The Carmelites and Antiquity

Mendicants and their Pasts in the Middle Ages

Andrew Jotischky

OXFORD

The Carmelites and Antiquity

The Carmelites and Antiquity

Mendicants and their Pasts
in the Middle Ages

ANDREW JOTISCHKY

For
CHRISTOPHER, CLEMENTINE, *and* GABRIEL

Preface

THE EVOLUTION OF the historical tradition of the foundation of the Carmelite Order by Elijah, the specific context in which that tradition developed, and its function both within the Carmelite profession and in the wider framework of medieval historical writing, form the subject-matter of this book. My interest in the Carmelites emerged from studying the religious life of the crusader states, in which they occupy a unique place as the only contemplative order founded in the Latin East. It quickly became apparent that an examination of the origins and early history of the order was inseparable from the study of its historiography. The Carmelites emerged as a group of regulated hermits on Mt Carmel in the early years of the thirteenth century. When, a generation later, they began to transplant themselves throughout Europe, they found that a detailed statement of their origins and function was necessary in order to make headway in the competition for patronage from the laity and to attain acceptance from the Church's hierarchy. The evolution of the historical tradition thus coincided with the new settlements in the West. This tradition offered a complex and detailed narrative of the origins of the order, the identity and history of its principal founding figures, and the place of the order within Christian history.

For the historian of crusading and of the religious life in the later Middle Ages in general, the Carmelite tradition is compelling: it fills gaps in the sources, makes connections between historical figures and with other traditions, and supplies a narrative of the contemplative life reaching back into antiquity. But it is at the same time deeply flawed in its chronology, and bears the unmistakable stamp of later authors looking back at historical events and at places that are only half-remembered. The further one follows the Carmelite historical tradition, the more the narrative and its inherent ecclesiology stimulate one's general thinking about medieval religious and historical sensibilities. If it is impossible to study the Carmelite Order without first grappling with its legendary tradition, that tradition is none the less worthy of study in its own right.

The title of this book will probably remind many readers of Beryl Smalley's *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century*. My debt to Miss Smalley's work—both to her studies of individual friars and to the general conception of her book—will be apparent throughout. But whereas she was interested in 'antiquity' largely in its specific sense of the classical past and its heritage, I have used the term more generically to signify 'the past', particularly the biblical and early Christian past. Although this book is not intended to be a history of the Carmelite Order in the Middle Ages, the opening chapter attempts to provide an outline narrative of the origins and early history of the order as a general background to readers who are not familiar with it. Chapter 2 considers the political and cultural context from which the Carmelite historical tradition emerged in the late thirteenth century. I have chosen the episode of the change of habit in 1287 as emblematic of problems experienced within mendicant culture in general, and the broad coverage of the issue in the second half of this chapter reflects a desire to understand the Carmelite case within a wider context. The earliest strictly datable Carmelite text (other than the rule itself) is the subject of Chapter 3. Although the *Ignea Sagitta* is not part of the mainstream of the Carmelite historical tradition, the text itself and the context in which it was written raise important questions about the different ways in which Carmelites understood their profession and the order's traditions *c.*1270. Part of my argument, moreover, is that the *Ignea Sagitta* should be seen as a distillation of twelfth-century reforming monastic ideology, and in this sense it has a proper place in a study of Carmelite historiography. In the following two chapters the outlines of Carmelite historical narrative as it developed from the end of the thirteenth century to the end of the fourteenth are reconstructed and then examined as affirmations of an emerging ecclesiology. The narrative is expanded in Chapters 6 and 7 through an examination of the additions to the corpus of Carmelite historical writing in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Chapter 8 departs from the narrow focus on Carmelite historiography to examine patterns in historical writing and thinking expressed in the work of the three other mendicant orders in the fourteenth century. I do not attempt here a comprehensive survey of the development of historical traditions—Franciscan and Dominican understandings of the past have already been the subject of many important studies, and the Augustinian Hermits' tradition certainly deserves such detailed consideration—but rather try to isolate certain preoccupations that bear comparison with the Carmelite examples

already discussed. Finally, Chapter 9 attempts the impossible—an examination of some of the principles that can be demonstrated to have governed the way in which friars thought about the past, both their own corporate past and its place within Christian history in general. The huge literature on medieval historiography has been both a guide and a burden, and I fear that many readers may find my discussion in this chapter either too generalized or too specific or insufficiently informed by theoretical argument. I have tried throughout the book to approach the subject from the texts themselves, to elucidate them to a readership that is probably unfamiliar with many of them, and to suggest how they, and the whole enterprise that underlay their composition, can be understood as part of medieval religious culture. Sins of omission there will always be; but I trust that other scholars will complete the journey on which I have embarked.

In the course of this book I have benefited from the kindness of many scholars. I would like to thank Professors Christopher Brooke, Joanna Cannon, Giles Constable, Julian Gardner, and Bernard Hamilton and Dr Patrick Zutshi for help on various points. My colleagues Dr Alexander Grant and Dr Keith Stringer, and Fr Paul Chandler, O.Carm., have read all or parts of this book in manuscript and made valuable suggestions. I am particularly grateful to Fr Richard Copsey, O.Carm., for his careful reading of the manuscript and for the many suggestions he made that have saved me from serious errors or omissions. Earlier versions of Chapters 2 and 8 were read to the Cultural History Seminar series at the University of Lancaster in 1997 and 1998, and parts of Chapter 7 to the 'Byzantium in the North' symposium at York in October 1999. I am grateful to the audiences of colleagues and postgraduates whose comments helped me to see the Carmelites through different eyes.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to the staff at various libraries: the Bodleian Library, Cambridge University Library, the British Library, and Lambeth Palace Library for help with the Bale manuscripts and various rare editions; the John Rylands University Library of Manchester (and in particular the staff at Deansgate), and my own university library at Lancaster. Thomas Townsend of the Norfolk and Norwich Record Office also provided invaluable assistance. The final stages of research and writing were made possible by the generous award of research leave from the Arts and Humanities Research Board in 1999/2000, which I acknowledge with thanks. Finally, my colleagues in the Department of History at Lancaster deserve my sincere thanks

Contents

Abbreviations

AASS	*Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana*
AFH	*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*
AFP	*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*
ALKG	*Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte*
AOC	*Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum*
AOCD	*Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum*
BEFAR	Bibliothèque des écoles francaises d'Athènes et de Rome
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis
CCR	*Calendar of Close Rolls*
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CPR	*Calendar of Patent Rolls*
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinum
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiarum Byzantinorum
IS	*Ignea Sagitta*
JEH	*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
MCH	Staring, *Medieval Carmelite Heritage*
MGH (SS)	Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores
MHC	Zimmermann, *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*, i
MOPH	Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum Historica
NNRO	Norfolk and Norwich Record Office
PG	Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeco-latina
PIMS	Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies
PL	Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina
PRO	Public Record Office
RHC	*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*
RS	Rolls Series
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

Introduction

Recalling the triumphal procession held in Milan in 1499 for the entrance of Louis XII, the sixteenth-century humanist Matteo Bandallo tells the following story about a dispute that ensued over the order of precedence in which the representatives of religious houses in the city were to march:

The excellent Master Gian Andrea Cagnuola, a Doctor of Law, turned to the Carmelite Prior and asked how long it had been since the order began. The Carmelite answered that it began on Mt Carmel, under Elijah. 'Then you already existed in the time of the Apostles,' observed Cagnuola. 'Yes,' observed the prior, 'as you well know; at that time we were the only friars in existence, since Basil, Benedict, Dominic, Francis and all the other founders of orders had not yet existed.' . . . The Duke had a jester, witty and brave, who—when he heard this fantasy which the Carmelite prior was uttering—leapt between the two and said to Cagnuola, 'Master Doctor, the father speaks truly, for at the time of the Apostles there were no other friars beside these. It is of them that St Paul wrote when he said, *periculum in falsis fratribus*. They are some of these false brothers. And at this clever joke of the buffoon, everyone started to laugh . . . and the Carmelites left, amid the people's jeers.'[1]

The joke itself is perhaps less significant than what it tells us about the cultural milieu in which such pretensions to antiquity were common. The humour relies on general familiarity on the part of the Milanese public with the Carmelite historical tradition, and on the shared assumption of its inherent implausibility. The jester's joke was in fact a variant of an earlier one, made in a more learned context. In the 1330s a similar irony had been observed by the Dominican friar Robert Holcot, who argued that if the Carmelites had existed in Old Testament times, they must have been the Pharisees and Saducees, who were the only religious orders known from those days.[2] In fact,

---

[1] Creighton Gilbert, 'Some Special Images for Carmelites, *c.*1330–1430', in T. Verdon and J. Henderson (eds.), *Christianity and the Renaissance: Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento* (Syracuse, NY, 1990), 165, trans. by author from Matteo Bandallo, *Le quatre Parti de la Novelle del Bandallo* (1554).

[2] Beryl Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1960), 330–1, trans. from Oxford, Bodleian Library MS and Misc 722, fos. 50ᵛ–51ʳ.

scepticism about the Carmelite claim to be the oldest religious order in existence can be found almost from the moment that Carmelite writers began to elaborate their historical tradition.

Whereas Holcot's jibe was made in the course of a lecture to theology students at Oxford, the one told by Bandallo exposed the Carmelites to public ridicule. The same kind of ridicule had provoked the order in 1287 into the extreme step of changing its distinctive habit, which had made Carmelites the targets of general mirth, into one more generic. People who develop pretensions to distinguished ancestry have always been liable to find themselves figures of fun. Even in an era, such as the late Middle Ages, when claims to a long ancestry made important cultural and political assertions on behalf of institutions, families, or dynasties, and could thus be understood as political statements, fun could be had by the irreverent with the more exorbitant claims to antiquity. The Carmelite Order's claim to have been founded by the prophet Elijah was one such claim. On the face of it, there is nothing more remarkable about the Carmelites' claim than that of the Knights of St John to have been founded by Judas Maccabeus, or the University of Oxford's claim to King Alfred as a founder, or, to cite the most celebrated case, the Brutus tradition prevalent in England from the mid-twelfth century onward. Seldom, however, has an institution based its *raison d'être* so firmly on a claim to an improbable antiquity as did the Carmelites in the Middle Ages, or indeed clung to it for so long in the face of rational scepticism.

Following Petrarch's revelation that the Donation of Constantine was a later invention, humanists thought themselves licensed to expose medieval inclinations to pretend a greater age for institutions, corporations, or families than was in fact the case. The legend of Trojan ancestry claimed by English, French, and Burgundians in the fifteenth century was a popular target. John Trithemius, abbot of Spanheim, wondered why the French were so proprietorial toward the Trojans— as though all Trojans had been models of virtue and rectitude! It is tempting to see such scepticism as typical of what we have come to assume was a 'humanist' respect for textual integrity, as opposed to medieval credulousness and disregard for the provenance of traditions. Yet Trithemius, a Benedictine humanist, believed, and wrote in defence of, the Carmelite historical tradition.[3] It was the period between *c.*1400 and *c.*1700, indeed, supposedly a golden age of humanist scholarship,

---

[3] Johann Trithemius, *Opera historica, quotquot hactenus reperiri potuerunt, omnia . . .*, ed. M. Freher, 2 vols, (Frankfurt, 1601), i. pp. xx, 5ᵛ.

that witnessed the flowering of the Carmelite legendary tradition. Although the tradition was a product of the medieval religious imagination, it enjoyed a life far beyond the medieval period. Moreover, the robust criticism of friars in other orders, such as Holcot, and the public ridicule to which Carmelites and other friars were sometimes subjected because of their claims to antiquity, suggest that what might at first sight appear credulousness on the part of medieval people signifies a more complex historical sensibility.

Because the history of the Carmelite Order is so entwined with its legendary tradition, it has attracted less attention from historians than most medieval religious orders. Like the Augustinian Hermits, the Carmelites languish in the shadow of the Franciscans and the Dominicans. The historian seeking to write a comparative history of the mendicant orders will search in vain for the breadth of source material for the Carmelites that renders the Franciscans and the Dominicans so central to the religious and social life of the later Middle Ages. There is little homiletic material, no apparent interest in Christian missions, and scarcely any involvement in preaching the crusades. Although there are hints of an internal crisis in the order's government in the late thirteenth century, no dissenting branch comparable to the Spiritual Franciscans, with its extraordinary literary tradition, emerged, and the order remained in good standing with the papacy. Despite the active involvement of English Carmelites in combating Lollardy, there is no source for this activity comparable to the continental Inquisition records for the Dominicans. Carmelites offered much the same ministry as the Franciscans and the Dominicans—preaching, hearing confessions, dispensing the sacraments, studying, and writing—but the impression conveyed by the sources is that they did so more quietly and obscurely.

Some types of source material, however, are plentiful for study of the Carmelites. It is now clear, thanks to the work of the pioneers of the early part of the twentieth century—notably Benedict Zimmermann and Bartolomé Xiberta—and their more recent successors, that Carmelite theologians were an important part of the university theology faculties.[4] The careers of individual Carmelite theologians so exactingly reconstructed by Xiberta have been placed in a wider context by Lickteig's *The German Carmelites at the Medieval Universities*.[5] The

---

[4] Benedict Zimmermann, *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*, i (Lérins, 1907); Bartolomé Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex ordine Carmelitarum* (Louvain, 1931).

[5] Franz-Bernard Lickteig, *The German Carmelites at the Medieval Universities*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 13 (Rome, 1981).

institutional history of the order and its relationship to the larger Church have been reconstructed by Ciconetti, building on the labours of Saggi and others in editing the constitutions of the general chapters.[6] At the same time, regional archival sources, particularly in Britain and Spain, have, in the last forty years, enabled historians to reconstruct the chronology and history of individual Carmelite houses. The pioneer here has been Keith J. Egan, whose work for the English province has been followed by Balbino Velasco and Jill Webster in Spain.[7]

Carmelite scholarship has also enabled us to clarify the different strands of the order's own historical tradition. A book such as this is only possible because of the work of the Carmelite scholars Zimmermann, Xiberta, Rudolf Hendriks, Ludovico Saggi, and, more recently, Joachim Smet and Adrian Staring.[8] The first significant examination of the historical legend was the extended article published in 1956 by Rudolf Hendriks, 'La Succession héréditaire', in which editions and translations of selected fourteenth-century texts were presented.[9] The seeds planted by Hendriks were brought to fruition in Adrian Staring's authoritative critical edition of the early historical sources, *Medieval Carmelite Heritage*.[10] The present study would have been, if not impossible, incomparably more difficult without the work of Staring in presenting reliable editions of the works that form the bulk of the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5. A first step in examining

[6] Carlo Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo: Origine, natura, significato*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 12 (Rome, 1973); L. Saggi (ed.), 'Constitutiones capituli Londonensis anni 1281', *AOC*, 15 (1950), 203–45; *idem*, 'Constitutiones capituli Burdigalensis anni 1294', *AOC*, 18 (1953), 123–85.

[7] Keith J. Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses, England and Wales', *Carmelus*, 16 (1969), 142–226; *idem*, 'An Essay Towards a Historiography of the Origin of the Carmelite Province in England', *Carmelus*, 19 (1972), 67–100; *idem*, 'Dating English Carmelite Foundations', *Carmelus*, 23 (1976), 98–118; Balbino Velasco, *Historia del Carmelo Espanol*, i (Rome, 1990); Jill Webster, *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia* (Leiden, 1999); *idem*, 'La trista història del convent de Nostra Senyora del Carme del Vallparadis de Terrassa', *Annuario d'Estudis Medievalis*, 25, no. 1 (1995), 215–34.

[8] *Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Beatae Virgine Mariae de Monte Carmelo, I (1318–1593)*, ed. Gabriel Wessels (Rome, 1912); Rudolf Hendriks, 'La Succession héréditaire (1280–1451)', in *Elie le prophète*, i: Etudes Carmélitaines, 35 (Bruges, 1956), 34–81, L. Saggi, *Sant'Angelo di Sicilia: Studio sulla vita, devozione, folklore*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 6 (Rome, 1962); Joachim Smet, *The Carmelites: A History of the Brothers of Our Lady of Mount Carmel*, i: *Ca 1200 until the Council of Trent* (Barrington, Ill., 1975); Ciconetti, *La regola del Carmelo*; Adrian Staring (ed.), *Medieval Carmelite Heritage: Early Reflections on the Nature of the Order*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 16 (Rome, 1989).

[9] Hendriks, 'La Succession héréditaire (1280–1451)'.

[10] Staring (ed.), *Medieval Carmelite Heritage*.

the development of the historical tradition from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, using Staring's work, was taken by Emanuele Boaga in 1991,[11] This book attempts to take this approach further by expanding the chronological range and by considering the Carmelite tradition within the broader context of mendicant and monastic perspectives of corporate histories.

It is impossible to overestimate the contribution of the Carmelite scholars who represent the first generation of critical historical scholarship within the order. Scholars such as Zimmermann and Xiberta inherited a tradition based largely on assumptions about the order's past that had remained unchallenged within the order for centuries. These assumptions derived ultimately from the texts examined in this book, which were composed between the 1240s and the 1530s.

By the latter date the shape of the tradition had already been formed. In place of the creativity displayed by the Carmelite authors of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, their successors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries used their energies to edit and collate. The earliest printed Carmelite collection, the *Speculum antiquum* published in Venice in 1507, is a slim volume of only a few texts, presented without commentary. During the 1530s/1550s John Bale transcribed scores of Carmelite texts, some of which would otherwise have been lost; but his printed works, however, all represent the new direction of his interests after his conversion to Protestantism.

It was not until the seventeenth century that Carmelites published works relating to their history and traditions in great numbers. Among them was Marco Antonio Alègre's *Paradisius Carmeliticae* (1639), in which a passage from Tacitus's *Historiae* was interpreted so as to provide evidence of Carmelite occupation of Mt Carmel in the first century AD. In 1643 the Bollandist Fathers, embarking on the first volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*, entrusted the entry for Telesphorus to a Carmelite, Segherus Paulus. The *Acta Sanctorum* provided an opportunity for Carmelites to incorporate their version of Christian history, according to which the Carmelite Order was the 'original' monastic order, into the mainstream of Catholic scholarship. Telesphorus was the name to which a fourteenth-century apocalyptic work, probably emanating from a Spiritual Franciscan circle, had been attributed. In the fifteenth century, however, Telesphorus featured in Carmelite writing as a

---

[11] Emanuele Boaga, 'La storiografia carmelitana nei secoli XIII e XIV', in Paul Chandler and Keith J. Egan (eds.), *The Land of Carmel: Essays in Honor of Joachim Smet, O.Carm.* (Rome, 1991), 125–54.

companion of the Carmelite saint Angelo, and Paulus used his commission to assert his order's claim to an Elianic origin. Lezana's *Annales sacri prophetice et Eliani ordinis beatae virginis Mariae de monte Carmelo*, published in 1650, amplified these claims.

The profusion of Carmelite apologetics provoked the indignation of some Bollandists. Like the Dominicans in the fourteenth century, the hostile Bollandists attacked the very fabric of the Carmelite tradition, using their vehicle of the *Acta Sanctorum* to do so. The existence of Berthold, the putative first prior-general of the order, was denied by Daniel Papebroch in 1668, in the last *Acta Sanctorum* volume for March.[12] In 1675 the entry for St Albert of Vercelli, the order's legislator, dismissed all claims for the existence of the Carmelites before the thirteenth century.[13] In 1680 an allegedly thirteenth-century *Vita*, that of St Angelo, which not only asserted the earlier existence of the order but also laid claim to a prophetic ministry, was rejected. The same year saw the publication of the most comprehensive collection of Carmelite historical texts yet amassed, the *Speculum Carmelitanum* of Daniel a Virgine Maria.[14] Daniel presented editions of the most important medieval historical texts, particularly Philip Ribot's *De institutione et peculiaribus gestis religiosorum Carmelitarum* (*c*.1375/96). He also compiled an armoury of apologetic arguments (*propugnacula*) to be used in defence against the order's critics. Historical scholarship within the order was itself a defensive imperative; in such a context, the critical examination of texts and manuscript traditions was unlikely to be received with favour.

The publication of papal bulls relating to the Carmelites, a project spanning most of the eighteenth century, provided a body of external critical source material against which the bull collections contained within many of the medieval Carmelite chronicles could be judged.[15] Yet Carmelite scholarship retained, throughout the nineteenth century, an overwhelmingly pietistic flavour. The Elianic foundation may no longer have been accepted as literal fact, but the historical tradition in which figures like Berthold, Brocard, and Cyril of Constantinople played a central role, remained unchallenged. Well into the twentieth century Carmelite authors accepted these fourteenth-century inventions as historical figures, because the basis for the critical examination

---

[12] *AASS*, Mar., iii. 788.   [13] *AASS*, Apr., i. 766–88.

[14] Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum sive historia Eliani ordinis fratrum beatissime virginis Mariae de Moute Carmelo*, 2 vols. (Antwerp, 1680).

[15] *Bullarium Carmelitanum*, ed. E. Monsignanus and G. Ximinez, 4 vols. (Rome, 1715–68).

of the sources had not yet been established. Even Xiberta maintained that Ribot's *De institutione* presented a plausible chronology of Carmelite history.[16] Moreover, the refusal by some Carmelites to accept the findings of historical scholarship provoked attacks on scholars, like Zimmermann, a Protestant convert, who was seen as responsible for criticizing the order's traditions.[17]

The past fifty years have seen a more rigorous examination of Carmelite historical sources, as well as the use of external archival records. Carmelite scholarship has been advanced immeasurably by the journal *Carmelus* and the Textus et studia Carmelitana series of the Institutum Carmelitanum, which themselves build on the tradition established by the earlier journals *Analecta Ordinis Carmelitanum, Etudes Carmélitaines*, and *Ephemerides Carmeliticae*. With a few exceptions, however, it is only recently that scholars from outside the order have begun to tap the enormous potential of Carmelite sources, and to restore the order to the greater prominence it deserves in the history of medieval religious, social, and cultural history. This book is offered both as a contribution to what is now a vigorous historiography, and as a tribute to the work of an earlier generation of Carmelite scholars.

[16] B. Xiberta, 'Elias et religio christiana in Monte Carmelo', *AOC* 7 (1931–2), 180–211.

[17] See the debate between Zimmermann and Patrick de Saint-Joseph in Patrick de Saint-Joseph, 'La Nouvelle Encyclopédie Britannique et la tradition monastique des Carmes', *Etudes Carmélitaines*, 1 (1911), 24–71.

CHAPTER ONE

The Carmelites, *c.*1187–1530

FROM HERMITS TO FRIARS, *c.*1187–1274

The history of the order begins with Mt Carmel itself.[1] Not so much a mountain as a sloping ridge gathering to a cliff top with breath-taking views over the bay of Haifa, Carmel covers an area of several square miles. Its heavily wooded escarpments are pierced by wadis riddled with caves. For hermits it is ideal country, being abundant in water, woods, vegetation, height, and, not least, spectacular scenery. It also enjoys, of course, the presence of the holy. The narrative accounts of Elijah in the Hebrew Scriptures cover a wide territory, from Sidon to the Jordan; but for Christian pilgrims and exegetes the geography of the prophet's career came increasingly to rest on Mt Carmel. This was the site of his most spectacular triumphs, against the priests of Baal and against the armies sent by King Ahaziah to arrest him.[2] The 'summit of the mountain', which overlooks the settlement of Haifa and the bay, was from the fourth century BC a place of local cult importance.[3] A cave below the summit was associated with Elijah in Jewish devotion, and came to be venerated by Christians and Muslims as well.[4] As early as the fifth century, monks had taken advantage of the natural grace of the location and the memory of Elijah.[5]

There was little institutional monastic settlement on Carmel, however, and the tone of Palestinian monasticism was set in the wildernesses of the Judaean desert rather than on the verdant slopes of the

---

[1] In preparing this chapter I have relied extensively on the following: Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*; Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses'; *idem*, 'An Essay'; Elias Friedman, *The Latin Hermits of Mount Carmel: A Study in Carmelite Origins* (Rome, 1979); Smet, *Carmelites*.

[2] 3 Kgs. 18: 19–46, 4 Kgs. 1: 1–18. All biblical references are to the Vulgate.

[3] K. Müller, *Geographi graeci minores*, Biblioteca Scriptorum Graecorum (Paris, 1882), 79.

[4] Andrew Jotischky, *The Perfection of Solitude: Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States* (University Park, Pa., 1995), 108–9.

[5] *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, vi. 414–18, for James of Porphyria, and viii. 1226 for Martinian. A sixth-century pilgrimage account, *Antonini Placentini itinerarium*, iii, CCSL 175 (Turnhout, 1965), 130, mentions a monastery dedicated to St Elisha about four miles to the south, in the wadi 'Ain as-siah.

Mediterranean. Between the sixth century and the twelfth there is no evidence of any monastic activity on Mt Carmel at all. When the evidence begins to emerge again after the silence, in the 1160s, the surprise is that monks apparently took so long to rediscover the charms of this area.

It took a disaster for Christendom before the advantages of Mt Carmel were fully appreciated once more. Although indigenous Orthodox monks had occupied the 'cave of Elijah' by the 1160s, and a group of Calabrian Orthodox monks had settled either on the summit of the mountain or about four miles south in the wadi 'Ain as-siah by 1185, the impetus for monastic growth in the region probably came from the conquest of the kingdom of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187.[6] Hermits and monks were sometimes, as in the Latin West, casualties of war. The monasteries on Mt Tabor had been attacked by Muslim raiders in 1183, and in his letter to the West in 1187 describing conditions in the kingdom after Saladin's conquest, Conrad of Montferrat mentioned the dangers faced by hermits in Jerusalem.[7] Galilee had been a popular resort of Frankish monks and hermits before 1187; we know nothing of the fate of the hermits, but the reform monastery of Palmaria, for example, disappears from the record entirely.[8] The population of Acre was swelled after 1192 by clerics and monks in exile from their churches in Jerusalem or in rural areas lost to the Muslims. It would be small wonder if some found their way to the agreeable slopes of Mt Carmel, a few miles to the south.

Between 1205 and 1214 there were certainly Franks living in the wadi 'Ain as-siah, for it is these unnamed and uncounted individuals who are the recipients of the rule from Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, addressed to 'B, and the other hermits living under his obedience by the

---

[6] *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, ed. and trans. M. N. Adler (London, 1907), 19, mentions the Christian occupation of the cave of Elijah. John Phokas, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, PG 133, col. 961, describes the community of Calabrians who settled on Mt Carmel, but he is not exact about the location. Friedman, *Latin Hermits*, 17, and, following him, Denys Pringle, *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Corpus, ii: L–Z* (Cambridge, 1997), 227, argue that the Calabrian settlement occupied the ruins of a Byzantine monastery on the summit of the mountain. I previously argued, *Perfection of Solitude*, 121, that the Calabrians settled in the ruins of St Elisha at 'Ain as-siah, but would no longer wish to be so certain about the precise location.

[7] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, xxii. 27, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CCCM 63A (Turnhout, 1986), 1052, for the raid on Mt Tabor, and Ralph Diceto, *Ymagines Historiarum*, ed. W. Stubbs, RS (London, 1876), ii. 61, for the hermits of Jerusalem.

[8] Benjamin Z. Kedar, 'Palmarée, abbaye clunisienne du XIIe siècle en Galilée', *Revue Bénédictine*, 93 (1983), 260–9.

spring on Mount Carmel'.[9] Albert's letter marks the foundation of the Carmelite community. It established, at the request of the hermits themselves, a way of life for a group of Christians dedicated to penance. It is clear from the terms of the rule that at least some of the hermits were laymen and illiterate. They were to live in individual cells and gather in an oratory to worship together. They were to observe fasts and a vow of silence, and devote themselves to prayer and meditation. They were not permitted to own property beyond the animals necessary as beasts of burden.[10]

How long Frankish hermits had been living on Mt Carmel before they approached Albert for guidance remains obscure. By inference from other well-known examples of monastic foundations, we might surmise that the request for a rule followed a period of initial settlement in which the hermits followed an oral tradition, perhaps mediated by an elected leader, but without official ecclesiastical oversight. A passage in Gunther of Pairis's *Historia Constantinopolitana*, which mentions three monasteries on Mt Carmel, suggests that some kind of settlement had already been made by 1204/5, and that the lord of Haifa, Werner, was keen to enshrine it in some more permanent arrangement.[11] One question that immediately comes to mind is the

[9] *The Rule of St Albert: Latin Text Edited with an Introduction and English Translation*, ed. and trans. Bede Edwards (Aylesford and London, 1973), 78–9.

[10] On the rule itself and the status of the hermits after the rule, see *Rule of St Albert*, 78–93; Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*, 50–107; *idem*, 'Letture simboliche della regola del Carmelo', *Carmelus*, 39 (1992), 22–86; Rudolf Hendriks, 'De primigenia ordinis Carmelitarum inspiratione in regula expressa', *Carmelus*, 15 (1968), 46–53; and Joachim Smet, 'The Carmelite Rule after 750 years', *Carmelus*, 44 (1997), 21–47. The earliest certain version of the rule is contained in Innocent IV's modification of 1247; in order to reconstruct the original, we must therefore, as expressed by Smet, *Carmelites*, 13, 'isolate elements in Innocent's text which would not seem to apply to the original situation on Mount Carmel'. That the original hermits were illiterate finds an echo in the *Dialogus* of John of Hildesheim (*c.*1374), in which he describes the hermits of Mt Carmel in Old Testament times in similar terms: 'Incolae vero vetusti montis Carmeli fuerunt eremitae simplices, non litterati, pauperes, membranas forte non habentes nec scriptores, orare potius consueti quam scribere': *Dialogus inter directorem et detractorem de ordine Carmelitarum*, i, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 339.

[11] Gunther of Pairis, *Historia Constantinopolitana*, PL 212, col. 250. This passage has been subjected to sceptical scrutiny by Friedman, *Latin Hermits*, 126–8, who describes it as 'far from . . . sober'. Friedman admits, however, that it is reasonable to conclude that there were indeed three convents on Mt Carmel at the time of the Fourth Crusade. The story told by Gunther—which is centred around the relics that Abbot Martin hoped to bring home to Pairis—may well be inaccurate, but it would be foolhardy to dismiss the contextual details altogether. Gunther is more likely to be referring to a genuine contemporary foundation than to its early Christian precursors, for the knowledge of which he would have to have had access to Greek sources that are unlikely to have been known at Pairis. Alfred Andrea, *The Capture of Constantinople: The 'Hystoria Constantinopolitana' of Gunther of Pairis* (Philadelphia, 1996), 6, describes Gunther's knowledge of Greek as 'superficial'.

relationship between the Frankish hermits for whom Albert legislated and the Orthodox monks who had been living on various parts of Mt Carmel since the 1160s.[12] The evidence of the *Historia Constantinopolitana* is ambiguous, not least because it presents the situation on Mt Carmel as Werner wished it to seem to Martin, abbot of Pairis. As we shall see, later Carmelite writers, particularly in the fourteenth century, realized the significance of the composition of the body of hermits at the time of Albert's Rule for understanding the chronology of the order. There is no evidence that Orthodox hermits were included among the body for which Albert legislated. On the other hand, neither is there evidence that the Orthodox community on Mt Carmel in 1185 was no longer in existence, and indirect evidence can be provided to suggest that a mixed composition is plausible. The Holy Land had always been home to eremitical monks from the Orthodox and Eastern traditions, and diverse sources from the late twelfth century indicate that hybrid communities of this type were known in certain areas.[13] They were noted by Western as well as Orthodox pilgrims and chroniclers, and there is enough evidence to suggest that specific practices, particularly of diet, were borrowed by Franks from indigenous monks.[14] This interaction was true not only of solitaries but even of cenobitic monks. For example, the Orthodox monastery of Mar Sabas in the Judaean desert offered Frankish monks a place within the liturgical life of the community.[15] This Latin interest in indigenous monastic practices is confirmed by the Frankish occupation of traditional Orthodox monastic sites, the prime example of which is the community on 'Mt

[12] Besides Phokas's Calabrians, who may still have been living on Mt Carmel in the early 1200s, there was an Orthodox monastery of St Margaret on the summit of Mt Carmel: Friedman, *Latin Hermits*, 70; Pringle, *Churches*, ii. 244–8.

[13] Examples are discussed in Andrew Jotischky, 'Greek Orthodox Monasticism around Mar Sabas in the Crusader Period', in Joseph Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage* (Louvain, 2001), 85–96, and *idem*, 'History and Memory as Factors in Greek Orthodox Pilgrimage under Crusader Rule', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *The Holy Land, Holy Lands and Christian History*, Studies in Church History, 36 (Woodbridge, 2000), 116–22. There is a history of such hybrid communities, for which see Bernard Hamilton, 'The Monastic Revival in Tenth Century Rome', *Studia Monastica*, 4 (1962), 35–68, and *idem* with P. A. McNulty, '*Orientale lumen et magistra latinitatis*: Greek Influences on Western Monasticism (900–1100)', in *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963: Etudes et Mélanges*, i (Chevetogne, 1963), 181–216.

[14] e.g. Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, liii, ed. F. Moschus Douai (1597), 87–91; Reginald of Durham, *Libellus de vita et miraculis S. Godrici, heremitae de Finchale*, x, Surtess Society (London, 1847), 42–3; Jotischky, 'Greek Orthodox Monasticism', 86–9, *passim*.

[15] Joseph Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, 4th–7th Centuries* (Washington, 1995), 274. This is a translation (by Leah di Segni) of the edition of the twelfth-century redaction of the Rule of Sabas made by E. Kurtz in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 3 (1894), 168–70.

Quarantana' (Jebel Quruntul), just north of Jericho.[16] We cannot rule out the possibility that the group who received Albert's Rule included Orthodox as well as Frankish hermits.[17]

The Western hermits on Mt Carmel are scarcely better known to us. The first secure individual names (other than the 'B' named as leader in Albert's Rule) date from the 1240s. It has been suggested that one of the early recruits may have been an Italian nobleman, Ubaldino of Mantua. This man was the recipient of a letter from Buoncompagno da Siena, who praises him for having abandoned the world for the religious life under the guidance of Albert.[18] Neither the precise identity of Albert nor the order chosen by Ubaldino can be fixed with certainty, but since Albert is referred to as *alter Elyseus*, and reference is made to his activities in Italy, an identification with Albert of Vercelli is possible.[19] If the Ubaldino thesis is correct, it attests to the capacity of the fledgling group on Mt Carmel to attract prominent laymen.

Virtually nothing is known of the Carmelites from 1214, when Albert died, until 1238. The rule was confirmed by Honorius III in 1226, and again by Gregory IX in 1229, with a modification regarding ownership of property and permission to celebrate divine services.[20] In 1238, however, an exodus from Mt Carmel to Cyprus took place. The migration was not total, but it was permanent, and marked the beginning of a crucial phase in the order's history, a phase that lasted until the end of the thirteenth century, and might be termed the order's 'age

[16] Pringle, *Churches*, i. 252–8.

[17] This issue is discussed more fully in Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 130–8. My conclusions were criticized by Joachim Smet, 'The Perfection of Solitude', *Carmelus*, 44 (1997), 176–81, but Smet's review failed to consider the broader contextual and circumstantial evidence for Latin/Orthodox interaction underlying my argument. Since the review appeared, more such evidence has been published: e.g. Ronnie Ellenblum, *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1998), 119–44, demonstrating the use of shared churches in parts of the Latin Kingdom.

[18] Buoncompagno, Letters, v. xx. 1, unpublished edition by Steven M. Wight. I am grateful to Dr Wight for bringing this to my attention.

[19] Another possibility, as Wight suggests, is Alberto Spinola (d. 1210), founder of the Canons of St Mark, who was noted as a preacher; but it is difficult to see why Buoncompagno would have referred to this Albert in such strong terms as *alter Elyseus*. The same objection can be raised against the suggestion that the letter was addressed to one of the Humiliati, with whom Albert was involved during his career as bishop of Vercelli: Vincenzo Mosca, *Alberto patriarca di Gerusalemme: Tempo, vita, opere*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 20 (Rome, 1996), 297–351; Frances Andrews, *The Early Humiliati* (Cambridge, 1999), 83–9.

[20] *Bull. Carm.* i. 1. The original of Gregory IX's bull *Ex officii nostri* (6 April 1229) is lost, but was reproduced in Battista Cattaneis (ed.), *Speculum ordinis fratrum Carmelitarum noviter impressum (Speculum antiquum)* (Venice, 1507), 31–2. A month later Gregory issued *Providi more: Bull. Carm.* i, 4.

of expansion'. The earliest witness to the Cypriot settlement, Vincent of Beauvais, gives as a reason for the migration the Carmelites' fear of the insecurity of Mt Carmel itself.[21] There was in fact no direct threat to Mt Carmel—nor was there to be any Muslim incursion in the area until the 1260s—but the treaty negotiated by Frederick II with al-Kamil was due to expire in 1239, and, in the event, the security of the region was assured only by the campaigns of Thierry of Champagne and Richard of Cornwall (1239–41).

Vincent was almost certainly reflecting the fears of the Carmelites themselves, which were to be made explicit in a papal bull of 1245, *Paganorum incursus*.[22] This bull effectively recognizes the need for removal overseas, and retrospectively permits a course of action that the hermits had in any case taken of their own accord. Between 1238 and 1245 the situation in the Latin East had worsened: in 1241 the crusading army of Thierry of Champagne had been defeated at Gaza, and in 1244 the army of the Latin kingdom was annihilated at La Forbie, in a disaster as grim as Hattin itself. Hopes for a new crusade following the fall of Jerusalem to the Kharazmians in 1244 were faint; only Louis IX of France appeared to be serious, and after the First Council of Lyons (1245) Pope Innocent IV openly tried to divert the crusade against the Hohenstaufen rather than the Muslims. Small wonder, then, that the years between 1241 and 1250 saw Carmelite expansion beyond Cyprus to Sicily, England, and Provence.

In 1242 two settlements were made at opposite ends of England: Aylesford, on the Medway in Kent, and Hulne, near Alnwick in Northumberland. The circumstances of the English settlement are intimately linked to crusading. Two knights returning from Richard of Cornwall's expedition, Richard de Grey and William de Vescy, each brought back with them a hermit to settle on their lands, Grey at Aylesford and Vescy in the forest of Alnwick. The circumstances of these settlements have been embellished by fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Carmelite tradition, but the dating and location are confirmed by external sources.[23] Further English settlements were made at

---

[21] Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, I. xxx. 123, ed. B. Beller (Douai, 1624), 1274–5. Vincent speaks of a dispersal *per varias regiones mundi*, but here he must be telescoping the events of several years, for the 1238 migration was only to Cyprus. On the Carmelites in Cyprus, see Nicholas Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1195–1312*, (Aldershot, 1997), 215–19.

[22] *Bull. Carm.* i, 8; Adrian Staring (ed.), 'Four Bulls of Innocent IV: A Critical Edition', *Carmelus*, 27 (1980), 281–2.

[23] *Fratris Thomas vulgo dicti de Eccleston Tractatus de adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, xxii, ed. A. G. Little (Manchester, 1951), 102, for Richard Grey; *Registrum cartarum conventus de Holne*, in

Losenham, in Kent, and Bradmer, on the north Norfolk coast, before
1247. After this date the foundations, in England and on the Continent,
come in a rush: London and Cambridge (1247), Marseilles (1248), Col-
ogne (1252), York (before 1253), Montpellier (before 1256), Norwich,
Oxford, and Bristol (1256), Paris (1258), Valenciennes (before 1259),
King's Lynn, Lincoln, and Würzburg (before 1260), Toulouse (before
1263), Brussels and Bruges (1264–5). By 1274 there were twenty-two
Carmelite houses in England, about the same number in France,
eleven in Catalonia, and three in Scotland, as well as those in Italy,
Germany, and elsewhere.[24] On average, a new foundation had been
made in England every eighteen months between 1247 and 1276.

   The speed of the Carmelites' settlement in the West from the early
1240s is not unparalleled; the Sack Friars, for example, expanded rap-
idly from their Provençal base in the twenty years after 1251, when they
already had twelve houses in southern France, to become the third
most populous order in France and Italy by the time of their suppres-
sion in 1274.[25] But the Carmelite expansion is remarkable on two
counts: first, the wide extent of the order's appeal throughout the West,
and, second, the change within the order's profession that both permit-
ted and facilitated such expansion.

C. H. Hartshorne (ed.), *Feudal and Military Antiquities of Northumberland and the Scottish Borders*
(London, 1858), Appendix IV, p. lxix, for Hulne. Egan, 'An Essay', 70–2, is cautious about ac-
cepting the direct role of de Vescy in bringing the Carmelites to England, on the grounds that
there is no evidence outside Carmelite tradition of de Vescy having been a crusader. In fact,
later Carmelite tradition confused the founder, William, with his son John, who participated
in the Crusade of the Lord Edward (1270–2). The Hulne cartulary shows that it was founded
at the same time as Aylesford, and it is difficult to see how de Vescy could have known enough
about the hermits of Mt Carmel in 1241/2 had he not himself been to the Holy Land. Keith
J. Stringer, 'Nobility and Identity in Medieval Britain and Ireland: The de Vescy, *c.*1120–1314',
in Brendan Smith (ed.), *Britain and Ireland, 900–1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European
Change* (Cambridge, 1999), 199–239, emphasizes the family commitment to 'the chivalric
ideology of noble society', and points to their patronage of mendicants: in 1286 John prom-
ised to found a convent of Poor Clares in Newcastle (though he never did); *c.*1290 William III
founded a Carmelite house at Kildare, and in 1295 he helped the Carmelites of York move to
a new site. See also Peter O'Dwyer, 'The Carmelite order in Pre-Reformation Ireland',
Carmelus, 16 (1969), 264–78.

   [24] Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 158, 163–7, 182–5, 187–93, 199, 207–9, 211–14,
224–6; Richard W. Emery, *The Friars in Medieval France. A Catalogue of Medieval French Convents,
1200–1550* (New York, 1962), *passim*, but see corrections by Adrian Staring, 'Notes on a List of
Medieval Carmelite Houses in France', *Carmelus*, 11 (1964), 150–60; Richard Copsey, 'The
Scottish Carmelite Province and its Provincials', in Egan and Chandler (eds.), *Land of Carmel*,
189–203; *idem*, 'Foundation Dates of the Scottish Carmelite Houses', *Innes Review* 49, no. 1
(Spring 1998), 41–65.

   [25] Richard W. Emery, 'The Friars of the Sack', *Speculum*, 18 (1943), 323–34, and 35 (1960),
591–5.

Properly speaking, the Carmelites were not an order, as such, until 1247. The Rule of Albert and its confirmations spoke loosely of a collection of hermits living a regulated life. Paradoxically, it was a radical change in the Carmelites' way of life brought about by the bull *Quae honorem conditoris* of 1247 that constituted the hermits as an order within the Church.[26] The bull itself was not a papal initiative, but rather a response to an application by Carmelites themselves. Two hermits, Reginald and Peter, presented to the curia the Carmelites' case for a modification of the rule that would lift the restriction on living in 'solitary places'. Although it can be argued—as, for example, by Bede Edwards[27]—that the structural change to the rule made by the bull was minimal, there can be no doubting its effect. By removing the restriction on location and permitting Carmelites to settle anywhere they were given *loca*, but at the same time retaining the prohibition on property ownership specified by Gregory IX (1229), the bull effectively turned the hermits into mendicants.[28] The importance of *Quae honorem conditoris*, therefore, lies in its status as a second founding document, not only modifying Albert's Rule, but turning the Carmelites toward a new kind of religious life.

Two aspects of the change of 1247 require some further discussion: the papal context and the internal Carmelite context. The change to the Carmelite Rule must be seen within the broader context of the papal direction of new orders. The drafting of the modified rule was entrusted by Innocent IV to two Dominicans, the theologian Hugh of St Cher and William, bishop of Tortosa. This was a canny choice for two reasons. William, as bishop of a see in the Latin East, might be supposed to have some familiarity with the conditions under which the hermits had first been constituted. Hugh, a distinguished theologian, also had experience of constitutional modification. In the 1250s the Dominicans' own constitutions had been examined by an internal commission in which Hugh seems to have been involved.[29] The Carmelite modification was followed, nine years later, by a more profound constitutional development when, in 1256, disparate groups of Italian

[26] The circumstances, context, and significance of *Quae honorem conditoris* have been thoroughly examined by Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*, 200–43. See also M. H. Laurent (ed.), 'La Lettre *Quae honorem conditoris* (1 Octobre 1247)', *Ephemerides Carmeliticae*, 2 (1946), 10–16.

[27] *Rule of St Albert*, 26.

[28] The crucial clause is 'Loca autem habere poteritis in heremis, vel ubi vobis donata fuerint': Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*, 231–43.

[29] See G. R. Galbraith, *The Constitution of the Dominican Order 1216–1360* (Manchester, 1925), 181–7, on changes to the Dominican constitution in the 1250s.

hermits, mostly in Tuscany and the March of Ancona, were gathered under the supervision of Cardinal Richard Annibaldi into a coherent order, the Augustinian Hermits.[30] The Great Union, as it has become known, allows us to see the principles of papal organization of the Church at work. Most of the hermits who became Augustinians had been following the Rule of St Augustine before 1256 in any case. The creation of a single body governed by constitutions and a general chapter both made administrative sense and at the same time acted as a safeguard against unlicensed action by hermits. As with the Carmelite modification of 1247, the Great Union turned hermits into friars.

The modification of 1247, however, was the result of Carmelite aspirations. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the hermits' fears for the security of Mt Carmel. But this is not the whole story of the hermits' expansion. Monks in the Latin East whose property and habitat had been endangered by Muslim incursions had, since the 1190s, been able to retire to Cyprus. The Carmelites, however, took opportunities to settle throughout the West by attaching themselves to the patronage of powerful lay magnates: Richard de Grey and William de Vescy in England, Louis IX himself in France. The pattern of expansion outlined above goes beyond the needs dictated by security, and suggests instead that some, if not all, of the hermits had decided to adopt a new *modus vivendi*. Papal approval of this was obviously necessary.

The rapid expansion of the order was temporarily halted in 1274, when the Second Council of Lyons decreed that no order founded after 1215 should be allowed to continue in existence. This decree, which was a restatement of the decree *Ne nimium* of Fourth Lateran (1215), effectively put an end to several mendicant orders, the most significant of these being the Sack Friars, but also including the Pied, Crutched, and Apostolic Friars.[31] The Carmelites and the Augustinian Hermits were left in an ambiguous position by the determining factor

[30] The best account of the background is Kaspar Elm, 'Italienische Eremitengemeinschaften des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts', in *L'eretismo in occidente nei secoli XI e XII: Atti della seconda settimana internazionale di studio 1962* (Milan, 1965), 491–559. See also Francis Roth, 'Cardinal Richard Annibaldi, First Protector of the Augustinian Order', *Augustiniana*, 2 (1952), 26–61, 108–49, 230–47.

[31] Richard W. Emery, 'The Second Council of Lyons and the Mendicant Orders', *Catholic Historical Review*, 39 (1953), 257–71; also *idem*, 'The Friars of the Blessed Mary and the Pied Friars', *Speculum*, 26 (1949), 228–38; Michael Hayden, 'The Crutched Friars', *Clairlieu*, 47 (1989), 147–75; F-A. Dal Pino, *I Fratri Servi di s. Maria dalle origine all'approbazione 1233–1304* (Louvain, 1972); M. de Fontette, 'Les Mendiants supprimés au 2ème concile de Lyon (1274): Frères Sachets et frères Piés', in *Les Mendiants en pays d'Oc au XIII siècle*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 8 (Toulouse, 1976), 193–217.

of an order's integrity, since both claimed, though neither could prove, that their foundation pre-dated 1215. The decree *Religionum* (c. 23) states that both orders remain in a 'reserved' position, while the pope decides their fate. Neither is permitted to found new houses or to recruit new members without specific papal permission, presumably until a final decision was made.[32]

   There is a distinct irony in the fact that this threatened suppression of the only contemplative order to have originated in the Holy Land was the work of a council designed specifically to unify Christendom in order to promote the recovery of the Holy Land.[33] As will be seen, however, Carmelite apologists in the fourteenth century were to interpret the decree rather differently, and even to declare it a confirmation of the order.[34] It is true that monastic chroniclers were also capable of looking back at the Second Council of Lyons in the same rose-tinted way; for example, the Dunstable annalist asserted that the council had confirmed the Carmelites and the Augustinian Hermits on account of their antiquity.[35] That this interpretation misunderstands the intention of Gregory X in 1274 was demonstrated by Stephan Kuttner, who argues that the manuscript variant of the decree emanating from the conciliar session itself was more hostile to the Carmelites and the Augustinian Hermits than the final version, disseminated through the Church. In so far as we can reconstruct the events, it seems that the Carmelites and the Augustinians argued before the council that they had been founded before 1215, but this claim was not necessarily accepted as true.[36]

---

[32] Norman P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i: *Nicaea I–Lateran V* (London and Georgetown, 1990), 326.

[33] On the crusading context of the Second Council of Lyons, see Sylvia Schein, *Fidelis Crucis: The Papacy, the West and the Recovery of the Holy Land 1274–1314* (Cambridge, 1991), 15–50.

[34] e.g. John Baconthorpe, *Compendium historiarum et iurium*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH*, 215–17.

[35] *Annales Monastici*, iii, ed. H. Luard, RS (London, 1866), 261.

