II. Frederick II appears again as the seventh head of the dragon, while in the accompanying text the seventh conflict *principum Ytalicorum et hereticorum* is again a topical addition, echoing the opening of the seventh seal. Perhaps we may detect here an emphasis on Italy as the centre of the crisis of history which gives a clue to authorship.

Four figures, in particular, show very clearly how Joachites distorted or made bad imitations of their master's figures. The three interlaced circles represent, we believe, an early and genuine figure; into this a wholly incongruous text has been inserted which is a simplified but muddled version of one belonging to a textual figure in the *Liber Con-*

---

[1]) This may appear a surprising assertion, but a close examination of all the passages concerned with the dating of Last Things in the *Liber Concordie* makes clear the following points: (i) Joachim's main calculation is based on generations and he expects the beginning of the third *status* in the forty-third generation after Christ or during the two preceding ones (fol. 8r ff.). (ii) Generations are to be reckoned approximately as thirty years, but not rigidly, and the length of the final generation cannot be certainly foretold (fol. 12v). (iii) Joachim derives the number 1260 from the multiplication of the generations (42 × 30) and from the number of days during which the Woman clothed with the sun was hidden in the wilderness (Rev. xii, 6) which he equates with the number of days that Elijah was hidden from Ahab (I Kings xvii) (fol. 12v). Clearly *days* can here stand for *years* and the year 1260 may therefore be the crucial one, but he insists that the length of the last generation is uncertain and his 'days' may be symbolic rather than to be strictly equated with years. Thus, although the two calculations (by generations and by 'days') clearly come together in a possible statement that the third *status* begins in the year 1260, we can find no passage in which Joachim states this in so many words. Instead, whenever the end of the second and the beginning of the third *status* is in question, he speaks in terms of *generations*: only God knows when the third *status* will begin (fol. 56r ff., 67v, 118r, 134r ff.). In the *Liber Figurarum* there is one passage running across the later tables of concords (Pl. III and IV) in which Joachim does specifically say that as the Old Testament was consummated in 1260 years, so '*testamentum novum sub eodem numero conclusum fore patet Mille scilicet ducentorum et sexaginta annorum*'. It is important to notice that he is here thinking, not in the pattern of the three *status*, but in that of the two testaments which cover the whole of history, so that only the Last Judgment follows the 'end' of the New Testament. Thus the reckoning here gives the date 1260 as the probable end of history; it does not give a date for the end of the second status and the beginning of the third. When Joachim's statements are considered altogether, it is extremely difficult to bring together calculations made on the pattern of 'twos' with those on the pattern of 'threes' in one chronological scheme. The third *status* cannot be pegged down to definite dates: although it is within time, it seems to hover over the end of history in a most elusive fashion. The clue to this lies, we believe, in the mystical rather than the historical character of the third *status*. On this point and on the alternative patterns of 'twos' and 'threes', see Reeves, *loc. cit.*, pp. 74-77.

cordie.[1] This goes in sets of three (three *status*, three persons, three pairs of guides, three groups of twelve) which fit very badly into the four sections created by the intertwining of the circles. The second figure is that of the *Mysterium Ecclesiae*. In V we saw the first stage in debasement[2] when the genuine text was preserved but the meaning perverted by the addition of the dragon's head; in the *Praemissiones* we see the second stage in which a new text has been substituted, intelligible by itself, since it goes straight through the liturgical year, but bearing no relation to the dragon head and tail which have transformed the spiral into something quite different. Just what the new figure is meant to convey, it is difficult to see, but it has undoubtedly been given an evil twist—with the tail, in most versions, curling away to the left, the side of wickedness, instead of to the right, as in the *Liber Figurarum*. Again, we find distortion in the Psaltery with ten strings. The essence of this figure lies in the form of the equilateral triangle (with a slightly blunted top) which, to Joachim, appeared as a symbol of the Trinity. Here it is distorted to an isosceles trapezoid with a broad top. The captions, too, are reversed, so that the nine hierarchies of angels and the *Homo* which belong on the left (the side assigned to God the Father) are transferred to the right (the side assigned to the Holy Spirit), while the seven gifts of the Spirit and the three theological virtues go over to the left.

Finally, we seem to have in the figure of the two trees of orders which occurs in three manuscripts[3] an imitative figure by a Joachite which has not been very successful. One tree—*Stipes arboris Legis Veteris*—springs from the *Ordo patriarcharum*; the other—*Stipes arboris Novi Evangelii*—from the *Ordo Apostolorum*. The branches of the trees are formed by Tribes and Orders in the first, and Churches and Orders in the second; the first culminates in *Tribus Effraym in Joseph*, the second in *Ecclesia Clarevallensis in Bernardo*. In S this figure is drawn in a clear and striking design[4] such as one would expect from a close disciple of the Abbot's. It picks up ideas scattered in the genuine writings, whilst in conception it resembles,

---

[1]) See above, p. 176 and p. 179 for sketches of this textual figure in other MSS.

[2]) See above, p. 176.

[3]) See the table at p. 183.

[4]) W has a cruder design and makes some bad mistakes in the captions; B has only a faintly sketched outline which follows W in design.

and in design it draws upon, the two trees of Orders in the *Liber Figurarum*.[1] A comparison with this latter, however, leads to the conviction that here we have, not a genuine figure of the Abbot's, but the work of a Joachite who was well-acquainted with the stock of Joachimist ideas but could not create for himself a clear and intelligible figure. The outstanding characteristic of the *Liber* is that each figure embodies a distinctive idea which imposes its own logic on the details and makes the whole understandable. If this be taken as a test of genuineness, our figure fails the test, for the details are muddled and the conception is not logically worked out. It is fairly easy to suggest the motive which prompted this Joachite to attempt a figure of his own, for its theme is that which kept Joachimism alive for so long—the spiritual succession of orders in the Church and the rearrangement of the hierarchy according to a final celestial pattern. We recall the popularity of prophecies concerning new orders, Salimbene's interest in Joachim's figure of the *Dispositio Novi Ordinis*,[2] the blank space left by the Dresden manuscript in the second Tree of Orders for the name of the final order[3] and the concern of the writer of MS. B with the succession of orders.[4] Here the intention is clearly to glorify the Cistercians, for, whilst the *Ordo Augustini regularis* and the *Ordo Cluniacensis* are only branches of the tree, the *Ecclesia Clarevallensis* crowns it. It is noteworthy that the application of Joachim's prophecy of new spiritual orders to the two Mendicant orders finds no place here; to this point we shall return.

This brief examination of the figures and texts in the *Praemissiones* suggests two things: first, that behind them there lie genuine figures, often, it would seem, early and simple ones; secondly, that these have been worked upon and formed into a collection by Joachites. That Joachim drew figures at an early stage of his development is clearly suggested by his own words: ". . . *que ut fidem inquirentibus facerem, iam dudum in figuras converti*",[5] and that various sketches and copies of figures circulated among his disciples seems extremely likely. But the *Praemissiones* does not bear

---

[1]) In O the two trees are crowned with elaborate heads of foliage (see Reeves, *loc. cit.*, Pl. III). In S the central portion of this design from O has been used for the heads of the trees.

[2]) *Cronica fratris Salimbene*, MGH Scriptores, XXXII 293.

[3]) See above, pp. 173-4.

[4]) See above, p. 185.

[5]) J. C. Huck, *Joachim von Floris u. die joachitische Literatur* [1938], p. 290.

the character of a collection of early, genuine figures. The thirteenth-century additions go too deep and in too many of the figures there are mistakes or perversions. One has rather the impression of Joachites working on their master's sketches, adapting his figures, making their own, as the scribe of manuscript B (or his source) certainly did,[1] building up explanatory texts from their knowledge of Joachim's writings. There is a notable difference in the use of text between the *Liber Figurarum* and the *Praemissiones*: in the former, with a few important exceptions,[2] the text is an integral part of the diagram and the figures stand complete in themselves, without the need of further supporting text; in the *Praemissiones*, on the other hand, a long section of text is introduced after the interlaced circles and the feebler figures are buttressed by explanatory sentences, grouped round but not integrated with the design. There is a sense of unity and harmony in the figures of the *Liber* which the compiler of the *Praemissiones* is unable to impose on the heterogeneous elements of his collection. Altogether, the primitive character of the *Praemissiones* has much more the mark of a timid and not wholly comprehending disciple who could not think original thoughts in figure form, than of the master mind just beginning to put together those complex and mystical designs which were so much more than textual illustrations or geometrical patterns.