[36] Stephan Kuttner, 'Conciliar Law in the Making: The Lyonese Constitutions of Gregory X in a Manuscript in Washington', *Miscellanea Pio Paschini*, ii, Lateranum, new ser. 15 (Rome, 1949), 73–4. The earlier variant reading is as follows: 'Carmelitarum et Heremitarum s.Augustini ordines, qui se asserunt ante dictum concilium institutos', compared to the disseminated version: 'Carmelitarum et Eremitarum s.Augustini ordines, quorum institutio dictum concilium generale precessit'. Kuttner's thesis is based upon a comparison of the published decree with a manuscript containing intermediary stages of the decretal process. See also A. Franchi, *Il concilio di Lione (1274) secondo la 'ordinatio concilii generalis Lugdunensis'*, Studi e testi francescani, 33 (Rome, 1965). Modern Carmelite scholars, however, have sometimes treated the decree of the Second Council of Lyons as an endorsement for the order: thus, e.g. Smet, *Carmelites*, 18, asserts that the council allowed the Carmelites to continue because they pre-dated 1215, which puts a misleading construction on Gregory X's intentions.

In the twelfth century, hermits seeking greater constitutional perman-
ence tended either to adopt an existing monastic customary or rule, or,
in the case of the Carthusians and the Cistercians, to create new ones
of their own. By the mid-thirteenth century, however, the current of
lay spirituality had changed. New orders sought to adapt monastic
models to urban life. One of the most remarkable aspects of the Car-
melite expansion is how quickly the early Western settlements changed
character. If one takes England as an example, the contrast between a
site such as Hulne or Burnham Norton, founded before the 1247
modification, and Norwich or London, is obvious. Hulne lies in the for-
est of Alnwick, visible from the Cheviots and about four miles from the
Northumbrian coast. It is a remote, although not barren, site.[37] The
ruins of the fourteenth-century priory at Burnham Norton can still be
seen a few miles inland from the north Norfolk coastline, but the ori-
ginal foundation was virtually on the beach.[38] In both cases, elements
of the original siting on Mt Carmel can be detected, despite the topo-
graphical and climatic differences. Burnham Norton had the sea,
Hulne the wooded hills. Both were recognizable *eremum* sites, remote
from major centres of population. Both settlements were made on land
donated by the local nobility. The Norwich convent, on the other hand,
was founded inside one of the city's parishes, St James Pockthorpe, by
a local inhabitant, Philip Cowgate.[39] In London—the first settlement
after the change of rule—the Carmelites settled in Fleet Street, close to
the heart of the city.[40] It is clear that the change of rule encouraged
Carmelites to become mendicant friars, exercising their ministry in
urban environments. The same trend can be seen outside England: in
Milan, for example, the first Carmelite settlement was probably of an
eremitical rather than a mendicant character.[41]

   Such a change of direction was not accomplished without oppos-
ition. From 1248 onward papal bulls in favour of the Carmelites tell the
unwritten story of hindrance and suspicion on the part of some paro-

[37] Writing in the mid-fourteenth century, William of Coventry described Hulne as 'in
foresta Scotiae confinia . . . in foresta remotus . . . per duo miliaria a qualibet saecularium
cohabitatione': *De adventu Carmelitarum ad Angliam*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 285–6.

[38] Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 159.

[39] Ibid. 207–8. A memorandum of the original foundation survives in Norfolk and Nor-
wich Record Office (NNRO), MS *Book of Pleas*, fo. 50[r–v].

[40] Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 188–9.

[41] Pier Giuseppe Agostini, 'I primi tempi dei Carmelitani a Milano', *Carmelus*, 13 (1966),
137.

chial clergy and diocesans.[42] The Carmelites were themselves far from blameless. In 1287, for example, those who had tried to settle in Coventry were found guilty of violating the papal ruling on the prescribed distance between houses of different orders of friars, and had to withdraw from the town altogether.[43] Even when houses were established legally, expansion within towns was sometimes difficult. Some English Carmelite houses reveal a tendency to move from suburbs to town centres—in effect, to become increasingly mendicant. The Cambridge Carmelites, for example, who had settled in Chesterton in 1247, moved two years later to Newnham, and in 1292 into the town itself, on the grounds that the friars were hampered from attending lectures by frequent flooding, and suffered from lack of access to food supplies.[44] The same reason, coincidentally, was given by the Paris Carmelites for their move from the original site near the quai des Celestins to a new house nearer the centre of the town.[45] Better access appears to have been a particular concern of houses in university towns; thus in 1318 the Oxford Carmelites moved to a new site granted by Edward II.[46] But the English Carmelites in general moved their sites a good deal, an indication of the numerical expansion of the order in the years up to the 1330s.

Moving could entail confrontations, and sometimes conflicts, with long-established houses of other orders or, more typically, with the secular clergy. The Carmelites of Montpellier, having been forced to destroy their house in the mid-fourteenth century because its proximity to the walls jeopardized the safety of the whole town, then found that the prior of Saint-Firmin, in whose parish the new site chosen by the town council was situated, objected to the friars' presence on his patch.[47] The Cambridge Carmelites paid a price for their new house

[42] e.g. *Registres d'Innocent IV*, ed. E. Berger, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 4 vols. (Paris, 1884–1921), no. 5563 (1252); *Bull. Carm.* i. 13–14 (1254), 15 (1256), 23 (1261), 54 (1309). The last of these forbids other mendicants to settle within a specified distance from a Carmelite house.

[43] *Registrum epistolarum fratris Iohannis Peckham Archiepiscopi Cantuarensis*, ed. C. T. Martin, iii (London, 1886), 946–7. The Carmelites eventually established a house in Coventry in 1342.

[44] Keith J. Egan, 'The Carmelites Turn to Cambridge', in Chandler and Egan (eds.), *Land of Carmel*, 155–70. Egan observes that Chesterton offered a useful compromise between the rural retreat required by tradition and the need for access to the university. The royal inquisition permitting the Carmelites to settle in Chesterton is dated 2 November 1247, barely a month after the bull *Quae honorem conditoris*, allowing the Carmelites to settle in towns, had been granted.

[45] Lickteig, *German Carmelites*, 113–14. See also the case of Girona, in Catalonia, which was prone to flooding: Webster, *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia*, 69.

[46] Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 211.

[47] Jill R. Webster, 'The Carmelites in Lunel and Montpellier in the Thirteenth and

in the centre of town when in 1294 they were compelled by the bishop of Ely to indemnify the parish of St John Baptist for losses suffered on account of their settlement.[48] Such agreements, arising out of conflict with local parishes, were not infrequent. One of the most spectacular of such cases in England occurred in Marlborough in 1317, when the friars apparently built a new church without paying the compensation to the parish of St Peter that had been ordered by an inquisition *ad quod damnum*. After a friar had assaulted one of the bishop of Salisbury's envoys, the whole house was placed under an interdict.[49]

The case of Norwich demonstrates the reasoning behind such agreements for compensation, and the cause of the hostility of the parochial church. The Norwich house lay in the parish of St James, just to the north of the River Wensum. The original grant of 1256 gave the friars a messuage of about the same size as the land occupied by the church and churchyard, but by the mid-1330s this had been extended by additional grants until the Carmelite property extended almost from the churchyard to the river, dwarfing that of the parish church itself.[50] The Carmelites rebuilt their church between 1343 and 1382, and added at the same time an impressive sculpted portal—the 'Arminghall Arch'—featuring royal figures in niches. Work of this quality must have been beyond the resources of a suburban parish church such as St James.[51] The advowson of St James was held by the

Fourteenth Centuries', *Carmelus*, 36 (1989), 155–6. This incident was probably not typical of the Carmelites' fortunes in Montpellier, since the relic of the true cross in the Carmelite church was the object of considerable local veneration, and, *c.*1320, a miraculous light appeared in the sky directly over the church, which was still remembered by townspeople seventy years later, 162–3.

[48] Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 165; *Liber memorandum ecclesie de Barnwell*, ed. J. H. Clark (Cambridge, 1907), 209–12. The priory of Barnwell held the advowson of the church of St John the Baptist.

[49] Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 197–8; *The Registers of Roger Martivall, Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. C. N. Elrington, 2 vols., Canterbury and York Society, 57 (Oxford, 1963), ii. 271–2. The Carmelites eventually agreed to a compensation of ten shillings annually.

[50] NNRO, *Book of Pleas*, fo. 50ʳ; NNRO, Norwich Survey, MC 146/1–12, 146/52.

[51] The rebuilding of the church is dated from the note in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. v. The dimensions of the church are given by the fifteenth-century observer William Worcestre as 46 paces × 36 in the nave, with a chancel of about 23 paces, and a cloister of 35 square yards: William Worcestre, *Itineraries*, ed. J. H. Harvey (Oxford, 1969), 236–7. A rough calculation translates Worcestre's paces to dimensions for the church of about 110 ft. × 60 ft. These dimensions correspond almost exactly to those given for the Franciscan church in Norwich, but the Augustinian Hermits had a much larger church and cloister (ibid. 238–9). For the Arminghall Arch, see Philip Lindley, 'The "Arminghall Arch" and Contemporary Sculpture in Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 40 (1987), 19–43. Lindley dates the sculpture to the 1330s, and refers by comparison to sculpture in the contemporary Ethelbert Gate in Norwich and in the Lady Chapel in Ely. The presence of royal figures leads Lindley to suggest that the

Benedictines of the cathedral priory of Holy Trinity, which in the 1250s, when the Carmelites arrived, had itself been engaged in expanding its influence in that part of the city.[52] The earliest indication of stresses between the communities occurs in a document of the 1270s, in which the Carmelites undertook not to receive oblations from the parish of St James or two other adjoining parishes.[53] This promise was evidently broken, and in 1376 a more formal agreement was made in which the Carmelites conceded a quarter of all fees from burials from named parish churches.[54]

The Norwich case was typical of the emerging relations between the Carmelites and the Church throughout Europe. In Toulouse, where the Carmelites settled some time before 1263, the friars found themselves treading on the toes of the parish of St Stephen. After a violent episode had been brought to an end by the intervention of the count, Alphonse of Poitiers, in 1269, the Carmelites agreed to pay a restitution to the parish in return for the privilege of being able to reside in the parish, celebrate divine office, and bury their own members and any lay people who so desired in their cemetery.[55] In the Iberian peninsula,

arch was intended as an 'affirmation of temporal and spiritual power', to compete with the portal of the cathedral priory, 100 metres away across the river (ibid. 24). A. B. Whittingham's unpublished notes on the arch made in 1977 include some interesting suggestions, such as that the male royal figures were Edmund Crouchback and St Louis, the female figures St Grata of Bergamo and St Justina of Padua: NNRO MC 186/182. I have been unable to trace a supposed connection between these female saints and the order, and the attributes (a unicorn for Justina, the head of Alexander for Grata) are undetectable in the present condition of the sculpture. More plausible, if pedestrian, identifications for the female saints are the Blessed Virgin, the order's patroness, Mary Magdalene, or St Anne, to which the order developed a special devotion in the fourteenth century.

[52] NNRO MC 146/6–7, DC 26, no. 1387.

[53] NNRO DCN 40/1, 87/6; J. Kirkpatrick, *History of the Religious Orders and Communities and of the Hospital and Castle of Norwich* (London, 1845), 157.

[54] NNRO DCN 87/3, which is a quitclaim by the Carmelite prior: Kirkpatrick, *History*, 157. The Carmelites were not alone in thus falling foul of Holy Trinity; in 1258 the Sack Friars acquired property in the parish of St Andrew in Norwich only on condition of an annual compensation to the parish: NNRO MC 146/17. In 1376 the Carmelites of King's Lynn also undertook an identical agreement with the priory of St Margaret, a dependent cell of Holy Trinity: Norwich, PRO 135/2/50, fo. 12^{r–v}. As was the case in Norwich, this agreement appears to have replaced an indenture of 1282 in which the Carmelites conceded all offerings and oblations to a parish church, on this occasion All Saints: PRO 135/2/50, fo. 13^{v}–14^{r}. On King's Lynn, see below, 30.

[55] Sabine Lesur, 'Le Couvent des grands Carmes de Toulouse au XIIIe siècle', in *Les Mendiants en pays d'Oc au XIII siècle*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 8 (Toulouse, 1973), 106–7. The case of Toulouse is particularly interesting because here the Carmelites also encountered difficulties with the local Jewish population, whose synagogue their convent abutted. It was this quarrel, presumably, that gave rise to the legend found in the fourteenth-century chronicle of Trenqua (1320), that the Carmelites had settled in Toulouse as early as 1238, and had

where the order does not seem to have settled before the 1280s, problems with the parish clergy emerged in the fourteenth century. In Gerona in 1305 the Carmelites' attempt to build a cemetery was challenged by the parish clergy,[56] while in Majorca the original foundation of 1305 may have been temporarily abandoned in the face of local clerical antagonism. When the friars returned, in 1321–2, a precise agreement was drawn up concerning their right to bury lay people in their cemetery.[57] Settlements also survive from 1386 and 1389 between the Carmelites and the parish clergy of Valencia.[58] The Italian settlement has been less fully studied, but examples of similar difficulties can be found. The agreement made by the Carmelites in Milan in the late thirteenth century to pay an annual tribute of a pound each of wax and incense to the archbishop appears to have been related to the grant of a licence to expand the friars' church rather than over the specific issue of burials, but may nevertheless be regarded as falling within the same general category.[59]

In the fourteenth century, the four mendicant orders were sometimes capable of working together to defend their privileges against the secular clergy. It was not unknown, of course, for the Dominicans and the Franciscans to co-operate, as, for example, in Bologna in 1305, in settling the boundaries of their respective ministries.[60] But the mutual pact of Bruges, initiated soon after 1320, went further by including as well the Carmelites and the Augustinian Hermits. In 1359 the mendicants of Bruges agreed to share a residence in Oostburg, but this was merely a prelude to the more far-reaching pact of 1370, in which it is

been given property in the city by a Jew who had converted to Christianity (ibid. 102). The entire chronicle is now regarded as a later forgery; see Adrian Staring, 'The Miracles of Toulouse', *Carmelus*, 38 (1991), 136–52.

[56] Jill R. Webster, 'Early Carmelite Foundations in the Crown of Aragon', *Carmelus*, 32 (1985), 173–4.

[57] Jill R. Webster, 'The Carmelites in Majorca', *Carmelus*, 34 (1987), 94, 96; and for the documents of 1321–2 from the Palma Cathedral Archives, 107–10.

[58] Webster, 'Early Carmelite Foundations', 171. In general, however, Dr Webster concludes from her study of the archival documents that the Carmelite settlement in Aragon was hampered more by the success of the Dominicans and the Franciscans than by any other factor (ibid. 181). There are examples of good relations between Carmelites and the municipal authorities: e.g. in Manresa: Webster, *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia*, 56. See also Balbino Velasco, 'Documentos del siglo XIII sobre los carmelitas en Espana', *Carmelus*, 33 (1980), 109–23; *idem*, 'El convento del Carmelo de Valencia en los siglos XIII al XVI', *Carmelus*, 35 (1988), 94–137.

[59] Cited by Agostini, 'I primi tempi', 148.

[60] Benvenutus Bughetti, 'Statutum concordiae inter 4 ordines mendicantes a.1453, 1458 et 1475 sancitum', *AFH* 25 (1932), 241–56.

possible to identify the emergence of a perceived 'ordo mendicantium' for the purposes of challenging the dominance of the secular clergy.[61]

These examples illustrate the threat perceived by the parochial churches as a result of the success of the friars in undertaking their ministry. The Carmelites—and, indeed, the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinian Hermits—were siphoning off income from the parish churches by attracting the custom of parishioners for burials.[62] This situation, of course, was not new. The same complaints were made about Franciscans and Dominicans as early as the 1230s,[63] and had indeed been made about orders founded in the twelfth century which were enabled, thanks to privileges granted by the papacy, to by-pass the normal channels of mediation between parishioners and the secular clergy. It is easy to see why the secular clergy and those institutions, such as the cathedral priory in Norwich, which benefited from parish tithes and fees, should have felt disadvantaged. But equally, it is difficult to see how the Carmelites could have acted in any other way. Once the modifications to Albert's Rule made in 1229 and 1247 required them to become mendicant, they had little choice but to seek support in habitable areas. As Smet has argued, the active ministry was probably adopted gradually and 'without premeditation', as the Carmelites began to negotiate a position for themselves within urban society.[64] The privileges of the mendicant ministry were granted only gradually by the papacy. In 1253/4 the Carmelites were allowed to preach and to hear confessions, in 1261 to build churches with a belfry and a cemetery, and in 1262 to bury lay people in those cemeteries—

[61] Walter Simons, 'Mendicant Collaboration in the Fourteenth Century: The Bruges Pact of 1370', in Chandler and Egan (eds.), *Land of Carmel*, 171–87, with text on 181–7.

[62] A comparison made by Helen Sutermeister of requests in Norwich wills from 1370 to 1532 for burial in mendicant churches shows the Carmelites to have fallen significantly behind the two major orders, and slightly behind the Augustinian Hermits. On the other hand, a comparison of testators leaving bequests to religious institutions across the same period shows the Carmelites on a level with the other mendicant orders: NNRO MC 146/27. The issue of oblations granted to the Carmelites in churches outside their own houses was raised in an appeal to Pope Clement VI by John Paschal, the Carmelite bishop of Llandaff, in 1345: *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Petitions I: 1342–1419*, ed. W. H. Bliss (London, 1896), 104. Paschal complained that the decree of Gregory IX permitting poor religious to celebrate and receive alms at altars outside their own church was being flouted by clergy hostile to the Carmelites; in reply, the papal chancery undertook to check whether the decree applied to Carmelites, or only to Dominicans and Franciscans.

[63] Most famously by Matthew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, ed. H. Luard, iii, RS (London, 1880), 332. The secular clergy continued to be hostile, as demonstrated, for example, by admonitory letters from Archbishop Pecham to the bishop of St Asaph in 1284 and to the archdeacon of Canterbury in 1287: *Registrum epistolarum . . . Iohannis Peckham*, 952–3.

[64] Smet, *Carmelites*, 14.

albeit only with the assent of the local parish. Crucially, however, no blanket privilege was yet granted to the order to engage in an active ministry, and this meant that, in theory, the permission of the bishop was still required before Carmelites could preach, hear confessions, and so on. Bishops were not always inclined to be generous to the order: in 1280, for example, the archbishop of Canterbury prohibited Carmelites from hearing confessions in Oxford, on pain of excommunication, and a year later he complained about unlicensed preaching by Carmelites in Winchester.[65] In 1307 the Carmelites in Barcelona were placed under interdict for preaching without permission.[66] Some bishops went still further, refusing to allow the Carmelites to enjoy privileges already granted in papal bulls; for example, the bishop of Salisbury in 1268 prohibited the Carmelites of Bridgeport from holding services in their own church.[67]

The threat perceived by the secular churches raises the question of how many Carmelite friars were active in the ministry. Exact calculations are impossible, and it is only by extrapolating from other evidence that a rough estimate may be reached. One general guide is the construction of new churches or the enlarging of existing ones. Some churches had already needed enlarging in the thirteenth century; in Milan, for example, where the Carmelites settled *c.*1250, the church was rebuilt between 1268 and 1285.[68] Rough calculations of the number of friars in each community have been made for the English foundations. This has been done on the basis of gifts from the royal purse, which were usually made to convents on a pro rata basis, depending on the number of friars.[69] Keith Egan's estimates for the English houses suggest a total Carmelite population in England between 1296 and 1347 (the period of greatest expansion) of 720. The largest houses were London (67 friars in 1347), Cambridge and Norwich (50 each in 1312–26), and Oxford (54 in 1296–1310, but declining to 45 by 1326). Most houses averaged between twenty and thirty, the smallest being

---

[65] *Registrum epistolarum . . . Iohannis Peckham*, i. 100, 219. The prohibition on hearing confessions extended to the Augustinian Hermits as well. Peckham, himself a Franciscan, was blatant in his favouritism toward his own order.

[66] Webster, *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia*, 53.

[67] *Bull. Carm.* i. 18. Alexander IV's bull *Ad audientiam nostram* of 1259, repeated in 1265, 1286, and 1290, had warned bishops not to obstruct Carmelites from holding services in their own churches: ibid. 18, 29–30, 524, 42–3.

[68] Agostini, 'I primi tempi', 147–8.

[69] J. C. Russell, 'The Clerical Population of Medieval England', *Traditio*, 2 (1944), 177–212, remains the standard summary of this method.

Plymouth, with eight friars in 1310.[70] Not all houses, however, are represented as having received royal grants; thus, for example, there is no calculation for Burnham Norton, Blakeney, or Appleby, and one may assume that these settlements in smaller centres had correspondingly fewer friars.

THE CHARACTER OF CARMELITE MENDICANCY

The implications for the Carmelites of the decree *Religionum diversitatem* were far-reaching; indeed, it might be said that the historiographical processes recounted in this book would not have occurred had such a decree never been promulgated. The Second Council of Lyons was, in a way, the fulcrum on which the order's further development rested. One specific aspect raised by the decree—the question of the order's physical identity and self-perception—will be examined in more detail in the next chapter. From the papal perspective, however, 1274 marks little more than a hiatus in the relations between the Carmelites and the popes. Gregory X died in 1276, having failed apparently to pass on his scepticism to his successors; for in 1286 Honorius IV confirmed the Carmelite Rule, and in 1298 Boniface VIII formally removed the restrictions placed on the order by the council. Furthermore, in 1326 John XXII reissued specially for the Carmelites the bull *Super cathedram* (1300), which specified mendicants' rights in relation to preaching and hearing confessions, while at the same time insisting that each mendicant convent should compensate the parish in which it was located with a portion of burial fees.[71]

Nevertheless, the precariousness of the Carmelites' position between 1274 and 1286 is clear from the letter of Peter de Millau, the prior-general, to Edward I of England, of 1282, begging him to intercede for the order in Rome.[72] Some confusion, moreover, seems to have attended the decree *Religionum diversitatem*. Frederick, archbishop of Salzburg, wrote in January 1275 to all clergy in his diocese that, contrary to popular rumour, the Augustinian Hermits had not been suppressed at Lyons, and should not be harmed or treated with

[70] Keith J. Egan, 'The Establishment and Early Development of the Carmelite Order in England' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1965), 144. The wardrobe accounts on which these calculations are based fail at 1344. See also Webster, 'Carmelites in Majorca', 106, for estimates of the population of the convent on Majorca in the 1320s.

[71] *Bull. Carm.* i. 524, 48–9, 66–7; S. Teuws, 'De evolutione privilegiorum', *Carmelus*, 2 (1955), 159.

[72] Thomas Rymer (ed.), *Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cujuscumque generis acta publica*, i, pt. ii (London, 1816), 618.

disrespect.[73] In such a climate, it is not surprising that the Carmelites feared for their future.

An acceleration in academic study by Carmelites may have been one consequence of the scare experienced by the order in 1274–86.[74] Carmelites had, of course, been attending lectures at Cambridge and Oxford since the 1250s, and the bull of 1253 granting Carmelites the right to preach might be taken as recognition of some accomplishment in learning, but only after the Second Council of Lyons did the order develop a provincial system of education. The first Carmelite to incept in theology at Paris was Gerard of Bologna in 1295; at Oxford, Peter Swanyngton, in 1292/1300; and in Cambridge, Humphrey de Nekton, *c.*1299.[75] Once the momentum had begun, however, the achievements of Carmelite theologians were considerable.[76] Guy Terrenus (d. 1342), who taught at the papal curia in Avignon, was an important figure in the development of an extreme Aristotelianism in the first half of the fourteenth century; his pupil John Baconthorpe (d. 1348), the greatest of all Carmelite theologians, was a biblical commentator of some originality.[77] In England, the critical response to Wyclif's doctrines in the third quarter of the fourteenth century was marked by the leading role of Carmelites, among them Richard of Maidstone, Robert Ivory, the

[73] *Salzburger Urkundenbuch, IV Band: Ausgewählte Urkunden 1247–1343*, ed. Franz Martin (Salzburg, 1933), ep. 81, 85–6.

[74] Lickteig, *German Carmelites*, 27, asserts that the 'probationary period' established at the Second Council of Lyons was imposed because the order was inadequately prepared for training its members to preach. Consequently, 'what certainly saved the order was its developing commitment to the academic life and the promising theologians the order was consequently presenting to the Church' (ibid. 30). This may indeed be so, but there is no foundation for the first statement, and the Lyons decree says nothing at all about the education of friars. In fact, an increased attention to learning was more probably inspired by the vitriolic attack on the competence of Carmelite friars by the prior-general Nicholas Gallicus in 1270, for which see below, Ch. 3.

[75] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 52ᵛ, 79, 118ᵛ; A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge, 1963), 420; *idem, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to AD 1500*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1957–9), iii. 1831.

[76] The indispensable guide to Carmelite theological writing in the fourteenth century is Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis*, with its fourteenth-century list of Carmelite Paris masters 1295–1360 at 23–39. See also Bruce P. Flood Jr., 'The Carmelite Friars in Medieval English Universities and Society 1299–1430', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 55 (1988), 154–83.

[77] Bartolomé Xiberta, *Guia Terrena, Carmelita de Perpinya* (Barcelona, 1932); *idem, De scriptoribus scholasticis*, 137–41 for Terrenus, 167–240 for Baconthorpe; Beryl Smalley, 'John Baconthorpe's Postill on St Matthew', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 4 (1958), 91–145; James Etzweiler, 'Baconthorpe and Latin Averroism: The Doctrine of the Unique Intellect', *Carmelus*, 18 (1971), 235–92; Leonard Kennedy, 'John Baconthorpe O.Carm. and Absolute Divine Power', *Carmelus*, 38 (1981), 63–8.

'white dog' Peter Stokes, and, in the next generation, Thomas Netter, the most important of all the anti-Wyclifite polemicists.[78] The anti-Wyclifite engagement of these scholars demonstrates a sophisticated ecclesiology, in which, unsurprisingly, the Carmelites, along with other mendicants, defended the principle of apostolic poverty. Long after the theological threat posed by Wyclif and his followers had waned, Carmelites could be found taking a lead in continuing rumbles of the debate over poverty. The preaching of the Carmelite Henry Parker on the evangelical poverty of Christ and the Apostles sparked a quarrel with the clergy of London between 1464 and 1468 that ended in disgrace for the English prior-provincial.[79]

The structure of higher study in the Carmelite order followed that in the other mendicant orders. The constitutions of 1294 determined, for example, that London should be the *studium generale* for the English province. Before attending the *studium generale* to study theology, aspirants had first to study logic and natural philosophy—presumably, though the constitutions do not specify this, at one of the *studia particularia*.[80] By 1324, *studia generalia* had been established, in addition to Paris, Avignon, and London, at Bologna, Cologne, Montpellier, Toulouse, and Florence. Of the *studia generalia*, Paris had the pre-eminent place, moving from its original location by the Seine in 1309 to be closer

[78] Arnold Williams (ed.), '*Protectorium pauperis*: A Defense of the Begging Friars by Richard of Maidstone, O.Carm.', *Carmelus*, 5 (1958), 132–80; *idem*, 'Relations between the Mendicant Friars and the Secular Clergy in England in the later Fourteenth Century', *Annuale Medievale*, 1 (1960), 22–92; J. P. H. Clark, 'A Note on Robert Ivory, O.Carm. (d. 1392)', *Carmelus*, 33 (1986), 35–9; Margaret Poskitt, 'Thomas Netter of Walden', *Aylesford Review*, 1 (1957), 174–7; Zofia Wlodek, 'Tomasza Nettera z Saffron Walden koncepcja koscirla', *Studia Mediewistyczne*, 26 (1990), 63–70 (French summary, 70–1); Kirk Stevan Smith, 'An English Conciliarist? Thomas Netter of Walden', in J. Sweeney and S. Chodorow (eds.), *Popes, Teachers and Canon Law in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1989), 290–9; Flood, 'Carmelite Friars', 171–9. The epithet 'white dog' comes, according to John Bale, *Anglorum Heliades*, BL Harley MS 3838, fo. 74ʳ, from Wyclif himself, and Stokes appears in a Lollard song about the Blackfriars synod: 'Tunc accessit alius, nominatur / rufus naturaliter, et veste dealbatus / omnibus impatiens, et nimis elatus / et contra veridicos dirigens conatus / cum O et I, sub tam rubre pelle, animus non habitat nisi unctus felle': *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edward III to that of Richard III*, ed. Thomas Wright, 2 vols., RS (London, 1859–61), i. 261. Other Carmelite theologians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have been discussed by J. P. H. Clark, 'Thomas Maldon, O.Carm., a Cambridge Theologian of the Fourteenth Century', *Carmelus*, 29 (1982), 193–235; Leonard Kennedy, 'Osbert of Pickenham O.Carm. (fl. 1360) on the Absolute Power of God', *Carmelus*, 35 (1988), 178–225; *idem*, 'Michael Aiguani (d. 1400) and Divine Absolute Power', *Carmelus*, 37 (1980), 81–7; J. Etzweiler, 'A Brief Treatise on the Intellect by John Bates O.Carm (d. 1429)', *Carmelus*, 24 (1977), 104–26.

[79] F. R. H. DuBoulay, 'The Quarrel between the London Secular Clergy and the Carmelite Order 1464–68', *JEH* 6 (1955), 156–74.

[80] Saggi, 'Constitutiones capituli Burdigalensis anni 1294', 135–6; Zimmermann, *MHC* 53–62.

to the university, and expanding substantially by 1386.[81] Even here, however, the Carmelites found it difficult to establish themselves within the theology faculty at the university, and in 1342 the prior-general Peter Raymond petitioned the papacy to grant equality with the other mendicants in appointments to doctorates in the faculty.[82] In fact, comparatively few Carmelites progressed from the *studia* of the order to the theology faculties of the universities.[83] Those who did provided the instruction for Carmelite students in the *studia*.

The course of studies for friars was a point of contention in the universities. The mendicants dominated the theology faculties in Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge, but were resented by the secular masters who outnumbered them in the arts faculties. Students at all universities were required to take the arts course before they could proceed to theology; but, under a papal privilege, friars continually sought dispensations for their members on the grounds that they taught the necessary groundwork for theology in the *studia* of their own order in any case.[84] The Carmelite lectorate in theology at the order's *studia* corresponded very closely to that in the universities, being centred on the study of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*.[85] The Carmelite general chapter of 1356, indeed, forbade its members to study arts, and this prohibition was promulgated in the constitutions of 1357.[86] The point was eventually settled in favour of the universities, but individual friars continued to receive dispensations.

The presence of Carmelites at the universities, and the increased expertise in preaching that resulted from advanced study, served to alter

---

[81]   Lickteig, *German Carmelites*, 113–17.

[82]   Ibid. 120–33; *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, 4 vols. (Paris, 1889–97), ii. 529, 537; *Bull. Carm.* i. 65–6. The clearest expression of opposition from the university came in 1319, when one of the Paris masters invaded the Carmelite house with an armed escort, destroyed the crucifix hanging over the altar in the friars' church, and smashed furnishings: *Chart. Univ. Paris*, ii. 230–2.

[83]   Margaret Poskitt, 'The English Carmelites: Houses of Study and Educational Methods', *Aylesford Review*, 5 (1963), 230.

[84]   Robert Ivory, for example, obtained such a dispensation in 1374 by papal provision: *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters, IV (1362–1404)*, ed. W. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow (London, 1902), 198. See also Flood, 'Carmelite Friars', 160.

[85]   J. Weisheipl, 'The Parisian Faculty of the Arts in the Mid-Thirteenth Century: 1240–1270', *American Benedictine Review*, 25/2 (1974), 215; Lickteig, *German Carmelites*, 62; C. Douais, *Essai sur l'organisation des etudes dans l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs (1216–1324)* (Paris, 1884), 113.

[86]   The arts course was described as 'imaginationes fantasticas seu opiniones quae prima facie male sonare': Zimmerman, *MHC* 127; Antoine-Marie de la Présentation (ed.), *Constitutiones des Frères de Notre-Dame du Mont Carmel faites l'année 1357* (Marche, 1915), 73; Flood, 'Carmelite Friars', 158.

the character of the order itself. It would be a misconception, however, to take as typical of the quotidian life of the Carmelites throughout Europe the activities of the friars at the universities. Most Carmelites spent their lives in the routine of prayer, contemplation, and pastoral ministry. Although the eremitical tendency became obscured from the later thirteenth century onward, it was not entirely lost. Carmelites were still required, even after the mitigation of 1247, to live in their own cells within the convent; nor was the rule about silence relaxed.[87] Some indications of a lapse in standards of observance in Carmelite convents emerge from the constitutions of the order; thus, for example, eating and drinking with lay people in cells was forbidden in the 1362 general chapter; in 1369 guidelines were laid down regarding private possession of money and goods by individual friars. The rules for dining in the refectory were repeated in 1324, 1345, and 1358, in order to ensure that dispensations were kept to a minimum.[88]

Even in England, where the documentation is fuller than elsewhere, most of our knowledge of the situation of Carmelite houses in the West from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries is limited to the circumstances of foundation, expansion (where it took place), and sometimes patronage. The occasional anecdotal incident serves to put flesh on this skeleton, but such incidents relate for the most part to the same theme, of hostility and tension between mendicants and local populations. The lack of sources is not simply the consequence of accidents of survival. It is far more difficult to reconstruct the workings of a mendicant than a monastic house, because the mendicants, by virtue of their profession, did not need to record the accumulation of property or its implications for relations with the wider society. Moreover, mendicant chroniclers tended to write histories of their order, rather than of individual houses. In England, however, three cartularies survive from Carmelite houses—those of Hulne, Aylesford,[89] and King's Lynn— and from these, something of the ordinary concerns of Carmelites can

[87] The constitutions of 1281 specified that cells were to be built 'according to the spirit of the rule' Saggi: 'Constitutiones capituli Londonensis' 210; the modified rule of 1247 had left unaltered Albert's prescription of a separate cell for each hermit; and this was observed in the Carmelite house at Chesterton by the Barnwell chronicler: *Liber de Bernewelle*, 211. Webster, *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia*, 83–5, has recently argued that a movement for a return to eremitical principles characterized the province of Catalonia in the fourteenth century.

[88] Zimmermann, *MHC* 177, 182, 289. Lapses in refectory practice also seem to have become common in large Benedictine abbeys in the fourteenth century: Barbara Harvey, *Living and Dying in England 1100–1540: The Monastic Experience* (Oxford, 1993), 38–46.

[89] The Aylesford cartulary survives in a seventeenth-century copy: Cambridge University Library MS Add. 7934.

be reconstructed. The following discussion is based on the King's Lynn and Hulne cartularies.

The King's Lynn cartulary provides an opportunity to trace the convent's emerging position in the town from the 1280s to 1376. The copy of a papal bull granting indulgences to those who contributed to the rebuilding of the church in 1273 and 1276 demonstrates the rapid expansion of a house founded probably only *c.*1260.[90] An undated letter of John, bishop of Norwich (1299–1324), reports to the abbot of St Benet of Hulme the complaints of the King's Lynn Carmelites about an assault on the house and its friars by the rector of St Edmunds in King's Lynn and four henchmen. Besides providing further evidence of the tensions between mendicants and secular clergy, this document preserves the names of six Carmelite friars. To judge from these names, recruitment to the convent seems to have been limited to Norfolk.[91] The cartulary also provides the names of some King's Lynn townspeople, in the form of corrody agreements dated between 1350 and 1400. Such agreements, common enough in late medieval monasteries, took the form of board and lodging for corrodians within the convent, in return for an entry gift. A typical example is the corrody of 1368 to Alan and Alice Smith, of King's Lynn, which grants to the couple for life the use of rooms in the convent, to be furnished by themselves, with access to the church and the cloister. The board provided by the convent—apparently to include an enviable fifteen gallons of beer a week, as well as white bread and meat daily—was also specified.[92] A corrody of 1377 lists the names of all forty friars present in chapter when the agreement was made; and, with the Bishop Salmon letter, the names overwhelmingly indicate local origins.[93] The corrodies reveal, in their unspectacular detail, the deep roots that had been sunk into the urban soil of Norfolk by the Carmelites. The priory was, literally, a feature of the scenery: a reference point in describing property boundaries—a thorn in the side of the parish of St Edmund, a haven for the prosperous in retirement.

[90] PRO 135/2/50, fos. 17ʳ–18ʳ. See also J. C. Cox, 'The Carmelites of King's Lynn: A Newly-Discovered Chartulary', in H. J. D. Astley (ed.), *Memorials of Old Norfolk* (London, 1908), 132–44, but dates here are unreliable. On the foundation date of the King's Lynn convent, see Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 182–3.

[91] PRO 135/2/50, fo. 18ʳ. The names of the friars are John de Easton, Richard de Fakenham, William of St [Faith?], Robert of Burnham [Norton], Henry de Brahm[?], and John de Windham (Wymondham).

[92] PRO 135/2/50, fo. 18ʳ⁻ᵛ.

[93] PRO 135/2/50, fo. 18ᵛ. The number of friars in 1377 corresponds roughly with Egan's estimate of forty-two friars there in 1326: 'Establishment and Early Development', 145.

The Carmelite priory at Hulne, in Northumberland, was of an older character. The surviving cartulary, in which the earliest document appears to date from 1278, tells a story of rural aristocratic patronage providing for the friars' nourishment, for their warmth and light, and even for the roof over their heads.[94] The de Vescy family, which had brought the Carmelites to Northumberland in 1242, continued to support the friars materially by granting them rights of way along roads in the forest of Alnwick, the right to take wood from the forest for fuel and for lime making, fishing rights in the River Alne, the right to quarry stone for building, the right to pasture their animals in the lord's park, to take honey and beeswax for their candles from the woodland bees, and to collect twelve carts of rushes for thatching.[95] Alms were also given at Martinmas and Pentecost. The de Vescy grants were confirmed when the lordship passed into the hands of the Percy family in the fourteenth century; the last such charter in the register dates from 1422.[96] The Carmelites of Hulne were clearly popular beneficiaries in the region, for other grants of wheat, oats, and money were received from local landowners.[97] The Hulne cartulary presents a picture of a typical rural community anxious, like any monastery, to protect its liberties and the material rights that had accumulated over the generations.

Yet there is an indication here, too, of the same tensions that characterized the urban foundations. Hulne was founded almost cheek by jowl with the Premonstratensian abbey of Alnwick, which had been a traditional beneficiary of the de Vescys.[98] At some point, perhaps in the late thirteenth century, a covenant was made between the two communities. The document does not survive, but the purpose must have been similar to those in Norwich and elsewhere, to govern the boundaries of their respective ministries. The Premonstratensians, who were founded as an active order with a parochial ministry, were rectors of the parish of Alnwick. A charter of 1355 reveals the Premonstratensians breaking the covenant by invading the Carmelite priory and stealing wax and oblations from the church.[99] The case appears almost

---

[94] The cartulary is London, BL, MS Harley 3897, but for published edition see Hartshorne, *Feudal and Military Antiquities*, Appendix IV, pp. lxix–cix; also W. H. St John Hope, 'On the Whitefriars or Carmelites of Hulne, Northumberland', *Archaeological Journal*, 47 (1890), 116–17.

[95] *Registrum cartarum conventus de Holne*, in Hartshorne, *Feudal and Military Antiquities*, pp. lxix–lxxi, and repeated in subsequent confirmations of this charter.

[96] Ibid., pp. lxxii–cii.   [97] e.g. ibid., pp. lxxxiv–lxxxv.

[98] Stringer, 'Nobility and Identity', 219.   [99] *Registrum cartarum*, pp. ci–cii.

identical to the disturbance at King's Lynn perpetrated by the rector of the parish whose advowson was held by the abbey of St Benet of Hulme. Even in the remote sites, the Carmelites found themselves in competition with pre-existing institutions.

The composition of the Carmelite Order, like that of the Franciscan Order, became increasingly clerical. The first Carmelites were probably lay brothers; but by 1281 laymen were excluded from both provincial and general chapters, and the constitutions of 1294 deprived them of a voice even in their conventual chapters.[100] The shift from a contemplative to an active ministry that took place between *c.*1247 and 1274, left little room for Carmelites who were unable to celebrate Mass, preach, or hear confessions. The original rule presupposed a community many of whose members were unable to read, and thus the liturgical observance of some early Carmelites was limited to recitation of the Lord's Prayer. From the start, however, there was also clearly a literate element within the order. The rule specifies that those who can read should say the psalms at the correct hours.[101] The hermits were also to attend daily Mass, presumably according to the local usage, that of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.[102] The general chapter of 1259 had debated the question of liturgical observance, but no record of its decree survives.[103] The spread of the order throughout the West, however, may have threatened liturgical uniformity. Smet mentions a thirteenth-century English ordinal that apparently 'exhibits considerable departures' from the rite of the Holy Sepulchre; yet a Carmelite liturgical calendar probably of the 1290s, now in Copenhagen (Arnamagnaean Institute MS A.M.249 a, fos. 1ᵛ–6ᵛ), includes the feasts of four early bishops of Jerusalem, as well as the Feast of the

---

[100] Saggi, 'Constitutiones capituli Londonensis', 238; Smet, *Carmelites*, 24.

[101] *Rule of St Albert*, 82–3. Edwards argues that the original rule made no distinction between the obligations on laymen and those on priests in the order: 'clerics and literate laymen alike are bidden to say the psalter'.

[102] Paschalis Kallenberg, *Fontes Liturgiae Carmelitanae*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 5 (Rome, 1962), 22, citing the constitutions of 1281: 'Ad ecclesiam veniant clerici ad omnes horas, et pro posse humiliter et devote et uniformiter divinum officium compleant, secundum usum dominici sepulchri.' On the development of Carmelite liturgy, see J. J. Boyce, 'The Liturgy of the Carmelites', *Carmelus*, 43 (1996), 5–41; *idem*, 'The Search for the Early Carmelite Liturgy', in Boyce, *Praising God in Carmel: Studies in Carmelite Liturgy* (Washington, 1999), 299–302; *idem*, 'The Carmelite Choirbooks of Florence and the Liturgical Tradition of the Carmelite Order', *Carmelus*, 35 (1988), 67–93, *idem*, 'Medieval Carmelite Office Manuscripts: A Liturgical Inventory', *Carmelus*, 33 (1986), 18–34.

[103] Two lists of general chapters survive, by John Trisse (1259–1361) and by Sibert de Beka and continuators (1264–1447). Trisse notes that the 1259 chapter concerned itself with the liturgy: Staring (ed.), *MCH* 305.

Transfiguration, which is common to all surviving calendars from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.[104] Moreover, the general chapter of 1312 formally adopted for general use in the order a rite composed by the German Carmelite Sibert de Beka, and this ordinal remained standard until 1580.[105] Zimmermann has argued that the 1312 rite made little alteration to the rite of the Holy Sepulchre, and that since in any case Carmelite churches tended to be poorly endowed, only a simple rite was necessary.[106] Carmelite missals continued to employ the formula 'extractum et excerptum de approbato usu dominici sepulcri sancti ierosolymitane ecclesie. In cuius finibus dictorum fratrum religio sumpsit exordium'—as, for example, in an early fifteenth-century Italian Carmelite missal now in the John Rylands Library in Manchester.[107] Thus the liturgy itself maintained a conceptual and historical link to the Holy Land that might otherwise have been forgotten.

Some new observances seem to have been imported into the West by the Carmelites: for example, the feast of the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin and the devotion to St Anne that would become standard features of late medieval religious practice. The Carmelites' devotion to the Blessed Virgin, apparent from the mid-thirteenth century onward, is specific to the order.[108] Nilo Geagea has emphasized the intensity of the celebration of Marian feasts even in the earliest Carmelite liturgy, and Sibert de Beka's ordinal maintained this tradition. From 1312 onward, the Blessed Virgin was commemorated daily with the antiphon *Ave stella matutina*, and the celebrations of the feasts of the Purification and the Annunciation were rearranged so as to occur on successive days, thus creating a Marian festival. The constitutions of 1324 prescribed a daily Mass to the Virgin and the singing of

[104] Smet, *Carmelites*, 24, referring to *Antiquum Ordinis Carmelitarum ordinale saec. XIII*, ed. Patrick of St Joseph (Tamines, 1912); Francis Wormald, 'An Early Carmelite Liturgical Calendar from England', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 39 (1966), 174–80.

[105] *Ordinaire de l'Ordre de Notre-Dame du Mont-Carmel par Sibert de Beka (vers 1312)*, ed. Benedict Zimmermann (Paris, 1910), from London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 193, a copy of 1320; Kallenberg, *Fontes Liturgiae*, 25, 80.

[106] Zimmermann, in *Ordinaire*, pp. xiv–xv. He finds similarities between the Carmelite liturgy and that of the Carthusians, a comparison strengthened by consideration of the rules of the two orders.

[107] John Rylands Library MS lat. 123, fo. 7r; M. R. James, *Descriptive Catalogue of Latin Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library in Manchester*, i (Manchester, 1921), 225–7. James suggests Padua as a provenance.

[108] Zimmermann, in *Ordinaire*, p. xvi. After 1339 Mary was remembered in the Gloria and Credo of the daily Mass. The general chapters of 1321 and 1324 prescribed that the *Salve regina* be sung after each canonical hour and at the end of the daily Mass.

the *Salve regina* following the canonical hours.[109] Peter de Millau's petition to Edward I asserts that the order was founded specifically for the praise and glory of the Blessed Virgin, and this idea seems to have been adopted by the general chapter of 1287.[110] As will be seen, Marian devotion was to become a characteristic feature of Carmelite historical writing.

The Carmelites' migration and settlement in the West were accomplished through powerful lay support. In England and France alike, the first settlements were made by returning crusaders—in the case of France, by Louis IX himself.[111] Many of the subsequent English foundations were made by members of the higher or lesser nobility. The prolific building programme throughout Carmelite provinces, especially in the last quarter of the thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth, attests to generous lay patronage. Just as the Carmelites emerged in the first quarter of the fourteenth century as supporters of the papacy—and particularly of John XXII—so they forged strong links with the English monarchy. Henry III had made occasional gifts to individual houses of wood for building, and Edward I was associated with the foundation of the house at Kingston-on-Hull.[112] But it was under Edward II that royal patronage of the order reached a peak. The special affection in which he held the order is demonstrated by the vow taken during the flight from Bannockburn in 1314, to grant to the Oxford priory the royal manor just outside the north gate of the town, to settle there twenty-four Carmelites who had been living on his manor in Shene, on an annual stipend of 120 marks, and further to extend the land grant in Oxford so that their house could be enlarged.[113] A Carmelite friar, Robert Baston, who had a reputation as a poet, accompanied Edward on campaign in the expectation of composing

[109] Nilo Geagea, *Maria, madre e decoro del Carmelo: la pietà mariana dei carmelitani durante i primi tre secoli della loro storia*, Institutum Historicum Teresianum Studia, 4 (Rome, 1988), 138–9, 160–1, 165–6.

[110] Rymer, *Foedera*, i. 618; *Acta Capitulorum*, i. 7.

[111] Jean de Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis*, cxliii, ed. Natalis de Wailly (Paris, 1874), 259; Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum fratrum ordinis beatae Mariae de Monte Carmelo*, vii, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 138–9.

[112] e.g. *CCR 1268–72*, 48 HIII, 1263, *CCR* 55 HIII 1271, 56 HIII 1272; Egan, 'Medieval Carmelite Houses', 185–6.

[113] *CPR 1317–21*, 11/12 EII, 1318, 75, 237; *Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynbroke*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1889), 9. On the patronage of Henry V and the English nobility in the early fifteenth century, see K. Alban, 'The Letters of Thomas Netter of Walden', in P. Lombard-FitzGerald (ed.), *Carmel in Britain: Essays on the Medieval English Carmelite Province*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1992), ii. 347–55.

verses celebrating an English victory; he was instead captured by the Scots, and found himself writing quite the opposite.[114] Baston's brother Philip was also evidently a member of the king's household, for in 1313 he was sent to fetch books from the Exchequer to Edward at Windsor.[115] The Carmelites' gratitude to their benefactor is shown by their remembrance of Edward as a lay brother of the order—ironically, along with Henry of Lancaster.[116] The timing of this royal favour is significant, for it was precisely in this period—roughly the first quarter of the fourteenth century—that the first fruits of the academic programme instituted in the 1280s and 1290s can be seen, in the theological activities of Terrenus and Baconthorpe and the production of the first texts explaining the distinguished origins of the order. Patronage from laymen of high status thus intensified at a time of growing self-confidence and sophistication among Carmelites. Such patronage continued well into the fourteenth century and beyond. John of Gaunt took Carmelites as his chaplains: notably Walter Disse, who was a vigorous preacher of the notorious Despenser's Crusade, Stephen Patrington, and the anti-Wyclifite John Kyningham.[117] On the Continent, too, the Carmelites attracted royal and aristocratic patrons: Alfonso V of Portugal and Constance of Castille also favoured them as confessors, and later tradition includes among Carmelite confrères Theobald IV of Champagne and Frederick III of Sicily.[118]

The attraction of the Carmelites to potential founders probably rested on the perception that they combined the best of the new mendicant direction of spirituality with the traditional monastic virtues of contemplation and seclusion. Until the conflict with the Lollards in the late fourteenth century, they were not associated, like the Dominicans, with the sometimes harsh suppression of heresy; unlike the Franciscans, they suffered no internal crisis to threaten the order's unity and thus affect public perceptions; unlike the Augustinian Hermits, they

---

[114] Benedict Zimmermann, 'De Roberto Baston, poeta, eiusque fratre germano Philippo', *AOCD* 3 (1928–9), 164–86, with text of the poem at 176–9; *Vita et mors Edwardi Secundi*, in W. Stubbs (ed.), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, RS (London, 1883), ii. 299–300; Copsey, 'Scottish Carmelite Province', 194.

[115] *CCR* 7 EII 1313. The books were mostly law codes.

[116] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 12ʳ.

[117] In 1389 Disse was granted an annulment of all he had wrongfully done in preaching the cross on behalf of Gaunt for his Spanish campaign: *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, iv. 271. On Patrington, see Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis*, 48. On the patronage of Henry V and the English nobility in the early fifteenth century, see Alban, 'Letters of Thomas Netter'.

[118] Flood, 'Carmelite Friars', 164; London, BL Harley MS 3838, fo. 19ʳ.

could demonstrate a coherent, unified foundation, albeit one shrouded in obscurity. The historic and geographical link to the Holy Land must have attracted the sympathy of many, while the order's seeming reticence in promoting crusading at least ensured that Carmelites were not tarred with the brush of expensive failure.

The Carmelites' apparent lack of engagement with crusading is perhaps the most surprising feature of the order's development in the later Middle Ages. To be sure, there are certainly signs of an interest in the recovery of the Holy Land. The devotion in the liturgical calendar to the noted crusade preacher St Richard of Chichester may be one example.[119] At least one Carmelite prior in England, William Hokyton of Aylesford, was appointed to preach the crusade (in 1346),[120] and the absence of other names may simply be due to the loss of records. One of the most prominent fourteenth-century Carmelites, Peter Thomas (*c.*1305–66), Latin patriarch of Constantinople and papal legate to the East, was active in the preaching and execution of the Crusade of Peter I of Cyprus that succeeded in capturing Alexandria in 1365.[121] It is worth noting, too, that the Carmelite presence in the Holy Land did not end with the beginning of the westward migration in 1238/42, but only with the fall of Acre in 1291. During the 1250s and 1260s there was a new building campaign on Mt Carmel itself.[122] By 1261 the Carmelites also had a house in Acre, despite opposition from the bishop, and there was also a house at Tyre.[123] Pilgrims were granted indulgences for visiting Carmelite churches in the Holy Land and Cyprus.[124] Carmelites themselves sometimes made pilgrimages to the Holy Land in the later Middle Ages: for example, John de Boukhil in 1312, and Nicolo Calciuri in the mid-fifteenth century.[125] Yet it was the Franciscans

---

[119] Wormald, 'Early Carmelite Liturgical Calendar', 176.

[120] Keith J. Egan, 'Aylesford's Medieval Library', *Aylesford Review*, 4 (1962), 234. I am grateful to OUP's second reader for bringing Hokyton to my attention.

[121] Philippe de Mezières, *The Life of Saint Peter Thomas by Philippe de Mezières*, ed. J. Smet, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 2 (Rome, 1954); F. J. Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas: Scholar, Diplomat and Crusader* (Philadelphia, 1966), is rather too faithful a paraphrase of Philippe's work.

[122] Bellarmino Bagatti, 'Relatio de excavationibus archaeologicis in S.Monte Carmelo', *AOCD* 3 (1958), 277–88; 6 (1961), 66–70; Pringle, *Churches*, ii. 251–7.

[123] *Bull. Carm.* i. 23; *Domus in Terra Sancta*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 262–6; Smet, 'Carmelite Rule after 750 Years', for a summary of the evidence.   [124] *Bull. Carm.* i. 21.

[125] *CCR* 6 EdII, 1312, contains a request from the Crown to the Carmelite prior-general to grant permission for John to go to the Holy Land, for a companion to be provided for him and accommodation arranged *en route* at Carmelite houses, 'the said John having vowed to go to the Holy Land for the health of the king and his subjects'; for Calciuri see Elias Friedman, 'Nicola Calciuri, O.Carm. (d. 1466), a Genuine Witness to the Carmelite Monastery in Wadi ʿAin as-siah?', *Carmelus*, 32 (1985), 60–73.

who, by negotiating the guardianship of the holy places, associated themselves with the popular devotion to the Holy Land in the later Middle Ages. Both the Franciscans and the Dominicans maintained tangible contact with the Holy Land through their extensive missionary activities. The Carmelites, though retaining the titular province of the Holy Land after 1291, made no attempt to establish missions in Syria or beyond. Carmelites may have been active as crusade preachers; but if so, little evidence for this survives. Carmelite interest in the Holy Land did not diminish, but, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, took an increasingly meditational, literary, and exegetical direction after 1291.

THE GOVERNANCE OF THE ORDER

Like all mendicant orders, the Carmelites organized themselves through regular general chapters. The earliest recorded chapter was held at Aylesford in 1247, the year of the modification of the rule, but the possibility of earlier chapters cannot be discounted. As will be seen later, the Carmelites, in looking back to their origins, retrospectively named early priors-general, but the first name that can be attached with certainty to the office of prior-general is that of Godfrey in 1249–50.[126] We are reliant for our knowledge of the leadership of the order in the early years on lists of priors-general made from the late fourteenth century onward. These lists, however, fail to present an agreed succession; there are four slightly different versions, for example, compiled from different sources, in the manuscript notebooks of John Bale (1495–1562).[127]

One of the most problematic figures in early Carmelite history, Simon Stock, appears in lists of priors-general from the end of the fourteenth century onward, where he is said to have been prior-general from *c*.1245 to 1266.[128] Simon thus became associated with the most crucial period in early Carmelite history, the change of rule and the

[126] P. Caioli, 'Il "Carmino" di Pisa', *Carmelus*, 3 (1956), 138–40.

[127] London, BL Cotton Titus D X, fo. 129ᵛ; BL Harley MS 1819, fos. 107ʳ–108ʳ; Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fos. 107–96; MS Selden supra 72, fos. 12ʳ–20ᵛ. The list in Harley MS 1819 was transcribed by Bale from John Grossi, but a different version by Grossi is found in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fo. 116ᵛ. For Trisse's list, see Xiberta, *De Scriptoribus Scholasticis*, 39–42.

[128] Bartolmé Xiberta, *De visione sancti Simonis Stock* (Rome, 1950), 281–313, for an edition of the early catalogues of priors-general. For the most recent discussion, see Richard Copsey, 'Simon Stock and the Scapular Vision', *JEH* 50 (1999), 652–83.

Western migration. In later Carmelite tradition Simon is given miraculous powers—changing water into wine, restoring a fish to life—and an entirely spurious eremitical career before his entry into the order.[129] The most famous episode with which he is associated, however, is the 'scapular promise', in which he received a vision of the Blessed Virgin's promise of protection for Carmelites, symbolized by the wearing of a scapular over the shoulders.[130] There is no independent evidence for the existence of Simon Stock. It is quite likely, however, that an Englishman called Simon, who may have been prior-general, was sufficiently charismatic and influential within the order in a period of transformation to have attracted later legend. Bartolomé Xiberta, arguing that the tradition of Simon Stock could be taken back to the early fourteenth century (in other words, almost to the beginning of a textual tradition within the order), implied that there could be no smoke without fire.[131] Probably the most persuasive argument in favour of the genuine existence of Simon is an episode in the *Vitas fratrum* of the Dominican Gerard de Frachet, in which a prior of the Carmelites called Simon relates a vision of the Blessed Virgin received by another Carmelite.[132] As Egan has argued, this does not settle the matter, for 'prior' does not necessarily mean prior-general, but it may have provided the kernel of the legend later attaching to Simon.[133]

In any case, if a Simon had been prior-general of the order in the mid-thirteenth century, it must have been been either before 1249–50 or between then and 1266, when Nicholas Gallicus succeeded to the office. In the most recent discussion of the topic, Richard Copsey rejects the theory that Simon was elected prior-general in 1247, but accepts that he may have been prior-general between 1254 and 1265.[134] Nicholas's term of office ended in 1270/1, and his chief fame rests on

[129] Bale, *Anglorum Heliades*, London, BL Harley MS 3838, fos. 11ᵛ–12ʳ, 15ʳ–ᵛ. The name Stock, explained by Bale as referring to his habit of living in the trunk of an oak-tree, appears in fact as 'Stoh' in the earliest reference, the Florentine Necrologium of 1369–74/96: Xiberta, *De visione*, 177, 183; Nicholas Gallicus, 'Nicolae prioris generalis *Ignea Sagitta*', ed. A. Staring, *Carmelus*, 9 (1962), 246 n. 38. In other early references, Simon appears simply as 'de Anglia' or 'natione Anglicus': Xiberta, *De visione*, 283, 302.

[130] Christian Ceroke, 'The Credibility of the Scapular Promise', *Carmelus*, 11 (1964), 81–123. Observations on the significance of mendicant clothing are made below, Ch. 3.

[131] Xiberta, *De visione*, 84–103, 172–89. See also the exchange between Xiberta and Lancelot Shepard in *Downside Review*, 68 (1949–50), 66–76; 69 (1950–1), 74–81, 82–4, and the discussion of the historicity of Stock in Egan, 'An Essay', 92–6.

[132] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum*, iii. 11, ed. B. M. Reichert, MOPH i (1897), 133.   [133] Egan, 'An Essay', 96.

[134] Copsey, 'Simon Stock', 658–9.

his authorship of the earliest surviving piece of Carmelite writing, the *Ignea Sagitta*, discussion of which is reserved for a later chapter.[135] The most reliable list of priors-general, compiled by John Trisse *c.*1360, begins with the name of Ralph Alemannus.[136] Staring argued convincingly that *Alemannus* was a corruption of *Alnevicus*, 'of Alnwick', and that Ralph ought instead to be identified with the Ralph de Fryston mentioned as prior-general in 1276 in the Patent Rolls.[137] Could 'Fryston' itself be a corruption of 'Fresburne'? Ralph Fresburne may have became the first prior of the Carmelite house at Berwick upon Tweed (*c.*1260), only 26 miles from Hulne.[138] Moreover, the name Fresburn/Frebern occurs in the Scottish nobility as early as the 1160s. One of the family's estates was Shipley, near Alnwick, and a Robert Frebern witnessed a charter on behalf of a relative of the de Vescys— the family that was to found Hulne.[139] Further, in the tradition transmitted by John Bale, the hermit brought back from Mt Carmel to Alnwick was named Ralph Fresburn.[140] This last point might be stretching it too far, but there was certainly a connection between Hulne and the important Anglo-Scottish land-owning families of Northumberland—a connection that might have embraced the prior-generalship of the Carmelite Order in the 1270s. Although their dates cannot be fixed with precision, the succession of priors-general after Ralph is clear. The growing importance of academic achievement within the order is signalled by the election to the prior-generalship of Gerard of Bologna, the order's first Parisian doctor, in 1297; in fact, much of the credit for this must go to his predecessor Peter de Millau (1277–94), in whose tenure of office the academic instruction of friars was established. Gerard's career in the schools must have been cut short by his election to office, but as prior-general he became prominent in the wider context of ecclesiastical government. He attended the

[135] See below, Ch. 3. Nicholas Gallicus, 'Nicolae prioris generalis', 307, follows the tradition according to which Nicholas resigned from office in 1270. Richard Copsey, 'The *Ignea Sagitta* and its Readership: A Re-evaluation', *Carmelus*, 46 (1999), 169–72, argues that it is more likely that he simply died in 1270.

[136] Trisse calls him 'de provincia Alamaniae Inferioris', in 'The Lists of General Chapters', ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 305. The dating is insecure, for while Trisse has him elected in 1271 and a new prior-general elected in 1275, Sibert de Beka, 'The Lists', 294, dates his period of office to 1273–6.

[137] A. Staring, 'Fryston, Raoul de', in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et géographie ecclésiastique* xix (Paris, 1983), 256–7; *CPR, 1272–1281*, 158.

[138] Copsey, 'Scottish Carmelite Province', 190, for the foundation of Berwick; but he rejects the Fresburne priorship.

[139] Stringer, 'Nobility and Identity', 215 n. 52, 223 n. 104.

[140] John Bale, *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum* (Basel, 1548), fo. 103ᵛ.

Council of Vienne (1311–12), counselled Philip IV on the suppression of the Templars, and advised the papal curia on the debate between the Conventuals and the Spiritual Franciscans.[141] Gerard's successor, Guy Terrenus of Perpignan, was a theologian of considerable importance. His generalate (1318–21), like Gerard's, was ended by elevation to office—in this case to the bishopric of Majorca, and his subsequent translation to Elne. The tradition begun by Gerard at the Council of Vienne of supporting the papal position against the Spiritual Franciscans in the debate over poverty was taken still further by Guy, whose *De perfectione vitae* sought to defend possession of temporalities by religious.[142] As will be seen, Terrenus's pupil, the prior-provincial of England John Baconthorpe, was also a papal advocate in the 1320s, and this strong papalism became a feature of the order's ecclesiology.

Given the Carmelites' loyalty to the papacy, the schism of 1376 might be expected to have presented a severe threat to the order. In 1381 the Urbanist provinces within the order (the five Italian, two German, one Irish, and two English provinces) elected a rival prior-general, Michael Aiguani, and the split continued until 1409, when both generals and their supporters attended the Council of Pisa and affirmed the deposition of the schismatic popes. In 1411 an extraordinary general chapter of the order at Bologna healed the division by appointing the Clementine prior-general John Grossi for all twenty-one provinces.[143]

A disputed election at the general chapter of 1430 may have provided the impetus for a second revision of the Carmelite Rule. In 1432 the Carmelites obtained from Pope Eugenius IV the bull *Romani pontificis*, which mitigated the Rule of St Albert and the 1247 modification, on the grounds that the original demanded too much of the friars.[144] The chief clauses that the Carmelites themselves considered in need of reform related to fasting and remaining within individual cells; the bull allowed them to eat meat three days a week and perambulate in the cloisters of their convents. As Smet comments, the

---

[141] *Chart. Univ. Paris.* ii. 125; F. Ehrle, 'Zur Vorgeschichte des Concils von Vienne', *AFLK* 2 (1886), 382. Was Gerard perhaps appointed to advise Philip IV on the Templars because of his order's own experience in the Holy Land? See Xiberta, *De scriptoribus Scholasticis*, 74–110, for Gerard's theological work.

[142] Joachim Snyder, 'Guido Terreni, O.Carm.: His Literary Participation in the Early Fourteenth-Century Poverty Disputes' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, 1950).   [143] Smet, *Carmelites*, 47–9.

[144] L. Saggi, 'La mitigazione del 1432 della regola carmelitana: tempo e persone', *Carmelus*, 5 (1958), 3–29, with critical edition of the bull.

mitigation of 1432 'may be regarded as the last stage in the process whereby the Carmelites became mendicants'. Smet regards the mitigation as a pragmatic necessity that merely brought the rule up to date with the mitigation of 1247, but at the same time was 'the source of every subsequent division in the Order'.[145] The bull recognized the effective abandonment by the majority of Carmelites of their eremitical past; yet, in so doing, it gave impetus to a new reforming spirit within the Italian province. Early in the fifteenth century a reformed observance was adopted in northern Italy, centred on Mantua.[146] The reformists obtained a bull in 1443 that effectively cut the Mantuan observance off from the rest of the order. The reformists not only refused to accept the mitigation of 1432; they insisted on a more severe monastic observance than had applied between 1247 and 1432.

Under the prior-general John Soreth (1451–71), however, the Mantuan congregation was encouraged to extend its recruitment in Italy, a process that culminated in the transfer of the *studium generale* at Bologna to the Mantuan allegiance. The diplomacy and charity of Soreth proved so effective in healing divisions that in 1462 the Mantuans even accepted parts of the 1432 mitigation.[147] Soreth's sympathy for the Mantuans was doubtless inspired by his own reformist credentials. During his generalate a wide programme of reform was instituted throughout the order, and was articulated in the decrees of the general chapter of 1456.[148] Perhaps because the reform was an active and ritual process requiring contractual obligations on the part of friars, it could not be imposed uniformly and at a single stroke over all provinces. It is difficult, therefore, to ascertain the full extent of the reform.[149] Even those houses that did not formally subscribe to the 'Callistine' reform promoted by Soreth were subject to revised constitutions in 1462. These not only clarify areas of observance left hazy by

[145] Smet, *Carmelites*, 86.

[146] L. Saggi, *La Congregazione Mantovana dei Carmelitani sino alla morte del B. Battista Spagnoli (1516)* (Rome, 1954); Graziano di S. Teresa, 'Gli "Statuta Prima" della congregazione Mantovana', *Ephemerides Carmeliticae*, 8 (1957), 439–519; 9 (1958), 222–45; 12 (1961), 127–95, 455–75.

[147] Saggi, *La Congregazione Mantovana*, 240–1.

[148] Gabriel Wessels, 'Epistola S. Cyrilli III prioris generalis et historia antiqua ordinis nostra', *AOC* 3 (1914–16), 430–2. The decree was confirmed in the bull *In decore sacrae*, 1457: *Bull. Carm.* i. 247–8; Smet, *Carmelites*, 94–5.

[149] Smet, *Carmelites*, 95–100. Smet judges that the reform was most successful in the province of Lower Germany, and quotes Henri Pirenne, *Histoire de Belgique*, 7 vols. (Brussels, 1929–32), iii. 338, to the effect that the Carmelites and the Dominicans were the only functioning religious orders in Belgium on the eve of the Reformation.

the 1432 mitigation, but also in form (they were published in a printed edition in Venice in 1499) and language reveal the influence of humanistic values and thinking.

The papal bull *Cum nulla* of 1452 gave Soreth authority to receive into the protection of the order convents of virgins, widows, béguines, and *mantellatae*. Women had always been a part of the Carmelite Third Order—the system of confraternities attached to individual mendicant priories. The oldest such confraternity of women among the Carmelites was the *sorores* of Venice, who were admitted to the order in 1300 as a *congregatio*. Similar confraternities of women were active in Bologna soon after 1300, and in Florence in the second half of the fourteenth century. Even before 1300, arrangements seem to have been made at a local level for the association of lay women with priories, the oldest such example being at Lucca in 1284.[150] The bull of 1452, however, gave the order a free hand in reshaping existing communities of women in terms of internal administration and liturgical observance. The 1450s saw a number of new houses, especially in the Netherlands, joining the Carmelites.[151] In 1455 Soreth drew up a rule—in essence, Albert's Rule with a few modifications—for Carmelite nuns. Like the Franciscan Second Order, the Carmelite nuns were required to take a vow of perpetual cloister, and there was thus a fundamental disparity between the professions of male and female Carmelites.[152]

Soreth's successor, Christopher Martignoni (1471–81), attempted to carry further the reform of the order's provincial structure in Italy. Although himself a member of the Mantuan Congregation, he failed to attract his colleagues' support and reopened the divisions of forty years earlier. Martignoni and his successor, Pons Rainaud (1482–1502), were both elected to the generalate after having been appointed as temporary generals by Sixtus IV. The progress of reform continued, patchily, during the first half of the sixteenth century. After a period of schism in the first quarter of the century, the reform of Albi, which had affected the southern French province, made its peace with the order.[153]

---

[150] Claudio Catena, 'Le Donne nel Carmelo Italiano', *Carmelus*, 10 (1963), 23–33. In Lucca the agreement between the Carmelites and the parish of San Donato exempted from parochial jurisdiction the properties inhabited by the lay confrères and lay sisters of the order.

[151] Adrian Staring, 'The Carmelite Sisters in the Netherlands', *Carmelus*, 10 (1963), 56–92.

[152] Ibid. 88 gives an example of the profession formula for women, taken from Brussels, Bibl. Roy. MS 11397–85, fo. 230ʳ.

[153] Smet, *Carmelites*, 122–7.

[154] Ibid. 249–61 for Denmark. The assertion (ibid. 261) that the English province was lost

But further quarrels with the Mantuan reform in the 1530s dogged the generalate of Nicholas Audet, and it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the more general movement of reform sweeping Christendom in the wake of Luther's rebellion against papal authority caught the Carmelites ill prepared to resist. In the provinces where the Reformation took hold, there was little or no resistance to the suppression of houses. Some prominent Carmelites embraced Protestantism; John Bale is the most notable English example, but there were others elsewhere, especially in Denmark.[154]

About forty Carmelites, including the prior-general Nicholas Audet, attended the first session of the Council of Trent. Audet's participation in the debates on Scripture and tradition reveal him to have been a moderate reformer; but on matters of authority he remained true to the traditional Carmelite papalist position.[155] By 1547, however, Audet's health had declined, and Carmelite participation waned. During the first session of the Council (1545–8), Carmelite representation, with the exception of the Portugese Balthasar Limpo, was effectively limited to Italian conventuals. But the second and third sessions saw fuller participation from the Mantuan Congregation and from Flemish and German Carmelites.

The vicissitudes of reform and retrenchment in the Catholic Church in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries left the Carmelites a strong, well-organized order with a coherent rule and constitutions. The transformation of the order from the early years of the thirteenth century to the mid-sixteenth century is in itself a remarkable achievement. The scattered laymen living as hermits on the frontiers of Christendom had become an order of friars vowed to communal poverty and engaged in teaching, biblical study, and public ministry. The order governed itself by regular general chapters, the decrees of which were enforced by provincial priors. The loss of the order's birthplace, the Holy Land, had scarcely interrupted the spread of the order or undermined its *raison d'être*. The loss of further provinces to the Reformation was compensated in part by the strengthening of Carmelite observance in Catholic Christendom. Above all, the order had survived the challenge to its integrity in 1274 and emerged the stronger for having

because of the king's need for a male heir takes too one-dimensional a stance on the Reformation in England.

[155] Adrian Staring, *Der Karmelitengeneral Nikolaus Audet und die katholische Reform des XVI Jahrhunderts* (Rome, 1959), 338–44.

confronted that crisis. A coherent ecclesiology based on papal authority and the articulation of a continuous tradition had been established, and within this ecclesiology the virtues of prayer and contemplation espoused by the first Carmelite hermits would continue to find a central place.

Identity and Antiquity: The Carmelite Habit

THE CHANGE OF HABIT (1287)

At the general chapter held at Montpellier in 1287, the Carmelite Order adopted a resolution to change the appearance of its habit, from distinctive grey and white vertical stripes to plain white. The striped habit, commonly known as the *pallium barratum*, which had been the order's badge of identity during the fifty years since the Carmelites had first arrived in the West, had aroused controversy within the order and suspicions from other religious.

Changing to a new habit, however, was not a simple matter of internal administration. The friars' new dress betokened to contemporaries a change of identity that went beyond the physical, recognizable outward appearance. Critics and observers wondered whether the new habit was meant to signify the adoption by the Carmelites of a new profession, or a change of spiritual direction. Were they seeking, in wearing white, to imitate an existing order, or even to make a fresh statement about their identity and their role within Christian society? The historical texts produced by Carmelites from the last years of the thirteenth century to the early sixteenth, and which form the core of this book, almost without exception seek to explain the nature of the old and new habits, and the change of 1287. It seems worthwhile, therefore, to examine what happened in 1287: why Carmelites at the time thought such a change was necessary and how later Carmelites understood this change.

The timing of the change is surely of moment. The adoption of a new image came only thirteen years after the Second Council of Lyons and its threat of suppression, and only a year after the Carmelites attained formal confirmation of their continued existence from Honorius IV.[1] The threat of suppression was a reminder of the importance of

[1] *Bull. Carm.* i. 524.

historical identity to a religious order. The change of habit was part of the Carmelite attempt to develop a coherent historical identity, of which physical image was one component. But for contemporaries, it was natural to wonder what a new appearance might signify when taken on by an order which had only recently won back its legitimacy from the papacy.

We are fortunate in the survival of the contemporary documents that allow us to understand the administrative mechanism by which the Carmelite habit was changed. The two notarial acts, *Notum sit* and *Invocantes*, drawn up at the general chapter at Montpellier in July 1287, describe the negotiations undertaken between the order and the papal curia during previous months, the process by which the change was effected, and the habits themselves.[2]

Technically, it is incorrect to speak of a change of 'habit'. Mendicant dress was based on the monastic habit, with modifications peculiar to each order. Thirteenth-century monastic clothing consisted typically of a tunic, over which was worn a *scapular* or *pelliceum*, to which was attached a hood, and a cloak to be worn when needed.[3] The second notarial act of the general chapter, *Invocantes*, records in detail the decision made in chapter on 23 July 1287 as regards the change of appearance. Before the clothing itself is described, is the following sentence: 'we ordain that it is not our intention to change the regular habit, but rather the outer clothing, commonly called the *mantellus*, which is not itself necessary to the order'.[4] It is only the cloak, or *mantellus*, which is not an integral part of the habit, that is being changed.

Paradoxically, the detail of the notarial acts is such as almost to confuse the issue. Three different words are used for the outer garment: *chlamys*, *mantellus*, and *cappa*. That these are meant to specify the same type of garment is clear from the way in which they appear in the text.

[2] The texts are edited by Staring, *MCH*, 54–70.

[3] The word 'habit' is here used in its loose contemporary sense referring to the whole ensemble of monastic or mendicant clothing. The nature of the habit had been closely defined by the early legislators of monasticism: e.g. in the West by John Cassian and Benedict. John Cassian, *De institutis monachorum*, I. i. 3, ed. J-C. Guy, SC 109 (Paris, 1965), 36, derives his model from Elijah, who was recognized as a man of God because of his appearance. Cassian's 'habit' consisted of a *cuculla* (hood), a linen tunic that left the arms bare and tied around the middle with a girdle, a *palliolum* (short mantle), and *melota* (the goat-skin cloak of Elijah): ibid. I. ii–ix. 38–50. Benedict also prescribed a *cuculla*, but to him this meant a cloak with a hood attached, and for manual work a *scapular* over the top: *La Règle de Saint-Benoit*, 5–6, ed. A. de Vogue and J. Neufville, 2 vols., SC 35 (Paris, 1972), ii. 618.

[4] Staring, *MCH* 66.

We order and prescribe . . . that the varied *chlamydes* or *mantelli* which we have been used to wear until now should be excluded from our persons and our order, and we abandon them from this moment. We change them, not as the habit but as the external sign [of the order], into white *cappae*, which replace the *chlamydes*. In doing so we are neither diminishing nor increasing the status of our order.[5]

The *cappa* was not merely a cloak of a different colour from the *chlamys*, but evidently had a different philological connotation. The new white cloak is always referred to as *cappa alba* rather than *mantellus* or *chlamys*, suggesting that the latter generally meant a coloured or in some other way extravagant garment. The new Carmelite dress was, from July 1287, to consist of a dark tunic, over which was worn a white *cappa* with a hood. The colour of the tunic is not specified, but it was to be of a different colour from the *cappa*, so that the two could easily be distinguished.[6]

The text of the act makes it clear that the old *chlamys* or *pallium barratum*[7] consisted of vertical grey stripes. The most authoritative description is a note in a sixteenth-century manuscript. Under an entry for Henry de Hanna, prior-provincial of England in 1287, is found a passage from the constitutions promulgated at the general chapter of 1281 in London: 'A professed friar shall have a cloak [*carpeta*], which is the mark of our order; not sewn together of separate pieces, but woven in one, and it shall have only seven stripes, so that we should be uniform [in appearance].'[8]

---

[5] Ibid. 67.

[6] Ibid. The new habit can be seen depicted in a number of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century representations: e.g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 180, fo. 1 (Richard Fitzralph's *De pauperie Salvatoris*), the fifteenth-century panels of St Albert Siculus in the Chiesa dei Carmine in Palermo, or the cycle of Carmelite saints in the Santuario del Carmine in S. Felice del Benaco, Brescia, dating to 1488. There is no contemporary representation of the old costume. The 'Carmelite' altar-piece made by Pietro Lorenzetti for the Carmelites of Siena *c.*1329 gives the closest impression, but here the cloak has horizontal bands rather than vertical stripes. John of Hildesheim, writing in the 1370s, had known an elderly Carmelite who remembered seeing the old *pallium barratum*, so it was surely not inconceivable for the Sienese Carmelites to have provided a memory of it forty years after the change.

[7] The term *pallium barratum* is not used in the text of the notarial act, but was in regular use in later Carmelite sources and in contemporary reports of the change of dress. The Carmelites were sometimes even known as *fratres barrati* on account of the striped cloak.

[8] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fo. 159ʳ. This passage does not appear in the only published edition of the 1281 constitutions: Saggi (ed.), 'Constitutiones capituli Londinensis'. The passage occurs in a treatise by John Bale, whose activities as unofficial historian of the English Carmelites in the 1520s to 1530s must have given him access to accounts of the general and provincial chapters since lost. His summary of general chapters is

This passage contains a strong hint as to the reason for the change to the *cappa alba* six years later: the need for uniformity of appearance. In the 1370s Philip Ribot, prior-provincial of Catalonia, was to explain the change in somewhat different terms: 'In different parts of Europe . . . the *pallium barratum* was seen by Christians as not properly religious, and because of its different colours it was held in derision by many people.'[9] The full proceedings of the 1287 general chapter offer a variety of reasons for the change, in which both the need for uniformity and the external perceptions of the Carmelites' appearance find a place. The first notarial act, *Notum sit*, of 22 July, is an instrument confirming the authority of the prior-general to effect the desired change and relating the prehistory of the decision to change. The decree of the 1287 chapter was the final act of a movement for change from within the order that had been brewing for a few years, and that has wider significance than simply a change in dress. As Adrian Staring has pointed out, Pope Martin IV had first received a petition for such a change after the general chapter at Pavia in 1284.[10] In February 1286 the order's cardinal protector, Gervasio Giancoleto, wrote to the prior-general to relay the pope's permission for the order to override previous statutes and change the habit. Such a change could only be effected at a general chapter, however, so the order had to wait until its next scheduled chapter, which was due in July 1287.[11] Gervasio gives as the reason for the desired change the variety of colours in the Carmelites' outer garment:

We have explained to our holy father Pope Honorius IV, from your petition, that, on account of the variety of colours in the cloaks (*chlamydibus seu mantellis*) which you wear, considerable detriment and scandal is caused for you and your order, because such varied cloths cannot easily be found; and this variety in the religious habit of very many [friars] scandalises the minds of those who see them with a less than pious intention.[12]

It seems clear that the variety referred to was of two kinds. The first was the nature of the habit itself, which demanded cloth of different

---

contained in London, BL MS 1819, fos. 59^r–61^r. On Bale's role in the development of Carmelite historical tradition, see below, Ch. 7.

9 Philip Ribot, *De institutione et peculiaribus gestis religiosorum Carmelitarum*, vii. 7, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 69.

10 Staring (ed.), *MCH* 50.

11 Ibid. 57–8, for correspondence between Gervasio and the Carmelites touching the change in habit, and 59–60 for the technical details of how this change was to be effected.

12 Ibid. 57.

colours. Because these cloths could not always easily be found, how-ever, Carmelites were wearing cloaks of widely differing appearance, depending on what colours were available when the cloak was made. Even in a single priory it must sometimes have been impossible to pro-duce an identical cloak for every friar. The evidence of Bodley MS Selden supra 41 confirms that it was unacceptable simply to sew to-gether strips of coloured cloth to produce a single habit, so the colours in any given *carpeta* may have depended on the availability of dyed cloth of the same kind. The normal way to produce such a cloak would simply have been to weave different grades of wool together in the same garment. Depending on its treatment, undyed wool might be white, brown, or grey, and a dye could be added for black.[13] Such a method would be neither as difficult nor as expensive as the notarial act suggests, and it seems likely that this reason would not have been sufficient, on its own, to have caused the change.

There were two causes of dissatisfaction with the striped *chlamys*; or, if we address Ribot's concern, two reasons why people were mocking the Carmelites for their appearance. First, the idea of a cloak of striped colours itself seems to have been inappropriate. This is confirmed by *Invocantes*, in which the delegates to the general chapter express the fear that the *chlamys* is too luxurious. 'We never see, and we never remem-ber having seen, those who are from approved orders of poverty wear-ing a *chlamys*.'[14] Since the Carmelite Order was founded in poverty and confirmed as an order without property, it was obviously inappropriate for the friars to wear a habit that might arouse accusations of wealth. It is well known, the text continues, that false religious, who make a pre-tence of being good, are accustomed to wear *mantellos* or *chlamydes*, but the mark of a true religious is to be genuinely poor.[15]

The parti-coloured habit, moreover, lacked patristic sanction. 'Let us also consider', the general chapter urged, 'what the great Basil said: "Nobody should wear a varied garment sewn with silk, or one

[13]   There is, of course, no proof that the Carmelites did not resort to the forbidden method of sewing strips together, but the simpler method may be considered more likely. I am in-debted to Frances Edwards of the Textiles Department of the Whitworth Art Gallery in Manchester for information on standard techniques in the production of cloths in this period. This discussion is based upon communication with Dr Edwards.

[14]   Staring (ed.), *MCH* 67. The wearing of a striped cloak was not in itself necessarily strange in western Europe in the thirteenth century. The social meaning of stripes and other variegated clothing has recently been examined by F. S. J. Lachaud, 'Furs, Textiles and Liv-eries: A Study of the Material Culture of the Court of Edward I (1272–1307)' (unpub. D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1992), 23–7, 220–39.

[15]   Staring (ed.), *MCH* 67–8.

decorated with different colours at the top." "[16] The importance of being seen to follow a rule of some antiquity extended to physical appearance. The Carmelites realized the benefits of copying the appearance of the monks of the early Church, and of following the prescription of a rule older even than that of St Benedict. The Carmelite abandonment of the striped *chlamys* thus appears to have had a similar force to the idealism of twelfth-century reformers such as the Cistercians in returning to the 'primitive monasticism' of the early Church. In embracing Basil, they were identifying themselves with a venerable tradition, and hoping to avoid the charge of innovating.[17]

If austerity was one driving force behind the dissatisfaction with stripes, another was the pragmatic problem of producing cloths of the right colours. Cardinal Gervasio's representations to the papacy suggest that what really worried the Carmelites was not just the expense and the difficulty of obtaining the necessary cloths (though this is mentioned again in *Invocantes*[18]), but the implication of having friars of the same order wearing habits that did not match. Gervasio's letter speaks of this as causing scandal to observers, and *Invocantes* develops this point. The ridicule in which the order is held by laity and religious alike because of the variety of habits is mentioned again, and a specific instance is given: young recruits to the order are being hindered in their studies (and perhaps discouraged from entering the order) because of this scorn.[19] A single order, which was one body, ought to have a single habit, or recognizable external uniform, lest the unity of the order be compromised. This was an argument with a practical as well as a symbolic force. Where there were friars from so many orders, each with their own habit, Carmelites might be mistaken for members of other orders. As will be seen later, this was a problem encountered by Franciscans in the thirteenth century. But one does not have to look far to see why the Carmelites were so concerned to present the appearance of a united order. The question of the unity of the order, at a time when the threat of suppression by the Second Council of Lyons (1274)

---

[16] Staring (ed.), *MCH* 65. At the Council of Reims (1122), Eugenius III prohibited the 'dishonourable variety of colours' for all clergy and bishops, as noted by Adam of Dryburgh, *De ordine et habitu canonicorum Praemonstratensium*, iii. 3, PL 198, col. 463.

[17] On the significance perceived by medieval Carmelites of Basil as a monastic legislator, see below, 114.

[18] Staring (ed.) *MCH* 64: 'Et panni tales etiam cum difficultate, cum sit eorum raritas et ordientium seu texentium paucitas, reperiuntur; quare tam in quantitate pretii quam in aliis plura dispendia patiuntur.'

[19] Ibid. 63.

was still a vivid memory, was obviously of the first importance, and the decision to change the habit in order to present this unity the better, shows how firmly appearance and identity were linked.

The concern for uniformity in habits enables us to see the relationship between the regulation of friars' clothing and the degree of central control exercised within the order. The reference in the 1287 acts to the habit, regretting the 'many scandals that have arisen from diversity within the Order', must be read with a wider application than simply clothing. The threat of suppression imposed in 1274, which had prohibited the further expansion of the order, was not lifted until 1286.[20] It was at about the same time as the 1274 decree against the proliferation of 'new' orders that the former prior-general of the Carmelites, Nicholas Gallicus (1265–70), cast further doubt on the viability and direction of the order through his treatise *Ignea Sagitta*.[21] It seems plausible that Nicholas spoke for many of the older generation of Carmelites, though evidence of a dissident group analagous, for example, to the Spiritual Franciscans, is lacking. The Carmelites may, nevertheless, have undergone an internal crisis no less disruptive than the Franciscans' (albeit on a smaller scale) in the period *c.*1270–87, of which the appeal for unity in the 1287 general chapter is the culminating act, and the change of habit the outward manifestation. By changing to the simple white *cappa*, the prior-general and his advisors were making a virtue of necessity, and solving a practical problem with considerable skill. If the change could be represented not as an innovation but as a reform that emphasized the order's roots in primitive monasticism, the criticisms of malcontents such as Nicholas Gallicus would have been at least partially met.

The Carmelites may have been quite sure of their own motives and reasons for changing their appearance, but not all outside observers were persuaded. The annalist of the Augustinian priory of Osney, outside Oxford, reported that 'the friars of Mt Carmel, driven by a self-willed vanity, changed their original habit from the multi-coloured, quadripartite *pallia* which they had worn since the founding of the order, discarding them with more imprudence than was seemly, and in their place they put on white *cappa*'.[22]

---

[20] *Registres d'Honorius IV*, ed. M. Prou, BEFAR 2nd ser. (Paris, 1888), no. 305; *Bull. Carm.* i. 524.
[21] Nicholas Gallicus 'Nicolae Gallicae prioris generalis'. For full discussion, see below, Ch. 3.
[22] *Annales Monastici*, iv. 312. The annalist's hostility to the order may have stemmed from misunderstandings between the Augustinians of Osney and the Oxford Carmelites, whose

The problems inherent in the Carmelites' strategy of 1287 were that any change seemed implicitly to criticize the image of the order until that point. Change could be seen as an admission of weakness and lack of integrity: in this case both the order's formal integrity as a constitutional entity and its historical integrity. There is some indication that the Carmelite change of habit was associated with a change of name. Thus only a few months after the general chapter of 1287, the bishops of Augsburg and Cologne wrote to their clergy, exhorting them to ensure that the Carmelites were called 'fratres beate Marie seu fratres domine nostre'.[23] In an important essay establishing the identity of the Pied Friars as a separate order, Richard Emery saw the new Carmelite habit as 'part of a campaign to rehabilitate the order once it had received final approbation' after the threat of 1274.[24] The Carmelites had been officially known as 'fratres beate Marie de Monte Carmelo' at least as early as 1248, when Innocent IV addressed them as such in a reissue of the bull *Paganorum incursus*.[25] But, as Emery remarks, they were generally called 'fratres barrati', 'fratres stripatrici', or some other such epithet derived from the visual image they presented.[26] Once the striped mantle had been abandoned, such nomenclature was obviously inappropriate, and the opportunity was taken to disseminate the official name preferred by the order. This may have led, in many instances, to the confused notion that a new order had been created, with a new name and a new appearance, from the rump of an old—and possibly discredited—one.[27]

This sense of confusion goes far to explain the outrage expressed by the Osney annalist at the 'self-willed vanity' and 'imprudence' of the

priories abutted one another until 1318: *Cartulary of Osney Abbey*, ed. H. E. Salter, 6 vols., Oxford Historical Society (Oxford, 1929–36), ii. 344–50. Other monastic chroniclers—e.g. Bartholomew Cotton, *Historia Anglicana* ed. H. R. Luard, RS (London, 1859), 167, and William Rishanger, *Chronica et Annales*, ed. H. T. Riley, RS (London, 1865), 97—simply record the change of habit without further comment. Ranulf Higden, relying of course on earlier material (and mistaking the date for 1279), describes the old habit as *stragulata*, *radiata*, and *birrata*: *Polychronicon*, ed. J. R. Lumby, RS 7 (London, 1882), 264. Rishanger and Higden both attributed the change to a papal initiative, whereas in fact the original impetus came from the Carmelites themselves.

[23] *Codex Diplomaticus Moenofrancofurtanus: Urkundenbuch der Reichstadt Frankfurt, I: 794–1314*, ed. J. F. Boehmer (Frankfurt, 1901), no. 536, p. 258; H. H. Koch, *Die Karmelitenklöster der Niederdeutschen Provinz* (Friburg, 1889), 172.

[24] Emery, 'Friars of the Blessed Mary', 236.   [25] *Bull. Carm.* i. 8.

[26] Emery, 'Friars of the Blessed Mary', 236 n. 69.

[27] A letter of Archbishop Frederick of Salzburg to his diocese in January 1275, in which he denies rumours that the Augustinian Hermits had been suppressed by the council, suggests that the situation after the Second Council of Lyons was not always clear: *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, ep. 81, pp. 85–6.

Carmelites in changing their appearance. A French monastic chronicle, however, added another detail that suggests a further layer of motivation. The chronicler of Corbie abbey noted for the year 1286:

The friars of the Carmelite order put aside their habit, which seemed to be a threat to the unity of the religious; that is, a *cappa* encircled with large stripes of grey and white. This habit they claimed to have been that of Elijah the prophet . . . Pope Honorius IV, on account of his probity, ordered them to abandon this habit, and instead to wear white *cappas* over grey tunics, with scapulars.[28]

The Corbie chronicler's reference to the *pallium barratum* as the habit worn by Elijah moves the problem of the habit into the new territory of Carmelite claims to Old Testament antiquity. The variegated cloak, so unsatisfactory as a mendicant habit, was given added authority by the assertion of its venerability. The association with Elijah gave meaning to a garment that was otherwise incomprehensible.

The scriptural accounts of Elijah show him wearing a cloak fashioned from animal skins, of the type later copied by John the Baptist.[29] How this ragged affair was transformed into the striped *carpeta* of the Carmelites in the thirteenth century remains a matter of speculation. The notarial acts of the 1287 general chapter, perhaps understandably, do not dwell on the history of the garment. We have to rely on later Carmelite interpretations, which themselves have a somewhat speculative flavour. Philip Ribot, writing about a century after the adoption of the white *cappa*, understood the importance of an order claiming such antiquity being able to furnish proof of having conformed to 'correct' monastic clothing, as specified by John Cassian. As Cassian knew, Elijah had been recognized as a man of God by King Ahaziah because of his distinctively shabby clothing.[30]

Whatever Elijah's cloak looked like while he wore it, it had been passed on to his appointed successor, Elisha, when he ascended into heaven on the fiery chariot.[31] The Carmelites' transformation from

[28] Cited in C. Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, ed. L. Favre (Paris, 1883), i, pt. 2, under the entry for *barratus*. Du Cange does not give a precise reference. Like Rishanger and Ranulf Higden, he credits the pope with ordering the Carmelites to change their habit.

[29] 2 (4) Kgs. 1: 8: 'vir pilosus, et zona pellicea accinctus renibus'.

[30] Ribot, *De institutione*, vii. 2, quoting Cassian, *De institutis monachorum*, iii. 1: 'Itaque monachorum, ut militem Christi, in procinctu semper belli positum, accinctis lumbis jugiter oportet incedere. Hoc enim habitu etiam illos ambulasse, qui in veteri testamento professionis hujus fundavere primordia, Eliam scilicet et Elisaeum, divinarum scripturam auctoritate monstratur.'

[31] 2 (4) Kgs. 2: 11–14. For discussion of thirteenth-century representations of Elijah's cloak

stripes—representing animal skins—to white could thus be seen as a re-enactment of Elijah's own passage from the earthly to the heavenly. Although this is not claimed explicitly by any Carmelite writer, it is implicit in explanations of the adoption of white in 1287.

According to the Corbie chronicler, the Carmelites in 1286–7 believed that their traditional habit had been worn by Elijah, and because this is the earliest evidence for the tradition of the habit, it must be taken seriously. The chronicler could only have known such a detail from the Carmelites themselves, although the only surviving historical text that can be dated before 1287, the *rubrica prima*, which makes allusion to Elijah, does not mention the habit.[32] Other than the notarial acts themselves, there is no extant discussion of the habit before the 1320s. Carmelite apologists of the fourteenth century developed the notion that the change of habit, far from being innovatory, was a return to the most ancient traditions of the order. A sophisticated rationale for the change of habit and for the history of the habit evolved, in which both the striped *chlamys* and the new white *cappa* were viewed in symbolic as well as strictly historical terms.

The first Carmelite apologist to address the question, John Baconthorpe (d. 1348), began with the nature of the cloak itself as a garment.[33] What the notarial acts call *chlamys* or *mantellus*, however, Baconthorpe, in common with the monastic commentators reporting the change in 1287, and following the terminology of Scripture, calls a *pallium*. This type of garment, he believed, had been inherited by the first Carmelites from Elijah himself.[34] But the nature, rather than simply the form, of the *pallium* was based rather on local custom. 'For the fashion of the religious who lived in the Holy Land was to wear a

and its symbolism, see F. Garnier, 'De la tunique d'Adam au manteau d'Elie', in *Le Vêtement: Histoire, archéologie et symbolique vestimentaires au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1989), 287–306.

[32] On the *rubrica prima*, see Staring, *MCH* 33–43, and below, pp. 106–11. The *rubrica prima* comprises the opening chapter of the 1281 constitutions, in which a separate chapter on the habit is included: Saggi, 'Constitutiones capituli Londonensis', 224.

[33] Staring (ed.), *MCH* 176–7, gives as the *terminus post quem* for his historical work 1317. The *Compendium historiarum et iurium*, in which the habit is discussed, had been completed by 1330, and was known to others by 1334.

[34] Baconthorpe, *Compendium*, vi, *MCH* 208–9: 'Legitur enim de Elia, quod ipse portavit pallium, ut habetur 4 Regum, c.2.' Baconthorpe took the word *pallium* from the Vulgate description of Elijah's cloak. The Carmelites probably referred to their cloak as a *pallium* rather than a *chlamys* or *mantellus* in order to emphasize the biblical associations, alluding specifically to the cloak of Elijah. In the notarial acts, however, which show the general-chapter trying to discredit the cloak and to show how harmful it had become to the image of the order, the more pejorative (from a monastic perspective) and non-scriptural terms *chlamys* or *mantellus* were used.

distinctive sign on their *pallium*, as is clear from the Hospitallers, Templars and Bethlehemites. And because of this the Carmelites initially wore a *pallium* with grey stripes.'[35] Thus Baconthorpe does not push back the historical origin of the stripes very far—only as far as the twelfth century. His comparison of the Carmelites with other indigenous orders of the Holy Land, however, is disingenuous. The Templars and Hospitallers wore crosses sewn on to their cloaks, and the Bethlehemites a star, whereas the Carmelites' stripes have no such obvious Christian symbolism, and are not explained by such a comparison.

Baconthorpe realized that the generic form of the garment—the *pallium*—was hallowed by scriptural history.[36] But the colour, or specific nature, was not so determined, and Baconthorpe is content to let that be a matter of natural historical development requiring no particular explanation. He was more interested in what he considered a prophetic reference to the future adoption of white by the Carmelite order: 'That, in the passage of time, the Carmelites would receive from the apostolic see the white *cappa*, was foretold before the birth of Elijah. For we read in the *Histories*, in 4 Kings 2, that before Elijah's birth, Sabacha, his father, saw in a dream men dressed in white saluting him.'[37]

The story of Sabacha, or Sobac, was a piece of early Christian apocrypha that first appeared, in Greek, in versions by pseudo-Epiphanius and pseudo-Dorotheus. According to the story, while Elijah was still in his mother's womb, his father Sobac dreamt that men dressed in white were greeting the new-born baby. The white vestments were on fire, and with this fire they nourished him. Sobac went to Jerusalem to ask for an explanation of the dream, and was told that his son would be a light for his people, who would judge Israel with fire and a sword.[38] The white-robed figures were angels who prefigured the future followers of Elijah, who would one day wear white. A Latin version was repeated by pseudo-Isidore of Seville, and it was presumably this version that circulated sufficiently widely in medieval Europe for Peter Comestor to include it in his *Historia Scholastica*.[39]

The prophecy was, if anything, more telling than a straightforward biblical statement of the colour of Elijah's cloak would have been. In this way the Carmelites could not only produce justification of their

---

[35] Ibid. 208.   [36] Ibid. 208–9.   [37] Ibid. 209.

[38] *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae*, ed. T. Schermann (Leipzig, 1907), 53, 66–7, 93, with a further anonymous recension.

[39] Pseudo-Isidore, *De ortu et obitu Patrum*, PL 83, col. 141; Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica: Liber IV Regum*, PL 198, col. 1387.

adoption of white, but also use the whole issue of the change of habit to emphasize the special role of the order in sacred history. The Carmelites, having been foretold by divine revelation to Elijah's father, were not to be judged as a merely human agency. Thus a situation that had seemed in 1287 to be potentially a source of weakness was transformed into a powerful statement of the order's antiquity and mission. Change, in the case of the Carmelites, was not a sign of weakness, but the fulfilment of a divine prophecy.

Baconthorpe was the first writer to adopt the Sobac story on behalf of the Carmelites. This does not mean that it had not enjoyed some circulation before the 1320s; Baconthorpe may have been merely recording what had been common currency among Carmelites for years. Nevertheless, if the tradition of the prophecy had been developed as early as 1287, one would expect to see some trace of it in the notarial acts—especially since the association of the Carmelites with Elijah had already become part of the order's constitutions.[40] But whoever first appropriated the story, Sobac's dream soon became part of the Carmelite tradition. Baconthorpe's contemporary, Jean de Cheminot, began his *Speculum fratrum ordinis beatae Mariae de Monte Carmelo* (1337) with Elijah, and repeated the prophecy of the men clothed in white.[41]

Visual testimony regarding the extent to which the Carmelites adopted the Sobac tradition as part of the prehistory of the order is provided by Pietro Lorenzetti's 'Carmelite' altar-piece for the Carmelite church in Siena, which was completed *c.*1329. The Lorenzetti altarpiece was a polyptych consisting of a central panel depicting the Madonna and Child with St Nicholas and Elijah, flanked on either side by panels with SS Agnes, John the Baptist, Catherine, and Elisha. Beneath this, the predella contained a long panel showing the reception of the rule by a group of hermits wearing the *pallium barratum* from St Albert of Vercelli, patriarch of Jerusalem. The predella is flanked on the left side by Sobac's dream and a scene showing the spring of Elijah, and on the right by the pope's confirmation of the rule and the granting of the new habit.[42] In the Sobac panel, the sleeping Sobac, visited by an angel, sees draped above him a white cloak. The depiction is thus

[40] As the *rubrica prima* to the constitutions: Staring, *MCH* 33–43.