All the evidence, then, suggests that we have here a collection of figures made by a thirteenth-century Joachite who drew partly on the Abbot's writings and textual figures, partly on the figures which appear in the *Liber Figurarum* and on other sketches which were in circulation, and partly on his own somewhat feeble invention. One feature remains a puzzle: the figures of the eagle and the trees of orders found in S and in three later manuscripts, but absent in the earliest version, V^3. The figure of the orders is, we have suggested, a Joachite invention on a subject of perennial interest in these circles; it might well, therefore, have been added by the writer of S, much as the writer of B (or his source) appears to have added his own figures. The eagle, on the other hand, is a simplified version of a genuine figure. Was it an early sketch, seized upon by a Joachite and

---

1) See above, pp. 184-5.

2) In the case of three figures—the *Septem Etates*, the Dragon and the *Mysterium Ecclesiae*—a long, consecutive text is added.

adapted for inclusion in this collection? If so, a certain incongruity of choice is apparent which may account for its absence from some manuscripts, for the *Praemissiones* is in all cases[1] associated with the spurious work *Super Esaiam*, and in this the eagle appears, indeed, but as the dreaded Hohenstaufen eagle, not the eagle of contemplation!

This leads directly to the last point to which we wish to call attention. The association of the *Praemissiones* with the *Super Esaiam* can hardly be accidental and it therefore becomes necessary to study the relation between the two. The *Super Esaiam* is a composite work which is very difficult to follow to-day and must also have been puzzling to the uninitiated in the thirteenth century. It consists largely of a commentary on chapters of Isaiah and some minor prophets, a commentary which presupposes a Joachimist scheme of ideas as a background, but which does not expound this as a coherent whole.[2] The need for annotation obviously gave rise to the notes which surround the text,[3] but even these do not offer a full exposition of the basic ideas. The work is full of elusive references, as, for instance, to the *tempus tertii status*, the *dies septimus*,[4] the two *testes* or *ordines*,[5] which hardly make sense without the sequence of ideas of which they form a part. This suggests at once the need for an accompanying 'manual of Joachimism' which might be a brief, straightforward statement of the main pattern of ideas and could appropriately be carried out in notes and figures. Is the *Praemissiones*, then, an A.B.C. of Joachimism

---

[1]) There is only one partial exception: B contains only the geographical section of the *Super Esaiam*.

[2]) The work contains the following parts: (a) Prologue of the Abbot Joachim to Fr. Raynerius de Pontio. (b) Commentary on the first eleven chapters of Isaiah. (c) Pars I *de oneribus sexti temporis*, containing a figure and notes on the 'burdens' of Isaiah, a commentary on part of Is. ch. xiii, a geographical section, returning at the end to a commentary on Isaiah and some of the minor prophets. (d) Pars II *de septem temporibus ecclesie*. (e) Pars III. (f) Pars IV. (g) Pars V. (h) Pars VI. O. Holder-Egger examined the relation of this work to another spurious work entitled *De Oneribus prophetarum* (*Neues Archiv*, 33 [1907], 136) but a number of problems remain to be solved in connection with this group of Joachite works on the prophets.

[3]) In the earliest MSS. the annotations are written in the same hand as the main text, in wide margins obviously designed for them. We can, perhaps, conclude that, in all probability, the notes formed part of the original work.

[4]) These two phrases occur immediately in the prologue without any kind of explanation.

[5]) See, for example, fol. 2^r, 5^r, 6^v, 7^r, 8^v in the 1517 edition, to which all further folio references are made.

in pictures? Taken simply as a straightforward manual for beginners it is not altogether satisfactory, since the choice of some figures and material seems rather odd. But if we suppose that the choice of the compiler was governed largely by references in the *Super Esaiam* which he wished to elucidate, the whole problem of why he made just this selection of ideas is illuminated. For instance, as the figures are usually arranged, the last of them, the Wheels of Ezechiel, immediately precedes, and is often placed opposite to, the prologue to the work; that prologue begins: *Si ad hoc rotarum mysterialium centrum ingredimur*, to which elusive opening the notes add a reference to Ezechiel but without any explanation of the significance of this symbol to Joachim. The figure, of course, sets out the whole complex of ideas associated with the Wheels—the four Gospels, four animals, four senses of Scripture, four orders—which, moreover, are alluded to several times in the *Super Esaiam*.[1] Again, it seems odd that the comparatively unimportant figure of the Trumpet (signifying the preaching of the Word) should be included until one perceives that the *nodus tube* is labelled *Ozias* (i.e. Uzziah) and that the accompanying note reads: *Nodus vero a quo tuba grossescere habuit significat insertionem novi ac veteris testamenti in quo missus est Esayas qui fuit altera vox dei de paradiso . . .*[2] The figures and their notes do, in fact, dovetail into the text of the *Super Esaiam* in many different ways: they echo phrases of the work and explain elusive ones; the selection of ideas is largely the same;[3] the political outlook—anti-German and anti-Hohenstaufen, aware of the menace of the Patarins, expecting the final crisis of history in Italy—is similar. The connection of ideas is particularly striking in three cases. The 5/7 pattern which is embodied in the Eagle and its accompanying notes is found in the *Super Esaiam*.[4] Two passages in the work contain a direct echo of the Babylon-Rome figure in the version peculiar to this collection of figures.[5] Most interesting of all are some obscure passages on the spiritual succession of

---

1) See, for example, fol. 1^r, 5^v, 6^r, 34^v, 36^r, 43^v, 57^{rv}.

2) In the calculations of Joachim the reign of Ozias became the central point from which the New Dispensation took its beginning and this point could be used, as in the Trumpet figure, to enhance the significance of Isaiah.

3) There is one exception: it is difficult to explain the inclusion of the figure of the Psaltery by reference to the *Super Esaiam*.

4) See fol. 4^v and 51^r.

5) See fol. 5^v and 10^r.

orders which only really become intelligible when read in conjunction with the figure of the Orders in the MS. Rossianus.[1] Here the idea seems to be so distinctive as to make almost certain some connection between the writer of the work and the designer of the figure.

Thus we arrive at the tentative conclusion that our collection of figures may have been put into this final shape as an explanatory supplement to the *Super Esaiam*, either by the writer or by someone closely associated with him. The author of this work is unknown, but when it is studied in conjunction with the figures certain characteristics emerge. The writer does not always understand the Abbot but he keeps close to what we may term the original Joachimism, drawing largely on the three main works and using some of Joachim's most characteristic ideas, as, for instance, not only the well-known pattern of threes but the much less popular, equally characteristic pattern of 5+7=12. His point of view is not only Italian but south-Italian, and one reference suggests that he belonged to the diocese of Cosenza with which Joachim was associated.[2]

Most interesting of all is the writer's attitude towards one of the key-points in Joachimist expectation—the prophecy of two new orders to lead the Church into the third *status*. It is often assumed that the *Super Esaiam* and the other important pseudo-Joachimist work, the *Super Hieremiam*, emanated from Franciscan circles and set out to claim a chief part in the drama of Last Things for the Minorites. A close reading of the *Super Esaiam* suggests, however, that although the writer returns often to the idea of the two *testes* or *ordines*, he draws it from the thought of Joachim himself and is not really concerned to develop its application to the two Mendicant orders in general or the Franciscans in particular.[3] In fact there is no real attempt to assign these two important rôles in the drama. The

---

1) See fol. 8r and 16v, and perhaps also the obscure reference to a tree on fol. 37v.

2) Fol. 14r. In the earliest MSS. the diocese of Cosenza is represented in a distinctive way in the geographical section of the *Super Esaiam*.

3) In the *Praemissiones* there is no direct reference to the two Mendicant orders. In the *Super Esaiam* there are two quite clear references (fol. 11v and 7r) which show that the writer knew of this application, but he does not stress it at all and there are many references to the two orders which give no suggestion of the Mendicants. Moreover, in these two passages there is no bias in favour of the Franciscans as the greater of the two orders, and in another passage (fol. 57r) the Angel of the 6th Seal, applied by the author of MS V and by many others to St. Francis (see above, p. 175, n. 1), is applied to Christ or St. Paul. The presumption that the writer is not a Franciscan seems strong.

figure of the Orders, however, together with a few hints in the *Super Esaiam*,[1] do suggest a more general belief that out of the Cistercian Order might emerge the leaders of the *Ecclesia Spiritualis* in the Age of the Holy Ghost. We remember that Joachim himself, though always refraining from assigning rôles and above all from glorifying his own order, hinted at the importance of the Cistercians in several passages[2] and that the Tree of the Orders in MS. O (fol. 13r) gives pride of place to this order, though it does not crown the spiritual tree as in the Joachite figure of the *Praemissiones*. All this suggests that the authors of the *Super Esaiam* and the *Praemissiones* were in close touch with the original tradition of Joachimism in south Italy, belonging, perhaps, to a group of disciples in the diocese of Cosenza rather than to a group of Franciscan Joachites. We have, then, the possibility of an active centre of Joachite writing in south Italy, producing the *Super Esaiam*, the collection we have called the *Praemissiones* and perhaps also the collection on which MSS. V^2 and P drew. Its characteristics, we suggest, are the extent to which it drew on the Abbot's original thought as expressed in his writings and figures and its absence of a marked 'party line' on the prophecy of the two new orders.