[41] Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, *MCH* 117.

[42] For a full description and discussion of the altar-piece, see Joanna Cannon, 'Pietro Lorenzetti and the History of the Carmelite Order', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 50 (1987), 18–28; this is based on scholarship since superseded by Staring's *MCH*: See also Henk van Os, *Sienese Altarpieces 1215–1460*, i: *Form, Content, Function 1215–1344* (Groningen, 1984), 37–8, 92–7; and Gilbert, 'Some Special Images'. The side panels of Elisha and John

not even a literal rendering of the Sobac story in the *Historia Scholastica*, but the extracted essence of it: the heavenly promise of the white *cappa* to the order that is being foretold.

The whole composition is redolent of the Carmelite perception of its foundation and antiquity. Joanna Cannon has drawn attention to the widespread use of polyptychs by mendicants as media for disseminating such perceptions.[43] The placement of Sobac's dream symmetrically opposite the granting of the new habit gives divine confirmation to the papal action of 1287, and removes any notion of the white *cappa* as innovatory. The Dominicans had the same idea in mind when they commissioned the late thirteenth-century altar-piece now in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples. One panel of this polyptych depicts the dream of Dominic, in which the Blessed Virgin bestowed the new habit to be adopted by the order on the dying friar Reginald. A related idea figures in the mid-fourteenth-century fresco cycle in the Augustinian Hermits' church (the 'Eremitani') in Padua, where St Augustine is clothed in the black cowl of a monk to mark his conversion by Simplicianus.[44]

The Carmelite use of Sobac may have been a response to the Dominican tradition of Dominic's dream. Some Dominicans, however, were ill disposed to allowing the Carmelites to interpret Sobac's dream in a way so favourable to them. The Oxford Dominican Robert Holcot, a contemporary of Baconthorpe who followed him in the schools, criticized the Carmelite use of Sobac in his commentary on the *Sentences* (1332–3): 'They cannot bring their argument to a conclusion, because it does not follow: he [Sobac] saw white men, or men dressed in white; therefore they were Carmelites. It might equally follow that millers or shepherds are Carmelites.'[45]

the Baptist are now in the Princeton University Art Gallery. None of the above descriptions, surprisingly, points out that Lorenzetti's representation of the *pallium barratum* is inaccurate, since it renders the stripes as horizontal rather than vertical.

[43] Cannon, 'Pietro Lorenzetti', 22–3; *idem*, 'Simone Martini, the Dominicans and the Early Sienese Polyptych', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 45 (1982), 69–93; also *idem*, 'The Creation, Meaning and Audience of the Early Sienese Polyptychs: Evidence from the Friars', in E. Borsook and F. Suberpi Gioffredi (eds.), *Italian Altarpieces 1250–1350: Function and Design* (Oxford, 1994), 41–62; S. Gieben, 'L'iconografia dei Penitenti e Nicolo IV', in R. Pazzelli and L. Temperini (eds.), *La Supra Montem di Nicolo IV (1289): genesi e diffusione di una regola* (Rome, 1988), 289–304; also C. Gardner-von Teuffel, 'Masaccio and the Pisa Altarpiece: A New Approach', *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museum*, 19 (1977), 23–68.

[44] Louise Bourdua, '*De origine et progressu ordinis fratrum Heremitarum*: Guariento and the Eremitani in Padua', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 66, new ser. 53 (1998), 186.

[45] Cited by Smalley, *English Friars*, 330–1, from Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fos. 50ᵛ–51. On Holcot, Smalley, 'Robert Holcot OP', *AFP* 26 (1956), 9.

This rationalist critique was part of a wider attempt by Holcot to undermine the basis of Carmelite claims to have been founded by Elijah. His arguments dealt with the Sobac legend only because the Carmelites themselves had made it part of the agenda. The external appearance of the Carmelites was now an emblem of their historical integrity, and thus of their integrity as an order. An attack on the Carmelite habit became, in the fourteenth century, an assault on the Carmelite account of its own past.[46]

The association of the habit with the putative history of the order gave critics an opportunity to question the events of 1287. In 1374 the Cambridge Dominican John Stokes debated the question of Carmelite origins with a Carmelite, John Hornby.[47] The physical identity of the Carmelites is the corner-stone of Hornby's defence of the order's antiquity against the Dominican's scepticism. Stokes appears to have argued that the change of habit in 1287 amounted to a more profound change of identity, and even suggested that the post-1287 Carmelites were a different order. Hornby, in response, rehearsed the general chapter's own arguments of 1287, that the *pallium barratum* was not in itself a habit, just as the white *cappa* did not constitute the habit, but only the 'signum extrinsecum ab aliis religiosis distinctum'.[48] There is perhaps a reminder here of Baconthorpe's argument that the *pallium barratum* was the Carmelite version of the Templars' or Hospitallers' distinctive badges of identity. Hornby argues that the *scapular*, not the *cappa*, is the real habit: one can celebrate Mass without the *cappa* and go anywhere not wearing it, without incurring any penalty or ceasing to be a Carmelite.[49] Not so the scapular. He continues: 'I concede freely

[46]   See below, Ch. 5, for Carmelite/Dominican polemic on the question of origins in the fourteenth century.

[47]   Hornby's defence, but not Stokes's arguments, survives in a fifteenth-century copy in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fos. 176ʳ–211ʳ. The debate is summarized and discussed at length by J. P. H. Clark, 'A Defense of the Carmelite Order by John Hornby, O. Carm., AD 1374', *Carmelus*, 32 (1985), 73–106. A report of the debate is also found in Cambridge, University Library MS Ff 6.11, fos. 24ᵛ–28ʳ. See also Patrick Zutshi and Robert Ombres, 'The Dominicans in Cambridge 1238–1538', *AFP* 60 (1990), 342 and n. 124.

[48]   Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 87 and n. 42.

[49]   Ibid. 87. The canon *Ut periculosa religiosis (Sexti Decr.* 3, tit. 24, cap. 2, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. E. Friedberg, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1881), ii, cols. 1065–6), decreed excommunication for any religious attending the schools without his habit. Hornby's reference to the importance of the scapular pre-dates the development of the tradition of the so-called scapular promise. The *Catalogus sanctorum* edited by Xiberta, *De visione*, 283, of which the earliest manuscript dates from the late fourteenth century, tells the story of how the Blessed Virgin appeared to the putative prior-general Simon Stock, holding out to him the scapular of the order with the promise that all who wore it would enjoy salvation. Christian Ceroke, 'Credibility of the Scapular Promise', 98, argues that Xiberta's preferred date of the first half of the fourteenth century

that we did once used to wear the *pallium barratum* to show that we were the true successors and sons of the prophets, who used to wear *pallia*. But that *pallium* was later changed into a white *cappa*, because the decretals expressly forbid and prohibit clerics from wearing a habit of different colours.'[50]

Hornby, like Baconthorpe, identifies the form of the *pallium* with the type of garment worn by Elijah and described in the Vulgate as a *pallium*. The decretal forbidding multi-coloured habits is not mentioned in the 1287 notarial acts, but Hornby remains close to the spirit of the general chapter's arguments here. He does not, however, explain why the *pallium barratum* had been striped, or whether the stripes were an attempt to imitate Elijah's *pallium*.

Not long before the Cambridge debate, the German Carmelite John of Hildesheim wrote a *Dialogus inter directorem et detractorem de ordine Carmelitarum* (*c*.1370–4) in which the detractor was almost certainly a Dominican.[51] The detractor asks, 'What kind of habit did your predecessors wear?', to which the director responds by recounting briefly the Sobac legend to explain the adoption of white in place of the *pallium barratum*.[52] He disavows any direct association, however, between the *pallium barratum* and Elijah's clothing. The habit worn by Elijah was

---

for the composition of the story is too early, and suggests that the original tradition 'cannot be restricted to the fourteenth century', and may indeed be nearly contemporary with Simon himself. The association of what is in fact a fairly generic theme (Mary bestowing a special badge of identity upon a religious order) with Simon Stock suggests that the tradition emerged in order to claim the special protection of the Blessed Virgin for the Carmelites. Copsey, 'Simon Stock', demonstrates that the tradition did not emerge until *c*.1400. As Ceroke, 'Credibility of the Scapular Promise', 103, points out, the constitutions of 1294, 1324, and 1357 use the term *scapular* loosely, and apparently interchangeably with 'habit'; the tradition may, therefore, have applied to the (new) Carmelite dress in general, rather than to the scapular in particular. Aside from Hornby, the first author to refer explicitly to the scapular in the context of the change of habit in 1287 was Thomas Bradley, writing *c*.1440: Xiberta, *De visione*, 108. Staring (ed.), *MCH* 332–3, supported a fourteenth-century date for the composition of the legend when he argued that the author of the *Catalogus sanctorum* (which he calls *Legendae abbreviatae*) was in fact John of Hildesheim, but this identification is challenged by Copsey, 'Simon Stock', 661, who argues that the legend was composed after John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus*. It would certainly be strange if John knew the scapular tradition that he would not have mentioned it in his *Dialogus*. In the fifteenth century, Arnold Bostius developed the 'protective patronage' into the practice of 'scapular devotion' to the Blessed Virgin by Carmelites: Xiberta, *De visione*, 157; E. R. Carroll, *The Marian Theology of Arnold Bostius, O.Carm.* (Rome, 1962), 32.

[50] Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 87, from Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fo. 191$^{r–v}$. The decree Horby cites is Gregory IX's *De vita et honestate clericorum: Decr. Greg. IX* 2, tit. 1, cap. 11, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ii, cols. 451–2.

[51] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*. For identification of the *detractor* as a Dominican, see below, 168 n. 61.   [52] Staring (ed.), *MCH* 352.

'vestis pilosa, grisea, non colorata per artem', and was known more-over as a *melota*, rather than a *pallium*. John the Baptist would later wear the same.[53] The detractor then asks why, if the Carmelites are followers of Elijah, they do not wear such a *melota*? The origin of the *pallium barratum* is then explained: Elijah's clothing was uncoloured, but when he bestowed it on Elisha as a mark of his succession, he did so by letting it fall from the fiery chariot as he was taken up to heaven. The uncoloured grey habit, as it passed through the fire, was singed by the flames so that the exposed parts became charred, but the parts protected by the folds remained their pristine grey.[54]

This ingenious explanation was not in fact John's own, but had appeared in the commentary on the constitutions of the order promulgated between 1357 and 1369, written by Jean de Venette, prior-provincial of France.[55] Jean de Venette, like Baconthorpe, explained the form of the *pallium* by reference to what he thought was local custom in the crusader states, citing the example of the Hospitallers, Templars, Bethlehemite Friars, and the order of Lazarus. Perhaps surprisingly for one writing a commentary on the rubric to the constitutions, Jean does not seem to have followed the 1287 general chapter's distinction between a *pallium* and a *chlamys*, but uses them as interchangeable words.[56]

Jean de Venette followed the earlier work of Jean de Cheminot in finding a symbolic, as well as a historical, explanation for the *pallium barratum*.[57] Cheminot had argued that the *pallium barratum* was designed by the prophet's followers (his *fratres*) to celebrate his sanctity. The two colours, white and grey, represented the dual virtues of chastity and penitence, the seven stripes the three theological virtues and the four

[53] Staring (ed.), *MCH* 353–4. The Vulgate, however, calls Elijah's cloak a *pallium*: 2(4) Kings 2: 8.

[54] *MCH* 361. John had earlier (*MCH* 359) digressed in describing the *pallium barratum* by recounting how he had met, in Frankfurt in 1338, a centurion Carmelite, Bartholomew, who had in his youth worn the old habit. The importance John attaches to this episode suggests that by the 1370s memories of what the old habit looked like had grown dim, even within the order.

[55] Jean de Venette, *Qualiter respondendum sit quaerentibus quomodo et quando ordo noster sumpsit exordiam*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 152–75, esp. 161. Staring has established that this is not the same work ascribed to Jean by Hendriks, 'La Succession héréditaire', 56–8, and called *Paragraphi fusius tractantes ordinis originem*. Jean was born in 1307/8 near Compiègne, was prior of the Paris Carmelites in 1339, and lector in 1340. Between 1342 and 1366 he was prior-provincial of France, and he died in 1368. The form of his chronicle, as Staring, *MCH* 149–50, has shown, arose out of the preliminary rubric to each set of constitutions. The *rubrica prima* of 1281 had been repeated with few variations until 1324, but in 1357, at the general chapter of Ferrara, Jean introduced a new rubric with an expanded history of the order.

[56] *MCH* 160.   [57] Ibid.

cardinal virtues.[58] Cheminot introduced a valuable new element into the Carmelite view of the habit by giving the *pallium barratum* a moral and theological interpretation, rather than relying on the weight of tradition alone. John of Hildesheim added a further detail: the seven strips together represented the seven days of Creation, and thus the passage of time in general. Moreover, the variety of colours was a symbol of the many tongues in which the apostles—and probably also, John thought, the early Carmelites—spoke at Pentecost.[59]

Philip Ribot, a contemporary of John writing *c.*1370, preferred a strictly historical to an exegetical explanation for the development of the habit. The original hermits on Mt Carmel, he argues, had worn plain white. When the Arabs conquered Palestine in the seventh century, they were outraged to find the Carmelites wearing a colour reserved, in their laws, for governors of cities or provinces, and forbade them the white cloak. The *pallium barratum* was therefore designed, and worn over the habit.[60] This explanation, though entirely speculative, has an echo of verisimilitude in the Arab prescriptions of certain colours to be worn by their Jewish and Christian subjects.[61] Moreover, by 'occupying' the Byzantine period in this way to explain the history of Carmelite clothing, Ribot is reinforcing in his readers' minds the antiquity of the order. The point of Ribot's explanation is to show that the 'change' of habit was neither a novelty nor a sign of weakness, but a resumption of original Carmelite custom. Ribot is surely correct in locating the origin of the striped cloak in the Near East, where it may possibly have been inspired by a local Islamic or even Jewish usage.[62] The originality of his explanation lies in the idea of the problematic striped cloak as a later addition imposed on the Carmelites by the

[58] Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, vi, *MCH* 135–6.

[59] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xi, *MCH* 363. Ribot, *De institutione*, vii. 5–6, 66–8, had a different explanation for the symbolism of the colours: the four white stripes represented the evangelists, and the three dark ones, sin and its remedies of contrition, confession, and penance. On the Carmelites' role at Pentecost in fourteenth-century Carmelite tradition, see below, 144.

[60] Ribot, *De institutione*, vii. 5–6, 66–8.

[61] Norman Stillman (ed.), *The Jews of Arab Lands* (Philadelphia, 1979), 157. But for a critical discussion of the main source for this prescription, see C. E. Bosworth, 'The "Protected Peoples" (Christians and Jews) in Medieval Egypt and Syria', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 62 (1979), 11–36, esp. 14–18.

[62] Frances Edwards has confirmed (private communication) that although Islamic garments often had striped patterns, this was also common in the West. An alternative hypothesis is that the cloak was based on Joseph's coat of many colours, but no allusion is made to this in any Carmelite source known to me. Joseph's coat is described in Genesis 37: 3 as *tunica polymita*, words which are never used in Carmelite sources.

conquering Arabs. This neatly removes any responsibility from the Carmelites for having adopted such a bizzare and, as it turned out, impractical garment.

It was the white *cappa*, rather than the rejected *pallium barratum*, that provided for fourteenth-century Carmelites a particularly rich field for symbolic exegesis. John of Hildesheim followed his reference to Sobac's dream with a corroborative example of the symbolic virtue of white from classical history. Socrates, the night before taking the draught of hemlock, dreamt that a white cock flew into his lap, then flew off into the heavens, and the philosopher took this as a sign of his innocence and of the heavenly rest he would soon enjoy. Similarly, John points out, white was the colour to be worn by the elect in heaven according to the Apocalypse.[63] White was also the colour worn by the Blessed Virgin at the Annunciation, and of course, as Jerome had pointed out, by Moses and Elijah as well as Jesus at the Transfiguration.[64]

Others had exploited the natural allegorical advantages of white before the Carmelites. The twelfth-century Premonstratensian Adam of Dryburgh, who later became a Carthusian, celebrated the quality of white as a symbol of the glory to be expected in the afterlife.[65] White was the colour universally associated with angels and angelic visitations. The Dominican legendary complied by Gerard de Frachet at the request of the master-general, Humbert of Romans, contains a number of prophecies foretelling the ministry of the order before its foundation or its arrival in a particular region. For example, a townsman of Montpellier saw a vision while on his deathbed of a procession of white-clad men in his garden; after his death his house and garden were acquired by the Dominicans.[66] Although the characteristic and distinctive article of Dominican dress was the black *cappa*, their tunics and hoods were white. The anecdote told by Gerard associates white with the order so as to claim for it the qualities of purity represented by the colour.

[63] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, vi, *MCH* 352, referring to Apuleius, *De dogmate Platonis*, I. i. 50, a story which he may have known from Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, iii. 60. The passage from Apocalypse 3: 4–5 reads: 'Ambulabunt mecum in albis quoniam digni sunt, et non delebo nomina eius de libro vitae'; also 19: 7–8, 7: 13–14.

[64] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, x, *MCH* 359–60.

[65] Adam of Dryburgh, *De ordine*, iv. 2, PL 198, col. 470, citing Apocalypse 6: 11, 7: 9.

[66] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, i. 4. 9, MOPH i: 23. A similar incident was reported in Limoges. In another anecdote, *Vitas fratrum*, i. 6. 16, MOPH i. 51, a Cistercian sees in his prayers a procession of white-clad men marching to the place where the Dominican priory would later be built, accompanied by the Blessed Virgin.

The Carmelites came late to white, and thus could not claim to have been singled out for its qualities in the same way as, for example, the Premonstratensians. Changing to white from another colour or pattern could never be as convincing as having adopted it in the first place. As the mockery of Holcot shows, it could expose them to ridicule no less than the *pallium barratum* had done. White in itself proved nothing. As Adam the Scot had warned, the interior clothing was more important than the exterior. What others saw might be an indication of identity, but in the final analysis the real monk or friar wore the spiritual gifts of Jesus' clothing.[67]

The Carmelites developed their rationale for the change in identity only gradually. There were practical reasons for waiting until 1287 before making such a change. Until 1274 they might have been confused with the Pied Friars, who wore a black scapular and a white cloak over it;[68] and after 1274 they had to wait for official papal reconfirmation of the order's continued existence before such a change would have been possible. The reasons given in the notarial acts recording the mechanism of change tell part of the story, but not the complex layers of motivations and aspirations behind them. It is debatable whether the expense and difficulty of producing the striped cloak was sufficient to require change. Papal decrees had prohibited coloured habits, but the *pallium barratum* was not, technically, a habit. People found the striped cloak derisory, not because stripes were inherently humorous, but because they were considered inappropriate for poor friars. The white cloak was necessary in order to protect the Carmelites' image of poverty. It seems clear, moreover, that the *pallium barratum* was more difficult to regulate than a plain white cloak would have been, and that the lack of uniformity in the appearance of the friars was troubling to the order's authorities. This, above all, touches most deeply on the Carmelites' sensitivities in the last quarter of the thirteenth century. The threat of suppression had been lifted, but the credibility of the order had still to be regained. Doubts prevailed among some older friars about the spiritual practice and image of the order. The powerful and popular Franciscans were being shaken apart by the scandal of disunity; the Carmelites, with a more precarious grip on the affections of the laity and the papacy, could ill afford such problems. Unity, above all, was essential for the preservation of the order, and this could be

---

[67] Adam of Dryburgh, *De ordine*, iii. 8, PL 198, col. 468, citing Rom. 13: 14.

[68] Emery, 'Friars of the Blessed Mary', 235–6. As Emery points out, some historians have fallen into this trap.

reflected in the fresh start promised by a new image. During the course of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the new habit became one of the building blocks of the Carmelite historical tradition, cemented into place by the fortunate association with Elijah. Carmelite scholars worked hard to show how the change of image in 1287 was not, as it must have appeared at the time, and appears today, a desperate political strategy to save the integrity of the order, but rather a confirmation of the antiquity of the order and its special role in the unfolding of sacred history.

THE PROBLEM OF MENDICANT DRESS

The Carmelites were not the only order troubled in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries by the issue of physical appearance and what it signified. The controversy between the Spiritual Franciscans and their conventual brethren over the length of their habit and the dispute between Augustinian canons and hermits over appearance are two obvious examples of how religious identity was jealously guarded. The ordinances repeatedly passed by the English Benedictine chapters over the colour, cut, and style of the monastic habit show the perceived link between appearance and morality.[69] In order to understand more fully the circumstances of the Carmelites' change of appearance, and its perceived meaning in a broader context, we will, in the second part of this chapter, stand aside from the Carmelites to examine the place of the habit in mendicant self-perceptions.

   In monastic tradition, the monk's habit could not simply be adopted; it had to be conferred, or won. The prophet Elisha received the habit of his master, Elijah, the prototype for all monks, as a sign of his succession to the prophetic ministry (4 Kgs. 2: 10–15).[70] The habit was a mark of graduation, like an academic gown, for the monk who had undergone the necessary trials to prove his commitment. A Dominican tradition first developed in the mid-thirteenth century shows the endurance and development of this idea. In its fullest manifest-

[69] The meaning and signification of the habit adopted for the representation of St Augustine became a bone of contention between Canons Regular and Augustinian Hermits in the fifteenth century; see Kaspar Elm, 'Augustinus Eremita—Augustinus Canonicus: A Quattrocento Cause Célèbre', in Verdon and Henderson (eds.), *Christianity and the Renaissance*, 84–107. For Benedictine ordinances, see *Documents Illustrating the Activities of the General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks 1215–1540*, ed. W. A. Pantin, Camden Society Publications, 3rd ser., 47 (1931–7).

[70] *Vita di Antonio, antico versione anonima latina*, vii. 13, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink (Rome, 1974), 24.

ation, in the fourteenth-century chronicle of Galvanus della Flamma (*c.*1340–1), Dominic, while praying for the dying friar Reginald, saw the Blessed Virgin accompanied by SS Cecilia and Catherine; the Virgin takes from Catherine a tunic, hood, and 'cappa', and shows it to Reginald, saying, 'This is the habit of your order.'[71]

The habit, once conferred, was a symbol of the 'otherness' of the monk. The corollary of conferral and acceptance of the religious habit was the rejection of worldly clothes, symbols of wealth and secular ambition. The most celebrated example of this, St Francis's rejection of his father's wealth, status, and mores by publicly stripping off his father's clothes and standing naked in church,[72] was itself an imitation of St Antony, who had set the tone for the monk's abandonment of worldly goods. In a similarly dramatic episode, the English noble William of Monklane, when deciding whether to join the Augustinian Hermits, stood flanked on one side by friars offering the black habit and on the other by his family, enticing him with rich clothing.[73]

The Rule of St Benedict specified that monks were to sleep in their habits. Medieval English attempts to reform the relaxed behaviour of Benedictines by insisting that monks wear not simply their underclothing in bed but their habits and shoes also show the continued importance of the ideal, and its erosion in practice.[74] The effect was to associate the monk ever more closely with the habit of his profession. There was to be no moment when the religious, conscious or unconscious, was not properly dressed for his—or her—vocation. In Idung of Prüfung's *Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian*, the Cistercian tells the Cluniac that it is inadequate to sleep, as the Cluniacs do, only in undershirts; the monk's cowl must to be worn at night to ward off the powers of darkness.[75] The breadth of application of this ideal can be

[71] Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica ordinis Praedicatorum 1170–1333*, xx. ed. B. M. Reichert, MOPH 2 (Rome, 1897), 14, taken from *Legenda Petri Ferrandi*, xxxv, MOPH 16 (Rome, 1935), 234–6.

[72] Thomas de Celano, *Vita Secunda S. Francesci*, xii, in *Analecta Franciscana*, 12 vols. (Quaracchi, 1885–1983), x. 129–260.

[73] Jordan of Saxony (Quedlinburg), *Liber vitasfratrum*, iii. 3, ed. R. Arbesmann and W. Hümpfner (New York, 1943), 362.

[74] *La règle de S. Benoit*, xxii. 5–6, SC 35, ii. 540–2. The 'King's Articles' of 1421: 'Although it is ordered in the rule of the blessed Benedict for all monks that they should sleep clothed, yet many believe it sufficient to sleep in undershirt and leggings; but let it now be made law that they should sleep not only in undershirt but also in their regular habit, wearing leggings and sandals without soles'; *Documents*, 115. The Benedictines complained that neither the rule nor the constitutions nor the customs of their order insisted on wearing the full habit in bed: ibid. 121.

[75] Idung of Prüfung, *Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian*, iii. 48–9, in J. O'Sullivan (ed.),

demonstrated by a thirteenth-century Dominican anecdote in which a friar sees in a vision the Blessed Virgin enter the dormitory of his priory one night and bless all the sleeping friars save one, a recent entrant still so attached to his comfort that he had taken off his girdle and sandals before going to bed.[76]

The twelfth-century Premonstratensian Adam of Dryburgh, comparing the laxity of contemporary black canons unfavourably with the austerity of his own order, argued that the exterior habit was an index of the customs observed by religious.[77] The monk or canon who neglected his tonsure and grew his hair long, or who wore a colour different from that prescribed, was betraying his profession. The implication was that the true monk had a duty to be recognizable as a member of his order to those who did not know him, by his appearance as well as by, or even before, his actions. The corollary, of course, was that a monk who could not be recognized by his exterior appearance was a false monk. If twelfth-century religious were aware of the dangers posed by 'false' monks or hermits who tried to exploit the generosity of the laity,[78] such dangers must have been even more striking in the mendicant culture of the thirteenth century, and particularly during the second quarter, when groups of wandering friars from a number of new orders were a common sight in the towns and countryside of southern France and Italy. It was a natural development for the generic monastic habit of the early medieval period to have become ever more specialized and clearly defined as the types of monastic profession proliferated.

At the same time, the older monastic orders were addressing lapses in their own regulations about appearance. A good example is provided by the reform statutes for the order of Prémontré promulgated by Gregory IX, and repeated by Innocent IV. Norbert, the founder and legislator of the order, had prescribed habits of white wool, or, for or-

Cistercians and Cluniacs, Cistercian Fathers Series, 33 (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1977), 135–6. The Cistercian admits that Benedict had not specified that monks were to sleep in the cowl.

[76] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, i. 5–6, MOPH i. 43–4, repeated by Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica*, xxix. 29, p. 21.

[77] Adam of Dryburgh, *De ordine*, iii. 3, PL 198, col. 46. Adam was born *c.*1140, and became abbot of the Premonstratensian house at Dryburgh, in the Scottish borders, *c.*1184, but joined the Carthusians at Witham in 1188. See James Bulloch, *Adam of Dryburgh* (London, 1958).

[78] See e.g. Payen Bolotin, *De falsis heremitis qui vagando discurrunt*, ed. Jean Leclercq, 'Le poème de Payen Bolotin contre les faux ermites', *Revue Bénédictine* 68 (1958), lines 95–116, pp. 79–80. See also the false hermit who tried to set up as a rival to Stephen of Obazine, *La Vie de S Etienne d'Obazine*, ed. M. Aubrun (Clermont, 1970), 52.

dained monks when celebrating Mass, linen. The reform statute on clothing banned linen drawers, and specified that each monk should have three tunics, a cappa, a cloak (*pelliceum*), and a scapular or *pallium*, but that fur should not be used for this. The cloak should not be worn without the tunic, and should be short enough for the tunic to show underneath. The tunic should reach down to the ankles, and the scapular should be a hand's breadth shorter. Leggings, stockings, and mufflers were to be distributed as need dictated, presumably with the Scottish houses of the order in mind. Greaves were forbidden, and gloves with fingers. The principle of all clothing was plainness and simplicity; nothing showy or *curiosum* could be tolerated.[79]

The Premonstratensian reform shows the kind of abuse that had become standard a hundred years after Norbert's foundation. Such reforming measures had to be repeated periodically. In 1245 at the First Council of Lyons Innocent IV ruled that abbots of the order must wear the same clothing, made from the same material, as the monks. Eleven years later Alexander IV had to remind abbots of this ruling, which was clearly unpopular and widely ignored.[80]

Benedictine observance, similarly, required constant supervision. The system of regular chapters for Benedictine abbeys established by the Fourth Lateran Council provided the papacy with a mechanism for the centralized supervision of customs. Papal statutes, such as the bull *Ne in agro* of Clement V in 1311, and Benedict XII's *Summi magistri* of 1336, bear witness to the largely unsuccessful attempts of popes to make Benedictine monks conform to a single set of customs. The English Benedictine province's statutes of 1363 recognized the binding nature of *Ne in agro* and its prescriptions for monastic clothing, but also admitted that the decree had failed in its purpose. Monks were wearing habits in personalized styles, with slits in the sides, or wide sleeves, or of a very broad or very short cut; some even wore stripes or hoops on their habits, and others copied secular fashions by wearing short over-garments. The *cuculla* of Benedict's Rule was blatantly being abused by

[79] *Les Statuts de Prémontré réformés sur les ordres de Grégoire IX et d'Innocent IV au XIIIe siècle*, ii. 13, ed. F. Lefèvre (Louvain, 1946), 56–8. For a further example of Gregory's legislation of monastic dress, see his letter of 1238 to John, Cistercian abbot of Brandulo, and Alberic, Dominican prior of Venice, for the appropriate clothing for a group of friars at St Andrew 'de Litore': *Registres de Grégoire IX*, ed. L. Auvray, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 3 vols. (Paris, 1896–1955), ii (1955), no. 4392: 'Regarding the brothers' clothing: they should have two tunics, a *cappa*, one scapular with sheep's wool, and a plain scapular for use in manual work in the fields and around the convent.'

[80] L. Lepaige, *Bibliotheca Praemonstratensis Ordinis* (Paris, 1633), iii. 664, 679–81.

monks who wore coloured fur or silk to line their hoods. The statute set out in detail acceptable Benedictine dress: a habit of pure black, of material costing a moderate price, and in cut of standard length, without separate sleeves. Hoods, unlined and black, should be woven on to the habit, not worn separately.[81]

The principle behind the Benedictine habit, as expressed in the 1363 provincial statute, was moderation. This was a virtue shared by the Rule of St Augustine, in which the prescription for clothing is simply that it should not be remarkable (*notabilis*), so as not to attract attention to the wearer. The canon should please not by dress but by behaviour. The twelfth-century *Dialogue* of the Augustinian canon Robert of Bridlington, which seeks to expound the rule point by point, quotes the description of the master's clothing in Possidius's *Vita S. Augustini*: Augustine himself, though a bishop, wore clothes and shoes 'moderate and seemly in quality, neither too elegant, nor yet extremely poor'. Augustine refused gifts of expensive cloaks that might befit his dignity as bishop, in favour of common wool, so that he should be able to give his own cloak to a priest or subdeacon in need without upsetting notions of propriety.[82] Outward status, whether acquired by birth or achievement, should not be reflected in outward appearance. The twelfth-century commentary stresses that the behaviour and demeanour of the individual canon, rather than his appearance, should be the benchmark of his worth.

The implication of this passage, as also of the creeping abuses of the Benedictine Rule, is that clothing had become an expression of individuality, by which religious sought to make statements about themselves apart from their membership of their order—in short, by which they sought to transcend the conformity imposed on them as religious.

Equally, however, monks, canons, or friars might equally emphasize their difference from the common run of religious by appearing as shabby as possible. The tension between unostentatious moderation and spectacular shabbiness can be seen in Idung of Prüfung's *Dialogue*, where the Cistercian regards the Cluniac's black habit as indistinguishable from a secular man's clothing, and in numerous similar twelfth-century examples.[83] The symbolic meaning of the colours of monastic

---

[81] *Documents*, xlvi. 65–7. That such provincial statutes, like the papal bulls, ultimately failed to outlive the reformers who promulgated them, is evidenced by the need for frequent repetition.

[82] Robert of Bridlington, *The Bridlington Dialogue*, xii, ed. and trans. anon. (London, 1960), 125, quoting Possidius, *Vita Sancti Augustini*, xxii.

[83] Idung of Prüfung, *Dialogue*, iii. 47, in O'Sullivan (ed.), *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, 135. The

clothing, and particularly of white, will be considered in due course. First, however, the politics of religious habits must be examined as part of the development of the new mendicant orders of the thirteenth century.

The proliferation of orders naturally entailed a proliferation of habits: as already suggested, this was of increasing importance in the mendicant culture of the thirteenth century, if only because friars were more visible than cloistered monks or canons. Friars, to a far greater degree than monks, had to consider the impact they made upon the laity. Dependent as they were for the essentials of life upon the people to whom they were ministering, the friars' visual appearance was inseparable from their broader identity. In order to compete successfully in the open market-place of lay patronage, friars had to impress by their immediate physical impact. If a vagabond monk or wandering hermit appeared to conform more to the image of the mendicant than, for example, a Friar Minor, he might attract the alms the Minors might regard as rightfully theirs.

The danger of being upstaged or pre-empted because of the convincing appearance of rival friars was acutely perceived by the thirteenth-century Franciscan Salimbene de Adam. A significant portion of his chronicle is devoted to an attack on the emulatory activities and appearance of other orders. In his defamatory account of the origins of two new orders, the Friars of the Sack and the Apostolic Friars, he attaches particular importance to physical appearance and clothing. According to Salimbene, the founder of the Apostolic Friars, Gerardino Segalleli, wanted to join the Franciscans but was rejected.[84] He was then inspired to found an order by studying the pictures of the Apostles on the walls of the Franciscan church of his native city, Parma. The Apostles had been depicted, Salimbene says, in the traditional way, 'with sandals on their feet and with cloaks fastened over scapulars'.[85] Segalleli made himself a habit of poor cloth, with a white

Cistercian compares the Cluniac's dress to 'a country boy's when dressed in tunic and cape', and declares it to be not in accordance with the Rule of Benedict. The force of the Cistercian's polemic depends, of course, upon exaggeration, and his description should not be taken as an accurate representation of Cluniac appearance. Moreover, Joan Evans, *Dress in Medieval France* (Oxford, 1952), 67, argues that Cistercian dress differed little from Cluniac. See Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996), 188–91, for some examples.

[84] Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, ccclxix, ed. Giuseppe Scalia, CCCM 125 (Turnhout, 1998), 388.

[85] Ibid.: 'Nam super coopertorium lampadis societatis et fraternitatis beati Francisci depicti erant apostoli circumcirca cum soleis in pedibus et cum mantellis circa scapulas

cloak tied at the shoulder to cover it, believing that by resembling Christ's Apostles (as he had seen them represented) he might more easily live like one; or even, perhaps, that in order to live like one of the Apostles, it was necessary to dress like one.[86] He sold his house and distributed the money to the people of Parma, in imitation of Francis in Assisi. But being apostolic was not so simple, as Salimbene pointed out. The money Segalleli threw into the crowds was picked up by ruffians and spent in the taverns; instead of helping the poor, he merely encouraged drunkenness and blasphemy.[87] Later, Segalleli abandoned his original cloak, and made himself a white sleeveless overcoat, which he wore with gloves. He resembled, Salimbene mocked, a clown rather than a religious.[88] Salimbene uses the example of the unfortunate Segalleli to expose the spurious claims made by a new mendicant order to the same authority as the Franciscans and the Dominicans. The Apostolic Friars are no more than cowherds, who have no right to the name they have assumed, for *apostolus* means 'sent', but they are sent not by God but by themselves; Segalleli himself is dissolute and incontinent.[89]

The heart of Salimbene's exposure of the Apostolic Friars is the lack of integrity of Segalleli's vocation. Segalleli's personal incontinence illustrates this general point, but the basis of Salimbene's critique is the absurd imitative clothing adopted by the would-be friar. For Salimbene, as well as for Segalleli, appearance is an indication of a deeper identity. But it was not the fact of Segalleli's attempt to imitate apostolic clothing that aroused Salimbene's scorn so much as his inability to reproduce that clothing plausibly. To decide to emulate the Apostles in appearance was perfectly reasonable, so long as one did it properly. Thus the question of whether or not the Apostles had worn

involuti, sicut traditio pictorum ab antiquis accepit et usque ad modernos deduxit.' For a useful approach to Salimbene, see C. Violante, 'Motivi e caratteri della cronica di Salimbene', in *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa—lettere, storia e filosofia*, 2nd ser., 22 (Pisa, 1953), 108–54.

[86]   Compare the example of the ninth-century chronicler Agnellus of Ravenna, who used the fresco paintings of bishops of Ravenna to inform his written description: 'De vero illorum effigia si forte cogitatio fuerit inter vos, quomodo scire potui: sciatis, me pictura docuit, quia semper fiebant imagines suis temporibus ad illorum similitudinem': *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis*, *MGH Scriptorum Rerum Langobardum* (Hanover, 1878), 297. The paintings Segalleli saw may not, Salimbene's assertions notwithstanding, have been typical of the iconography of the Apostles; perhaps more typical are the Apostles wearing simple cloaks in the mid-thirteenth-century frieze at the Porte Saint-Honoré in Amiens.

[87]   Salimbene, *Cronica*, ccclxix–ccclxx, 388–9.
[88]   Ibid. 389 for Segalleli's first costume, ccclxxxiii, 403, for the new costume.
[89]   Ibid. ccclxxiii–ccclxxiv, 393–4.

sandals became a point of controversy between the Franciscans and the Dominicans at the beginning of the fourteenth century. In his treatise *Contra aemulos Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum*, the English Dominican Thomas Sutton responds to the charge that the Friars Preachers are not genuinely 'apostolic' on the threefold ground that they wore sandals, whereas the Apostles had gone barefoot, that they abstained from meat, while the Apostles had eaten whatever they were given, and that they accepted gifts of money, which the Apostles had not. Sutton responds to the first charge by quoting biblical references to Peter's footwear (in Acts 12: 8), and by citing the relic of Christ's sandals preserved in St John Lateran in Rome. Against the argument that the Apostles were often depicted without sandals, Sutton remarks that those who put their faith in paintings on walls rather than in Holy Writ are hardly to be trusted.[90] The arguments used are perhaps of less interest than the importance attached to the precise physical imitation of the Apostles by the mendicants. An apparently minor point of dress is coupled by the Franciscan critic with a defence of the ideology of begging for money. The physical image of the Dominicans was as important as their behaviour and methods of exercising their profession; unless they looked the part, their claim to be genuinely apostolic would not be taken seriously.

Sutton's treatise owed its contemporary force to the dispute between the Spiritual Franciscans and the conventuals. The tragic course of the conflict has been told elsewhere and need not detain us here.[91] But one aspect of it has important bearing on the discussion of religious dress. The habit, being the external symbol of a friar's profession, was an obvious emblem for the Spirituals. The *Regula bullata* specified that professed friars were to have a tunic with a hood and, if they needed it, another without a hood. Shoes were permitted, rather grudgingly. The habit should be 'wretched' in quality, and could be repaired when needed with patches of sackcloth.[92] The constitutions promulgated at the general chapter of Narbonne in 1260, however (like the reformed

---

[90] Thomas Sutton's *Contra aemulos Fratrum Praedicatorum* is partially preserved in Oxford, Lincoln College MS 81, fos. 32ʳ–33ʳ, and has been edited by F. Pelster, 'Eine Kontroverse zwischen englischen Dominikanern und Minoriten über einige Punkte der Ordensregel', *AFP* 3 (1933), 74–80.

[91] For this conflict in general, see Duncan Nimmo, *Reform and Division in the Franciscan Order (1226–1538)* (Rome, 1987); Decima L. Douie, *The Nature and Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli* (Manchester, 1932); and for the specific issue of poverty, Malcolm Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty* (London, 1961), and David Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty: The Origins of the Usus Pauper Controversy* (Philadelphia, 1989).

[92] Rosalind B. Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars* (London, 1975), 121.

statutes of the Premonstratensians and the fourteenth-century English Benedictine statutes), can be taken as an indication of a shortfall in observance. They repeated Francis's prescription of 'vileness' in clothing, specifying that this referred to price and colour, and controlled the friars' access to new habits by ordering all materials to be bought in common by each priory, and handed out strictly according to need.[93]

The Spirituals saw clothing as reflecting moral standards. In the fourteenth-century collection known as the *Acta beata Francisci*, the story is told of a friar who was so disgusted by the vileness of the habit that he decided to leave the order. Then, in a vision, he saw Francis leading a procession of friars in paradise, all of them clad in shining white raiment, and understood that he who wanted to wear such fine clothing in eternity must wear sackcloth on earth.[94] The Spirituals' insistence on asceticism in clothing led them to adopt their characteristic uniform of a habit of exaggerated shortness, and it is a mark of how firmly this habit became identified with their observance that in his bull *Quorundam exigit* (1317), John XXII ordered the abandonment of the short habit as a symbol of their obedience to the papacy.[95]

If Gerardino Segalleli's eccentric clothing made him an easy target, the Sack Friars, or Friars of the Penitence of Jesus Christ, were a different matter. The only narrative account of their foundation is that in Salimbene's chronicle. It was easy for him to be dismissive, since he was writing after the suppression decreed at Lyons in 1274. According to his account, two laymen of Hyères, in Provence, were so impressed by the preaching of the Provençal Franciscan Hugh of Digne that they sought entry into the order. When Hugh told them to go into the woods and eat roots, they did exactly that, in the process adopting the kind of habit worn by the Poor Clares. In Salimbene's account of the Sack

---

[93] 'Statuta generalia ordinis edita in capitulis generalibus celebratis Narbonae an. 1260, Assisii an. 1270 atque Parisiis an. 1292', ii. 3, ed. M. Bihl, *AFH* 34 (1941), 42. The communal purchase and provision of cloth for habits was well known from the Rule of Benedict (ch. lv), and was adopted by the Premonstratensians and Augustinian Canons as well. A useful discussion of the Franciscan habit and its permutations can be found in P. Gratien, 'Saint François d'Assise au Musée du Trocadéro: Notes d'Iconographie Franciscaine', *Etudes Franciscaines*, 38 (1926), 493–507. I am grateful to Professor Julian Gardner for bringing this to my attention.

[94] *Acta Beati Francisci et sociorum eius*, xxii. 1–17, ed. Paul Sabatier, Collection d'études et de documents sur l'historie religieuse et littéraire du moyen âge, 4 (Paris, 1902), 75–7. The *Acta* probably date from *c.*1322–8. The Italian translation of parts of the *Acta*, known as the *Fioretti di San Francesco*, circulated later in the century.

[95] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, v (Rome, 1780), 128–30. The bull required all Franciscans to wear the habit as prescribed by the constitutions of the order.

Friars' beginnings, the adoption of a specific form of clothing was an essential part of the profession of mendicancy, just as it had been for Segalleli. 'The laymen went away and made themselves coats of many colours of the kind that the servants of the Order of St Clare used to wear, and then they began to beg bread throughout the town in which the Minors were residing.'[96]

Identity was the key to success. In order to begin earning a living as friars, the laymen must look like friars. What to wear in order to beg for alms was therefore one of the first decisions facing prospective mendicants. The whole point of Franciscan clothing was that it was nondescript and anonymous, a habit such as might be worn by anyone genuinely careless of personal appearance. But once the Franciscans had become well known in the towns and countryside of southern France and Italy, as they certainly were by the time the Sack Friars were establishing themselves there, any friars attempting to follow a similar profession wearing similarly nondescript, shabby clothing would appear to be imitating the Franciscans. Salimbene seizes upon this point in his description of their early history, when he accuses them of imitating the Poor Clares.

For Salimbene, the clothing chosen by the laymen explained their success in establishing themselves as mendicants. '[Food] was readily given to them, because we and the Friars Preachers taught all men to beg; and whoever put on the hood and wanted to, could make himself a mendicant rule.'[97] The people of Provence had been educated to expect that men who wore 'mendicant' clothing should be rewarded with alms. Behind Salimbene's scorn for the Sack Friars lies fear of their expansion. He was convinced that the early success and popularity of the Franciscans and the Dominicans had encouraged others to copy their example by borrowing not only their methods but also their appearance. Mendicant culture, seen through Salimbene's eyes, was a culture of image and self-promotion: if one looked like a friar, one would be taken for a friar. The apparel, as Polonius knew, oft proclaims the man.

The Sack Friars soon adopted the clothing that gave them their nickname: a habit made of sackcloth, over which they wore a coat of the same material. They may first have been called 'fratres saccati' by Franciscans jealous of their own identity. It was Francis, after all, who had first specified that friars were not to replace worn-out habits with

---

[96]   Salimbene, *Cronica*, ccclxvi, 385. The coats are described as *mantelli catabriati*.
[97]   Ibid.

new ones, but patch them up as often as necessary, if need be with sack-cloth.[98] To Salimbene, it looked as though, by taking sackcloth as the primary material for their habits, and thus as the obvious sign by which they would be identified, the Sack Friars were borrowing from the rule of an established order. Even the Sack Friars' sandals were identical to the Minors', as Salimbene complains: 'For those who want to make a new Rule always beg (*mendicant*) something from the Order of the Blessed Francis, either the sandals or the girdle or even the habit.'[99]

The Franciscan response to the proliferation of imitative mendicant orders was not, initially, to petition for their suppression, but to ensure that they could not look like and be mistaken for them, the 'original' friars. A particular worry was the concentration of eremitical groups in Tuscany and north Italy such as the Tuscan Williamites (followers of William of Maraval (d. 1157, canonized 1202) and the north Italian Johnbonini (followers of John Bonus, 1188–1249). At first, those her-mits, like the Johnbonini, who had adopted the Rule of St Augustine in the 1220s, wore a simple brown, grey, or colourless habit, like that of the Franciscans. Grey was not originally a colour identified with a particu-lar order: it was simply a neutral, unbleached, and undyed cloth. But Francis's insistence on the use by his followers of uncoloured, cheap cloth had become, by Salimbene's day, a legislative prohibition on any colour other than grey or brown for Franciscan friars.[100] The grey or brown habit that started as an anonymous, 'uncharged' item of cloth-ing became a symbol of identity, of belonging to a specific order. In 1240 the Franciscans complained to the pope that the Johnbonini of north Italy were being mistaken for Minors because of their insistence on wearing grey habits. The Johnbonini, not yet recognized as an order, were instructed by the pope to change to either white or black habits. Another group of Augustinian hermits, the Brettini in the March of Ancona, continued to wear their original grey cloth even after the pope had prescribed a change of colour.[101] A 'patent' was thus developed for the grey habit of the Franciscans, in the form of a papal

[98] 'Regula Prima', in *Opuscula sancti patri Francisci*, Bibliotheca Franciscana Ascetica Medii Aevi, 2nd edn. (Quaracchi, 1941), i. 24–62.

[99] Salimbene, *Cronica*, ccclxvii, 386.

[100] 'Statuta generalia', ii. 1–2, Bihl, 42. Although in England the Franciscans have collo-quially been known as 'Greyfriars', contemporary representations of Francis and Francis-cans show habits of brown rather than grey. The colour depended on the grade of wool used, but to Francis either shade of non-colour was acceptable. The important point was that it should be undyed, and that no special treatment should have been used.

[101] Francis Roth, *The English Austin Friars 1249–1538*, 2 vols. (New York, 1966), i. 14–15.

privilege prohibiting any friars other than the Minors from wearing grey.[102] This became a standard form of self-defence against imitation. In 1257 the Sack Friars, so scorned by Salimbene for their imitation of the Franciscans, were themselves demanding from the pope a 'patent' for their sackcloth habits—only two years after the initial papal approval of the order.[103] Papal confirmation was no longer enough: preventative measures now had to be taken to protect an order's identity.

The Great Union of 1256, in which the Order of Hermits of St Augustine was created out of the disparate eremitical groups in Italy, was welcomed by Salimbene.[104] He rightly saw that the centralized control of eremitical groups would make for less diversity of appearance, and thus less confusion on the part of the laity. Naturally, all friars of the new Order of Augustinian Hermits were required to wear the same habit. Salimbene, indeed, gives the impression that it was the very process of forcing the Brettini to abandon grey for black that effected the Great Union of 1256. The need to change the habit in order to protect the Franciscans was, for Salimbene, the cause, not the result, of the formation of the Order of Augustinian Hermits.

Salimbene's concern over the physical identification of religious orders seems a peculiarly thirteenth-century problem. It is true that conventual monks, ensconced in the cloister, had never impinged on society in so public a way as the mendicants. Even so, in the countryside monks or hermits unaffiliated with a particular house, or in the process of establishing a new house, must always have been a familiar sight. Wandering preachers like Norbert of Xanten (before the foundation of Prémontré) or Henry of Lausanne, or the Waldenses, were presumably indistinguishable from one another in terms of dress and appearance.[105] The need to regulate mendicant behaviour carefully

[102] Salimbene, *Cronica*, ccclxvii, 386: 'Sed nunc ordo fratrum Minorum papale privilegium habet quod nullus talem habitum ferre presumat per quem frater Minor ab aliquo credi possit.'

[103] *Registre d'Alexandre IV*, ed. C. Bourel de la Roncière, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 2 vols. (Paris, 1902), i, nos. 357, 199. The extent to which this was becoming a more general problem can be seen from Gregory IX's decision in 1236 to compel the brothers of St Thomas in Acre to change the colour of the red cross they wore sewn on to their cloaks to red and white, because plain red was already worn by the Templars. We can assume that the pope's attention had been drawn to this detail in the first instance by the Templars: *Registres de Grégoire IX*, ii, no. 3005.

[104] Salimbene, *Cronica*, ccclxvii, 386. For the Great Union and the origins of the Augustinian Hermits, see Roth, 'Cardinal Richard Annibaldi'.

[105] The Waldenses, e.g., were described by Walter Map as wearing woollen clothes and going about barefoot, *De nugis curialium*, i. 31, ed. and trans. M. R. James, rev. C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983), 126.

after the Fourth Lateran Council's prohibition of new orders made such attitudes of *laissez-faire* impossible.

Orders such as the Sack Friars and the Carmelites, which were expanding so rapidly in the 1250s and 1260s as to be perceived as a threat by older established orders, were faced with a dilemma over appearance. Once the standard grey or brown (or uncoloured) and black habits had been 'patented', new orders had to seek variations of colour and design. They had to find an identity that would indicate to episcopal authorities and to the laity their genuine difference from other orders. This discussion has concentrated on the examples for which there is the fullest documentation, but the same situation applied to orders such as the Friars of the Blessed Mary (the Pied Friars), the Crutched, or Holy Cross, Friars, the Friars of the Penitence of the Martyrs, and the Servite Friars.[106] In addition there were the even more obscure Friars of John the Baptist, whose origins, like those of the Carmelites, lay in the Levant,[107] and the Bethlehemite Friars, who had a convent in Cambridge in 1257.[108]

One strategy was to draw attention away from the style or colour of the habit itself and direct it instead toward the means by which the habit had been 'given' to the order. The Carmelites' appropriation of the Sobac tradition, which is one example of this, is paralleled by the Dominican association of their habit with the Blessed Virgin. The story of the dying Reginald being given the habit by the Virgin has already been mentioned. Other Dominican legends seem to lend the

[106] For these orders and their fates, see Emery, 'Second Council of Lyons', 261–71. The Servites appealed against the suppression, obtaining in 1277 a judgement from three canonists attached to the papal curia that the decree did not forbid the holding of property or rents; the order continued to fight attempts to suppress it in the 1280s, and secured bulls of confirmation, as did the Carmelites, from Honorius IV: A. Giani, *Annalium sacri ordinis fratrum Servorum Beatae Mariae Virginis*, 5 vols. (Lucca, 1719–25), i. 122, 160. The grounds on which the order was reprieved may have been that it had adopted the Rule of St Augustine, and so may be said to have antedated 1215.

[107] Alphonse of Poitiers presented a gift of 60*s.* to the 'fratres heremiti sancti Johannis Baptiste' in Avignon in 1269: *Correspondance administratif d'Alfonse de Poitou*, ed. A. Molinier, 2 vols. (Paris, 1894, 1900), i. 769, ii. 77. A letter from Peter, prior-general of the order, to Alphonse between 1252 and 1265 states that the order's first house was on the Black Mountain, near Antioch: *Layettes du tresor des chartes*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1863–1909), iv. ed. E. Berger, 117–18. Berger was sceptical about the genuineness of the document, but he perhaps did not appreciate the importance of the Black Mountain as a notable eremitical site, where, in 1235, Gregory IX had recognized a group of hermits who had adopted the Rule of St Benedict: *Registres de Grégoire IX*, ii, no. 2660.

[108] Matthew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, v. 631. The Bethlehemites, distinguished by the stars they wore on their habits, to represent the star that proclaimed Jesus' birth, must have sympathized with the indignity suffered by the Carmelites for the sake of the *pallium barratum*.

habit a special quality almost amounting to a personality of its own. In an anecdote related by Gerard de Frachet, and dated to 1252, a secular master at the University of Salamanca was invited to a sermon, and then lunch, by the subprior of the Dominican house, but refused because he did not want to go out of doors in the heavy rain. He was lent a Dominican *cappa* and changed his mind; but when he put it on, the subprior said to the assembled company, 'I call you to witness that Master Nicholas has today assumed our habit.' Nicholas walked about all day in the rain wearing the *cappa*, but at night he was seized by a fever and thought he was dying. A heavenly voice told him that he was being punished for having treated the Dominican habit irreverently by using the *cappa* for something so trivial as protection against the rain. Nicholas wisely promised to keep the habit he had worn so lightly and to join the order, whereupon he recovered.[109] The moral of the story is that the habit is not simply a garment worn for convenience, but an emblem chosen by God: to wear it meant one was a Dominican (as prophesied in this story by the subprior), and was held in divine favour. The development of such traditions in the mid-thirteenth century seems to have been a particular response to the Franciscans. In contrast to the Franciscan ethic of studied shabbiness, the Dominicans endowed their habit with a degree of grandeur. The ideal of moderation and anonymity prized by the Rule of St Augustine (the Dominicans' Rule) was upheld not by obvious appearance but by the special divine favour shown to the habit.

Distinctive identities such as those of the Carmelites or the Bethlehemites were counter-productive. Mendicant habits were supposed to be purely functional, on the grounds that begging friars could not give the impression of genuine need if they were wearing expensive or sophisticated clothing. What were contemporaries to make of begging friars who wore outer garments of different-striped colours, or distinctive symbols sewn on to their cloaks? Yet, by patenting their 'minimalist' habits, the Franciscans and Sack Friars had removed the most natural and obvious form of mendicant clothing from the arena, forcing newcomers to adopt identifiable clothing that critics might find far removed from the original mendicant ideal. Looking back a hundred years later, the Carmelite apologist Philip Ribot explained that the habit had been changed because it had become a source of deri-

---

[109] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, iii. xiii. 8, MOPH i. 186–7. The same story was told, with a change of detail that loses some of the effect, by Galvanus della Flamma (*c*.1340–1), *Cronica*, MOPH 2. 27.

sion.[110] The Carmelites could not win: if they retained the *pallium barratum*, they were mocked; but, by changing to a white habit, they aroused the charge of 'wilful vanity'. The attempt by fourteenth-century Carmelite writers to integrate the new white habit into the ancient history of the order reflects this frustration, and serves as a response to the generic criticism made by members of the 'established' orders such as Salimbene of the newer friars.

[110]   Ribot, *De institutione*, vii. 7; *Speculum*, i. 69.

The *Ignea Sagitta* (1270): The First Defence of Carmelite Tradition

Little assessment of the Carmelites' own response to the changes taking place in their order is possible until the last third of the thirteenth century. Friars Reginald and Peter, the delegates sent to the papal curia to request a mitigation of the rule, obviously represented a decision-making body within the order, probably an embryonic general chapter. The formal process of applying for mitigation was a recognition of a situation that had already transpired, for, since the migration to Cyprus in 1238, new houses had been springing up in England (from 1242) and Sicily (1240/2). Between the 1240s and 1270, when the Carmelites spread with such extraordinary self-confidence, colonizing moorlands and remote sea coasts, then drifting into suburbs, and finally settling four-square in the towns, no dissent is heard from within the order. Yet the changes brought about by such an expansion were immense. Life in a town, even for enclosed religious, meant a new set of relationships: for example, the problems of space, of contingent buildings, of noise. These priories, even if individually small in numbers of friars, represented a huge influx into the order. The new friars may not have been totally ignorant of the Holy Land and of the traditions of contemplation on Mt Carmel, but whatever impulse attracted a recruit to the house in, for example, Norwich in 1256 or Avignon in 1263, it can hardly have been the same as had appealed to the hermits who had gathered by the spring of Elijah in the early years of the thirteenth century. It is not surprising that in 1270 a rumble of discontent is heard; what is surprising, rather, is that it should have taken so long to emerge.

When it came, the rumble was the thunder of an old man bitter with the resentment of betrayal. Nicholas Gallicus had been prior-general

of the order from 1266 to 1271. His election—unless the delegates did not know the man they were electing—must have represented in itself a reaction against the expansionist years. Since the expansion, dependent as it was on the modification of the rule, had been sanctioned by the delegates to previous chapters, we can surmise that such a reaction had begun to gain ground before 1266. Nicholas's protest was a reaction against the transformation of an eremitical order of contemplatives located on remote hilltops, on coastal marshland, or in forests, into friars whose ministry lay in towns. The only evidence for his remonstration is the Philippic addressed to the order by Nicholas after his retirement, and it is in itself a testimony to failure. Nicholas probably retired because he could make no headway against the expansion: the *Ignea Sagitta* is a warning of the consequences of that failure.

The traditional view that Nicholas resigned the office of prior-general has been challenged by Richard Copsey, who argues that Nicholas died in 1271, and that his death is a more likely reason, in the absence of further evidence, for his disappearance from the sources. The resignation thesis seems, indeed, to have rested simply on the tone and content of the *Ignea Sagitta*, Nicholas's parting shot to the order.[1] Copsey argues further that the *Ignea Sagitta* was unknown until the early fifteenth century, and had no impact on the development of Carmelite thinking.[2] Jill Webster has pointed out, however, that Nicholas's successor, Ralph de Fryston, retired and chose, moreover, to be buried at Hulne; she sees this as an indicator of the continuing influence of eremitical ideals among the order's leadership.[3] Nicholas's disillusionment

---

[1] Copsey, '*Ignea Sagitta*', 169–72. Nicholas appears as prior-general at the general chapter held at Toulouse in 1266: *Correspondance administrative d'Alphonse de Poitiers*, ii. 504, no. 1961. The general chapter held in 1271 elected Ralph 'Alemannus' as his successor: Nicholas Gallicus, 'Nicolae prioris generalis', 237–307. As Staring points out, the 1271 chapter was held a year earlier than normal in the three-year cycle, probably because Nicholas had expressed an intention to retire early. According to the catalogue of priors-general inserted into John Grossi's *Viridarium de ortu religionis et floribus eiusdem* (*c.*1400/1411–17), Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek MS 218 fos. 71^v–75^v (before 1430), and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fos. 114^r–115^v (early fifteenth century), Nicholas succeeded Simon Stock on his death in 1250, and resigned in 1269. This long generalate, however, depends upon a wild dating of Simon's office from 1200 to 1250. It is more likely that Simon died in 1265, and that Nicholas was elected at the general chapter held at Pentecost in 1266, and resigned at the general chapter at Messina in 1269. Jean Trisse's list of priors-general, *MCH* 318, which is reliable, begins with Ralph Alemannus, who succeeded Nicholas.

[2] Copsey, '*Ignea Sagitta*', 171–3, demonstrating that Nicholas's name appeared in the list of priors-general only in 1390.

[3] Webster, *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia*, 8, following Shepard, *English Carmelites*, 20. In fact Ralph almost certainly came from Hulne. Copsey, '*Ignea Sagitta*', 165, sees Ralph's retirement and burial in his own convent as unremarkable.

may have been the result of his tenure of office; but it is equally possible that he was known to hold strong views in favour of eremitism before his election and that he was indeed elected for that reason, in reaction against the newer developments.[4]

Other than the little he tells us himself, nothing is known of Nicholas Gallicus. He describes himself as an old man in 1270, which allows for the possibility that he had joined the order as early as the 1230s or even before, and in any case before the exodus to Cyprus and beyond. The postscript to the *Ignea Sagitta* says that it was written at the hermitage at 'Mt Enatrof'. As Adrian Staring has pointed out, this otherwise unidentifiable place must surely be Fortane in Cyprus—the same letters written in reverse. Fortanie *in heremo* is listed as the order's first Cypriot settlement in the fourteenth-century *Domus in Terra Sancta*.[5] If Nicholas had indeed become a Carmelite in the Holy Land, he may have been a refugee at Fortanie in 1238, and retired there from the prior-generalate thirty years later. This must remain speculative, however, since nothing is known of his career before his election to the generalate. Staring has argued that the content of the *Ignea Sagitta* betrays no personal background in the Holy Land; on the other hand, Nicholas's feeling for the eremitical life is such as to suggest a personal experience of solitude. This would have been possible only if he had joined the order either in its earliest stages before the migrations of 1238 and the 1240s, or if he had lived in one of the early eremitical houses in the West, such as Hulne or Burnham Norton. But this would leave only a narrow window of *c.*1240–7 and, moreover, make him middle-aged rather than old in 1270. A compromise solution would be to assume that he was professed at Fortanie after 1238, spent most of his career there, and retired there after relinquishing the generalship of the order.

The prologue to the *Ignea Sagitta* consists of an appeal to 'mater mea piissima'. The Holy Mother is not only the Virgin Mary, however, but, allegorically, the Carmelite Order; even, perhaps, the Church itself.

---

[4] Copsey, '*Ignea Sagitta*', 166–73, argues that the lack of any knowledge of Nicholas or his work in Carmelite circles until the fifteenth century is an indication that he enjoyed no support within the order. Lack of knowledge of a work may indeed suggest this, but it is worth reminding ourselves that at the same period the Franciscan authorities were actively suppressing written testimony about St Francis that they found inconvenient.

[5] *MCH* 262–6. But Coureas, *Latin Church in Cyprus*, 215–19, believes Nicosia and Famagusta to have been the first foundations on Cyprus, and suggests (in private correspondence) that Fortanie may be a later invention. This, however, leaves Nicholas Gallicus's 'Mt Enatrof' unexplained.

Nicholas's technique throughout rests on allusion rather than precision; he never once mentions the Carmelite Order or other orders by name, but the implication is clear enough. The crisis he begs the Holy Mother to address is the division between the 'true sons' and the 'stepsons' (*privigni*), which is harming the pristine qualities of the order.[6]

Chapter 1, outlining the theme of the whole, draws parallels between the Carmelites' present situation and that of the Israelites during the Babylonian Captivity. Citing Jeremiah, Nicholas bemoans the Carmelites' exile from their true home, the *eremum*.[7] The lament continues in chapter 2, where Nicholas now uses the parable of the Good Samaritan: the Carmelite Order is like the man who fell among thieves on the road to Jericho. Only in chapters 3 and 4 is the precise nature of Nicholas's complaint outlined. The *privigni* are betraying true religion—in other words, the correct observance of the Carmelite profession—by preaching, hearing confessions, and generally consorting with the laity. Nicholas presents the arguments in favour of mendicancy, then accuses mendicants of unbearable pride in doing 'good works'. Do they really imagine that they can lay bare what is secret simply by preaching? They are no help to anybody, either themselves or others: the solitary life alone leads to perfection, and by mixing with people, they have only learnt the ways of the secular world. Which of these 'stepsons' really knows the word of God? How could they, indeed, when they allow no time for contemplation; for only through contemplation can understanding be reached. What they build up in their preaching, they destroy by the example they set. The practice of hearing confessions is particularly dangerous, for hearing the catalogue of people's sins corrupts vulnerable friars.[8] Here Nicholas indulges in a rare moment of reflection from his personal experience:

Run through the provinces [of the Order], go from person to person, and tell me who can be found in the Order worthy and fit for preaching, hearing confessions, giving advice to the people? . . . You will say, perhaps, that there are many. To which I, who have travelled through the provinces and encountered

---

[6] The language used by Nicholas recalls that of Peter Damian's letter to Mainard, abbot of Pomposa: Peter Damian, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ep. 153, ed. Kurt Reindel, iv. (Munich, 1993), 14–15, which Peter begins by characterizing the unreformed monk as *spurius puer*.

[7] 'Egressus est a filia Sion omnis decor eius, et principes eius velut arietes non invenerunt pascua': Lam. 1: 6, and 'Dispersi sunt lapides sanctuarii in capite omnium platearum': *IS* i, p. 274.

[8] 'Nam inter lepram et lepram discernere nescientes tamquam scientiae et iuris ignari, solvunt quae solvi non expedit, ligant quae ligare utique non oportet': *IS* iv, p. 281.

many people, will reply sadly: there are very few who know how to exercise this office.[9]

Nicholas fears above all the corrupting effect of civic society on the Carmelites. Mendicants, he argues in chapter 5, live in the very jaws of the dragon. He does not believe in the *nova Religio* to be found only in towns. Friars who claim to be preaching are in fact consorting with women: 'The principal and chief cause of this scurrying around is to visit not pupils but prostitutes; not to visit widows living in penury but to gather together with foolish young girls, béguines, nuns and fine ladies.'[10] Listen to me, he warns, you hermits who have been called away from the hermitage: your homes in the wilderness were safe havens, but cities are spiritually dangerous, and by living in them, you have made yourselves the satellites of evil powers.

The theme of the safety of the wilderness is developed further in the next four chapters. God led the Carmelites into the mountain wilderness as a particular favour, and the mark of this favour can be seen in the biblical examples of mountains as places of divine revelation: Abraham and Isaac on Mt Moriah, Moses on Mt Sinai, Jesus fasting in the wilderness and transfigured on Mt Tabor. When Jesus wanted to pray, he climbed to high places to be alone; when he wanted to show himself to the people, he came down from the mountain.[11] If this lesson does not suffice, then the Carmelite Rule should, for it specifies that only deserted places are suitable for correct observance. The rule does not simply say that the hermits should live 'in wildernesses, or where places are given to you to live', but adds, '[places] suitable and fitting for the observance of your profession'. The present-day friars, moreover, have twisted the spirit of the rule so as to interpret the clause as 'in wildernesses, or wher*ever* places are given to you'; effectively contrasting the *eremum* with 'other places' and thereby suggesting that an alternative is permissible to the *eremum*, when clearly the rule does not intend such an alternative.[12] The spirit of the rule meant only to clarify, and to indicate that the specific *eremum* site of Mt Carmel was not the only possible residence for Carmelites; they might live in wildernesses elsewhere, but never away from a wilderness.

Even by misinterpreting it, the 'stepsons' are unable to fit the pattern of their behaviour into the observance demanded by the rule. In the rule, the hermits are required to live in individual cells physically separate from each other; whereas in the urban priories, the cells touch

---

9 *IS* iv, p. 281.   10 *IS* v, p. 282.
11 *IS* vi, p. 286.   12 *IS* vii, p. 288–9.

each other because they are all part of the same building. '[The rule] does not say touching each other, but separate, like the heavenly bride and groom; contemplative souls talking to one another undisturbed in peace.'[13] Moreover, the rule requires Carmelites to remain in their cells, or next to their cells, day and night; clearly, friars in towns are unable to do this. What good are cells, Nicholas asks, when you use them only for sleeping? Cells are meant to be places not of rest, but of work—the work of meditation. In this simple contrast, the whole theme of the *Ignea Sagitta*—the polarity between contemplative life and mendicancy—is expressed. Nicholas continues to develop the significance of the cell as the emblem of the contemplative's profession. The contemplative's cell is his sanctuary, a place half-way between earth and heaven: 'Certe inter cellam et caelum nullum scio medium, et ideo de hac ad illud facillime pervenitur.'[14] The friars, who do not know the correct use of cells, Nicholas calls *eremitae-cives*, intending by the juxtaposition of eremitism and urban life to expose the futility of their profession. Once again, he appeals to the examples of Abraham and Isaac, and of Moses on Mt Sinai. The lesson of Scripture is that God can be found on mountain tops, not in valleys.

In chapter 11 Nicholas develops a new theme: the natural beauty of the mountain. Hills, he says, flow with milk and honey. Here, all nature harmonizes to praise God: 'The roots germinate, the grass grows strong, leaves and branches rejoice and praise in their own way for us.'[15] In contrast to hermits who dwell amidst the gentle harmony of nature, the 'city-hermits' hear only the sounds of human strife. They drink from the chalice of Babylon, from which fire and brimstone spill, rather than the chalice offered by Jesus.[16]

Almost at the end of his diatribe, Nicholas turns briefly to dialectic. According to Aristotle, two opposite propositions cannot hold true at the same time; therefore, it is impossible for Carmelites to be both city-dwellers and hermits. They must choose between desert and city; there can be no bastardized version of the contemplative life.[17] Finally, in a rousing conclusion, Nicholas takes up once again his dialogue with the

---

[13] *IS* viii, p. 291.

[14] *IS* ix, p. 295. This expression was not Nicholas's own invention; compare William of Saint-Thierry, *Epistola domni Willelmi ad fratres de Monte Dei*, xxxi, ed. J. Déchanet, SC 223 (Paris, 1975), 168: 'Cellae siquidem et caeli habitatio cognatae sunt; quia sicut caelum ac cella ad invicem videntur habere aliquam cognationem nominis, sic etiam pietatis.' A similar point is made by Adam of Dryburgh: 'Non est hic aliud nisi domus Dei, et porta caeli': PL 153, col. 824.   [15] *IS* xi, p. 299, citing Isa. 25: 1–2 and Ps. 64: 13.

[16] *IS* xii, p. 302; Ps. 10: 7.   [17] *IS* xiii, p. 303.

Holy Mother, and makes a last appeal to abandon cities and return to solitude.

MONASTICISM, MENDICANCY, AND TRADITION

The *Ignea Sagitta* is primarily an attack on mendicancy in the context of the Carmelite Order. As such, it is fascinating evidence for traditional reactions to the friars' ideals, expressed at a time when the friars were already well established, and their way of life familiar in Christian society. By 1270 it was too late to complain that mendicancy was an unwarranted novelty; yet, because Nicholas is talking about the Carmelites rather than about religious orders in general, the tone and force of his writing are such as to suggest that he was writing at a time when mendicancy was genuinely new. This impression arises partly because Nicholas's debts to the monastic ideals of the eleventh- and twelfth-century reformers are so clear. Themes familiar from the spiritual and instructional writings of Peter Damian, the Carthusians Guigo I and II, and the Cistercians, notably Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St Thierry, and Gilbert of Holland, emerge in Nicholas's discussion of the superiority of the contemplative life over the active ministry. In this sense, Nicholas, though interested primarily in the contemporary problem of his order's direction, was engaging with monastic tradition. Like the fourteenth-century writers who invented a past for the order, Nicholas understood the need to locate the Carmelites within this tradition.

One of the rare moments in the *Ignea Sagitta* where Nicholas seems to abandon, albeit temporarily, his confrontational style, is his celebration of the physical beauty of the *eremum*. Chapter 11 opens with a passage of sustained joy in the sights and sounds of nature.[18] The passage concludes with citations from Isaiah 25: 1–2 and Psalm 64: 13; the rest of the chapter, in more typical style, contrasts the effects of the 'fragrance of flowers' with 'the intolerable foetid stench' of city streets. Within the first paragraph, however, Nicholas demonstrates a striking sensitivity to natural beauty; this, indeed, is one of the moments in the *Ignea Sagitta* that most persuasively argue for the author's personal experience of mountain solitude.

Nicholas begins by reflecting on the consolation offered by natural beauty for those troubled by developments in the order. The sky, decorated with an array of planets and stars, inspires awe in those who

---

[18] *IS* xi, p. 298.

contemplate it; meanwhile the birds, so attractively attired, sing sweetly, and the mountains induce internal sweetness of heart. In the solitude of the *eremum*, the surounding hills are the hermit's conventual brethren, which join with him in an organic song of praise to God. The germination of roots, the greenness of the grass and leaves, the scent and colour of flowers—nature's own act of worship—provide spiritual comfort to the hermit. The animals of the undergrowth become his companions. Silent, like the solitaries, they show by example the wonders of God's created world.[19]

This passage, which in its response to the natural world serves to make Nicholas a more attractive character than he might otherwise appear, will strike a chord with anyone who has been moved by a fine view of hills or a wooded valley. Although generic and conventional in its inclusion of individual elements—birds, mountains, sky, flowers, and leaves—and therefore deliberately non-specific in terms of place, it might easily be a meditation inspired directly by the sights and sounds of the hermitage on Mt Carmel itself.[20] The beauty of the site—the mouth of a lush valley on the slopes of Mt Carmel from which the sea can be seen—attracted comment in the early thirteenth century. The Cistercian Gunther of Pairis, describing his abbot Martin's pilgrimage in the Holy Land immediately after the Fourth Crusade, refers to Mt Carmel as 'a place abundant with every good thing, fertile in the fruits of the earth, dressed handsomely with vines and olive groves and generally speaking well-endowed with trees, as well as pasture-land'.[21] This description is set in the context of an attempt to persuade Martin to stay behind to take over the direction of the hermitage. Although Gunther's description probably owes as much to rhetoric and convention as to Martin's personal observation, the natural beauty of the site nevertheless forms part of the appeal to Martin. Pilgrimage guides from the 1230s also characterized Mt Carmel as a notably beautiful place. *Les Pèlerinages por aler en Jherusalem* (*c*.1231), for example, speaks of 'a lovely and delightful place where the Latin hermits live who are called brothers of Mt Carmel . . . all around the place many springs issue from the rock of the mountain'.[22]

[19]   *IS* xi, pp. 298–9.

[20]   'Attractively-attired birds' suggest a more exotic location than Hulne, for example.

[21]   Gunther of Pairis, *Historia Constantinopolitanae*, PL 212, col. 250. For discussion of this passage, see Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 130–3.

[22]   *Itinéraires à Jérusalem et descriptions de la Terre-Sainte rédigés en français aux XIe–XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, ed. H. Michelant and G. Raynaud (Geneva, 1882), 89–90. See other versions of the text at 104, 189.

Monastic literature associated with reformers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries emphasizes the importance of natural beauty in the monk's environment. Here, for example, is part of Walter Daniel's well-known description of the site of Rievaulx:

High hills surround the valley, encircling it like a crown. These are clothed by trees of various sorts and maintain in pleasant retreats the privacy of the vale, providing for the monks a kind of second paradise of wooded delight. From the loftiest rocks the waters wind and tumble down to the valley below, and . . . join together in the sweet notes of a delicious melody. And when the branches of lovely trees rustle and sing together and the leaves flutter gently to the earth, the happy listener is filled increasingly with a glad jubilee of harmonious sound.[23]

The elements of such a description, which almost match Mt Carmel itself, could be repeated many times from Cistercian sources—for example, in the writings of William of St Denis, Gilbert of Holland, and Miro of Ripoll.[24] Members of the order whose most famous figure, Bernard of Clairvaux, was said to have been so indifferent to his surroundings that he passed by Lake Geneva without noticing it,[25] were in fact highly susceptible to the natural world. Cistercians were, of course, like the early Carmelites and other contemplatives who sought the *eremum*, more exposed to it than monks in an urban or pastoral setting. The desire to escape society necessitated settlement in remote places where the land was uncultivable and the beauties of nature stark. Reforming monks came to see in such a landscape a vocabulary that could be used to describe the virtues of the monastery itself. Garden imagery had, of course, long been a part of monastic vocabulary.[26] The classical and biblical notion of Paradise as a *hortus conclusus* had always seemed particularly apt for characterizing the monastery. Thus William of Malmesbury described Thorney Abbey as 'the image of Paradise, resembling in its pleasantness heaven itself'.[27] Peter the

[23] Walter Daniel, *Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, ed. and trans. F. M. Powicke (Oxford, 1959), 12–13.

[24] Giles Constable, 'Renewal and Reform in Religious Life: Concepts and Realities', in G. Constable and R. L. Benson (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1982), 37–67, examples at 48–51.

[25] Alan of Auxerre, *Vita secundi Bernardi*, xvi. 45; an episode cited by many historians, e.g. Constable, *Reformation of the Twelfth Century*, 266.

[26] E. R. Curtius, 'Rhetorische Naturschildung im Mittelalter', *Romanische Forschungen*, 56 (1942), 219–56; G. Penco, 'Il senso della natura nell'agiografia monastica occidentale', *Studia Monastica*, 11 (1969), 327–34.

[27] William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum Anglorum libri quinque*, iv. 186, ed. E. S. A. Hamilton, RS 52 (London, 1870), 326–7.

Venerable, trying to persuade the bishop of Trier to enter Cluny, re-
ferred to the 'paradise of love' that awaited him: 'there is the tree of
life, there joyful conveniences, and glittering things beautified with
aromas and incense, whose sight will delight you, whose smell will
please you and whose taste will satisfy you'.[28] The cloister might repre-
sent a garden, nature enclosed or even appropriated, but this is neither
what Walter Daniel was describing at Rievaulx, nor what Nicholas
Gallicus envisaged in his meditation on contemplation and the natural
world. Like the Cistercians, Nicholas appears to be moving away from
the ideal of the *hortus conclusus*, an enclosed, specific place, to the
identification of Paradise with the wider outside world, where nature
stands in contrast to human society.[29]

An identification of natural beauty with spiritual comfort lies be-
hind Nicholas Gallicus's excursus on nature. The benefits of bird-song,
of a view of hills or stars, are internal; they induce awe and thus wor-
ship of God in the hermit.[30] Moreover, they sustain his faith in his pro-
fession, because the trees, plants, and animals themselves join the
hermit in affirming the goodness of the created world.[31]

The natural world was not to be taken at face value. Just as it symbol-
ized Paradise when taken as a whole, so its individual elements were
emblems of particular spiritual qualities or status. Nicholas empha-
sizes the importance of mountains or hills: they 'exude miraculous
sweetness', and 'flow with milk and honey'; they are the 'conventual
brothers' of the hermits.[32] Elsewhere in the *Ignea Sagitta* Nicholas con-
trasts the mountain as a place of closeness to God with lowlands (where
towns are to be found) as inimical to worship. Thus Christ prayed in
high places, and preached in the lowlands; Moses climbed Mt Sinai
to receive God's commandments, and came down again to teach the

[28] Peter the Venerable, *Letters*, ep. 86, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967),
i. 227.

[29] See specifically, among Cistercian writers, Gilbert of Holland, *Tractatus VII ad Rogerum
abbatem*, ii. 4, in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Opera omnia*, ed. J. Mabillon, 2 vols. in 6 (Paris, 1839),
2[5], 376.

[30] On bird-song specifically, see Charles Oulmont, *Les Débats du clerc et du chevalier dans la
littérature poétique du moyen-âge* (Paris, 1911), 13–16.

[31] Compare Miro of Ripoll, *Vita*, in *Espana sagrada*, 28 (Madrid, 1774), 306. Franciscan
writers were eager to take up the theme of the goodness of creation, e.g. Arnold of Bonneval,
Hexaemeron, PL 189, col. 1535. Francis's closest followers identified the saint's love of the cre-
ated world and its creatures as a fundamental aspect of his spirituality: *Scripta Leonis, Rufini et
Angeli sociorum S. Francisci*, ed. and trans. R. B. Brooke (Oxford, 1970), 162–6, 178. See also the
remarks of George Boas, *Essays on Primitivism and Related Ideas in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore,
1948; repr. New York, 1966), 75.

[32] *IS* xi, p. 299.

Israelites.[33] This is a common theme in the contemplative literature of reformers. Peter Damian, for example, describes the Israelites as hill-dwellers, and the Canaanites as living in the valley.[34] Guigo II the Carthusian, referring to Moses on Mt Sinai, concluded that 'only at the top of the mountain of wisdom does the burning fire of love give us a sight of God's glory'.[35] William of Saint-Thierry's 'Golden Epistle' to the Carthusians of Mont Dieu refers to Psalm 23: 4: there will come to dwell on the Lord's mountain 'a race of people who seek the Lord, seek the face of Jacob's God'.[36] In his *Exposition on the Song of Songs* he describes a mountain as 'raised above the earth, as is the chosen soul, in whom, through the love of heavenly things in contemplation, human nature is elevated above what pertains to man'.[37]

The symbolic value of height was universally recognized. The higher one was in a physical sense, the closer to God; hence the force of Simeon the Stylite's spectacular form of eremitical withdrawal. Francis of Assisi received the stigmata in his hermitage on Mt La Verna, a place especially dear to him for its solitude.[38] The nearer to God, the farther, too, from the influence of evil; thus, a Frankish monk in twelfth-century Antioch would climb the Black Mountain whenever he wanted to escape the torments of the devil.[39]

In order to reach high places, one had to climb, and the process of ascending itself provided more allegorical imagery for the progress of the Christian on the path toward God. Guigo II's treatise is called *The Ladder of Monks*; John Climachus's famous work (translated into Latin in the early fourteenth century by Angelo Clareno) was called *The Ladder of Paradise*, and the English mystic Walter Hilton called his masterpiece *The Ladder of Perfection*. That Guigo's treatise could have been variously attributed to Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Anselm

---

[33] *IS* vi, p. 285.

[34] Damian, *Die Briefe*, ep. 153, iv. 22, citing Josh. 17: 16.

[35] Guigo II the Carthusian, *Lettre sur la vie contemplative et Douze Méditations*, med. iv, ed. E. Colledge and J. Walsh, SC 163 (Paris, 1970), 144–6.

[36] William of Saint-Thierry, *Epistola*, xxv. 162.

[37] William of Saint-Thierry, *Expositio super Cantica Canticorum*, ii. i, 149, ed. J. Déchanet and M. Dumoutier, SC 82 (Paris, 1962), 316. See also i. x. 131, 278, for reference to Moses reaching the height of contemplation on the mountain.

[38] *Scripta Leonis*, 14, 20–1, for Francis's Lenten fast on La Verna in 1224, and 176–8, 252–5 for other episodes located there. On the stigmata, see M. Bihl, 'De stigmatibus S. Francisci Assiniensis', *AFH*, 3 (1910), 393–432.

[39] Benjamin Z. Kedar, 'Gerard of Nazareth, a Neglected Twelfth-Century Writer in the Latin East: A Contribution to the Intellectual History of the Crusader States', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 37 (1983), 73.

is an indication of the common currency of such imagery among monastic reformers of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.[40] Analagous spiritual writings, such as Richard of St Victor's pair of treatises *The Stages of Love* and *Four Stages of Impetuous Love*, similarly characterize the Christian life as a sequential series of steps.[41] If climbing serves as a metaphor for the search for God through meditation, then those, like the 'true' Carmelites, who live on the mountain, could be said to have succeeded in the quest. This notion of ordered, upward progression, physically and metaphorically, stands in positive contrast to the 'rushing about on frequent circuits' of the *eremitae-cives*.[42] Because they are in constant but directionless motion, the 'false' Carmelites will never attain closeness to God. Thus the mountain is not only desirable, but a necessary part of the monk's equipment.

   The benefits of the natural world seemed more precious when contrasted with the mire of urban life. The subtext of the whole *Ignea Sagitta* is, in a sense, an attack on urban society; for, as Nicholas realized, mendicancy depended on towns to provide a constituency for the 'urban monk'. For Nicholas, monasticism was simply incompatible with the city, because the effects of urban life made prayer and contemplation—the true work of the monk—impossible.[43] Reading the *Ignea Sagitta*, one is reminded of John Donne's verse, 'Cities are sepulchres; they who dwell there are carcases, as if no such there were.' In his loathing of towns, Nicholas once more found common ground with earlier monastic writers. His suspicion of the distractions offered to religious by towns may have been informed by Augustine's characterization of the *civitas* as a place in which the Christian was prevented from attaining inner peace. Typically, the town was a place of moral corruption.[44] Monastic hostility to towns must sometimes have derived from

[40]   Guigo II, *Lettre*; Walter Hilton, *Scala perfectionis*, trans. M. Noetinger and E. Bouvet, 2 vols. in 1 (Tours, 1923); John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, PL 40, cols. 997–1005.

[41]   Richard of St Victor, *De gradibus caritatis* and *De quatuor gradibus violentiae caritatis*, PL 196, cols. 1195–208, 1207–24.

[42]   *IS* v, pp. 282–3.

[43]   For comments on the appeal of mendicant practices, as opposed to monastic ideals, to urban societies, see Lester K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London, 1978), 197–9. Michael Richter, '*Urbanitas-rusticitas*: Linguistic Aspects of a Medieval Dichotomy', in Derek Baker (ed.), *The Church in Town and Countryside*, Studies in Church History, 16 (Oxford, 1979), 149–57, offers a conceptual discussion of the town in early medieval writing.

[44]   Augustine, *De catechizandis rudibus*, xvi. 25, CCSL 46 (Turnhoult, 1969), 149–50. The description of London in the 1190s by Richard of Devizes, a Winchester monk, is worth citing in part here: 'Every quarter of it abounds in grave obscenities . . . The number of parasites is infinite. Actors, jesters, smooth-skinned lads, Moors, flatterers, pretty boys, effeminates, ped-

specific circumstances and experience. Relationships between monasteries and towns were often fraught with commercial and tenurial tensions.[45] Towns represented commotion, disorder, flux, and above all money, in opposition to the monastic ideals of harmony, rhythm, continuity, constancy, and austerity. Images of towns could be used to describe tensions even within the monastic life; thus Peter Damian characterizes the cloister as being like a public market-place to a monk in search of true solitude.[46]

Negative images of towns were provided for monks by Scripture. In his commentary on the Song of Songs William of Saint-Thierry refers, when dealing with the verses 'I will rise and go about the city; in the streets and in the broad ways I will seek him whom my soul loves' (3:1–2) to Psalm 54: 10–11: 'I have seen iniquity and contradiction in the city. Day and night shall iniquity surround it upon its walls; and in the midst thereof are labour and injustice. And usury and deceit have not departed from its streets.' In William's mind, the city is to be equated to the world, and he uses this verse as an opportunity to lament the intricate involvement of the Church in secular affairs. Thus he attacks the Church's ownership of property, monks' familiarity with secular accomplishments, and monasteries engaged in lawsuits.[47] In a broad sense, Nicholas may have taken inspiration from such a passage. The context is not identical, for William is concerned with a state of affairs more profound than the involvement of a single order in an urban ministry, but the roots of Nicholas's discontent can be identified in the tradition represented by William.

A more positive attitude toward urban life is discernible during and after the thirteenth century, and this exposes one of the most interesting features of Nicholas Gallicus's treatise: the conservatism of his thinking. The *Ignea Sagitta* is more in tune with the rhetoric of the twelfth-century reformers than that of the 'new spirituality' of the thirteenth. By the time Nicholas was writing, the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Politics*, with its ideal of the city as the natural form of human society,

erasts, singing and dancing girls, quacks, belly-dancers, sorceresses, extortioners, night-wanderers, magicians, mimes, beggars, buffoons: all this tribe fill all the houses. Therefore, if you do not want to dwell with evildoers, do not live in London': *The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes of the Time of King Richard the First*, ed. and trans. John T. Appleby (London, 1963), 65–6.

45 To cite an example contemporary with the *Ignea Sagitta*, the riot of the people of Norwich against the cathedral priory in 1272: Cotton, *Historia Anglicana*, 146–9. It is doubtless important here to distinguish between urban and rural monasteries.

46 Damian, *Die Briefe*, ep. 153, iv. 18.

47 William of Saint-Thierry, *Expositio*, ii. vi. 190–4, 380–4.

had influenced a new generation for whom the monastery was no longer, as in William of Saint-Thierry's day, the unchallenged exemplar of human perfection. Treatises on forms of government, such as John of Viterbo's *On the Government of Cities* (*c*.1228) and, a century later, Marsilius of Padua's *Defender of the Peace*, took the city as the natural form of human political arrangement. In the same generation as Marsilius, the Lorenzetti brothers were painting their great fresco cycle in Siena depicting good and bad government, with a city as its location. This is not to suggest, of course, that such views prevailed throughout Christendom; it was notably in the highly urban society of Italy that the virtues of the city were appreciated.[48] Nevertheless, it is possible to see not only the revival of a classical idealism about urban life, but also an acknowledgement of a Christian heritage. Augustine, after all, had characterized the chosen as forming a city, and the Apocalypse of St John evoked images of heaven in urban terms: Paradise was the New Jerusalem, a city with gates of pearl and onyx, not an arcadian landscape of trees and mountains.[49] This imagery provided even a twelfth-century Cistercian like Gilbert of Holland with a different approach to the verse from the Song of Songs rendered in such negative terms by William of Saint-Thierry. 'The circuit of the city', he declares, 'is not the tour of a gadabout, but a quest.' The city of the text is nothing less than the city of God, and the entire created universe can be characterized as the city of God, glorious in both its beauty and its harmony. The city is ordered by God's own regulation, for all forms and impulses in creation derive from divine efficiency. The language Gilbert uses to describe the figural city is striking in the way that it dwells on elements of town architecture—the broad and well-linked streets, the wide squares that allow light to enter.[50] The force of the imagery lies in the presumed contrast of the heavenly city with humanly evolved cities; nevertheless, it is a model derived from the realization that cities can be places of beauty and order, that squares and streets do not by their nature necessarily represent filth and corruption.

Even those suspicious of urban life might see good reasons for concentrating the Christian ministry there. Humbert of Romans, the

---

[48] But it was not only Italians who acknowledged the virtues of civic life: Otto of Freising, describing the civilizing effects of Latin on the Lombards, characterizes literary elegance as coming from *urbanitas*: *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*, ii. 13, MGH (SS) 46, 112.

[49] Augustine, *De catechizandis rudibus*, vii. 11, CCSL 46, 131. Gregory the Great describes his metaphorical *civitas* (*Jerusalem supernae visio pacis*) in concrete terms: *Cura Pastoralis*, PL 77, cols. 13–149.

[50] Gilbert of Holland, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, sermo IV, i, iii, PL 184, cols. 26–7.

Dominican minister-general (1254–63), found the very sinfulness of cities a powerful attraction for his order. Preaching was more effective there because people were more heavily concentrated; moreover, their morals were worse, and they were thus in greater need of preaching; finally, it was from the towns that influences spread to the countryside, and therefore, by preaching in towns, one reached the whole of Christian society.[51]

Nicholas Gallicus, who was sceptical about the value of preaching in the first place, must have been unimpressed by such arguments. He is careful, however, not to extend his attack on mendicancy to other orders. He does not criticize the profession of mendicancy *tout court*, but rather the attempt by the *privigni* among his own order to combine mendicancy—specifically, preaching and hearing confessions—with the Carmelite tradition of solitary contemplation. In the context of the Carmelite Rule and the order's origins, it is an impossible combination. Contemplative life cannot be diluted with the work of public ministry. In his most explicit criticism of preaching, Nicholas stops short of rejecting its value altogether. Instead, he argues that the Carmelites who preach do so badly, because they are not properly qualified. Ignorant themselves, they merely mislead others.[52] Nicholas accuses them of being motivated by vanity in wanting to teach: 'their ears are open and itching to catch some breath of adulatory praise'. They are 'usurping the office of preaching', Nicholas asserts. That he is attacking the ignorance of the Carmelites who preach, rather than preaching itself, becomes clear when Nicholas indulges in personal memory. His own term of office required him to travel throughout the provinces of the order; in the course of his duties he found very few Carmelites whom he considered capable of fulfilling the offices of preaching and hearing confessions while still remaining true to the order's ideals.[53] The problem was one of compatibility. A Carmelite needed solitude; he needed his cell and an unpeopled landscape in order to accomplish the work of contemplation that defined the Carmelite profession. This profession was complete by itself, and needed no alteration or addition. Nicholas cannot understand why Carmelites should want to attempt to combine contemplation and action: 'What inspires such people, who lack knowledge . . . to preach?'[54]

[51] *Humberti de Romanis de Eruditione Praedicatorum II: Maxima Biblioteca Veterum Patrum*, ed. M. de la Bigne, xxv (Lyons, 1677), 491.

[52] *IS* iv, pp. 279–80.   [53] *IS* iv, p. 281.   [54] *IS* iv, p. 280.

Nicholas could call upon previous monastic tradition to support his attack on monks who engaged in public works. Peter Damian criticized monks who neither strove for the beauty of Rachel nor accomplished the tasks of Leah—in other words, who were distracted by the attempt to combine contemplation and work:

These are they who, whatever they are engaged in, always want to be wandering about and rushing from one place to another; who, since they cannot remain calm, wish to appear obedient, and therefore conceal the diseases of vice under a cloak of righteousness. They are not worn out by toil for the sake of obedience, but instead obey their superior so that they do not lose the opportunities provided by their work. They endure idleness, but enjoy work, because the wandering and turning the mill of affairs is sweet and pleasurable to them.[55]

The scriptural models provided by the contrasting figures of Rachel and Leah in the Old Testament, and by Mary and Martha in the New, were a rich source of exegesis for monks interested in the relationship between contemplation and action. In a comprehensive recent study, Giles Constable has traced the development of ecclesiastical attitudes toward the problem in terms of the interpretation of Mary and Martha.[56] Although Nicholas Gallicus does not employ this scriptural model, it is clear that his attack on the mendicant Carmelites derives from the same question: what did, or should, the Carmelite life mean, and of what, therefore, should it consist? Traditionally, the Christian life was taken to reflect a balance between the roles of Mary and Martha, between action and contemplation. Bernard of Clairvaux, for example, used a domestic image to show how Mary, Martha, and their brother Lazarus each had functions within the family to prepare for Jesus' visit. Lazarus cleaned the house, Martha prepared the feast, and Mary completed the practical work by her *non otiosum otium*.[57] Action—the work done by Lazarus and Martha—preceded the contemplation of Mary. Both formed part of a cycle, in which the true contemplative also finds time to preach and then returns to the peace of solitude.[58] Nicholas clearly disagreed with this interpretation. For one thing,

[55] Damian, *Die Briefe*, ep. 153, iv. 34.

[56] Giles Constable, 'The Interpretation of Mary and Martha', in *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought* (Cambridge, 1995), 1–143. The debts to Constable's work will be obvious in what follows, and particularly to those examples discussed on 47–113.

[57] Bernard, *Sermo 2 in assumptione*, vii, ix, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. Rochais, 8 vols. (Rome, 1957–77), v. 236–7.

[58] A parallel can be found in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Sermo XVII in assumptione*, PL 195, cols. 306–9.

contemplation had to precede action, not the other way around; it was in the work of contemplating God that one learnt what action to take. Monks who wanted to preach were ignorant, because they were confusing two different offices, and ignorance was no basis on which to hear confessions: 'they loose what should not be loosed and tie what should not be tied. I cannot recommend a doctor who thinks he can heal with one and the same treatment all those who suffer illnesses. Who can help but laugh when you, who don't know how to advise yourselves, say you want to go out and advise other people?'[59]

Nicholas's apparent hostility to public ministry would seem to place him, in the light of Constable's researches, outside the mainstream of twelfth- and thirteenth-century monastic thought. A generous critic might find in Nicholas, who after all accepted public office, a fulfilment of the advice given by Adam of Dryburgh, the Premonstratensian canon who became a Carthusian: namely, that the office of Martha should not be sought, but neither should it be refused if offered.[60] The initial horror of taking prominent office, coupled with the eventual acceptance of it (exemplified for example in St Anselm's doubts about the archbishopric of Canterbury[61]), was almost a model of monastic behaviour in itself.

This was a problem that, from the other perspective, troubled Innocent III a hundred years after Anselm. He wrote to Peter of Castelnau, his legate Rainer, the abbot of Tilieto, and Peter, abbot of La Ferté (whom he transferred first to the bishopric of Ivrea and thence to the patriarchate of Antioch), on the need to accept responsibility when the Church required it.[62] In these letters he suggests that the part of Mary was the more selfish, because it was concerned with one's own salvation, while Martha's was fruitful for others. Moreover, to reject the summons of action in favour of contemplation was to risk displeasing God, who might refuse to receive those who had refused to minister to him.

---

[59] *IS* iv, p. 280.

[60] Cited by Constable, 'Interpretation of Mary and Martha', 96.

[61] R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990), 265–7.

[62] Constable, 'Interpretation of Mary and Martha', 97–9. See also Fiona Robb, 'Who hath chosen the better part?', in J. Loades (ed.), *Monastic Studies*, ii (Bangor, 1991), 157–70. The letter to Peter of La Ferté, not cited by Constable, is in *Innocenti III Registrum*, ix. 172, PL 215, cols. 1004–8. Peter continued to work for the interests of the Cistercian Order, 'in which we have lived from boyhood', as, for example, when he persuaded the pope to allow him as patriarch to incorporate monastic communities on the Black Mountain, outside Antioch, into the order: *Registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 3468.

If the tendency among cloistered monks was to see action and contemplation as different but necessary aspects of the profession, friars in the thirteenth century not unnaturally preferred to distinguish between them by seeing the active and contemplative as whole types in themselves.[63] Thus, for example, Francis of Assisi planned the hermitages for his followers according to the prescriptions of Peter Damian for Fonte Avellano, whereby two friars were to act as mothers and two as sons, but he characterized their roles as Martha and Mary respectively. The role of the 'mothers' was to keep the 'sons' away from wordly contacts.[64] The separation is perhaps even more profound in the thought of Giles of Assisi. The fact that Martha continues to work even after Christ's rebuke shows, in his opinion, the validity of the active ministry; yet Mary's unwillingness to help her proves the ultimate superiority of the contemplative. The sweetness Mary received from contemplation was so strong that she was unable to leave what Bernard had called 'non otiosum otium'. This sentiment is the more poignant coming from a friar who had effectively, like Francis himself in later years, abdicated the active ministry.[65] Giles, who died in 1262, was a contemporary of Nicholas Gallicus. The parallel between Nicholas's and Giles's—albeit more temperately expressed—conception of active and contemplative is suggestive of the complexities inherent in the mendicant profession, and points forward to further parallels between the disenchanted Carmelite and disaffected Spiritual Franciscans in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

AN INCIPIENT ECCLESIOLOGY?

Nicholas's views on the Carmelite profession and the threat to it that mendicancy posed are clear; but the question remains of how he saw his order in the broader context of the Church. I have already suggested that he was not opposed to public ministry *per se*, and this is further borne out by his reference to the example of Jesus as the founding inspiration of the Carmelites. In chapter 6 Nicholas turns to Scripture as the model for Carmelite ideals.[66]

---

[63] Constable, 'Interpretation of Mary and Martha', 110–13.

[64] Francis, *De religiosa habitatione in eremo*, xlvi, in F. Boehmer (ed.), *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi* (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1904), 68; Damian, *Die Briefe*, ep. 50, ii. 108.

[65] Giles of Assisi, *Dicta* xiii–xiv, *Biblioteca franciscana ascetica medii aevi*, iii (Quarachi, 1905), 50–2.