The sixteenth-century editors found the *Praemissiones* preceding the *Super Esaiam*. They had already entered upon their task of editing what they took to be the works of Joachim with the publication of the *Super Hieremiam* in 1516. When this was followed in 1517 by the *Super Esaiam* they published the figure collection as a prologue. Their next edition—the *Liber Concordie* in 1519—does not contain this prologue, but when in 1525 they republished the *Super Hieremiam* they decided that the figure collection 'would form a useful introduction here too, as also in their edition of the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* and *Psalterium decem chordarum* in one volume in 1527.[3] The reasons which led these editors—an Augustinian hermit and his friends—to focus their attention on Joachimist works form an interesting study in sixteenth-century thought with which we shall deal elsewhere. Here we only wish to add a note on their editions of these figures. The manuscript used by them did not contain the three extra

---

[1]) See fol. 8r, 16v, 37v, 38v.

[2]) *Lib. Conc.*, fol. 11r, 23r, 57v-60r.

[3]) Here they split up the figures, placing four pages in front of the *Expositio* and the Psaltery and the Wheels in front of the *Psalterium*.

figures and consequently these remained unpublished. For the rest, the editors reproduced the text and form of the figures most faithfully. They seem to have felt the necessity of justifying the inclusion of these figures, even in their edition of the *Super Esaiam*. Hence they prefaced them with an interesting little introduction, and again, with a rather more philosophical one, in the edition of 1527. The main point they make is that these figures must be regarded as the *universalia* or *generalia* of Joachim:—*Quia (teste Aristotele in prologo physicorum) oportet ex universalibus in singularia procedere: ita et Abbas Joachim volens circa* Romanam *ecclesiam et alias particulares ecclesias ac nationes populosque diversos quedam singulariter ex sacro eloquio prenunciare quedam generalia premittit*. As such they are essential to an understanding of his works. The introduction then comments briefly on each figure, showing, in the case of the *Super Esaiam*, the connection of some figures with the work and, in the 1527 preface, pressing home the point that Joachim cannot be understood without them.

Thus, quite unaware as they must have been of the long and intricate history of this figure tradition, the sixteenth-century editors yet hit upon the truth when they declared that the *Super Esaiam* could not be understood without these figures and that the Abbot created his 'general' figures to illumine his particular points, though they could not have known that the *Super Esaiam* and its figure collection were pseudo-Joachimist works and that Joachim's original *Liber Figurarum* contained many more 'universal' figures.

The figures that the Abbot created were in a real sense general expositions of his system of thought—not illustrations to his text merely, but

---

Addendum. When this article was already in proof, we found—following a clue given by E. Renan, *Nouvelles Études* (1884), p. 225—that a 12th-century MS. of the works of Isidore of Seville (Paris, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 11864, *olim* St. Germain 58) contained at the end, in a hand of the early 13th century, the following Joachimist material:

(1) fol. 151^{v} *Earlier Tables of Concords* from the *Liber Figurarum* (see above, p. 178).

(2) fol. 152^{r} *De 7 Sigillis* (see above, p. 178, n. 2).

(3) fol. 151^{v}-152^{v} (across the foot of fols. 151^{v}, 152^{r}) *Epistola subsequentium figurarum* (see above, pp. 180-2).

(4) fol. 152^{v} *Epistola: Universis Christi fidelibus* (see above, p. 178).

It will be obvious that, in its selection of material, this collection bears a close relationship to MSS. V^{2}, P. and that its early date is a fact of importance for the questions investigated in this article. We hope to deal with this later.

independent designs, embodying the multitudinous patterns of his thought in some ways far more adequately than words could do. Perhaps the hold which Joachimism exercised over the minds of so many in the thirteenth century is in part to be explained by the appeal of these striking images to men's imaginations. Certainly the existence of these various manuscript collections of figures shows the continuing interest in them and reveals to us some of the focal points of that interest—the never-ceasing preoccupation with the Dragon of the Apocalypse and the imminence of a last and worst Antichrist, the age-long conflict of Babylon/Rome with Jerusalem, the expectation of new spiritual men or of new orders to bring in the Age of the Holy Ghost.

Oxford.

M. REEVES
B. HIRSCH-REICH