[66] *IS* vi, pp. 285–6. Nicholas mentions two separate incidents of withdrawal in Jesus' life: the Transfiguration on Mt Tabor and the fasting for forty days in the wilderness after his

Thus the Saviour climbed to the solitude of the mountain or withdrew to the desert in order to pray; but when he wanted to preach to the people or to show his works he came down from the mountain. See who it was who planted our fathers in the solitude of the mountain; who assigned it to them as an example to them and their successors, wanting those deeds which are never devoid of mystery to be transcribed into example . . . Some of our ancestors in antiquity followed this most holy rule of our Saviour, and, aware of their imperfections, lived for a long time in the solitude of wildernesses. On the rare occasions that they left the wilderness, they did so together, and from what they had reaped in the solitude of contemplation, they sowed the cut grain in the threshing of preaching.[67]

Jesus' ministry was thus informed by his withdrawal to the wilderness. Since the early Carmelites were following Jesus' example, they combined solitary living on Mt Carmel with preaching. It was only on rare occasions, however, that they left their solitude: the bulk of their work was the contemplation and meditation accomplished on the mountain. Moreover, the public ministry was the *result* of this work on the mountain; it did not exist in order to provide a balance with solitary living, but derived from solitude. Without contemplation, there could be no preaching. Once the example of Jesus and the early Carmelites is cited, the earlier criticism of the friars' practices can be seen in a fuller context. The friars are ignorant because they have not devoted themselves to contemplation in solitude before starting on their public ministry; they have undertaken a difficult task without the necessary preparation. There is no room for doubt which of the two, to Nicholas, was the more important work. Contemplation was not a means to the end of public ministry, but an end in itself; preaching was simply a by-product of contemplation.

In two respects Nicholas's conception of the Carmelite Order can be compared to the way in which Franciscans and Dominicans of his day articulated their own roles. The relationship between contemplation, study, and preaching was obviously a central issue for all monastic and mendicant orders, and one dealt with in differing ways. The

---

baptism. The latter fast was, in medieval pilgrimage tradition, held to have taken place on Mt Quarantana, near Jericho. Both are thus examples of mountain-dwelling, rather than simply generic wildernesses. The twelfth-century pilgrim Rainer of Pisa, who went to the Holy Land *c.*1140, imitated Christ by fasting for forty days on Mt Quarantana—where he had rocks thrown at him, according to his biographer, by the devil—and later stayed at the Benedictine Abbey of Mt Tabor for forty days in memory of Christ's Transfiguration: Benincasa, *De S. Rainerio Pisano, AASS* June, iv. 354–6.

[67] *IS* vi, pp. 286–7.

early Franciscan ambivalence about preaching based on biblical study (as exemplified, for example, in the Three Companions' story of Francis giving away a friar's Bible) had by the time Nicholas Gallicus was writing been modified by legislation.[68] Dominicans were required to study theology for three years, the first year of which was regarded as a probationary period. Only after a period of intensive study were friars permitted to teach. Like Nicholas, Dominic did not want ignorant friars to preach.[69] Nicholas's priorities were of course different. Perhaps, rather like Francis, he regarded preaching as the fruit of lived experience rather than formal study. Moreover, Nicholas saw the training of the *eremum* not as an apprenticeship to be undergone once only, at the start of a career of preaching, but as a constant state—indeed, as the normative and central part of the Carmelite's life. Nor did Nicholas want his preachers to be living in urban houses while undergoing training. The relationship is perhaps better expressed by comparison with the Augustinians or Premonstratensians, both of whom saw public ministry as deriving from the normative monastic life of the Canons. This comparison is also inexact, however, since the Canons lived in communities, whereas the Carmelites were required to live in individual cells. The balance between contemplative life in the wilderness and occasional public ministry ascribed to the first Carmelites by Nicholas Gallicus was in fact unknown in the medieval Church.

It is not at all clear, though, that Nicholas expected the Carmelites of his own day to emulate their predecessors so exactly. He does not address the question of preaching in a contemporary context except to condemn the way it is done by the *privigni*; the only positive mention of preaching occurs in the context quoted above, of following the example of Jesus. The use of the example set by Jesus as a model for the early hermits is revealing of a mind-set that owes much to broader mendicant ideals of the period. Monks in the twelfth century might see themselves as copying the example of Jesus, but they were far more likely, if they looked back to the origins of their profession, to see as exemplars Elijah, John the Baptist, and the Desert Fathers.[70] The friars,

[68] 'Statuta generalia', 76–82.

[69] W. A. Hinnebusch, *A History of the Dominican Order*, i (New York, 1966), 290–9, for the novitiate. The earliest constitutions were written by Dominic in 1216, and were supplemented by the general chapter of 1220–1. The earliest surviving copy dates from *c.*1238. The prescription on training for preachers probably dates from Jordan of Saxony's additions of 1222–5: Brooke, *Coming of the Friars*, 189.

[70] *Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia*, ed. G. Constable and B. Smith (Oxford, 1970), pp. xxiv, 11–13, specifies Jesus as possible exemplar; but Peter the Venerable, *Letters*, ep. 20, i. 29–30, represents the more commonly found tradition.

however, and especially Francis and his followers, identified themselves unshakeably with the *vita apostolica* practised by Jesus and the Apostles.[71] Nicholas's appeal to Jesus as an exemplar, if not the founder, of the Carmelites shows that he was more attuned to the currents of mendicant thinking than might appear from an initial reading of the *Ignea Sagitta*.

The *Ignea Sagitta* is the earliest substantial piece of Carmelite writing, and thus represents for historians the first opportunity to determine the historical character of the order as perceived by Carmelites themselves. Nicholas's immediate purpose was not to trace the history of the order; nevertheless, his argument for retaining eremitism depended upon a high degree of historical consciousness. The *Ignea Sagitta*, whatever its impact in its own day, presents a debate between the development of a 'mendicant eremitism' in the Carmelite Order since 1247 and the observance of an older tradition of contemplative life. In order to participate at all in such a debate, Nicholas must assume the existence of a history stretching back beyond the Rule of Albert. In fact, he chooses to locate the origins of this older tradition specifically in the scriptural example of Jesus. The appeal to Jesus as founder-figure or exemplar looks more remarkable when compared to the historical consciousness revealed in the only earlier Carmelite source, the brief *rubrica prima* that was appended to the beginning of the constitutions of the general chapter of 1281, but which probably dates back to the 1240s.[72] In the *rubrica* the association of antique monasticism on Mt Carmel is made with Elijah, rather than Jesus.[73]

Nicholas based the integrity of the Carmelite Order firmly on the patronage of the Blessed Virgin. From the very start he appeals to the *mater piissima* as the guarantor of the order's ideals; when those ideals are betrayed, it is the Holy Mother who is tarnished.[74] The use of Marian imagery, particularly the attribute of maternity, enables Nicholas to imply that the Carmelites took their beginnings from the Blessed Virgin. By calling Carmelites 'sons' or 'stepsons' of the Blessed Virgin (depending on their level of observance), Nicholas side-steps the

[71] *Scripta Leonis*, 284–6. About a decade after Nicholas was writing, the Franciscan Peter Olivi would develop his ideas of Francis as the *alter Christus*, the wax in which the imprint of the seal is made. See Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 45.

[72] Staring, *MCH* 289–90. The constitutions of 1281 are the earliest to survive, but the first known general chapter was held in 1247, and, as Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*, 89–90, has argued, the *rubrica prima* was probably first formulated during the 1240s.

[73] See below, 108–9.

[74] *IS*, prologue, i, pp. 271–2, and *passim*.

problem of specific historical origins altogether, while still suggesting through allegory that Carmelite life was divinely ordained because born from the Virgin.

Nicholas Gallicus was the first Carmelite to draw on the pre-eminent popularity of the Blessed Virgin as part of his attempt to articulate the identity of the order. As we shall see, this tradition was to develop more explicitly in the fourteenth-century treatises on the order's history. In origin, however, it went back to at least the mid-thirteenth century. Papal bulls addressed the Carmelites as 'fratres ordinis beatae Mariae de Monte Carmeli' as early as the 1240s.[75] During Nicholas's own generalate—and possibly as a result of his own initiative—a confraternity of Our Lady of Mt Carmel was established in Toulouse.[76] Similar lay confraternities emerged in Siena and Florence.[77] In 1282 the prior-general Peter de Millau described the Blessed Virgin as patron of the order, and the constitutions of 1294 directed friars that 'whenever anyone asks about our order or its name, the name of the Blessed Virgin is to be given'.[78] Not surprisingly, given her attributes of nurturing, new orders found in Mary reassurance of the necessity for their mission.[79]

Artistic evidence supports the theory that Carmelite devotion to the Virgin was already profound at the end of the thirteenth century; we can, moreover, associate such devotion with Cyprus. Professor Jaroslav Folda has recently discussed a panel painting from the church of Agios Kassianos in Nicosia which he shows to have been the result of Carmelite patronage.[80] The panel depicts a gilded Virgin and Child enthroned with, at her right side and much smaller in scale, a group of ten Carmelite friars.[81] On each side of the central panel, eight miniature

[75]   *MCH* 33. See, in general, Geagea, *Maria madre e decoro del Carmelo*.

[76]   *Correspondance administratif d'Alphonse de Poitiers*, i. 169.

[77]   Smet, *Carmelites*, 25.

[78]   Rymer, *Foedera*, 618; Saggi, 'Constitutions capitali Burdigalensis', 184.

[79]   See below, 180–2, for Dominican/Carmelite polemic on this point.

[80]   Jaroslav Folda, 'Crusader Art in the Kingdom of Cyprus, *c.*1275–1291: Reflections on the State of the Question', in N. Coureas and J. S. Riley-Smith (eds.), *Cyprus and the Crusades* (Nicosia, 1995), 209–37. The following discussion is heavily indebted to Folda's work, and I express my gratitude to him for bringing my attention to the painting.

[81]   Ibid. 218, 220–1. Gilded images of the Virgin had been common in the West since the early Christian period, but were virtually unknown in the Byzantine world. Folda suggests that the gold used in the image of the Virgin might be evidence that the panel was commissioned in thanksgiving for the safe arrival of the refugee Carmelites from the mainland after the loss of Acre in 1291. He suggests as a model for this panel the sculptured altar-piece in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Florence by Coppo di Marcovaldo known as the Madonna del Carmelo, usually dated *c.*1265–75.

scenes depict scenes from the life and miracles of the Virgin; although many of these scenes are in poor condition, at least one also depicts Carmelites. The panel must be dated after 1287, since the Carmelites are wearing white *cappae* over dark habits. The iconography of the central image represents the Virgin as Queen of Heaven, clearly sheltering the Carmelites under her right arm: a visual display of what had already been claimed by Nicholas Gallicus. This iconography in Carmelite art in Cyprus is significant, given that Cyprus was the first refuge of the fleeing hermits in 1238 and that Nicholas chose to retire to the Cypriot convent of Fortanie.[82]

Although Nicholas Gallicus vented his spleen exclusively on the *privigni* of his own order, it is difficult to avoid seeing a more fundamental ideology in his work. By virtue of the association with the Blessed Virgin, he was making a more general statement about the place of the Carmelite Order within the Church. A distinct, and highly conservative, ecclesiology, is inherent in the nature of the treatise. In some respects what Nicholas had to say was the stuff of conventional complaint. The genre of the lament for the deterioration of the Church's integrity was common in the twelfth century. Monastic reformers, satirists, and disappointed clergy attacked the Church's endowed wealth, the ignorance of the clergy, the failure of monks to live according to their vows, and the corruption of papal functions by money. One manifestation in the twelfth century of this traditional genre of complaint was the debate over the 'correct' or most authentic forms of religious life. In an age of great diversity of profession within the Church, the choice of religious order could be bewildering.[83] Each order symbolized and represented a different facet of the religious life facets that could be characterized by reference to biblical example, as in the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia*.[84] From multiplicity of choice, and awareness of that choice, came the conviction that one form of religious life was better—truer to an 'original' ideal— than all others. One twelfth-century monk who wrestled with the problem of competing ideals was Adam of Dryburgh. In his reflection on

[82] The miracle scenes are almost impossible to identify in the current state of preservation. One group of scenes on the left side seems to tell a story involving the protection by the Blessed Virgin of a group of Carmelites in a church where they are about to be attacked by a group of soldiers and tonsured clerics.

[83] See Caroline Walker Bynum, 'Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?', *JEH* 31 (1980), 1–17, esp. 6–8, citing *inter alia* Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, PL 188, cols. 1139–248, and Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Liber de aedificio Dei*, PL 194, cols. 1187–336.

[84] *Libellus de diversis ordinibus*, p. xxiv and *passim*.

Carthusian ideals, *De quadripartito exercitio cellae*, Adam considers the importance attached to seclusion in other monastic orders. Neither the Augustininan Canons nor the Cluniacs nor the Cistercians demand such strict solitude as his own order. With his previous experience of preaching and administration, Adam was well able to discern between different monastic practices. His conclusion—that canons are like sailors battling the storms of the world, while Carthusians have reached the peace of a safe harbour—may be rather predictable, but it is reached in a spirit of generosity and understanding.[85]

Such debates over interpretation became more marked, and more precise, in the age of the friars. The model of the *vita apostolica* had throughout the twelfth century served as an ideal for a variety of communities of monks and canons, but it was only one of a variety of such models.[86] Monastic traditions were vague enough in origin, and thus broad enough, to encapsulate a variety of offshoots, but the insistence of the Franciscans, for example, that they were following the dictates of the Gospels alone ensured that a level of criticism was reached, both between different orders and within orders, that was more fundamentalist in spirit, and more bitter in effect, than those of the twelfth century.

The most damaging controversy was between the friars, and took shape around the 'poverty question' that dogged the Franciscan Order from roughly the last quarter of the thirteenth century until the 1320s.[87] Franciscans debated the issue of apostolic poverty, and how this ideal was to be realized in the friars' profession, with Dominicans, at the level of detailed biblical exegesis.[88] More significant in the context of Nicholas Gallicus's complaints about *privigni* is the split within the Franciscan Order itself over the question. As articulated in the writings of the Spiritual Franciscans, particularly Ubertino da Casale and Angelo Clareno, this was a conflict formulated along lines formally similar to those in the *Ignea Sagitta*: a struggle between the few who clung to Francis's ideals and the many who had been led astray.

[85] Adam of Dryburgh, *De quadripartito exercitio cellae*, x, PL 153, col. 818, but misattributed here to Guigo II.

[86] Constable, 'Renewal and Reform', 52–66.

[87] There is a wealth of literature on the subject of poverty in the Franciscan Order, among which see esp. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, and now the Italian edition with revisions, *Povertà francescana* (Milan, 1995); Douie, *Nature and Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli*; Gian Luca Potestà, *Angelo Clareno: dai poveri eremiti ai fraticelli* (Rome, 1990); L. Pellegrini, *Insediamenti francescani nell'Italia de ducento* (Rome, 1984).

[88] e.g. Johannes Pecham, *Tractatus contra fratrem Robertum Kilwardby*, in F. Tocco (ed.), *Tractatus tres de paupertate*, British Society of Franciscan Studies, 2 (Aberdeen, 1910), 91–147.

The ecclesiology of the Spirituals, indeed, has been characterized by one historian as a 'remnant ecclesiology' that located the true Church in a small band of the faithful as opposed to the apostate many.[89]

Broadly speaking, there are similarities of approach and attitude between Nicholas Gallicus and some Spiritual Franciscans, especially Angelo Clareno. This argument may appear less than credible in the light of Carlo Ciconetti's conclusion that the most significant influence on the *Ignea Sagitta* was William of Saint-Amour's *De periculis novissimis*.[90] The Parisian theologian's attack on the Joachimist doctrines of Gerard of Borgo San Donnino led to a wider-ranging denial of the validity of mendicancy as a profession. This sentiment, and the apocalyptic language in which it is expressed, make comparisons with the *Ignea Sagitta* attractive. But I have argued that Nicholas's opposition to Carmelite mendicancy should not be taken as an attack on mendicant ideals *per se*; and apocalyptic language was hardly the preserve of the enemies of the friars. Nevertheless, one would not want to stress the similarities too much, or to suggest dependencies or influences between Nicholas and the Spirituals. For one thing, not enough is known of the audience of the *Ignea Sagitta* to make such claims; for another, the Spiritual authors themselves differed over the interpretation of the Franciscan tradition.[91] Further, at the time when Nicholas was writing, the split in the Franciscan Order had not yet become explicit: critics of wealth and endowment within the order attacked the laxity of friars who did not observe the statutes, rather than the structural problems inherent in the interpretation of poverty that would later become so apparent.[92] Then, of course, the issues themselves were different for the Carmelites. The bench-mark of what constituted a genuine religious life was, for Nicholas Gallicus, not poverty but solitary contemplation.[93] Nevertheless, he uses apocalyptic language similar to that of

---

[89] Scott Hendrix, 'In Quest of the *vera ecclesia*: The Crises of Late Medieval Ecclesiology,' *Viator*, 7 (1976), 354.

[90] Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*, 299–309.

[91] Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 25–6, shows for example how much more extreme Angelo Clareno's attitudes were than those of Olivi or Ubertino. See also Gordon Leff, 'The Making of the Myth of a True Church in the Later Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 1 (1971), 1–16.

[92] Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 29–30.

[93] The ideals of poverty and contemplation were linked, however, and during their sojourn in Greece after dispensation from their Franciscan vows by Celestine V in 1295, Angelo and his companions lived a form of eremitical life of which Nicholas would have approved: *Angeli Clareni Opera, i: Epistolae*, ep. 49 (LIII), ed. pp. 240, 245–6. By contrast, Peter Olivi was in his *Treatise on usus pauper* of 1279/83 dismissive of the eremetical ideal, describing certain unnamed friars who had adopted it as 'foolish' and 'impelled by demonic instigation': Burr, *Olivi*

Angelo Clareno in characterizing those who fail the test of true obser-
vance. Nicholas warns the *privigni* that they are drinking from the chal-
ice of Babylon, and that those who drink such filth in this life will in the
afterlife drink from the cup of torment, and swallow fire and sulphur in
eternity. Angelo Clareno claimed that anyone who accepted Boniface
VIII as pope was part of the synagogue of Satan, and therefore outside
the Church.[94]

Nicholas was no Joachimist, and does not employ a formal organiza-
tion of history as part of his understanding of the *vera ecclesia*. But con-
nections between past and future loom large in the *Ignea Sagitta*. The
guarantee of monastic integrity is tradition, specifically Carmelite
tradition. Thus he appeals to a vision of an unspoilt past: 'remember
. . . how glorious and holy you were in your pristine state, and how
wonderful and famous in everybody's eyes, when you gathered to-
gether our fathers the holy hermits in that place of spiritual sensibility
and brought them up wondrously by the water of refreshment, feeding
them unceasingly nourishing food'.[95]

Nicholas rests his arguments on the history of the Carmelite Order,
and particularly on 'our fathers the holy hermits'. Urban mendicancy
is deplorable not simply because it is wrong-headed, but because it
runs counter to Carmelite history. Similarly, the Spirituals argued that
property ownership contradicted the ideals and practice of their
founder; furthermore, Olivi and his heirs were able to find in the per-
son of that founder a symbol of the historical process itself. The care-
ful vagueness achieved throughout the *Ignea Sagitta* by the allusive
quality of Nicholas's language leaves the way open for a broad inter-
pretation of his meaning. Was he speaking only of the Carmelite

---

and Franciscan Poverty*, 65. There are also, of course, many further contrasts to be drawn be-
tween the Spirituals' situation and that described by Nicholas. The Spirituals depicted the
betrayal of their ideals as being forced on them by the papacy, whereas the Carmelites
brought about their own transformation. See Andrew Jotischky, 'Some Mendicant Views of
the Origins of the Monastic Profession', *Cristianesimo Nella Storia*, 19 (1998), 31–49; and Lydia
von Auw, *Angelo Clareno et les spirituels italiens* (Rome, 1979).

[94] *IS* xii, p. 302. Angelo's arguments are summed up, and dismissed, by Olivi, *Epistola ad
Conradum de Offida*, in Livarius Oliger (ed.), 'Petri Johannis Olivi de renuntiatione papae
Coelestini V quaestio et epistola', *AFH*, 11 (1918), 366–73. Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 115,
remarks, however, that despite his distance from the Italian zealots in Angelo Clareno's camp,
the more moderate Olivi still 'shares a common apocalyptic perspective . . . in the final an-
alysis his quarrel with them is not over whether the dragon will emerge in history but where
and when'. In this general sense of viewing the progress of his order in terms of an apocalyp-
tic structure, Nicholas Gallicus belongs with all the Spiritual Franciscans. See below, 293–8,
for comparative survey of themes in Franciscan historiography.

[95] *IS* ii, p. 276.

Order, or of the origins and practice of contemplative religious life in general? If one reads from the start the complaint to the *mater piissima* as a general lament to the Holy Church, then such an interpretation becomes possible. Again, in the passage quoted above in which Nicholas alludes to the origins of the Carmelites, is he referring specifically to Carmelites when he speaks of 'our ancestors' being 'planted on the mountain' by Jesus, or to the origins of monasticism as a profession in the more generic sense employed, for example, in the *Libellus*? Nicholas presumably intended this vagueness so that his lament could be read on two levels: the one specific to his order, the other a more general comment on the drift of monasticism within the Church. The potential for dual interpretation, if taken to a logical conclusion, means that Nicholas was identifying the earliest Carmelites with the earliest monks.[96] In other words, he was implying that monasticism as a profession began when the ancestors of the Carmelites of his own day followed the example of Jesus in withdrawing from human society—the first Carmelites were the first monks.[97]

In the context in which it was written—as a response to prevailing winds of change—Nicholas's work has considerable significance for assessing the identity of the Carmelite Order as perceived by one of its most influential members. Despite its apparent ineffectiveness in preventing what its author most feared, the *Ignea Sagitta* is an invaluable document. Nicholas raises the same issues of identity and status that would trouble fourteenth-century Carmelites. He was less concerned than his successors with establishing historical lines of influence or identifying a specific historical narrative. Yet he was wrestling with essentially the same questions: What did it mean to be a Carmelite? Where did the spiritual origins, and thus the integrity of the order, lie? And how was the order to be located within the Church's mission?

[96] See esp. *IS* vi, pp. 286–7, quoted above.
[97] For discussion of this in the context of other mendicant writing on monastic history, see Jotischky, 'Some Mendicant Views', 45–8.

The Development of Carmelite Historical Narrative *c*.1240–1400

THE EARLY ANONYMOUS TEXTS

Carmelite history writing began with the exodus from Mt Carmel to the West. The earliest historical text produced by the order, the *rubrica prima*, survives in its original form only from 1281, but this version already bears the stamp of a well-tried narrative.[1] The *rubrica* is not a chronicle, but a formulaic statement, almost liturgical in nature, of the origins of the order. Forming a prologue to the constitutions emanating from the general chapters of the order, it survives in slightly varying forms from 1281, 1294, 1324, 1327, 1357, and 1369. Each successive version shows the increasing sophistication of the Carmelite historical narrative.[2] Benedict Zimmerman, with knowledge of only the 1324 version, speculatively dated a putative original version to 1247–74—in other words, the first generation of the settlement in the West. The character of the statement, Zimmerman argued, stems from the need for the newly arrived friars to explain who they were to an ignorant public.[3] Following this assumption, Ciconetti pushed the *terminus a quo* back to 1238, the date of the first exodus to Cyprus.[4]

The need to explain their identity was not unique to the Carmelites. Franciscans and Dominicans encountered similar demands.[5] Francis

[1] *Rubrica prima*, *MCH* 33–43.

[2] Saggi (ed.), 'Constitutiones capituli Londinensis'; for the 1294 version, *idem*, 'Constitutiones capituli Burdigalensis'. Staring's edition of the *rubrica*, *MCH* 33–43, provides the variations from subsequent constitutions.

[3] Zimmermann (ed.), *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*, 277. The 1324 constitutions, edited from London, BL Add. MS 16372, are at 20–114.

[4] Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*, 89–90.

[5] Simon Tugwell, 'Friars and Canons: The Earliest Dominicans', *Monastic Studies*, ed. J. Loades, 2 (Bangor, 1991), 205 n. 51, points out that in northern France the Dominicans were initially known as *ordo Iacobitorum*.

and his followers stand out vividly in the images drawn by his early biographers, because they offered new patterns of religious life by confronting an often sceptical laity. This need was determined by the mendicant character of the new orders. Potential donors naturally wanted to know who they were being asked to support: Where had the friars come from? Where were their convents? Who was their founder? What were their principles? How did they differ from other wandering friars or from monks who stayed within the walls of their monastery? The need to respond to these questions determined the nature of the self-perception of the new orders. Above all, they wanted to show how they differed from other orders. This was of primary importance to the Carmelites, as relative late-comers to religious life in the West.

Given the necessarily reactive character of the *rubrica*, a date in the earliest years of the Carmelite migration, before a coherent account of the order's history had been developed, seems likely. The modification to the rule in 1247 may present a further landmark. Staring commented that the 'exclusively eremitical character of the *rubrica* points to a time before the change of rule'.[6] This is, to a degree, an argument *e silentio*. It is true that the *rubrica* says nothing about the change to the rule; but since its purpose was to present a persuasive historical pedigree for the friars, one would hardly expect it to dwell on a profound change in the order only a few years previously. It is striking to find no mention of the changes of 1247 in any subsequent version of the *rubrica*—even after the order had lost much of its early eremitical character. It is incontestable, however, that the 1281 version represents the bare bones of Carmelite self-perception, and for this reason it should probably be seen as the work of the first friars to have arrived in the West.

If the initial purpose of the *rubrica* was to inform potential almsgivers or to persuade sceptics of the order's history, by 1281 a more internal purpose can be discerned. The opening sentence, 'How to reply to those asking by whom and how our order had its beginning', is followed by a qualification explaining whom such information was likely to benefit: 'Since certain of our younger friars do not know how to reply satisfactorily to those who ask by whom and how our order had its beginnings, we wish to reply on their behalf in a written formula.'[7] This is testimony to the gulf that had opened up between the hermits living in isolation on Mt Carmel and the friars who were now joining the order in England, France, Italy, and Germany. The new generation

---

[6] Staring, *MCH* 34.   [7] Ibid. 40.

of Western recruits had no memories of Mt Carmel and little reason, beyond the liturgical ties to the Holy Sepulchre, to connect their profession with the eremitical foundation in the Holy Land.[8] Liturgical practice may have provided an initial lead to enquirers, but it could not give a full answer to people who wanted to know where the Carmelites came from, how their ideals had been formulated, or what was characteristic about their spirituality. The Carmelites had to accept as recruits men who might have no knowledge of the order's past, but the consequence of this was that they were unable to establish a clear narrative of their identity based on their origins. The Carmelites in the West had, even if unwittingly, cut themselves off from their roots. Fourteenth-century writers within the order would turn back to Mt Carmel and exploit the devotional significance of its history and geography. But in the last quarter of the thirteenth century there must have been many Carmelites for whom Mt Carmel was little more than a name. If this was true of Carmelites themselves, it must have been even more the case for outsiders. The original function of the order—penitential contemplation in imitation of Elijah—had expanded as a result of Innocent IV's new rule, and a new constituency had been found. In the period of new foundations between 1247 and 1287, the Carmelites needed a new sense of identity. The *rubrica* of 1238/1281, therefore, looked inwards as well as outwards.

In content, the *rubrica* is lapidary. A single sentence asserts the belief that the holy fathers of the Old and New Testaments had from the time of Elijah and Elisha lived on Mt Carmel, attracted by the solitude of the place and the opportunities it afforded for contemplation. They settled by the spring of Elijah 'in holy penance', and were followed by a continuous line of hermits living the same manner of life.[9] The successors of this line of hermits were collected together into a single *collegium* by Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, in the time of Innocent III. The rule that Albert wrote for them was approved by Honorius III and subsequent popes.[10] A final sentence affirms the unbroken succession of the Carmelite tradition by stressing that the friars of the present day are still followers of the original fathers' profession, although now spread throughout the world.[11] The 1294 version differs in few essentials. The formula is now said to be a response to a more general question about the order and what kind of beginning it had.[12] The central tenet remains the same, but the sentence concerning papal approval

---

[8] See above, 32–3.   [9] Staring, *MCH* 40.
[10] Ibid. 41.   [11] Ibid.   [12] Ibid. 40.

pushes back confirmation of the order to before 1215.[13] It is thus the order's earliest statement about its past that establishes the practice of contemplative life on Mt Carmel for the purposes of penance from the days of Elijah and Elisha. Although Elijah is not specified as the order's founder precisely, the implication is there, particularly since the prophet was so inexorably linked in contemporary tradition to Mt Carmel. The *rubrica*, in its earliest versions, does little more than claim that the order then in existence was the successor *in manner of living* to the anonymous hermits of Elijah's day.

Elijah had, almost since the beginning of Christian biblical exegesis, been seen as an ideal type of monk. He exemplified fasting and personal asceticism, poverty, lack of concern over appearance, and anchoritism.[14] More powerfully, he prefigured Christ: like Christ, he suffered persecution from his people, but was sustained in the wilderness by the poor and needy;[15] like him, he gathered disciples;[16] and of course, like Christ, he did not die but was taken up to heaven.[17] He was further associated with Christ through the miracle of the Transfiguration.[18] Medieval exegetes took up these themes. Hugh of St Victor thought that he prefigured the Church itself, and Rupert of Deutz considered him a proto-Christian.[19] It was hardly surprising that the Carmelites sought to identify their origins so closely with him.

In the 1320s the constitutions of the order begin to reflect the development of a more ambitious historical narrative. The *rubrica* of 1324–7 introduced a new sentence to the effect that after the Incarnation the successors of the first hermits built a church on Mt Carmel dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and on the strength of this were subsequently given the privilege of being known as 'fratres beatae Mariae de monte

---

[13] Ibid. 41. This doubtless reflects the need to respond to the decree *Religionum diversitatem* of the Second Council of Lyons. The absence of a firm date in the original version of the *rubrica* may be an argument for dating it to before 1274.

[14] St Ambrose, *De Elia et jejunio*, PL 14, cols. 698–728; *idem*, *Epistolae*, lxiii, PL 16, col. 207; St Jerome, *Epistolae*, xxii. 9, PL 22, col. 400, and cxxx. 10, col. 1116; also *idem*, *De exodo, in vigilio Paschae*, in G. Morin, (ed.), *S. Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus sive homiliae*, CCSL 78 (Turnhout, 1958), 540; John Cassian, *Collationes*, xviii. 6, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 13 (Vienna, 1886), 511–12; Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, i. 12, PG 67, col. 894; Basil of Caesarea, *Constitutiones asceticae*, iv. 5, PG 31, col. 1358; John Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, xxvi, PG 88, col. 1050.

[15] Caesarius of Arles (pseudo-Augustine), *Sermo* xl, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 103 (Turnhout, 1953), no. 224, 514–18.

[16] Prosper of Aquitaine, *Liber de promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, ii. 29, PL 51, col. 803.

[17] St Ambrose, *De Cain et Abel*, i. 2, PL 14, col. 319.

[18] Jerome, *Tractatus in Marci Evangelium*, viii, 11. 7, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 78, 481–2.

[19] Hugh of St Victor, *Allegoriae in Vetus Testamentum*, VII. xiv–xv, PL 175, cols. 710–12; Rupert of Deutz, *De Trinitate et operibus eius* In Reg V, 9–10, PL 167, cols. 1243–5.

Carmeli'.[20] This is the first indication of the Marian devotion that was to be a characteristic feature of the order. In the present context, the importance of this insertion lies in the addition of a new element in the long stretch of uncharted time between the prophets and Patriarch Albert. The effect is to demonstrate that the Carmelites were not only followers of a proto-monastic profession of great antiquity, but that their ancestors had been early converts to Christianity. This theme and the history of the order in the apostolic period were to exercise Carmelite writers throughout the fourteenth century and beyond.

The final version of the *rubrica* was introduced into the constitutions between 1357 and 1369.[21] It adds little beyond extra polish to the outlines created a century earlier. The *ecclesia* dedicated to the Virgin built by the first-century hermits now becomes an *oratorium*, and the hermits chose their title from it. A further Marian reference is found in the concluding sentence, where the help of the Virgin is invoked for the hermits' continued adherence to the Elianic tradition. The transition from eremitical followers of Elijah to members of a religious order is left obscure in the *rubrica*. The founders are described simply as *sancti patres*, and the Carmelites of Albert's time and of the present as their *successores*. The mention of Albert's role in providing a rule and, perhaps more crucially, in gathering the hermits together in a *collegium*, seems to define his patriarchate (1205–14) as the moment at which the disparate hermits became an order. In the 1294 version there is already some concern to emphasize that this took place before 1215. Staring has pointed out that the inclusion of the church built by the hermits has a similar purpose, since a religious community, in order to be defined as such, needed a church, with a patron to whom the members had placed themselves in service.[22] The status of the Carmelite Order in its earliest historical (as opposed to legendary) period has been thoroughly examined by Ciconetti, who made much of the notion of *poenitenti* in the context of juridical organization in the Western Church of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[23] What strikes one about the *rubrica*,

---

[20] Staring, *MCH* 41.   [21] Ibid. 42–3.

[22] Ibid. 35. The origins of the tradition of the oratory dedicated to the Blessed Virgin on Mt Carmel are unclear. It may derive from the conflation of Elijah's sacrifice on the mountain with a classical tradition in which the Emperor Vespasian consulted a pagan priest, Basilides, on Mt Carmel, in order to know whether his war against the Jews would be successful; Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, v, ed. M. Ihm (Stuttgart, 1967), 298; Tacitus, *Historiae*, ii. 78, ed. C. D. Fisher, new edn. (Oxford, 1977), 101. The third-century Neoplatonist Iamblichus also believed that Pythagoras had used the mountain for meditation: *De vita Pythagorica*, iii, ed. L. Deubner, new edn. V. Klein (Stuttgart, 1975), 11.

[23] Ciconetti, *La Regola del Carmelo*, 50–77.

however, is the lack of precision concerning not only the status but even the profession of the followers of Elijah. The salient feature of the putative early Carmelites is not so much their eremitical way of life (which is mentioned only in the phrase 'montis solitudinem pro contemplatione . . . amatores'), but rather their location on Mt Carmel. It was geography, rather than profession, that made plausible the unbroken line of succession from the prophets to the present day.

The *rubrica prima* was by nature formulaic, and the later versions follow the pattern of the original, rather than keeping pace with new developments in the order's historical narrative. It was a conservative statement, much like a creed, the purpose of which was to reflect the unchanging nature of the order's essentials. During the century and a half after the first appearance of the Carmelites in the West, other treatises and chronicles fleshed out the bare skeleton of the *rubrica prima*. The first of these, dating from the end of the thirteenth century, was an anonymous treatise in the form of a letter addressed to all Christians, known from its opening words as *Universis christifidelibus*.[24] The authorship of the work is still uncertain, though its recent editor, Adrian Staring, has made a convincing case for Sibert de Beka, the Carmelite liturgist who was to become prior-provincial of Germany in the early fourteenth century.[25]

The *Universis christifidelibus* is heavily dependent both in content and nature on the early versions of the *rubrica*. Ostensibly it served the same purpose, to satisfy questioners about the order's origins, albeit in a more literary form. All four extant manuscripts of the chronicle conclude with a list of papal confirmations of the rule.[26] This suggests that its true purpose was not simply edification, but apologetic. The papal bulls provided the best proof of the status of the order against doubters; indeed, there would be little purpose in including them were this status not being questioned. That the *Universis christifidelibus* was intended for external as well as internal consumption is further suggested by the use of non-Carmelite sources, such as Jacques de Vitry's *Historia Hierosolymitana* and Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*, to provide

[24] *Universis christifidelibus* [henceforth *UC*], ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 81–90.

[25] *MCH* 80. The author of the *UC* was identified as Sibert de Beka by John Bale, London, BL Harley MS 3838, fo. 168ʳ. The later fourteenth-century Carmelite authors Jean de Cheminot, John of Hildesheim, and Bernard Oller all cite the *UC*, the latter two identifying it as the *Cronica romana* of Sigebert, which is presumably an alternative reading for Sibert.

[26] Staring, *MCH* 76–7, points out that the errors in the papal confirmations being identical in all the manuscripts indicate a common source. The earliest version of the *UC* seems to have dated from soon after 1289, which is the date of the last papal bull mentioned.

evidence for the occupation of Mt Carmel by hermits.[27] The *Universis christifidelibus* is more ambitious and innovative than the *rubrica*, and constitutes the first attempt to account for the problem of what happened to the original followers of Elijah on Mt Carmel after the Incarnation.

Like the *rubrica*, the *Universis christifidelibus* calls these proto-Carmelites *sancti patres*, and the same vocabulary is used to describe their manner of life: 'they truly loved the solitude of this mountain for the sake of contemplating the heavens'.[28] Although these hermits continued to live on the mountain *incessanter*, not all of them lived there all of the time. After the Incarnation, at the time when Jesus began to preach, many Carmelites went to Jerusalem and settled near the house of St Anne, where they were better placed to hear the teaching of the Messiah, about whom they had read 'from the books of their fathers'. These Carmelites were to be identified with the 'pious men' of Acts 2:5 ('Erant autem in Ierusalem habitantes Iudaei viri religiosi').[29] The Vulgate word *religiosi* is of course generally taken in a generic sense, but by giving it the strictly contemporary specific sense of applying to a member of an order (a 'religious'), the *Universis christifidelibus* can claim a biblical proof both for the existence of the Carmelite Order in the first century and for the assumption that the hermits of Mt Carmel were among the first converts to Christianity.

The *Universis christifidelibus* continues to locate these hermits in Jerusalem during the reigns of Titus and Vespasian. They escaped the sack of the city and the enslavement and exile of the Jews because of their known virtue, as is clearly shown in Jacques de Vitry's *Historia Hierosolymitana*.[30] Their successors flourished by following the manner of life described in Hebrews 11:37–8: they wore skins, suffered the afflictions of self-imposed asceticism, and lived alone in caves or on mountains.[31] This is the clearest assertion yet of the eremitical character of the order. However, what the *Universis christifidelibus* describes is an itinerant, rather than a fixed, kind of eremitism: the hermits *circuierunt, in solitudinibus errantes*. This wandering existence was very different from that demanded of the Carmelites in Albert's Rule, and of course could

---

[27] Staring, *MCH*, 83. The *Historia Hierosolymitana* is cited, but apparently incorrectly, as a source for the persecution of the sons of the prophets by Vespasian. As Staring's note indicates, this passage does, however, bear similarities to the table of contents of Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale*.

[28] Staring, *MCH* 81.   [29] Ibid. 82.

[30] See above, n. 27.   [31] Staring, *MCH* 83.

easily be interpreted as gyrovagrancy, that most nefarious of monastic crimes. Doubtless the Carmelites were thinking rather of the example of Elijah, who had wandered in solitude.[32] The identification of the Carmelites with this wandering eremitism was doubly important, for besides giving them biblical sanction, it enabled their later apologists to slip free of the limitations imposed by Albert's Rule on the hermits of the early thirteenth century.

The wandering existence is further emphasized in the next passage, which recounts how in the time of Peter's episcopacy in Antioch, the Carmelites were spread throughout various regions in order to disseminate the Christian faith.[33] There follows the most significant innovation in the *Universis christifidelibus*:

Soon after this a certain John, patriarch of Jerusalem and a brother of the aforementioned order, established a rule for them, which was subsequently written down to be observed in posterity by the holy fathers Paulinus and Basil. In the course of time Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, gathered together in a single *collegium* the scattered brothers and established them under the obedience of a single head for ever.[34]

John of Jerusalem's connection with the Carmelites is genuinely mysterious. Although he was the author of some liturgical and dogmatic works, few have survived, and there is nothing to suggest a strong link to monasticism, still less to Mt Carmel.[35] His appearance in the *Universis christifidelibus* is the first sign of interest in him in the medieval West. The only explanation must be that some figure was sought who could form a link between the Church in Jerusalem in this period and the hermits of Mt Carmel. By providing a rule, John gave the hermits status as an order within the Church. This was obviously an anachronism in the context of the early Church in Palestine, when orders and rules had no meaning, or at any rate a very different meaning from that in the West in the 1290s. To a friar writing the history of his order, the anachronism was of vital importance. Because John was a historical

[32] Ambrose, *Epistolae*, lxiii, PL 16, col. 207: 'Hinc illi processerunt viri, Elias, Elisaeus, Joannes, Elisabeth, qui pelliceis tunicis et caprinis exuviis induit, inopes atque egentes, angustiis et doloribus afflicti, in solitudinibus errabant, inter alta et condensa montium, invia rupium, speluncarum horrida, fovearum vadosa, quorum conversatione dignus orbis terrarum non erat.'

[33] Staring, *MCH* 83.

[34] Ibid. 83–4.

[35] G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, i, Studi e Testi, 118 (Vatican City, 1944), 337. Properly speaking, he was bishop, not patriarch, since in his day (386–417) the see of Jerusalem was not yet a patriarchate.

figure, but one about whom relatively little was known, it was easy to adopt or appropriate him for the history of the order. It is still not clear why a Carmelite writing in the 1290s seized upon John rather than someone else, but the lists of patriarchs of Jerusalem from James the Apostle onward were accessible to Western authors, and he figures in the *Historia Tripartita*.[36]

The identity of Paulinus presents greater difficulty. An obvious candidate is Paulinus of Nola (d. 431), since he was not only a monk but a near-contemporary of Patriarch John and Basil; however, he wrote no rule. Staring has ingeniously suggested that the name of Paulinus was mistakenly associated with Basil by the author of the *Universis christifidelibus* because of the existence of a Latin rule of the seventh–eighth centuries, the *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem*, which was attributed to Basil, and of a similar work, the *Liber exhortationis ad Henricum comitem* by Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia (787–802).[37] It seems more likely, however, that Paulinus is a scribal error for Rufinus of Aquileia, the near-contemporary of Basil whose translation of Basil's works on monastic regulation into Latin has become known as the 'Rule of Basil'.

Basil himself is a different matter. Because of his fame as a monastic founder, his presence must be of great significance in the development of a Carmelite historical narrative. He was regarded in the West as a figure comparable in the Orthodox tradition to Benedict.[38] By including Basil, the author of the *Universis christifidelibus* was fixing a lodestar to the otherwise obscure history of his order. At this stage, however, Basil still played an indirect role. He is brought in not as himself a Carmelite, or even as a legislator for the order, but as someone who simply passed on a rule already in existence. Following the logic of this assertion, one is left with the rather startling conclusion that the 'Basilian rule'—the collection of precepts associated with Basil—was not the work of Basil himself but of Patriarch John; and, furthermore, that it was originally designed as a rule for the hermits of Mt Carmel.[39] The

[36] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, iv. 368, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1998–9), i. 644–5, and ii. 324 for note citing parallels in English manuscripts, e.g. London, BL Cotton Tiberius B.v, fos. 19ᵛ–22ʳ, a tenth- to eleventh-century manuscript from Winchester.

[37] *MCH* 75.

[38] The Second Lateran Council (1139) regarded the three standard monastic rules as those of Basil, Augustine, and Benedict: Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 202.

[39] Thus Guy Terrenus, *Quatuor unum*, ed. J. S. Volckmartianus (Cologne, 1631), 278, cites the Rule of Basil against the Spiritual Franciscan insistence on not wearing sandals.

very roots of Orthodox monasticism must thus be sought in the practice of eremitism on Mt Carmel.

This is the first of a series of such appropriations by Carmelite chroniclers, with similarly far-reaching implications. It is significant that the first such appropriation, Basil, should be a figure so unambiguously associated with Greek Orthodoxy in the Western consciousness. Carmelites trying to establish a credible status based on antiquity for their order within the Catholic Church were faced with the inescapable facts of geography. If one went back beyond the first crusader settlement, Mt Carmel was part of the Orthodox world. Claiming that one's forebears had lived on Mt Carmel during the period when Christian monasticism was being developed (claiming, indeed, that they had been at the forefront of such development) meant acknowledging a Greek Orthodox rather than a Western past. The *Universis christifidelibus*, in putting flesh on the skeleton of the *rubrica prima*, had dealt with the problem of how to transform the Jewish followers of Elijah into Christians, but in so doing had introduced a new one: how to convert, in retrospect, the Orthodox monks for whom the Greek-speaking Patriarch John wrote a rule, into Western Catholics. The concluding sentence of the narrative portion of the chronicle, taken from the *rubrica*, allots this role of conversion to Patriarch Albert in the crusader period.[40] The problem of a Greek past might have been circumvented had the order been able to show that Carmelites had become a recognizable constituent of the Western Church at or before a time when East and West began to diverge, but this could not be done so long as the geographical imperative of Mt Carmel was retained.[41]

The transformation of Orthodox monks into Latins was confronted by subsequent Carmelite writers during the 1320s to 1330s. Another anonymous treatise, the *De inceptione ordinis* (*c*.1324), provides a brief narrative of the order's origins that is reliant on the 1324 version of the *rubrica prima*.[42] As with the *Universis christifidelibus*, much of the text is

[40] *MCH* 84.

[41] Naturally, the putative hermits and monks in the early period would not have been concerned with the question of Orthodoxy as opposed to Catholicism, since the notion of distinct Churches did not emerge until the ninth or tenth century. My point, however, is that this question did acquire considerable significance from the twelfth century on. At the time when the Carmelite legendary tradition was first developed, in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, there was considerable hostility between Latin and Greek Churches, a fact that can scarcely be ignored in considering the historiography of the Carmelites. For the hermits, in the minds of the Carmelite writers, the question did not arise; for the writers themselves, it certainly did.

[42] *De inceptione ordinis beatae Mariae Virginis de Monte Carmeli*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 98–106; an

taken up with a list of the papal confirmations of the order from Alexander III (*sic*) onward, and a comparison of dates of these confirmations with the equivalent dates for the Franciscans and the Dominicans.[43] The most important new feature of *De inceptione* was the explanation of how the hermits of Mt Carmel had become absorbed by the Catholic Church. Ironically, this explanation was not in itself a Carmelite invention, but instead was taken from the *De quatuor et in quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignavit* (1277/8) by the Dominican Stephen of Salagnac.[44] Stephen himself took his knowledge of the Carmelites from a brief passage (written *c*.1240) about Mt Carmel in the *Speculum Historiale* of his fellow-Dominican Vincent of Beauvais, where credit for having gathered together the hermits scattered over the mountain into a single foundation is given to Patriarch Albert.[45] Stephen expands on this, acknowledging that Mt Carmel had been since the Church's birth an eremitical site. In the place of Albert, however, Stephen substitutes Aimery of Limoges, patriarch of Antioch (1140–93). Aimericus Malafayda (as Stephen calls him) had both gathered together the hermits and secured papal confirmation of the new foundation. Aimery's nephew, moreover, was one of those early hermits.[46]

The replacement of Albert by Aimery may be simply a textual slip, but it may also be something more. Stephen, like Aimery, himself, was a Limousin, and may have allowed local patriotism to obscure his judgement. Aimery is not known to have had any connection to Mt Carmel during his long office, but he was sufficiently concerned about hermits to prohibit unsupervised eremitical monasticism on the Black

earlier edition is G. Wessels (ed.), 'Anonymi opusculum *De inceptione ordinis beate Marie Virginis de Monte Carmelo*', *AOC* 8 (1935–6), 178–82.

[43]   *MCH* 101–6.

[44]   Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor et in quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignavit*, ed. T. Käppeli, MOPH 22 (Rome, 1949).

[45]   Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, xxx. 123, pp. 1274–5: 'Idem quoque Honorius Papa regulam eremitarum fratrum habitantium in monte Carmeli, quem Helias frequentasse legitur approbavit, et eis in remissionem peccatorum observandam tradidit e venerabili Alberto Patriarcha Hierosolymitano editam.'

[46]   Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor in quibus*, 179–81: 'Fuerunt ab initio nascentis Ecclesiae in Terra Sancta et maxime in Carmelo eremitae multi, sicut patet ex chronicis et multis sanctorum vitis. Horum conversationem videns felicis recordationis Aymericus Malafayda, patriarcha Antiochenus, multum ipsos spiritualiter in Domino nutriebat et in scriptis modum vitae ipsorum redignes, ipsos separatim in cellulis per totum montem Carmeli antea habitantes sub cura unius ipsos adunavit et per professionis vinculum colligavit et per sedem apostolicam confirmari curavit . . . Praedictus patriarcha Antiochenus fuit de Salaniaco, Lemovicensis diocesis, et habuit in dicto ordine Carmelitarum nepotem suum, sanctum virum et famosum.'

Mountain outside Antioch.[47] Aimery, according to Stephen, accomplished three things: he established the hermits who had lived scattered across the mountain in individual cells; he put them under the obedience of a single superior; and he secured papal confirmation. Aimery's interest in Mt Carmel was aroused by what he had read about the hermits: 'in scriptis modum vitae ipsorum redigens'. By saying that Aimery had *read* about the hermits of Mt Carmel, Stephen is accepting the notion of a tradition of eremitism sufficiently well established to have attracted the notice of previous commentators. Reading between the lines, one could even take Stephen's words as a reference to Patriarch John's rule. That Stephen, a Dominican, should have recorded the recent history of the order in terms that recognized the continuity of eremitical life on Mt Carmel is an indication that the Carmelites' account was plausible to other orders in the later thirteenth century.[48]

Although neither the *rubrica prima* nor the *Universis christifidelibus* had mentioned him, the author of *De inceptione* took over Aimery's role as recorded by Stephen. The date of Aimery's supposed involvement with the hermits is fixed by reference to subsequent earthquakes felt in Antioch, Tripoli, and Damascus in 1165.[49] In addition to gathering the hermits together and securing papal approval, Aimery apparently also gave them the title of 'fratres eremitae beatae Mariae de monte Carmeli'. But whereas Stephen of Salagnac replaced Albert of Vercelli altogether with Aimery, *De inceptione* was unable to dispense with so clearly attested a founding father. According to *De inceptione*, Aimery did not actually write a rule, but merely provided a *modus vivendi*. It was left to Albert to hand down the old rule of Patriarch John: 'certum regulam tradidit observandam'. The essentials of this rule are then given: the election of a prior from among the community, the oath of obedience and chastity and the abdication of property, and the establishment of individual cells for the hermits.[50] This is taken, of course, directly from Albert's Rule of 1205/14. The phrase 'ipsos in unum collegium congregavit' is reserved for Albert rather than Aimery. *De inceptione* thus extends the process of refounding the community into

[47] Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 122–3.

[48] The more so since his own work, *De quatuor et in quibus*, was designed to show the superiority of the Dominicans over other orders.

[49] *MCH* 99. The earthquake in fact occurred in 1170: Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, xix. 6, ed. and trans. J-B. Chabot, 4 vols. (Paris, 1899–1924), iii. 339; William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, 934.

[50] *MCH* 100.

two distinct phases, one taking place between 1140 and 1165, and the next between 1205 and 1214.

A good deal can be inferred from *De inceptione* about the kind of eremitical monasticism lived on Mt Carmel before this process. Aimery collected 'under the supervision of a single man' the hermits who had been living separately in little cells over the whole of Mt Carmel since the days of Elijah.[51] Because none of the *Universis christifidelibus*'s account of the conversion of the prophets to Christianity and of the apostolic era of the Carmelites is mentioned in *De inceptione*, it can be inferred that the author clearly did not recognize any substantial change in profession or manner of life from that established by Elijah until the time of Albert. There is no mention of John, Paulinus, or Basil, or of any rule given prior to the crusader era in the twelfth century. This removes, by simple silence, any suggestion of Greek Orthodoxy from the Carmelite past, and suggests that the followers of Elijah lived in a loose confederation without formal organization or leadership, observing as individuals the example of Elijah and Elisha. Moreover, whereas the *rubrica* had specified that the hermits had always lived by the spring of Elijah, *De inceptione* clearly indicates that they had to be collected together by Aimery from the whole area of Mt Carmel.[52] Even so, it was not until Albert's more decisive intervention that the hermits could be thought of as a recognizable religious order with a written rule that conformed to accepted monastic practice.

The *rubrica prima*, *Universis christifidelibus*, and *De inceptione ordinis* are between them responsible for a significant accomplishment. They are far from being sophisticated or complex; they contain no argument, and betray no awareness of a wider historical context. Yet they succeed in establishing the fundamental principles of the Carmelites' origins by emphasizing the geographical specificity of the order; they begin the construction of a narrative spanning several centuries; and they identify the means by which the main features of the order are transmitted over time. This was to be the foundation upon which, during the course of the fourteenth century, the larger edifice was built.

FROM THE 1320S TO THE 1370S

The first Carmelite to weave a richer tapestry from the early writings was the English theologian John Baconthorpe. A native of Norfolk

---

[51] *MCH*, 100.

[52] Ibid. 99: 'ipsos [the hermits] separatim in cellulis per totum montem Carmeli habitantes, sub cura unius adunavit'.

who entered the order at Blakeney, Baconthorpe studied at Oxford and Paris, graduating as master of theology in Paris before 1324. Between 1326 and 1333 he was prior-provincial of the order in England, and continued to be active in the universities.[53] His four treatises on the order are roughly contemporary with *De inceptione*, probably spanning it by about seven years on either side.[54] Although they represent the most sophisticated treatment of the themes hitherto explored by Carmelite writers, they are at first sight of little value in tracing the development of the historical narrative. Baconthorpe examined the origins of his order thematically, rather than historically, with emphasis on analogy and exegesis. Much of his work is repetitive. Above all, he develops much further the Marian devotion of the order first alluded to in Aimery's alleged renaming of the order in *De inceptione*, and at about the same time in the 1324 version of the *rubrica prima* by reference to the construction of the church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin in the first century AD.

As we have seen, Marian devotion was already a feature of Carmelite spirituality in the middle of the thirteenth century. The *rubrica* of 1324 and *De inceptione* reflected rather than created it, for the first-century church and Aimery's new title for the order by itself would have meant little unless they had drawn on a current trend toward Marian devotion within the order. It may have been Baconthorpe himself who played the most prominent role in articulating the theory of a popular devotion within the order. At any rate, exposition of the Blessed Virgin's patronage of the order forms the basis of three of his treatises: the *Speculum de institutione ordinis pro veneratione beatae Mariae*, the *Tractatus super regulam ordinis Carmelitarum*, and the *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*.[55] In the first, Baconthorpe sought to unite Elianic and Marian traditions in the early history of the order, while in the *Tractatus* and *Laus religionis* Mary takes precedence over Elijah as a figure whose life parallels the virtues reflected in the Carmelite Rule.[56] The most

[53] For full biography, see B. Xiberta, 'De Iohanne Baconthorpe, O.Carm.', *AOC* 6 (1932), 3–128, 516–25.

[54] Staring, *MCH* 176–7, dates the works between 1317 and 1334.

[55] Ibid. 185–253. The manuscript tradition is not extensive. Two of these three treatises are preserved in a single manuscript, Oxford Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, an early fifteenth-century miscellany from the Cistercian abbey of Kirkstall in Yorkshire. In the case of the *Tractatus*, this is the only surviving manuscript copy, but the *Speculum* survives in one earlier manuscript, Rome, Bib. Vat. MS lat. 3991. The *Laus religionis* is known from a unique source, a copy made in the 1520s by John Bale, in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73.

[56] Gabriel P. Bueno Conto, 'Doctrina Ioannis Baconthorpe de Immaculata Conceptione', *Carmelus*, 2 (1955), 54–84, 216–303, shows that Baconthorpe's theological

fruitful of his works for historical narrative is a fourth treatise, the *Compendium historiarum et iurium*, composed before 1330.[57]

Baconthorpe sets out from the start his intention to prove the case for Carmelite antiquity 'through deeds rather than tales', and this no doubt explains the exclusion of some contemporary developments from the historical narrative. For instance, he either did not know or did not believe in Patriarch John; at any rate, he omitted him entirely from his discussion of the early history of his order. His method is legalistic rather than historical, and it proceeds by logic rather than by narrative. Thus, although he accepts that the origin of the order lies with Elijah, this must be proved by discussion of geographical location, for which he turns to Vincent of Beauvais and to the preface to Albert's Rule itself.[58]

Baconthorpe dwells longer than the anonymous texts, however, on the nature of the earliest Carmelites. Following Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica* (I Regum II), he locates the origins of monastic life in the example of the prophet Samuel. Elijah, a prophet in succession to Samuel, was by virtue of being a prophet also a devotee of the conventual life, which he passed on to Elisha and his followers. Monasticism, therefore, is to be identified from the first with prophecy and the prophetic profession, through the practice of contemplation.[59]

Baconthorpe does not address the history of the order between these prophetic origins and the Rule of Albert. This is not to say that he discounted the historical narrative current in his own day, of which he can scarcely have been unaware. The narrative was simply not to the purpose of his work. What concerned him was not how to show that Mt Carmel had been the seat of a continuous monastic presence since Elijah, but rather to prove that the order, in terms of the ecclesiastical strictures of the day, pre-dated the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. How much older the order was than this did not seem greatly to interest him. He did not need to make reference to monastic origins specific to his own order, as did some other Carmelite writers.[60] The *Compendium*

understanding of Mary developed during the 1320s from a rejection of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to acceptance of it by 1330.

[57] *MCH* 199–217. Baconthorpe himself referred to the work in a *quaestio* dated 1330, and in 1334 it was referred to by another theologian: ibid. 177.

[58] *Compendium*, prima particula, *MCH* 200, citing Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, xxx. 123. The lines immediately following are: 'Et hoc idem testificatum est a multis Romanis pontificibus, qui in regula bullata sic scribunt: "Priori et fratribus, qui in monte Carmeli iuxta fontem Eliae morantur, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem."'

[59] *Compendium*, tertia particula, *MCH* 203–4.

[60] Smalley, 'John Baconthorpe's Postill on St Matthew', 140–2, points out that Baconthorpe

was a defence against a particular point of attack, and had to persuade by canonical, rather than historical, argument.

A more faithful follower of the anonymous narratives was Jean de Cheminot. A younger contemporary of Baconthorpe, Jean de Cheminot was teaching in Paris in the later 1330s, but probably never completed the theology degree, and spent his career as lector in the Carmelite house at Metz. The comparatively large number of manuscripts of his *Speculum fratrum ordinis beatae Mariae de monte Carmeli* (ten survive) attests to his influence on subsequent Carmelite history writing.[61] He wrote in 1337, by which time the order had almost reached the centenary of its emigration from the Holy Land, and consequently 100 years of disseminating the narrative of its antiquity in the West. During that century the *rubrica* had been fully absorbed into the identity of the order. There can have been few Carmelites living who remembered the change of habit, fewer still the Second Council of Lyons.[62] Any Carmelites alive in 1337 who still had personal memories of the Holy Land must have been very elderly. Mt Carmel, no longer accessible as a monastic site, had become instead a symbol of the order's identity.

The purpose of the *Speculum* was as much to provide material for contemplation as to convince sceptics outside the order or even to teach young novices. Although more interested in history than Baconthorpe, Jean de Cheminot was, like him, attempting more than simply a chronological narrative. Like Baconthorpe's *Compendium*, the *Speculum* is arranged thematically rather than chronologically. Jean de Cheminot examines the papal confirmations of the order as an integral part of the work, rather than in the appendix form used in the manuscripts of the later versions of the *rubrica*, the *Universis christifidelibus*, and *De inceptione*. The work is divided into seven chapters, which deal in turn with the founders of the order, the place of origin, the conversion to Christianity, the patronage of Mary, the rule, the habit, and the migration to the West. From the start, he evokes authorities to attest to the historical narrative he is presenting. Jerome's letter

refrained from using his biblical commentary as a vehicle for promoting ideas about the origins of monasticism, in contrast to his master, Guy Terrenus. For further discussion of the ecclesiology of Baconthorpe and Terrenus, see below, Ch. 5.

[61] Jean was nominated as lector for his fourth year of studies at Paris at the general chapter of 1336: *MCH* 114. The date of 1337 for his *Speculum* is found in Wiesbaden, Landesbiblothek MS 84, fos. 130ʳ–134ᵛ.

[62] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, *MCH* 359, writing in the 1370s, was to describe one, but the story is told because he was an exception.

to Paulinus of Nola on eremitism, which was well known in Western monastic literature, is read by Jean de Cheminot as a specific statement of the foundation of the Carmelite Order: 'Our chief is Elijah, our leaders Elisha and the sons of the prophets who lived in the fields and wildernesses, and made dwellings for themselves by the river Jordan.'[63] John Cassian is similarly used to show that the origins of monasticism could be linked to the specific case of Elijah, and thus to Mt Carmel, where Elijah had lived and whence he had been assumed into heaven.[64] But Jean de Cheminot was not content with Elijah and Elisha alone. Baconthorpe had shown the link between the prophetic profession and the monastic; it followed that Jonah and Obadiah, the 'sons of the prophets', were also monks who lived on Mt Carmel in succession to Elijah and Elisha.[65] John the Baptist was likewise a prophet of the same school, as demonstrated by the fact of his burial by the sides of Elisha and Obadiah in Samaria. Isidore of Seville had numbered the Baptist with Elijah among the exemplars of eremitism. All that Jean de Cheminot had to do was read the generic as though it were specific: because John was a prophet, he must perforce have been a hermit associated with Carmelite monasticism, as all prophets since Elijah had been.[66]

Jean de Cheminot recognized that Mt Carmel was only one of a number of sites cultivated by the followers of Elijah and Elisha. Some hermits lived by the Jordan, others in Samaria, others still in Sarepta (Sidon), the site of the miracle of the widow's oil cruse. But, as Jean de Cheminot shows (from Vincent of Beauvais, though other authorities might have been chosen), Mt Carmel took precedence over other sites because of its association with Elijah.[67] Skilful use of Jacques de Vitry enabled Jean de Cheminot to show that the monastic community established by Elijah continued up to the present day. Jacques's description of the types of monastic and eremitical life in the Holy Land after the crusades, which was intended by the author to refer to the period between 1099 and Jacques's own day (1210s to 1230s), is quoted in

[63] Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, i, *MCH* 116–17, citing Jerome, *Epistolae*, PL 22, col. 583.

[64] Ibid. 117, citing John Cassian, *De coenobiorum institutis*, i, 1, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 17 (Vienna, 1888), 8–9.

[65] ibid. 118–19. The tradition in Western exegesis was that the boy whom Elijah revived from death (3 Kgs. 36) was in fact Jonah. Jerome, *Commentaria in Ionam prophetam*, prol., CCSL 76 (Turnhout, 1969), 377–9, who appears to have been the source, maintained that this was a Jewish tradition.

[66] Ibid. 119–20, citing Isidore, *Etymologiae*, vii. 13.

[67] Ibid. 121, citing Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, i. xix. 98, which is itself a borrowing from John Cassian, *Collationes*, xviii. 6.

support of the continuity of monasticism on Mt Carmel from the time of Elijah.[68]

Unlike the author of *De inceptione*, Jean de Cheminot was concerned to show how the followers of the Jewish law could have become Christian monks. He quotes from a source known to him as the *Cronica romana* a passage very similar to that in the *Universis christifidelibus* about the settlement of Carmelites in Jerusalem to hear Christ's preaching, and their subsequent conversion. Although the passage is condensed, the debt is very clear, and it is not unlikely that, as Staring surmised, the *Universis christifidelibus* was in fact what Jean de Cheminot meant by the *Cronica romana*.[69] Subsequent Carmelite apologists, including John of Hildesheim and Philip Ribot, would use the same source and the same name for it, but there is ostensibly no reason why the *Universis christifidelibus* should have been given this title. In any case, for Jean de Cheminot the authority of the source is sufficient to explain the conversion from the Old Law to the New. Given the momentous implications of such a conversion, we may well wonder whether the authority of such a recent (and cursory) treatise as the anonymous *Universis christifidelibus* would have been sufficient by itself in Jean de Cheminot's carefully constructed argument. Perhaps the *Universis christifidelibus* had by the 1330s come to be regarded as a much older source, and thus as an authority with greater credibility. It may be worth noting that in the mid-fifteenth century one Carmelite writer, referring to the *Universis christifidelibus* by the name of its supposed author, confused Sibert de Beka with the eleventh-century bibliographer Sigebert of Gembloux.[70] Some similar confusion may have been in Jean de Cheminot's mind.

Jean de Cheminot also follows the *Universis christifidelibus* in his discussion of the regulation of the Carmelite hermits. In a near-exact quotation, he recounts the roles played by Patriarch John, Paulinus, and Basil.[71] But he regards the rule provided by John as a regression from the original monastic ideal established by Elijah for the sons of the prophets. The penitential way of life of these earliest monks was so difficult that it proved impossible for their successors to imitate. Jean de Cheminot quotes from Cassian's *Institutes* a passage illustrative of the

[68] Ibid. 122, citing Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, i. 52, in J. Bongars (ed.), *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanau, 1611), 1075.

[69] Ibid. 125, and 80 for identification of the *UC* as the *Cronica romana*.

[70] Thomas (Bradley) Scrope, *Chronicon de institutione, successione, intitulatione et propagatione ordinis fratrum beate virgine Dei genetricis Mariae de monte Carmeli*, iii, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum* (Antwerp, 1680), i. 177.

[71] *Speculum*, v, *MCH* 130.

origins of monasticism, implying, without specifying, that the Carmel-
ite hermits were to be understood as Cassian's 'few but virtuous men'
who removed themselves even from the communal life espoused by the
Apostles in Acts, in order to live in greater solitude.[72] But it was to Patri-
arch John that the Carmelites owed their structural beginnings. Jean de
Cheminot adds nothing to the *Universis christifidelibus*'s explanation of
this earliest phase of regulation. His innovation is to link together the
schemes outlined in the *Universis christifidelibus* and *De inceptione*, so that
Aimery of Antioch—and subsequently Albert—are presented as hav-
ing built on legislation already put in place by John.[73] Jean de
Cheminot really does little more than cut and paste from the existing
works. His contribution is to lend greater precision to the Carmelite
narrative. He specifies, for example, that the Carmelite hermits were
observing the Basilian Rule (or the rule of Patriarch John) at the time
that Albert wrote his new rule for them.[74]

Cheminot's purpose was to show that the hermits were not simply a
loose confederation living all over Mt Carmel, whom Aimery gathered
together, but a genuine order within the Church, with a recognized
and venerable status. The problem raised by such precision was that it
made explicit what *De inceptione* had left ambiguous—that the hermits
whom Aimery collected together and for whom Albert composed his
rule were Greek Orthodox rather than Latins. If one followed the logic
of the Carmelites' argument for continuity of occupation of Mt Car-
mel from the time of Patriarch John, this was in fact the only plausible
scenario. Nevertheless, it was a surprising claim to make in the mid-
fourteenth century, when mutual hostility between Latin and Ortho-
dox Churches was the norm.[75] It was left to the more creative mind of
Philip Ribot, writing in the 1370s, to find a way of absorbing the prob-
lem of the Carmelites' Greek Orthodox past.

An exact contemporary of Cheminot, Jean de Venette, used
Cheminot's *Speculum* and Baconthorpe's *Compendium* for his historical
examination of the order. A Paris scholar, like Jean de Cheminot, Jean
de Venette was prior of the Paris Carmelites in 1339, and from 1342
to 1366 was prior-provincial of France. His chronicle, the *Qualiter et*

---

[72] *Speculum*, v, *MCH* 129–30.   [73] Ibid. 130–1.   [74] Ibid. 132.

[75] In 1339, for example, the Orthodox envoy to the papal curia, Barlaam, doubted
whether the Greek resentment of the Latin Church would ever permit proper understand-
ing: *Acta Benedicti XII (1334–1342)*, ed. A. L. Tautu (Vatican City, 1958), no. 43; see also Joseph
Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198–1400* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1979), 196–9, and, generally, on
attempts at reunion of the Churches in the fourteenth century, O. Halecki, *Un Empereur de
Byzance à Rome* (London, 1972).

quomodo, arose from the 1324 version of the *rubrica*.[76] Staring has suggested that it served as a commentary on the expanded *rubrica* of the 1357 and 1369 constitutions. As is to be expected from this pedigree, it adds little to the narrative of earlier commentators. Jean de Venette begins with the *rubrica*, and continues with eight lengthy commentaries on aspects of the themes raised therein.

Like Jean de Cheminot, Jean de Venette cites Jerome's and Cassian's tributes to Elijah as founder of eremitical monasticism, and proceeds to discuss Elijah's parentage and the story of his father Sobac's dream.[77] He then treats Mt Carmel itself, again virtually transcribing the second chapter of Jean de Cheminot's *Speculum*, and quotes the same passage of the *Universis christifidelibus* (which he also calls the *Cronica romana*) as Jean de Cheminot had done to explain the chronology of the hermits' conversion to Christianity.[78] A chapter on the Marian title and one on the habit follow. It is in the latter that Jean de Venette shows for the first time signs of creative thinking, with his analysis of the allegorical meaning of the colours of the pre-1287 habit.[79] His treatment of the rule adds nothing to Jean de Cheminot and his sources: once again Patriarch John is the author of the original rule, and Paulinus and Basil its transmitters. Aimery of Antioch had, by the mid-fourteenth century, become firmly established as the motivating factor in the twelfth-century reorganization of the hermits, and Venette merely repeats an already familiar story.[80] There follows a catalogue of the papal confirmations, the mitigation of the rule under Innocent IV, the ruling of the Second Council of Lyons, and the subsequent bulls to the order, and finally an account taken from Jean de Cheminot of the dispersal of the order and the settlement in France.[81]

Jean de Venette adds so little to the narrative that it is difficult to know what his purpose in writing could have been other than to bring up to date, by reference to recent bulls, the story already known by Carmelites. Staring's characterization of his work as a commentary on the rubric implies that it was written to provide an up-to-date version of

[76] John de Venette, *Qualiter respondendum sit quaerentibus quomodo et quando ordo noster sumpsit exordium*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 152–75.

[77] Ibid., paraphus i, *MCH* 153–4. The passage on Sobac's dream is taken from Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica* 3 Regum, PL 198, col. 1387.

[78] Ibid. ii–iii, *MCH* 155–7.

[79] Ibid. v, *MCH* 159–63; see above, p. 60. John himself must have realized the novelty of what he had to say on this matter, to judge by the relative length of this chapter.

[80] Ibid. vi, *MCH* 163–5.

[81] Ibid., paraphus ultimus, *MCH* 166–75.

the background to the *rubrica* for the benefit of Carmelites, rather than as a polemical or apologetic piece with sceptics in mind. Jean de Venette's work can be seen as an official version written by the prior-provincial for French Carmelites. It is perhaps surprising, if this is so, that only four manuscripts survive, as opposed to the ten for Jean de Cheminot.

Both Jean de Cheminot and Jean de Venette were Francocentric in their version of the order's history. To them, migration to the West meant the settlement of the hermits in France by Louis IX. A different perspective is provided by the English Carmelite William of Coventry, also known as Claudius Conversus. William was presumably a lay brother of the order, if the nickname Claudius ['crippled'] is to be taken literally, for cripples could not be ordained priests. He wrote three historical treatises on the order, two of which provide entirely new information and count as among the most interesting contributions to Carmelite historical writing.[82] The dating of these works is uncertain. Our only source is John Bale, who in two places gives quite different dates: 1340 and 1360.[83] William influenced later English Carmelites such as John Hornby, Richard Paston, Richard Ely, and Bale himself. The manuscript history of his work is brief, however, and the earliest, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, dates from the 1420s.[84] This manuscript, which also contains Baconthorpe, was English in provenance. Although the *Chronica brevis* was subsequently published in the *Speculum antiquum* of 1507, which was printed in Venice, this cannot be taken as an indication that his work was known to continental Carmelites, since much of the material in the *Speculum* came from England.

William's *Chronica brevis* is a summary overview of the history of the order from Elijah to 1298, written in annal form and relying for early dates on Jerome's edition of Eusebius. The beginning of the order is placed firmly in the year 4274 from the creation of the world, when Elijah was taken up to heaven and Elisha began his prophetic ministry.[85] William says only that Elisha took up headship of the sons of the

---

[82] William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 272–8; *idem*, *De duplici fuga fratrum de Carmelo*, *MCH* 278–82; *idem*, *De adventu Carmelitarum ad Angliam*, *MCH* 282–6.

[83] John Bale, *Cronica seu fasciculus temporum ordinis Carmelitarum*, Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fo. 107ʳ (1340), and *Catalogus maius scriptorum Britannorum*, i. 461–2 (1360).

[84] The *Chronica brevis* survives in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fos. 124ᵛ–125ᵛ, Bale's own copy in Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fos. 41ᵛ–44ᵛ, and the printed *Speculum antiquum* of 1507. The *De duplici fuga* survives uniquely in Bale's Selden supra 72, fos. 45–47ʳ, and the *De adventu* in Laud Misc 722, fos. 117ᵛ, 120ᵛ–121ʳ, the *Speculum antiquum*, and Bale's transcription in Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 32ʳ–33ᵛ.

[85] William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, *MCH* 272–3.

prophets living on Mt Carmel. He does not mention other prophets, but accepts the established notion that a permanent form of community had been founded by Elijah. Some 910 years later, the Word became incarnate. William does not adopt the narrative of the conversion to Christianity, and makes no mention of the foundation in Jerusalem. He does, however, provide a specific date (AD 83) for the construction of the chapel (*capella*, rather than the *ecclesia* of the *Universis christifidelibus* or the *oratorium* of Jean de Cheminot), of the Blessed Virgin on Mt Carmel. This is the first indication of such a date, but there is no clue as to William's own source.[86]

The next date given is 1099, the capture of Jerusalem by the crusaders. Here, for the first time, crusading finds a mention in the history of the Carmelites. According to the *Chronica*, after the fall of Jerusalem, Albert, archbishop of Pisa, wrote a rule for the Carmelites, and confirmed the existence of the order in various locations in his diocese and in Cyprus.[87] The conflation of Daimbert of Pisa with Albert of Vercelli, although clumsy, is understandable in the light of William's overall concern. By having the rule written and the order confirmed 100 years or more before the actual event, William is able to push back even further the chronology of the order within the Latin Church. Although he does not say so explicitly, William must have been aware that the location of the hermits in Palestine presented a problem of ecclesiastical allegiance. It is curious that he omits details of the existing narrative of the order that deal with the Carmelite hermits in the apostolic and early Church eras. It is an omission that demands an explanation beyond the supposition that these historical facts were not known in the English province. England was not, at least in the context of the Carmelite Order, an isolated backwater: continental Carmelites had been involved in restructuring the province (1300–2), and Baconthorpe was not the only English scholar to have studied abroad.[88] Moreover, if Jean de Venette's 'official' treatise was circulated outside the French province, then William would have known of Patriarch John and the

[86] Ibid. 273. The date corresponds to the reign of the Emperor Vespasian, and may therefore derive from the conflation of the classical tradition of an altar on Mt Carmel; see above, n. 22.

[87] Ibid. 273–4.

[88] The Scottish and Irish provinces were separated from the English province in acrimonious circumstances at the beginning of the fourteenth century, in the generalate of Gerard of Bologna. Bale's account, in *Anglorum Heliades*, London, BL Harley MS 3838, fos. 27–8, is supposedly based on the memoirs of the German friars to whom the commission was entrusted. See B. Zimmermann, 'Fra Gerardo da Bologna e le provincie irlandese e scozzese', *Rivista storica Carmelitana*, 2 (1930), 77–87; Copsey, 'Scottish Carmelite Province', 193–4.

putative early legislation of the order. Why, then, does he jump from AD 83 straight to 1099? The answer will become more apparent as the rest of the *Chronica brevis* and its sequel, the *De duplici fuga*, are examined.

William also brings into the narrative the Second Crusade (errone-ously dated 1153), which he thinks was led by Bernard of Clairvaux.[89] This slip is perhaps forgivable, given Bernard's involvement in the preaching of the crusade, but it has a further explanation beyond that. William writes that on his return to the West, Bernard wrote two books on the solitary life dedicated to the monks of *mons Dei*, which is identified as Mt Helios in Cyprus. Here the body of the early Christian monk Hilarion was buried; here also was a Carmelite convent. The ascription of William of Saint-Thierry's *Epistola ad fratres montis Dei* to Bernard of Clairvaux was common from the thirteenth century on-ward.[90] But the appropriation of a treatise written for Carthusian monks on behalf of the Carmelites is ingenious. As with the literal reading of Jerome's and Cassian's tributes to Elijah, the effect is to place the Carmelites at the centre of monastic culture. The reader as-sumes that the Carmelites were not only an existing monastic order within the Church, but that they had spread beyond Palestine to Cy-prus by the middle of the twelfth century, and that they already enjoyed a reputation for contemplation sufficient to attract the attention of St Bernard.

William twice discusses the presence of the Carmelites on Cyprus. As was known from Vincent of Beauvais, there had been Carmelites on the island since 1238. But William was the first to show an interest in a mythical history of the Cypriot foundation. The notion that the Car-melites had originally been spread widely, rather than restricted to a single site, was known from the *Universis christifidelibus* in the 1290s. Wil-liam adds substantially to this. The Cypriot foundation on Mt Helios was, he claims, flooded by refugees from Mt Carmel after Saladin's in-vasion of the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187. In consequence of this, Richard I founded two new Carmelite houses on the island, at Limas-sol and Fortanie.[91] This is further expanded in William's *De duplici fuga*.

[89] William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, *MCH* 274.

[90] The first manuscript of the *Epistola* ascribed to Bernard is from the twelfth century, but the definitive tradition of Bernard's authorship became established only in the thirteenth. By the time William of Coventry was writing, Bernard's authorship was universally accepted. The mistaken ascription probably arose from a confusion with Bernard's *De diligendo Deo*, also known as the *Epistola ad fratres de monte Dei de caritate*; see J. Déchanet, *The Golden Epistle* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1980), pp. ix–x.

[91] William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, *MCH* 274–5.

Here William mourns the martyrdom of Carmelites from Acre and other unspecified cities in 1187; only the pre-existing foundations on Cyprus and Sicily remained untouched. 'The vine of the Carmelites of the mother of Christ would have been totally eradicated, had not the Lord God already planted its seed in Cyprus and Sicily.'[92] The original site on Mt Carmel was then repopulated, according to William, as a result of the crusader reconquest of Acre in 1191. William was, in effect, transposing the actual situation in 1238, when Mt Carmel was temporarily evacuated, and 1291, when the last house in the Holy Land was lost, back to an imagined situation in 1187. It will be readily apparent that this could only be achieved if the whole medieval part of the narrative of foundation were substantially changed.

Although William's account departs radically from the received wisdom of the *rubrica prima* and all subsequent narratives, there may be a germ of truth in it. His main source is the *Chronica* of Roger of Howden, which attests to the devastation of Haifa and Carmel by Saladin.[93] Moreover, it is likely that the original Frankish eremitical occupation of Mt Carmel came about as a result of the threat to Galilee posed by Saladin's campaigns of 1187–91. But whatever the situation of Mt Carmel, there is no evidence that Richard I founded convents for monks or hermits in Cyprus. From William's point of view, however, this detail was necessary in order to explain how the Latin Church had come to enjoy dominance over the native Greek Orthodoxy on the island. From Roger of Howden, William took the names of two prominent members of Richard's clerical entourage—John, bishop of Evreux, and Nicholas, a royal chaplain—and assigned to them the role of advising the king to found churches with Latin priests to say masses for the souls of the crusader dead.[94] Of necessity it must have been Carmelites for whom these churches were founded, because, as William explains, at that time the Carmelites were the only Catholics among the indigenous population. 'The Carmelites took their belief in the mother of Christ, their rule and ordinal from Christ initially and from the church of Jerusalem, which always believed and celebrated according to the custom of the Latin Catholic Church.'[95]

In reinforcing the now standard line of his predecessors that the Carmelites had been involved in the propagation of Christianity since

[92] William of Coventry, *De duplici fuga*, MCH 279–81.
[93] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs, 4 vols., RS (London, 1868–71), iii. 105–6.
[94] William of Coventry, *De duplici fuga*, MCH 280–1. The manuscript mistakenly gives Eboracensis (York) for Ebroicensis (Evreux).
[95] Ibid. 281.

the days of the Apostles, William also takes the opportunity to snipe at Greek Orthodoxy, by implying that the Latin West, rather than the Greek East, represented the traditions of the primitive Church. William makes his meaning plain by adding that 'all the other [Christians in Cyprus] were Griffons [i.e. Greek Orthodox] who neither believed nor celebrated according to the Roman Church'.[96] This forms an important departure from the assumptions that had informed the narratives of the *Universis christifidelibus* and Jean de Cheminot. For William, there could be no ambiguity about the status or allegiance of the Carmelite Order: it was, and had always been, Catholic, because it had received its teaching from the apostolic Church. William must have had in mind the figure of Patriarch John, but he makes no mention of him. Furthermore, he shows no inclination to tackle the problem of the language in which the *regula et ordinale* of the early Carmelites must have been written. Insisting that the Carmelites had always followed Catholic doctrine was tantamount to saying that the original teaching of the Church had been Catholicism, as understood in William's own day, as opposed to Orthodoxy. For this reason William does not address the issue of the reorganization of the order in the crusader period; nor does he include Aimery of Antioch in his account. Aimery's role had been to mediate the transition from Orthodoxy to Catholicism; since this transition was rejected by William, there was no need for Aimery. The hermits of Mt Carmel had been established by Elijah, and received correct doctrine from the Apostles, and needed no restructuring. The only initiative required from the ecclesiastical hierarchy was the confirmation of existing Carmelite houses in the Holy Land and Cyprus. Between AD 83 and 1099, no change had taken place in the nature or composition of the order.

This picture of Carmelite tradition is, of course, both anachronistic and unworkable, for monks and hermits in early Christian and Byzantine Palestine were almost exclusively Greek in language and rite, if not ethnicity.[97] A separation between Eastern and Western Churches, though an accepted fact in the fourteenth century, made no sense when

---

[96]   William of Coventry, *De duplici fuga*, *MCH* 281.

[97]   Palestinian monasticism between the fourth and sixth centuries was in fact quite cosmopolitan, encompassing monks from Armenia, Cappadocia, Egypt, and the western Mediterranean. But although pockets of Latinity remained,—e.g. in the community on the Mt of Olives in the ninth century—by the time of the Arab invasions the character of monasticism was Eastern rather than Western. For an introduction, see Lorenzo Perrone, 'Monasticism in the Holy Land: From the Beginnings to the Crusaders', *Proche-Orient Chrétien*, 45 (1995), 31–63.

applied to the apostolic Church. To say that the Carmelites had always been *Latin* Christians was to misunderstand—perhaps deliberately—the evolutionary formation of the Church.[98]

William's Cypriot excursus adds important new details to the Carmelite historical narrative. Although he was something of a maverick, in the sense that his account fell outside the mainstream and was never fully adopted by other Carmelite historians, his contribution reflects a growing preoccupation with explaining the immediate prehistory of the order before Albert's Rule. Ribot's synthesis of Carmelite history owed much, directly and indirectly, to William's earlier work. Furthermore, William was the first—and in some sense the only—Carmelite writer who tried to incorporate the crusades into his account of the order's history.

In the third of his short historical works, William turns to the question of how the Carmelites reached the West, and in particular England. The *De adventu Carmelitarum ad Angliam* represents a tradition that became firmly established in England, but was apparently unknown elsewhere. William's assertion that the Carmelites reached England through the agency of two English knights who had accompanied the Crusade of Richard of Cornwall (1241–2), Richard de Grey and William de Vescy, has been extensively examined by Keith Egan.[99] External evidence largely supports this part of William's account, but his explanation of how the crusaders came into contact with Mt Carmel in the first place is unique. According to *De adventu*, in 1238 the Muslims raided Galilee and besieged Acre. Among the besieged were Richard

---

[98] For further discussion and background, see Andrew Jotischky, 'The Carmelites and Greek Orthodox Monasticism: A Study in Retrospective Unity', in R. N. Swanson, (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, Studies in Church History, 32 (Oxford, 1996), 117–29. It is perhaps worth noting that at the time William was writing (assuming that we take Bale's revised date of 1360), the papal legate to the East and Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Peter Thomas, who was a Carmelite, caused a riot in Cyprus when he tried to enforce the obedience of the Orthodox clergy to Rome. On this episode, see Macheras, *Recital Concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus*, ed. and trans. R. M. Dawkins, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1932), i. 90–1; Philippe de Mézières, *Life of Saint Peter Thomas*, 92–3; Halecki, *Un Empereur*, 60, 70–1.

[99] Egan, 'An Essay', 68–79. The role of de Grey can be confirmed from the Franciscan Thomas of Eccleston (1258/9), *Fratris Thomas vulgo dicti de Eccleston tractatus de adventu fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, xxii, ed. A. G. Little (Manchester, 1951), 102. Although there is no direct evidence for the role of de Vescy, the cartulary of Hulne records William de Vescy (not, as William of Coventry has it, John) as the founder of the convent: Hartshorne, *Feudal and Military Antiquities*, Appendix IV (the Hulne cartulary), p. lxix. Egan is too cautious about accepting the de Vescy connection. It is true that there is no direct evidence that he was a crusader in 1241–2, but his son John took part in Lord Edward's Crusade of 1270–2, and the de Vescy were prominent in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries for their military service, as noted by Stringer, 'Nobility and Identity'.

of Cornwall's crusaders and the hermits of Mt Carmel, who had been driven into the town by the raiders because the Muslims knew the tradition that the spring of Elijah would never fail as long as the hermits remained on the site, and feared that if they were left unmolested, water could be channelled from the spring into the besieged town, thus enabling the defenders to hold out for longer.[100]

Conditions for the defenders worsened when the Muslims poisoned the river, until finally an armed sortie guided by the hermits slipped through the siege lines to Mt Carmel. The hermits sank to their knees in prayer, and were rewarded by the sight of the spring of Elijah miraculously welling up once again. The siege collapsed, and the crusade was saved because of the intervention of the hermits and the sacred qualities of their habitation.[101] Richard de Grey and William de Vescy, who were among the crusaders, were so struck by the miracle that each brought one of the hermits back to England with him to found a convent on his lands.[102]

There is, alas, no trace of an episode resembling this in the contemporary accounts of the Crusade of Richard of Cornwall. There was no siege of Acre in the mid-thirteenth century. Besides, William's date for the crusade is inaccurate, for Richard of Cornwall did not arrive in the East until 1240.[103] The inaccuracy is revealing, however, for 1238 was the date of the initial migration of the hermits from Mt Carmel to Cyprus, as given by Vincent of Beauvais and cited in *De inceptione ordinis* of *c*.1324.[104] William was following established tradition in taking 1238 as a crucial date in the narrative of the Carmelite migration, though he ascribed to the date the more far-reaching move to the West.

Carmelite history writing was initially dominated by French Carmelites. In the generation after Jean de Cheminot and Jean de Venette, however, a German Carmelite, John of Hildesheim, took up some of their themes in a complex defence of Carmelite antiquity. John had studied in Paris, graduating as bachelor of theology in 1361, before beginning a career of teaching and administration in Carmelite houses

[100] William of Coventry, *De adventu*, *MCH* 282–3.
[101] Ibid. 284–5.   [102] Ibid. 285–6.
[103] Sidney Painter, 'The Crusade of Theobald of Champagne and Richard of Cornwall, 1239–41', in Kenneth Setton (gen. ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, 6 vols., ii: *The Later Crusades 1198–1311*, ed. R. L. Wolff and H. W. Hazard (Philadelphia, 1962), 474–7. Staring, *MCH* 282 n. 12, suggests that William may have been thinking of the campaigns of Baibars in 1265–7, but Acre was not besieged then either, and in any case such a hypothesis would demand a re-dating of the *De adventu*.
[104] Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, xxx. 123, pp. 1274–5, *MCH* 104–5.

in Germany. He died as prior of Marienau in 1375.[105] His *Dialogus inter directorem et detractorem de ordine Carmelitarum* was written probably in the last few years before his death. There is no reason to doubt that it was the record of an actual debate between a Carmelite (possibly himself) and a friar of another order, who, from internal evidence, must have been Franciscan or Dominican.[106] Although there are only three extant manuscripts of the work, the earliest of which dates from 1428, the *Dialogus* was sufficiently popular to have inspired a verse version, the *Opusculum metricum*.

John's main contribution to the historical narrative (as opposed to Carmelite ecclesiology, which is discussed in the next chapter) was to introduce new characters: Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria; Cyril 'of Mt Carmel', and Eusebius of the Black Mountain. His history, however, is not a simple relating of the past, along the lines of the early chronicles. It is rhetorical in tone, and in some places repetitive, as the disputants engage various features of the Carmelite self-presentation. At root, it is the claim to antiquity and its implications for an understanding of the order and its role in the Church that are at issue.

John devotes considerable attention to the details of the biblical account of Elijah's career. He adds little, however, to the narrative known to Carmelites for over a century, of Elijah living as a hermit on Mt Carmel and engendering a community of disciples there. What kind of life, the detractor asks, did the disciples lead there? They followed the 'law of Moses', but after the Incarnation were converted to belief in Christ.[107] John then jumps centuries to consider Patriarch Albert's Rule. He attributes to Albert the responsibility for having gathered together all the hermits on Mt Carmel. He is more definitive in his statement of Albert's significance than had been customary in earlier Carmelite works. He is unambiguous in his understanding of the effect of the rule: 'de illis eremitis', he says of Albert, 'fecit coenobitas'.[108]

This is surely too simplistic a view of the situation on Mt Carmel in the early years of the thirteenth century. Pilgrimage accounts leave no doubt that Carmelites before the middle of the century were regarded by contemporaries as hermits, albeit living in a community.[109] By the

---

[105] Rudolf Hendriks, 'A Register of the Letters and Papers of John of Hildesheim, O.Carm. (d. 1375)', *Carmelus*, 4 (1957), 124–32.

[106] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xv, *MCH* 377, and see below, Ch. 5.

[107] Ibid. viii, *MCH* 355.   [108] Ibid.

[109] *Les sains pèlerinages que l'en doit requerre en la Terre Sainte*, in *Itinéraires à Jérusalem*, 104; see also 180, 190.

1370s distinctions between hermits and cenobites were everywhere more fixed, and the fluidity of twelfth- and early thirteenth-century monasticism had been lost. Hermits, to John, were episcopally licensed individuals living in visible seclusion, rather than monks who had simply opted for a form of communal life less institutional than might be the norm in a Benedictine house.[110] The reason for John's somewhat misleading characterization of Albert's role is presumably that he knew that after 1215 it was no longer possible for monks to found autonomous houses, and he therefore had to demonstrate that the Carmelites had become fixed and recognizable as an order in Albert's day. To suggest flexibility arising from the gradual evolution of an eremitical community into a mendicant order would have been to lay the order open to the charge of innovation—or, worse, of having no status as a genuine order. John makes the point more solid with his use of the term *coenobitas*, by identifying the Carmelites of Albert's day with the Benedictines and the Cistercians.

It is perhaps strange that John makes no use of the 'intermediate' figures in Carmelite history: Patriarch John and Aimery of Antioch. Instead, he introduces an enigmatic figure called Cyril. This character is introduced obliquely. In his discussion of the pre-eminent holiness of Mt Carmel, John cites the preamble of a letter written by Joachim of Fiore, the Cistercian visionary, to Cyril, 'presbytero in monte Carmeli, monte sancto, monte uberrimo'.[111] From this introduction, it might be surmised that John was following a known tradition. John did not in fact invent either Cyril or the connection to Joachim, but he was the first Carmelite to make use of either. A work known as the *Oraculum Cyrilli*, a fanciful and turgid prophecy about the fate of the Church purportedly related to Joachim by Cyril, the recipient of the prophetic vision, had originated in a Spiritual Franciscan milieu in the late thirteenth century.[112] In content, the prophecy bears certain similarities to Angelo Clareno's *De septem tribulationibus* and Ubertino da Casale's *Liber arboris vitae*, and has nothing whatever to do with Carmelite history. One manuscript of the *Oraculum* was owned by John of Hildesheim, and probably acquired while he was a student in Paris.[113]

[110] On licensing of hermits in England, see Anne K. Warren, *Anchorites and their Patrons in Medieval England* (Berkeley, 1985).

[111] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, iii, *MCH* 346.

[112] The *Oraculum Cyrilli* was edited by P. Piur, 'Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli nebst dem Kommentar des Pseudojoachim', in K. Burdach (ed.), *Von Mittelalter zur Reformation*, iv (Berlin, 1912), 223–327. The text of the *Oraculum* purports to have been written in Greek.

[113] Hendriks, 'Register', 118; Kurt-Victor Selge, 'Un codice quattrocentesco dell'Archivio

In the context of the development of Carmelite historical narrative, Cyril has a double significance. First, he demonstrates the existence of an ecclesiastical presence on Mt Carmel in Joachim's day (i.e. the 1190s–*c.*1210), well before the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. It was of course assumed that a priest named Cyril living on Mt Carmel must have been a Carmelite, rather than a solitary hermit with no connection to the hermits who were soon to be organized by Albert of Vercelli. Furthermore, the fact that the *Oraculum Cyrilli* derived from a Spiritual Franciscan source having no connection to the Carmelites bolstered the claim for the integrity of the Carmelite 'historia' by providing external evidence. Like Aimery of Antioch, Cyril was a figure known from an impartial source. The case is given stronger backing by the fact that the Spiritual Franciscans were in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries no friends of the Carmelites. Guy Terrenus and his pupil Baconthorpe opposed the doctrine of absolute poverty, and the order as a whole supported John XXII's bull against the Spirituals.[114] There was thus no reason for the Spirituals to invent a character such as Cyril to promote Carmelite history, and indeed no reason to write about him unless they accepted as genuine the Carmelite tradition of a monastic presence on Mt Carmel in the twelfth century. The Cyrilline tradition, indeed, indicates that the whole Carmelite assumption of an organized monasticism deriving from Elijah was accepted as true by many mendicants before 1300.

From a purely historical perspective, Cyril presents intriguing possibilities. The name is unambiguously Greek. We know, although medieval Carmelites did not, of the white-haired Calabrian priest described by the pilgrim John Phokas in 1185.[115] Joachim was also a Calabrian, although not Orthodox. Did an Orthodox Calabrian monk known to the Cistercian abbot migrate to Mt Carmel in the 1180s? And was the memory of this association preserved, to be resurrected a century later? Spiritual Franciscans, who had close links to Joachites in southern Italy, might have picked up an oral tradition about 'Cyril', and found in the white-haired Calabrian a suitable vehicle for the transmission of their own ideals. However genuine the historical background, Cyril's Orthodoxy made him a figure of considerable significance for the account of the order's restructuring in the

Generale dei Carmelitani, contenente opere di Arnaldo da Villanova, Gioacchino da Fiore e Guglielmo da Parigi', *Carmelus*, 36 (1989), 166–76.

[114] See below, p. 162–6.
[115] John Phokas, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, PG 133, cols. 961–2.

twelfth century developed by John's contemporary Philip Ribot. By the time that John Bale was collecting Carmelite materials in the 1520s, a separate *vita* of Cyril was in existence.

PHILIP RIBOT

The fourteenth century saw the development of Carmelite historical writing from simple narrative chronicle to a sophisticated defence of the claim of antiquity against critics. The lapidary annalist style of the early anonymous texts was transformed by the theologians John Baconthorpe, Jean de Cheminot, and John of Hildesheim into textured argumentation that blended apologetic with canon law and biblical exegesis. Without new historical material, however, the content of this apologetic writing followed a predictable pattern. John of Hildesheim relied heavily on Jean de Cheminot, who in turn took his cue from the *Universis christifidelibus*, *De inceptione*, and ultimately the *rubrica prima*. It was only in the last quarter of the fourteenth century that a truly original contribution to the Carmelite historical tradition emerged. The work of Philip Ribot, the prior-provincial of Catalonia from 1385, advanced knowledge of the Carmelite past considerably by adding vivid detail to the framework of the *rubrica* and its successors.[116]

Ribot's *Decem libri de institutione et peculiaribus gestis religiosorum Carmelitarum* is organized according to the same themes that had preoccupied his predecessors: the Elianic origin of the order, the transmission of a rule, the habit, the role of the Blessed Virgin as patron, and the papal confirmations of the order. His method, however, shows the mind of a historian rather than, like Baconthorpe, a canonist or, like Jean de Cheminot, a theologian. For Ribot understood—perhaps from observation of the debates with Dominicans—the need to persuade by

[116]   Philip Ribot, *Decem libri de institutione et peculiaribus gestis Carmelitarum*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i (Antwerp, 1680), with separate pagination. A new edition is currently in preparation by Paul Chandler, O.Carm., based on his Ph.D. thesis at the University of Toronto. The dating of Ribot's work is uncertain. Boaga, 'La storiografia carmelitana', 144–5, suggests 1379/91. Geagea, *Maria madre e decoro*, 256, argues for a date after 1385, when Ribot became prior-provincial; but there is no reason why he could not have written it before being elected to office. More pertinent is the question of when *De institutione* became widely known. Geagea, *Maria madre e decoro*, 267, follows Hendriks, 'La Succession héréditaire', 69, and Saggi, *Sant' Angelo di Sicilia*, 31, in arguing that the work was not influential until at least the 1380s and perhaps later, on the grounds that neither of the two prior-generals Bernard Oller and John Grossus appear to have known it. By the 1420s it was known about, but apparently not yet available, in England, for Thomas Netter, the English prior-provincial, sent abroad for a copy: Zimmermann, *MCH* 464.

use of plausible historical evidence, rather than by appeal to authority. Whereas Baconthorpe had proceeded by appeal to the self-evident truths of canon law, and Jean de Cheminot on what little help the Scriptures could give, Ribot introduced new sources which could themselves bear witness to the past. His work has the deliberate character of an edition of scholarly texts, each relating to a particular theme in Carmelite history. Ribot's method, brilliant in its resourcefulness, was to make the principal characters of the existing narrative tell their own story.

De institutione is organized around four supposedly authoritative texts. Patriarch John of Jerusalem, first used by the *Universis christifidelibus* in the 1290s, had been adopted uncritically by Jean de Cheminot and Jean de Venette. Ribot went even further by introducing the supposedly authoritative text of John's Rule, called *De institutione primorum monachorum*, as part of *De institutione*. Likewise, 'Cyril of Mt Carmel', until then an obscure prophetic voice, became in Ribot's hands a crucial figure in the development of the order as the third prior-general. Ribot tells the story of the Carmelites in the crusader period through the medium of what purports to be Cyril's letter to another Carmelite prior, Eusebius. Finally, Ribot presents what purported to be a chronicle written by the late thirteenth-century prior-provincial of the Holy Land, William de Sanvico (of Sandwich), on the dispersal of the order in his own day. The fourth source is the *tractatus* on the rule by Sibert de Beka.[117] In each case Ribot took a historical figure—or at least, in the case of Cyril, one assumed to have been historical. His purpose is primarily neither polemical nor apologetic, but rather, in the tradition of the earliest Carmelite historical writing,

---

[117]   The older tradition of treating these as four separate and presumably genuine works persisted in Carmelite historiography into the twentieth century. The influential Carmelite scholar Bartholomé Xiberta, 'Elias et religio christiana in Monte Carmelo', reviewing Clemens Kopp, *Elias und Christendum auf dem Karmel*, Collectanea Hierosolymitana, 3 (Paderborn, 1929), in *AOC* 7 (1931–2), 180–211, claimed that it was possible to demonstrate that *De institutione primorum monachorum* was older than the mid-thirteenth century from internal evidence. Writing as late as 1988, Geagea, *Maria madre e decoro*, 131–3, still found it necessary to refute Xiberta's proofs point by point. Xiberta's argument was threefold: (i) the biblical citations lack the chapter divisions introduced in 1214 by Stephen Langton, (ii) the use of the word *ortus* rather than *conceptio* suggests an early date, and (iii) the eremitical character of the work suggests the period before the shift to mendicancy. Even if these points are accepted as valid, all three can be refuted by arguing that Ribot deliberately chose to make his work appear older than it was. As Geagea argues, no Carmelite work before Ribot cites any of Ribot's 'sources'. It is curious, then, that Geagea still finds it necessary to give *De institutione primorum monachorum* a separate section in his discussion of thirteenth-century sources, as though it were a genuine source!

informative. He provides what had most obviously been lacking from previous Carmelite accounts: the raw material of the past. The result is the most coherent and imaginative synthesis yet produced by the order.

The Western patristic tradition of exegesis gave Elijah a prominent role as an exemplar of monasticism. Ambrose, influenced by Basil of Caesarea, had considered Elijah the most important of all the prophets.[118] His contemporary, Jerome, who knew the solitary life well, considered that Elijah's importance lay in his providing a model for two of the essential components of the monastic life: asceticism and virginity.[119] Augustine developed the notion of Elijah as a Christian forerunner and a symbol of Paradise.[120] The idea of Elijah as the 'prototype monk', whose example was followed by John the Baptist, Antony, and Paul of Thebes, was most clearly articulated by John Cassian.[121] Cassian, who had studied monasticism in Egypt before establishing his own community at Marseilles, helped to mediate the Greek exegetical tradition to the West. Yet, although Greek exegetes were interested in Elijah's symbolic attributes as models for the monastic life, there was little development of the notion of Elijah as leader of a proto-monastic community.[122]

It was Isidore of Seville, writing *c*.600, who first saw in Elijah possibilities for an institutional role within Christianity. His *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, an attempt to provide a scriptural rationale for the development of the Church's institutions and liturgy, identified the manner of life of Elijah, Elisha, and the 'sons of the prophets' in building cells for themselves near the Jordan as the direct precursor of the forty-day fast instituted in the Church's calendar.[123] In this, of course, he followed an earlier sentiment of Jerome;[124] but for Jerome the exemplary role of Elijah was moral, rather than institutional. The notion of the sons of the prophets living in a community dedicated to prayer and contemplation goes back to Justin Martyr in the second century,[125] but it does

---

[118] St Ambrose, *De viduis*, i. 3, PL 16, cols. 233–62; Eliane Poirot, *Les Prophètes Elie et Elisée dans la littérature chrétienne ancienne*, Collection Monastica (Turnhout, 1997), 489–91. See in general B. Botte, 'Le Culte d'Elie dans l'Eglise chrétienne', in *Elie le prophète*, i: *Etudes Carmélitaines*, 35 (Paris, 1956), 208–18.

[119] Jerome, *Epistolae*, xxii, 9, PL 22, col. 400.   [120] Poirot, *Les Prophètes*, 498–504.

[121] Cassian, *Collationes*, xviii. 6, CSEL 13, 511–12.

[122] For a survey of the Greek and Oriental patristic traditions on Elijah and Elisha, see Poirot, *Les Prophètes*, 31–190, 393–480.

[123] Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ii. xvi. 1, ed. C. M. Lawson, CCSL 113 (Turnhout, 1989), 74.   [124] Jerome, *Epistolae*, lviii. 5.

[125] Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, lxxxv, 6, trans. A. Lukyn Williams (London, 1930),

not seem to have been developed by patristic exegetes in either East or West. It was left, indeed, to Albert of Vercelli's Rule, to recall the exact words used by Justin to describe the 'monasticism' of the sons of the prophets, who built a house in which to 'repeat and meditate on the law and precepts of God'.[126]

This is neither the time nor the place to rehearse the evolution of exegetical theory and style in the medieval West. In the context of the Ribotian synthesis, however, it is worth recalling the development in the twelfth century, by Hugh and his followers at the Parisian house of St Victor, of biblical exegesis according to the literal and historical sense.[127] The debt of the Victorines to contemporary Jewish biblical scholarship has been noted by Beryl Smalley.[128] The Victorines' method, and indeed the study of Scripture itself, came to be overshadowed in the fourteenth century by the scholastic method developed in the university theology faculties. It was the friars, of course, who came to dominate university theology, and Ribot, like most Carmelite writers, was a product of the universities. Scholasticism may have separated theology from biblical exegesis, but, as Smalley has shown, the Dominicans in particular sought at first to maintain the traditions of the Victorines.[129] Something of the historical curiosity of this older school echoes in Carmelite historical writing. Peter Comestor, for example, who was been all but forgotten by the mendicant postillators, was an important source for Carmelites, and not only for his story of Sobac's dream.

Ribot certainly had in mind something more literal than the patristic exegetes. He adopted the 'sons of the prophets' to staff the putative monastic community on the site of Elijah's spring. Jonah became Elisha's disciple after the prophet had rescued him from death; here Ribot follows Jerome's tradition that Jonah was the son of the widow of Sarepta.[130] Micah and Obadiah were also members of the same

184. See J. G. Williams, 'The Prophetic "Father": A Brief Explanation of the Term "Sons of the Prophets"', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 85 (1966), 344–8.

[126] *Rule of St Albert*, viii, 82–3.

[127] Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1952), 83–195; Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de L'Ecriture*, pt. 2, vol. i (Paris, 1961), 287–436; see also M-D. Chenu, *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (Chicago, 1968), 162–201.

[128] Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 149–95.

[129] Ibid. 268–70. Not all thirteenth-century friars were scholastics: the Franciscan Roger Bacon, who was perhaps the most widely read of the English scholars, famously denounced the scholastic method: *Opus Minus*, ed. J. S. Brewer, RS (London, 1859), 323.

[130] Ribot, *De institutione*, ii. 4; *Speculum*, i. 24. The Hieronymian tradition of Jonah is in Jerome, *Commentarium in Ionam prophetam*, prol., p. 378.

community.[131] Thus far, Ribot has not strayed far from Jean de Cheminot's earlier speculations. It is the assumptions he makes about them, rather than simply their inclusion, that is striking. After returning from exile, Elijah 'led them to observe the monastic life . . . enjoining them to praise God with great devotion in psalms and on the lyre and cymbals'.[132] The implication is that even a monastic liturgy was established by Elijah. The sons of the prophets then followed him 'as much in their monastic way of life as in their habitation of certain places'.[133] This was going further than saying what everyone already accepted, that Elijah was a symbolic forerunner of monasticism.

    Establishing the location had always been important to Carmelite apologists. If it could be shown that the order had occupied a single site continuously, then the contention that it had always constituted an order became more plausible. Any mention of Mt Carmel by the Old Testament prophets was therefore taken as evidence of the status of the site as a monastic foundation. Isaiah 32: 16: 'et habitabit in solitudine iudicium, et iustitia in charmel sedebit', became (reading *carmel* for *charmel*) in Ribot's hands a proof-text for demonstrating the use of Mt Carmel as a site for religious devotion. 'See then, how the prophet describes the decorous order of the lives led by the future Carmelites, who later lived alone in individual cells on Mt Carmel, and daily summoned each other to judgement by mental contemplation.'[134] No previous author had paid such close attention to the details of Carmelite tradition as Ribot. By simply extending the formula of the *rubrica*, he arrived at the conclusion that the sons of the prophets lived the kind of eremitical contemplative life that was recognizable to his readers from later sources. His use of William of Saint-Thierry's 'golden letter' (attributed by Ribot, as by William of Coventry, to St Bernard), which expounded the etymology of the word *cella* so as to link it to the word *caelum*, shows precisely how Ribot wanted the early Carmelites to be seen: not as 'proto-monks' stumbling upon a form of life from which the monasteries of the West would one day claim descent, but as fully-fledged monks of whom the terminology of Cistercian or Carthusian monasticism was perfectly valid.[135]

---

[131] Ribot, *De institutione*, ii. 2; *Speculum*, i. 22.

[132] Ribot, *De institutione*, ii. 6–7; *Speculum*, i. 26.

[133] Ribot, *De Institutione*, ii. 8; *Speculum*, i. 27.

[134] Ribot, *De institutione*, iii. 5; *Speculum*, i. 33.

[135] Ribot, *De institutione*, iii. 6; *Speculum*, i. 34–5. Jerome had coined the phrase 'monks of the Old Testament' for the sons of the prophets: *Epistolae*, cxxv. 7. In common with most

Any prophet worth his salt had to be a public figure—more public, certainly, than the Carthusians whom William of Saint-Thierry was addressing. Although 'cities seemed like prisons, and solitude like Paradise', it was necessary for the early followers of Elijah to frequent society in order to fulfil their prophetic functions.[136] There was nothing new in this, of course: the *Universis christifidelibus* and Jean de Cheminot, for example, had referred to the 'house of St Anne' in Jerusalem.[137] But Ribot wanted to demonstrate that the early spread of Carmelite hermits throughout the Holy Land in fulfilment of their role as prophets did not invalidate their status as hermits or monks. Permeating *De institutione* is a respect for the traditional interpretations of forms of monastic life, and a concern to show how the order from its earliest days fitted into such forms. The monks of Mt Carmel, Ribot asserts, were known as 'anchorites' because their way of life corresponded to the classical conception of anchorites. But the salient feature of their anchoritism was not, as one might expect, living alone in a cell or in the wilderness, but exposing oneself to the assaults of the devil.[138]

Elijah's leadership of a wider community, and his responsibility for that community before God, were also part of the prophetic function. It was a crucial aspect of the Carmelite descent from Elijah and the prophets, for (in Carmelite thinking) had Elijah been nothing more than a solitary, there could have been no Carmelite Order. This meant that Elijah had to combine the functions of the true anchorite, or solitary, with communal forms of monasticism. Ribot does not follow the distinction as far as his successors would in the fifteenth century. Nevertheless, his emphasis on Elijah's role as a monastic leader in his own day, rather than simply as the 'type' preferred in the exegetical tradition, left the way open for Elijah to be seen as a monastic founder of the same stamp as, for example, St Benedict or St Augustine.

All medieval monks, to some degree, traced their origins back to scriptural precedent. But if a Benedictine cited John Cassian's well-known passage tracing the roots of monasticism back to Paul of

contemporaries, Ribot attributes the golden letter to St Bernard; see above, n. 90. He may have read the relevant passage about *cella* and *caelum* in the *Ignea Sagitta* rather than in William.

[136] Ribot, *De institutione*, iii. 7; *Speculum*, i. 35.

[137] *UC*, *MCH* 83; Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, iii. *MCH* 125.

[138] Ribot, *De institutione*, iii. 8; *Speculum*, i. 36–8. On the question of demonic attack as a determinant of the eremitical life, it may be worth noting that one of Ribot's sources for this section, Gerard of Nazareth's *De conversatione virorum Dei*, contains more than one twelfth-century example of hermits suffering demonic assault. This was also a feature of contemporary Orthodox eremitical practice: Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 94–5. The ultimate model was, of course, Antony's persecution by demons in *Vita Antonii*.

Thebes and Antony, and thus to the imitation of John the Baptist and Elijah, he was speaking figuratively.[139] Ribot was not. Since all monastic practice could be traced back to Elijah, it could be said to have begun on Mt Carmel. Thus Gerard of Nazareth's general description of the hermits he encountered in the crusader states as 'those who, following the example of Elijah, chose the silence of solitude over the tumult of cities',[140] referred not to monks or hermits generically, but specifically to monks who lived on Mt Carmel: to the Carmelite Order, in other words. Ribot has a rather sniffy note on the failure of Cassian and Isidore, whom he quotes, to distinguish between the generic pursuit of solitude after the example of Elijah and the early Carmelites themselves.[141]

The Carmelites were thus the original monks, because they followed Elijah in all particulars. This could include prophetic and preaching activities that took them away from Mt Carmel. Any monk or hermit in the Holy Land could fall into the category of Carmelite, because, even if encountered far from Mt Carmel, he could claim simply to have been engaging in some other aspect of the monastic profession. There is a hint of this current of thought in the *Ignea Sagitta*, as also in Jean de Cheminot; but in Ribot's work it is a deep and ever-present conviction.

The outlines of the *rubrica prima* enabled Ribot to rationalize Scripture so that it conformed to the idiom in which he was working. Elisha converted Jonadab, son of Rechab, to the monastic life, and Jonadab's sons—these monks apparently married and had children—continued the tradition. 'They served their father, and abstained from wine; nor did they build houses or own fields or plant vineyards, but lived instead in tents all their days.'[142] Making Carmelites out of Jonadab and his sons helped to explain in literal terms the letter of Jerome to Paulinus on monasticism, where the father called himself a follower of Antony, Hilarion, Macarius, Elijah, and the sons of the prophets, 'in which number are also counted the sons of Rechab, who did not drink wine

---

[139] For example, the treatise *De prima institutione monachorum*, ed. from London, BL MS Cotton Vitellius E. XII, fo. 85, in W. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, i, ed. J. Caley, H. Ellis, and B. Bandinel (London, 1846), pp. xix–xxii; see also W. A. Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises on the Origins of Monasticism', in V. Ruffer and A. J. Taylor (eds.), *Medieval Studies Presented to Rose Graham* (Oxford, 1950), 189–215.

[140] *Ribot, De institutione*, iii. 8; *Speculum*, i. 36, citing Gerard's *De conversatione virorum Dei*. This passage from *De conversatione* was not known by the Centuriators of Magdeburg, from whose compilation (1562–74) Benjamin Z. Kedar published extracts: 'Gerard of Nazareth', 71–7.

[141] Ribot, *De institutione*, iii. 8; *Speculum*, i. 37.

[142] Ribot, *De institutione*, iv. 5; *Speculum*, i. 42.

or eat pulses, who lived in tents and were praised through Jeremiah by the voice of God, who promised them that the line of the man who stands in the presence of God would never fail'.[143] Jerome, moreover, had also explained how the sons of Jonadab had escaped captivity when the Israelites were defeated by the Assyrians.[144] This was particularly useful for Ribot, explaining as it did how a continuous presence had been maintained on Mt Carmel despite the Babylonian Captivity. There was considerable scope here for allegorical exegesis. The lovers of solitude were permitted to remain in the Promised Land because their way of life did not make them reliant on cities and buildings, while, by contrast, citizens were led into captivity, just as Adam and Eve had been expelled from Paradise.[145] Once again, there is a resounding echo of Nicholas Gallicus's impassioned plea for a return to the values of the *eremum* 100 years before Ribot. In Ribot's day, however, such echoes had poignancy rather than real meaning. While Carmelite friars might write feelingly about their eremitical past and meditate on Mt Carmel as a source of contemplation, they lived unequivocally among people and in towns.

By the time Ribot was writing, one aspect of the Carmelite past had been subjected to particular criticism. In the 1330s the Oxford Dominican Robert Holcot had mocked the Carmelite interpretation of the story of Sobac's dream. More devastating than his jibe about white-clad figures signifying millers or bakers, rather than Carmelites, was his subsequent point that if the Carmelites were a religious order in Old Testament days, then they must have been either Pharisees, Sadducees, or Essenes, since these were the only *religiosi* at that period.[146] Ribot sought to identify the Jewish *viri religiosi* in Jerusalem of Acts 2: 5 with the Carmelites, thus anchoring the conversion firmly in the Scriptures.[147] He had already shown that Elijah and the sons of the prophets

[143] Jerome, *Epistolae*, lviii (*ad Paulinum*), PL 22, col. 583; also cited in *De prima institutione monachorum*; Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, i, p. xix.

[144] Ribot, *De institutione*, iv. 8; *Speculum*, i. 45.

[145] Compare the rather different use of the Babylonian Captivity by William of Coventry, *De adventu*, MCH 284–5.

[146] See above, 57–8; Smalley, *English Friars*, 187–8. As Smalley points out, however, Holcot's own understanding of the past was nothing to brag about: 'even the most charitable explanation will not save Holcot's scholarship' (ibid. 160). He was particularly susceptible to using invented sources in his descriptions of the classical past.

[147] Ribot, *De institutione*, v. 5–8; *Speculum*, i. 50–2. This also stemmed from the patristic notion of the virtuous Jews who would be saved by the teaching of the prophets: Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xx. 29, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCSL 48 (Turnhout, 1955), 752–3. Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Carmelites would proudly claim the Essenes as their predecessors; see below, Ch. 7.

had to live a life that was at various times both fixed and vagrant.[148] Now he explained that the Carmelites would regularly go to Jerusalem to celebrate certain feasts, such as Succoth (Tabernacles) and Pentecost. In the year in which Christ ascended into heaven, 'all these religious were gathered in Jerusalem soon after his ascension, in order to celebrate the feast of Pentecost there'.[149] The Carmelites, lodging in Mt Zion (evidently the convent at the house of St Anne had not yet been founded), heard the commotion from the upper room, where the Apostles were being visited by the Holy Spirit. Rushing outside to see what was happening, they were among the first to hear the Apostles speaking in tongues. Peter recognized the successors of Elijah as holy men of the Old Law, and preached to them and baptized them in the name of Christ. Some of the Carmelites who had been praying in the Temple at the time were baptized by the Apostles a little later.[150]

The ingenuity of this explanation is admirable. It allowed the Carmelites to associate themselves with the best of Jewish religious tradition, while emphasizing their eremitical profession and thus avoiding connection with the Pharisees. It was the perfect response to Holcot's accusation of descent from pharisaic priesthood. Since the Jewish prophets, Elijah among them, had exemplified righteous resistance to authority, an acknowledgement of the Jewish past was not in itself problematic. But identification had to be made with the inspired prophetic tradition, rather than the rigid legalistic orthodoxy that Jesus had criticized. The Carmelites had been Jews, but Jews who understood the law in its allegorical sense, and were not weighed down by the observance of the letter.[151]

The newly converted Carmelites began to preach the Gospel at once, just as their predecessors had preached repentance under the Old Law. Among these predecessors Ribot included John the Baptist, who represented Carmelite monasticism outside Mt Carmel with his ministry at the Jordan.[152] This was uncontentious enough, for the Baptist was counted among the saved, as one who had borne witness to the truth in so far as it had been revealed to him. But Ribot grants this position to all the pre-Pentecost Carmelites: 'for the monks of old on this

---

[148] Ribot, *De institutione*, iii. 7; *Speculum*, i. 35.
[149] Ribot, *De institutione*, v, 5; *Speculum*, i. 50.
[150] Ribot, *De institutione*, v. 6–7; *Speculum*, i. 51.
[151] Ribot, *De institutione*, v. 8; *Speculum*, i. 52.
[152] Ribot, *De institutione*, v. 2; *Speculum*, i. 48.

mountain were Christians in true faith if not in name, just as are the monks of today'.[153]

The identification of the Carmelite Order with the prophets, and of the prophets with the origins of monasticism, was crucial in order to define the kind of life lived by pre-Christian monks. One critic of Carmelite antiquity writing in the late fourteenth century argued that since begging was forbidden in Jewish law, the early Carmelites were either not real Jews or not real mendicants; in either case, their descent from Elijah was impossible, since the prophet did not beg.[154] In fact, the traditional monastic view of Elijah as a precursor of monastic virtues such as stability and solitude had already given way to the idea of the prophet as proto-friar in the work of the Spiritual Franciscan Peter Olivi, who argued that mendicancy as a profession had been shared by Christ and the Apostles, and by his precursors Elijah and Elisha.[155] Ribot did not respond to this specific argument about mendicancy, although the criticism may have been quite widespread. Underlying his work, instead, is the suggestion that the prophetic ministry, which after all entailed preaching (and indeed, it could be argued in the case of John the Baptist, hearing 'confessions' of penitents), was akin to mendicancy rather than simple monastic or eremitical solitude.

Ribot's insistence on identifying the early order with the prophets, and comparing their way of life to that of *monachi moderni*, shows how important it was to be more careful and more specific in discussing the past than earlier writers had been. The assumptions of continuity in the *rubrica*, *Universis christifidelibus*, and *De inceptione* were by the end of the fourteenth century in need of fuller historical explanation.

Ribot extended the same care to the problem of the rule. In the section of *De institutione* that purports to be the letter of Cyril to Eusebius, prior of the Black Mountain, he explained that the rule written by John of Jerusalem in the reigns of Honorius and Arcadius was not itself new, but simply confirmed in testamentary form an oral tradition handed down from Elijah to the sons of the prophets. The rule was written in epistolary form as an address to John's disciple Caprasius.[156] One might wonder why the Carmelites suddenly needed a written rule in the late fourth century when they had been content with an oral

[153] Ribot, *De institutione*, v. 1; *Speculum*, i. 47.
[154] Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises', 202–6, ed. from London, BL MS Cotton Claudius E. IV, fo. 346ᵛ.
[155] Peter Olivi, *Firmamentum trium ordinum* (Venice, 1513), fo. 118ʳ, and see below, Ch. 8.
[156] Ribot, *De institutione*, viii. 1; *Speculum*, i. 72.

tradition for so long.[157] It was important for later Carmelite historians to be able to show that, at a time when monastic traditions were taking root in the forms of 'rule' compilations such as those of Basil or Cassian, the Carmelite monks had an independent and original tradition of their own. Patriarch John's function was to fix a point in the past that could serve as a *terminus a quo* for a written rule. As John of Hildesheim had explained to the detractor in his *Dialogus*, in 'antiquity', few written records were kept, and religious did not write down how they lived in codified formulae. Elijah knew how to live virtuously from divine inspiration, and it had been sufficient to pass this on orally. But the detractor's suspicion of oral tradition, which was vague, was understandable, and a fixed date obviously necessary.[158]

Ribot's supposed transcription of Cyril's letter continues with an account of the Persian and Arab invasions of Palestine in the seventh century. Neither of these was fatal for the Carmelite settlements, although the latter necessitated a degree of regression.[159] Ribot had to deal in some way with the Muslim invasion. An obscure group of hermits living quietly on a mountain might have been left untouched by the invader, but a venerable religious order of the extent and influence envisaged by Ribot would surely have provoked some encounter from the new rulers. Ribot's own success in painting a picture of Carmelite origins meant that he had perforce to venture into areas that had been safely ignored by his predecessors.

Previous Carmelite historians had created something of a muddle when it came to explaining the refashioning of the order in the crusader era, and especially the role of Patriarch Albert in this process. The introduction of Aimery of Antioch by Stephen of Salagnac in the mid-thirteenth century had not been universally accepted by

[157] Geagea, *Maria madre e decoro*, 261, remarks that in Ribot's conception the church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin supposedly built by the Carmelites in AD 83 constituted a 'centre of gravity' for the interior life of the early Carmelites. It is perhaps not too far-fetched to suggest that the church functioned for the followers of Elijah before John of Jerusalem as a rule-substitute.

[158] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, i, *MCH* 339.

[159] Ribot, *De institutione*, viii. 1, ix. 1; *Speculum*, i. 73–4, 95, cf. *De institutione*, vii. 6, 68. William of Coventry, *De duplici fuga*, *MCH* 279, envisaged the Carmelites continuing to live undisturbed despite the Muslim invasion, and cites—incorrectly, as it happens—Jacques de Vitry's *Historia Orientalis* as evidence: 'et ab anno passionis eius 50 usque ad annum Domini 1099 manserunt fratres in Carmelo et in aliis locis Terrae Sanctae. Nam ante annum Christi praenotatum, quo Godfridus de Bullon et ceteri Christiani . . . Terram Sanctam Christianis subiugarunt, non fuerunt Saraceni pauperibus Carmelitis neque ceteris Christianis multum infesti, sed permiserunt ipsos secum cohabitare in civitatibus et in castris, ut patet intuenti Historiam Ierosolymitanum.'

Carmelites. John Baconthorpe and William of Coventry ignored him, as did John of Hildesheim. Aimery seems, indeed, to have been a foible of the French province. But there could be little doubt of his usefulness: he helped to establish a pre-Fourth Lateran Council dimension to the order's history, but one that still fell within the period of Frankish rule. It is easy to see why Aimery, who had no ostensible connection to Mt Carmel, was used in this role. Any reader of Gerard of Nazareth's *De conversatione servorum Dei* would have known that Aimery had forbidden solitary eremitism on the Black Mountain, and placed solitaries under the supervision of the Latin Church.[160] By a slip of the eye or the pen, Mt Carmel could be substituted for the Black Mountain. Alternatively, the Black Mountain could be *added* to Mt Carmel as a Carmelite site. After all, if it was acknowledged that the order had occupied other sites before the Arab invasion of the seventh century, it was natural to assume that it would resume occupancy of those sites once the Holy Land had been restored to Christian rule. The Black Mountain, a well-known centre of both cenobitic and eremitical monasticism, was a fitting location.[161] This helps to account for Eusebius, recipient of the letter of Cyril in Ribot's *De institutione*, who is identified as 'prior of the Black Mountain'. It was not Ribot himself, however, who was responsible for the addition of the Black Mountain to Carmelite history. The *Domus in Terra Sancta*, a fourteenth-century document listing Carmelite houses in the East, identified convents in Antioch and the Black Mountain.[162] Ribot gives a similar, but not identical, list in the section of *De institutione* purporting to be the chronicle of William of Sandwich, in which the vicissitudes of the order in the thirteenth century are described.[163]

Aimery's action in gathering together the scattered hermits on Mt Carmel, as described by Stephen of Salagnac and taken up by *De inceptione* and Jean de Cheminot, should be understood in the light of what Gerard of Nazareth had written about him. Ribot expands on the language of his sources. Aimery, acknowledging the praiseworthiness of the friars of the Blessed Mary of Mt Carmel, encouraged them

[160] Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 31–2.   [161] Ibid. 25, 27–9, 81 n. 39.

[162] *Domus in Terra Sancta*, *MCH* 265: ten houses altogether are listed. William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, *MCH* 276, evidently knew the list.

[163] Ribot, *De institutione*, ix. 2; *Speculum*, i. 97–8. Ribot lists Tyre, Sidon, Tripoli, Mt Lebanon, Antioch, the Black Mountain, Mt Quarantana (Jebel Quruntul, outside Jericho), and Valim in Galilee. The full list of houses in *Domus in Terra Sancta* is as follows: 'Domus montis Carmeli, Domus Achon (Acre), Domus Tyri, ide est Sur, Domus in heremo, Domus Ierusalem, Domus de Nasyn, Domus Belli Loci iuxta fontem ortorum, Domus Triplois, Domus Antiochie, Domus in Montana Nigra.' A variant reading gives *conventus* for *domus*.

to renew the existing buildings on Mt Carmel (which are not, however, described) and to found new monasteries in towns and wildernesses.[164] Ribot then explains why Aimery took such an interest in Mt Carmel. After the Frankish settlement of the Holy Land, the composition of the order changed as Franks joined the indigenous hermits on Mt Carmel. Ribot assumed, of course, that this must have begun to happen in the first generation after 1099. The Franks who joined the order, Ribot explained, did not all follow the practices laid down by John of Jerusalem from Elijah's oral tradition, because they were unable to read Greek. Frankish religious were threatening to swamp the original community, and destroy the character of the order. Aimery thus had John's Rule translated into Latin, and gathered the hermits together 'by the bonds of obedience' in order to curb the audacity of the imprudent Franks.[165] It was Aimery, furthermore, who established the office of prior, appointing to it in 1121 the hermit Berthold.[166]

This date is of course impossible, because Aimery did not even become patriarch of Antioch until 1142. Since the inclusion of Aimery is itself a mistake that Ribot simply followed, the date does not much matter. The situation that Ribot reconstructs is actually rather close to what probably happened on Mt Carmel in the years between 1187 and *c*.1215, and Albert of Vercelli may indeed have done exactly what Aimery is portrayed as doing. The difference is that the very situation that, according to Ribot, Aimery tried to prevent—the loss of indigenous character in the face of large numbers of Franks—may actually have occurred in the years between the fall of Jerusalem and the Fourth Lateran Council. If any indigenous Greek Orthodox monks did form part of the community reflected in Albert's Rule, their influence cannot be detected in the rule itself. Moreover, by appointing as prior a hermit who, judging from his name, must have been a Frank, Aimery was at the least acknowledging, if not encouraging, the situation created by the influx of Franks.[167]

---

[164] Ribot, *De institutione*, viii. 2; *Speculum*, i. 75.

[165] Ribot, *De institutione*, viii. 2; *Speculum*, i. 97.

[166] Ribot, *De institutione*, viii. 2; *Speculum*, i. 97.

[167] Aimery had little reason to be a Grecophile, since he was himself forced from office and replaced by an Orthodox patriarch as part of the settlement between Baldwin III and Manuel Comnenus in 1165: Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London, 1980), 45. He thanked the Pisan theologian Hugo Eteriano for the gift of his book on Orthodox doctrinal errors, *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, 5 vols. (Paris, 1717), i. 479–81. On Aimery's career, see Bernard Hamilton, 'Aimery of Limoges, Latin Patriarch of Antioch (*c*.1142–*c*.1196) and the Unity of the Churches', in

Berthold was a new addition to the Carmelite *œuvre*, and one who would become standard well into the twentieth century.[168] There is no clue as to Ribot's source for this name, or indeed that of Berthold's putative successor, Brocard, in 1166. According to Ribot, it was under Brocard's priorship that Albert of Vercelli reissued the Rule of John of Jerusalem that had been translated by Aimery. Naturally, Albert's Rule is underemphasized; it added little, Ribot remarks, to existing Carmelite practice.[169] Throughout Ribot's account, Albert's contribution is mimimal. Although the *rubrica prima* had made his rule a corner-stone of the order, from Ribot's perspective, the patriarch's specifications for the community on Mt Carmel were trivial. Albert's Rule was really a generic formula, such as might have been adopted by a number of a communities in any part of Europe or the Mediterranean; what makes it distinctive is the emphasis it places on penitential contemplation. Ribot wanted to demonstrate that the hermits learned little from it about the eremitical life that they did not already know from John of Jerusalem. Moreover, Albert's Rule celebrated and promoted the ideals of stability and rootedness in a single location that were, as Ribot had taken pains to explain, not representative of the order's history.[170] The Carmelites' descent from Jewish prophets made them naturally wandering preachers and contemplatives. The migration of the order in the thirteenth century, told through the mechanism of William de Sanvico's chronicle, once again revealed the true mission of the Carmelites.

Ribot's *De institutione* gave the most complete and informative historical synthesis of the order up to the period when external sources begin to mention the Carmelite hermits. The outlines had already been sketched in the 1240s, and the background and main characters filled in by a gradual process of self-discovery, apologetic, and disputation over the next century and a half. The reconstruction of the order's history pure and simple was not, however, the sole priority of all Carmelites interested in their past. Once the history was known, its purpose

K. Ciggaar and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States: Context, Contacts, Confrontations*, ii (Louvain, 1999), 1–12.

[168] Zimmermann, *MCH* 269–76, accepts Berthold as a genuine figure, as does L. J. Lallement, *Aux sources de la tradition du Carmel* (Paris, 1953), 49–50.

[169] *De institutione*, viii. 4; *Speculum*, i. 80. The chapter is headed 'Quod nulla, aut pauce, Albertus in praedicta Regula inseruerit, que Iohannes prius in institutione huius religionis non habebat, sed quae Iohannes in Generali suadendo scripserat, Albertus in regula in speciali determinat.'

[170] *Rule of St Albert*, 80.

could be developed. John Baconthorpe, John of Hildesheim, and John Hornby, in particular, were more concerned with analysing the nature of the order, and what a religious order really meant, than with establishing the historical details themselves. The following chapter provides an examination of some of the issues that preoccupied them.

Carmelite Ecclesiology in the Fourteenth Century

Twelfth-century monks and canons grappled with the concept of 'orders' within the Church.[1] In its widest definition, as argued, for example, by the Cistercian Gerhoh of Reichersberg, any lay Christian living a good life could in some sense be called a member of an 'order'.[2] R. N. Swanson has argued that what was meant by being a 'religious' or 'leading a religious life' could vary greatly in the centuries after the Fourth Lateran Council, and might embrace lay people as well as professed monks, canons, or nuns.[3] This principle was accepted by canonists in the thirteenth century; thus Hostiensis's *Summa aurae* (*c.*1255) declared that 'in the wide meaning, a "religious" is so called who lives a holy and religious life in his own house, even if not professed . . . such a person is called a "religious" not because he is bound to a specific rule, but on account of his manner of life, which he leads more strictly and with more holiness than other laypeople'.[4]

The concern of a friar like Salimbene at the growth of other new orders can be seen as the proprietary reaction of a professed religious bewildered and threatened by the choice that this looseness of thinking implied for his own order. The decree *Religionum diversitatem* of the Second Council of Lyons, which Salimbene welcomed,[5] attempted to restrict the expansion of such choice by concentrating on the formal

---

[1] Bynum, 'Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?', 5–7.

[2] Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Liber de aedificio Dei*, xliii, PL 194, col. 1302: 'Habet enim omnis ordo, et omnino omnis professio in fide catholica et doctrina apostolica suae qualitate aptam regulam, sub qua legitime certando poterit pervenire ad coronam.'

[3] Robert N. Swanson, *Religion and Devotion in Europe c.1215–c.1515* (Cambridge, 1995), 102–6.

[4] Cited ibid. 104 with summary discussion of the question. See also Peter Biller, 'Words and the Medieval Notion of "Religion"', *JEH* 36 (1985), 351–69. For a slightly different perspective on the question, see Gary Macy, 'Was there a "the Church" in the Middle Ages?', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, Studies in Church History, 32 (Oxford, 1996), 107–16.

[5] Salimbene, *Cronica*, cccxvi, 255.

element of the religious life: the rule. This decree was, of course, merely a restatement of *Ne nimia*, promulgated by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Already by the beginning of the thirteenth century, it was clear to the papacy that the growth of new 'orders' was potentially damaging to its administrative control of Christian society. Innocent III's own activities in promoting Francis and Dominic, in underwriting the Humiliati, and in producing rules for individual houses shows his concern at the lack of any formal means by which an order was founded or came into being. Before 1215, fluidity between different orders and differing states of the religious life can be illustrated by example from the lives of many twelfth-century monks. One example is the practice of 'loaning' monks from a monastery to teach specific customs or traditions to the monks of another order, as was done at Obazine in the Limousin, and attempted at Palmaria in the kingdom of Jerusalem.[6] Although episcopal oversight of a new foundation was highly desirable, it was impossible to enforce throughout the Catholic world, and especially in 'frontier' areas such as southern Italy, eastern Europe, and the Levant. Communities of unregulated hermits sprang up everywhere: those that survived might eventually think of themselves, or be perceived, as an 'order', but it was impossible to determine at what point, or on whose initiative, this process had begun.

The Great Union of 1256, from which the Augustinian Hermits were born, shows the principle of Innocent's decree being renewed during the succeeding century. But it was neither simply bureaucratic or administrative convenience demanded by the increased weight of legal business, nor ideological centralization, that induced the papacy to limit the expansion of diversity. The problem with the rapid growth of religious life was that its expression might not always conform to orthodox Church teaching. A sympathetic pope like Innocent III could rescue a group like the Humiliati, over which the suspicion of heresy hung;[7] but for others, notably the Waldenses, Innocent came too late. It is easy to see why Innocent thought that papal approval and confirmation of a religious order at an early stage were so crucial, and the strict control of new foundations so desirable.

The relations of Francis and Dominic with successive popes show how the government of the Church could regulate the foundation of new orders without restricting the emergence of new reforming ideas.

---

[6] *Vita Stephani Obazinensis*, ii. 12, ed. and trans. M. Aubrun (Clermont-Ferrand, 1970), 112; Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 43–4.

[7] Andrews, *Early Humiliati*, 64–98.

In the case of Dominic, a creative reforming spirit was channelled through an existing religious rule, the Augustinian. The rule for Augustinian Canons, based on letters acknowledged to have been written by Augustine of Hippo, allowed considerable freedom for individual houses to develop their own customs for the regulation of more specific matters than those treated by the letters. Thus the Dominicans, while following the Augustinian Rule, developed a highly centralized religious order spread throughout the Christian world in the generations following the Fourth Lateran Council, without contravening the decree *Ne nimia*.

The Carmelites' position was less secure. Although they just escaped the limit imposed by *Ne nimia* (because Albert's Rule must be dated before his death in 1214), it is only ten years after the Fourth Lateran Council that the hermits of Mt Carmel appear in papal sources, in the confirmation granted by Honorius III in 1226. Even allowing for the loss of important archival material, it seems probable that common knowledge of the Carmelites in the West was spread only with the bulls issued to them by Innocent IV, beginning in 1245. The perception of the Carmelites was thus of a new (meaning post-1215) order, and this perception was doubtless enhanced by the fact that they arrived in the condition of refugees. The Carmelite historical texts we have examined leave no doubt that, from the order's point of view, such a perception was unfounded. The intent of the endeavours of John Baconthorpe and his successors as apologists—notably John of Hildesheim, John Hornby, and Bernard Oller—was to establish the constitutional basis on which the antiquity of the order rested. But the historical texts on which they drew were terminologically imprecise. How clear was the distinctive way of life of the Carmelites to readers of these texts? To put the question another way, what kind of an 'order' were the Carmelites—in 1238 (when they first arrived in the West), in 1247 after the modification to the rule, and in 1274?

The *rubrica prima* speaks of a group of hermits living 'in penance' on Mt Carmel, but does not use the word *ordo* in this context. The *Ignea Sagitta* leaves little doubt that the Carmelites were strictly eremitical in origin, and to be identified with a particular kind of mountain-top eremitism. But it also reveals the potential for division within the order, as the author bemoans the descent from the mountain to the cities, symbol of the adoption of mendicancy. The premises, and purpose, of the order seemed to have changed during the course of a generation. What kind of religious life did they represent? This was the

question underlying the criticisms of the Carmelites by, for example, the Osney annalist and the detractor in John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus*. At one point the detractor says: 'There are only three approved rules— that of St Benedict, that of St Augustine and that of St Francis.'[8] Where did the Carmelites fit into this scheme? Albert's Rule owed something to the Benedictine and Augustinian Rules; but by John's day, in any case, the Carmelites would have been unrecognizable to Albert as the hermits for whom he had written the rule. They were friars, but, unlike the other friars, they followed neither the Franciscan nor the Augustinian Rule. With what authority had they changed their status, and with what implications for the principle of *Ne nimia* and *Religionum diversitatem*? It was these questions that Carmelite historical apologists had to address in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

JOHN BACONTHORPE

The first Carmelite whose writings provide a coherent response to the problem is Baconthorpe, working mostly in the 1320s and 1330s. It is worth considering the timing and context more closely. Baconthorpe was not the first Carmelite to have been a prominent academic theologian: Peter Swanyngton and Gerard of Bologna had incepted in theology, and Baconthorpe had himself been taught at Paris by Guy Terrenus. His Carmelite works arose out of his conventional biblical scholarship, and can be limited to the period between 1317 and *c*.1330. During this period he was successively bachelor and master of theology in Paris, and from 1326 to 1333 prior-provincial of his order in England. It is possible that in the latter role he was confronted by the need to provide cogent defences of his order's claims against opposition encountered from the episcopal hierarchy and from other orders. But it was also in the 1320s that the conflict between Spirituals and Conventuals in the Franciscan Order reached its tragic climax, with the condemnation and punishment of the Spirituals by John XXII. Baconthorpe's work reveals him to be a firm supporter of the papal interpretation of apostolic poverty.[9] Although the Carmelites, so far as we know, had avoided becoming embroiled in this issue, it must have been useful, in this climate, to have reached a definitive answer to the question of what it meant to be a Carmelite, just as the Franciscans were determining, more painfully, what constituted a Franciscan. It is

---

[8] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xvi, *MCH* 380.

[9] Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis*, 168–75; Smalley, 'John Baconthorpe's Postill', 108–9.

surely no coincidence that it was also in the 1320s that the Sienese Carmelites commissioned from Pietro Lorenzetti the altar-piece depicting salient episodes of their order's history; or that the Augustinian Friars, soon after winning from the papacy in 1327 the right of guardianship over the tomb of St Augustine at the Ciel d'Oro, commissioned a fresco cycle celebrating their history.[10]

The Lorenzetti altar-piece contains one panel depicting a theme typical of mendicant altar-pieces of the duecento and trecento: the giving and confirmation of the order's rule. For Baconthorpe, the papal confirmation of the order's status was the main plank in his defence. In the *Speculum* he begins a chapter by asserting (incorrectly) that the order had been approved at the Fourth Lateran Council: 'Et haec institutio praecessit Laterenense concilium: sexto, de religiosis domibus c.1. Et in eodem concilio haec religio et regula fuerunt approbatae, sicut et omnes religiones et regulae Lateranense concilium praecedentes.'[11] He goes on to discuss the treatment of the order by the Second Council of Lyons and after: 'Postmodum in concilio Lugdunensi fuit ordo in suo statu reservatus cum clausula "donec".' But soon afterward, the sixth book of decretals confirmed the status of the Carmelites, along with that of the Augustinian Friars: 'Carmelitarum ordinem, cujus institutio Lateranense concilium praecessit, in solido statu volumus permanere.'[12] This confirmation was further underlined by John XXII's bull *Sacer ordo* of 1317. The significance of the solution to the hung clause *donec* from the Second Council of Lyons that found its way into the decretals was not lost on Baconthorpe. In fact, he misquotes slightly, since the decretals spoke of the order preceding only 'dictum concilium generale' rather than specifying the Fourth Lateran Council. By inserting 'Lateranense concilium', Baconthorpe ensures unequivocally that the Carmelites are acknowledged in canon law as having constituted an order (or *institutio*) before 1215.

---

[10] Cannon, 'Pietro Lorenzetti'; Bourdua, *'De origine et progressu'*.

[11] Baconthorpe, *Speculum*, iv, *MCH* 191. Baconthorpe's reference to 'sexto, de religiosis domibus' is to the decree *Ne nimia*.

[12] Ibid. 192, citing *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, c. 1, iii, 17, in vi; E. Friedberg, ii. 1054–5. In his *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*, ii. 2, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 235, Baconthorpe discusses a textual variant, noting that some critics prefer to read *solito* for *solido*. This change of a single letter obviously had profound implications, for the meaning would then be that the Carmelites were confirmed not 'in solid status' but 'in their accustomed status', which, at the time of the decretal, would be the position of uncertainty into which they were placed by the Second Council of Lyons. As Baconthorpe argues, both here and in *Compendium historiarum et iurium*, *MCH* 213, the correct reading is *solido*, and the substitution of *t* for *d* is a common scribal error.

Baconthorpe uses three words besides *ordo* to describe the Carmelites: *institutio*, *religio*, and *regula*. As Giles Constable has recently shown in a discussion of ideas of the ordering of society in the Middle Ages, the use of the term *ordo* varied greatly, according to the perspective and purpose of the writer.[13] It was too vague a word for medieval writers to use without qualification in describing a religious order, because its connotations were of rationality and harmony in a general and cosmic sense, rather than of adherence to a specific set of instructions or qualities.

Baconthorpe's intention is to show, by use of *religio et regula*, that the Carmelites were tied to a fixed and unchanging body of legislation, legislation that had a place in the wider jurisdictional organization of the Church. He must of necessity be more precise in his terminology than the *rubrica prima* or other purely narrative accounts of the order's history. But he was aware that papal decrees and canon law reflected a reaction to an existing situation in their treatment of the Carmelites, rather than the creation of a new set of conditions. Chapter iv of Baconthorpe's *Speculum* is entitled 'That the Roman popes correctly decided to approve both the rule of the order in canon law and its ancient institution'.[14] But popes obviously did not make their decision to approve the order in a vacuum. As far as Baconthorpe was concerned, the decretals confirmed the existence of an order that could be demonstrated from other sources to have enjoyed a long history. Chief among these sources, for Baconthorpe, was Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*, in which he found proof of the antiquity of the order and the rule.[15] It was thus a narrative chronicle, rather than a papal document, that provided testimony to antiquity. Canon law could confirm the truth of the Carmelite claim, but the claim itself was based on a tradition arising independently of papal action. Historical tradition, when based on sufficient authority, is the mainspring from which law arises. As Baconthorpe asserts in his treatise *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*, every confirmation must arise from a preceding event or circumstance, and the confirmation of the order did not mark its starting-point.[16] Although the form of the *Speculum* (and of Baconthorpe's other Carmelite works) is more analytical than the narrative historical texts such as

---

[13] Constable, *Three Studies*, 251–360, esp. 251–66.

[14] Baconthorpe, *Speculum*, iv, *MCH* 190.

[15] Ibid. 191, citing Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, xxxi. 123. The reference should in fact be to book xxx.

[16] Baconthorpe, *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*, ii. 2, *MCH* 235.

the *rubrica prima*, *De inceptione ordinis*, and *Universis christifidelibus*, at root Baconthorpe still relied on the accepted narrative tradition contained in them, and it is on the narratives they supplied that he erected his defensive ramparts of canon law and papal decretals.

The title by which the order was to be known exercised Baconthorpe considerably. Chapter 3 of the *Speculum*, for example, examines the reason why the Carmelites are properly addressed in papal bulls as 'fratres ordinis beatae Mariae de monte Carmeli'. In fact, popes had addressed the Carmelites in different ways during the course of the thirteenth century: as 'fratres heremiti de monte Carmelo' (Honorius III in 1226, Gregory IX in 1229, Innocent IV in 1245 and 1247),[17] 'fratres ordinis eremitarum de monte Carmelo' (Innocent IV in 1245),[18] and eventually as 'fratres ordinis beatae Mariae de monte Carmeli' (Urban IV in 1262).[19] There was no single, 'legal' way of referring to the Carmelites—and, doubtless, many 'unofficial' or irreverent ways of referring to them. Although papal bulls of protection were issued in favour of the order, these did not define absolutely the 'canonical' title, and hence status, of the hermits. Thus, for example, the bull *Paganorum incursus* (1245) assured the hermits that they were under papal protection, and in *Ex parte dilectorum* (1252) Innocent IV informed all bishops that the Carmelites were permitted to settle wherever they were given property or space to build; but in neither document are the hermits referred to as an *ordo*, or indeed as *institutio*, *religio*, or *regula*.[20] It was perhaps only when the status of the hermit-friars was questioned that such hard and fast distinctions were necessary. It was the cumulative effect of papal correspondence in favour of the Carmelites that allowed the friars to define themselves as a *religio*. A single letter of protection or confirmation was no great thing, and even rather shadowy 'orders' like the hermits of the Black Mountain could boast one;[21] but a series of such confirmations by successive popes indicated a degree of permanence. The first collection of bulls in favour of the Carmelites was probably made in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, perhaps by Sibert de Beka, but certainly at around the time or

[17] *Bull. Carm.* i. 1, 5, 8; Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, i. 7524, 12623; *Registres d'Innocent IV*, i. 3279.

[18] Staring (ed.), 'Four Bulls of Innocent IV', 280–1. The bull is *Cum dilecti filii*, issued in 1245, 1247, and 1256.

[19] *Registres d'Urbain IV*, ed. J. Guiraud, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 4 vols. (Paris, 1901–29), iii. 122, 127.

[20] Staring (ed.), 'Four Bulls', 281–5.

[21] *Registres de Grégoire IX*, ii. no. 2660, for 1235.

just before Baconthorpe's own work.[22] The very survival of the papal confirmations in Carmelite collections, and the constant reference to them in the Carmelite literature of the fourteenth century, are themselves indications of the hardening self-perception of the order. Moreover, as Staring has pointed out, in most of the bulls collected by Carmelites in the fourteenth century the title of the order is altered from earlier usage 'heremitae de monte Carmeli' to the intitulations obviously preferred by the Carmelites themselves, 'heremitae beatae Mariae de Monte Carmeli'.[23]

If demonstration of such documentary proof of status enabled Baconthorpe to construct a case for the validity of the order's profession, historical precedent provided the foundations on which to build. As an explanation of why the Carmelites are properly called 'fratres ordinis beatae Mariae de monte Carmeli', Baconthorpe first of all establishes from biblical texts that Carmel refers symbolically to the Blessed Virgin, and then discusses the question of how orders take their names: either from a holy founder, or from a geographical place, or both. The Hospitallers of St John are an example of an order's title being supplied by both elements, and so, properly, are the Carmelites.[24] The first Carmelites lived on Mt Carmel in imitation of 'the Carmelites of the blessed Mary, Elijah and Elisha'; their successors thus take the same name. This process is enshrined in canon law: '*Ex loco enim et sancto quo praedecessores in religione fuerunt intitulati, intitulantur successores*'.[25] The Marian title is further guaranteed by the construction of the oratory dedicated to the Blessed Virgin on Mt Carmel, after the Incarnation. Religious may also take their title—as did the Templars—from the church of which they are ministers.[26] Another source that provides religious with their title—the rule they follow—also fits the Carmelites' claim to be called after Mary, for in their manner of life and rule they are imitators of the Blessed Virgin.[27] Although all these

[22] Staring (ed.), 'Four Bulls', 275. This collection is now lost, but its existence is confirmed by a note in the catalogue of the Staatsarchiv in Frankfurt. Two other collections of bulls from Alexander IV (1254–61) to John XXII (1316–34) survive in Rome, Archivio Generale dei Carmelitani MS II C.O II 35 and MS Extra III 3. The former is in Latin with a Spanish translation and also includes Ribot's *De institutione*; the latter includes Jean de Cheminot's *Speculum*, and, Staring suggests, dates from *c*.1350 with a southern French provenance.

[23] Staring (ed.), 'Four Bulls', 277. See below, p. 268, for similar concern by Augustinian Hermits about their correct title.   [24] Baconthorpe, *Speculum*, ii, *MCH* 189.

[25] Ibid. iii, *MCH* 190, citing *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, c. 25, X, V, 40; Friedberg, ii. 922.

[26] Ibid., citing *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, c. 20, X, V, 33; Friedberg, ii. 865.

[27] Ibid.: '*Regulam insuper habent imitantem vitam beatae Mariae, ut patere potest intelligenti eius vitam angelicam et regulam . . . Et a regula a sancto sumpta intitulantur religiosi, sicut monachi sancti Benedicti.*'

arguments are couched as references to the relevant body of canon law, they depend all the same on historical tradition, rather than legality. It is historical tradition alone that determined the construction of the oratory to Mary on Mt Carmel—a tradition that appears for the first time in the 1320s, in the writing of Baconthorpe himself and in the later versions of the *rubrica prima*. Although Baconthorpe appeals to canon law to establish the Carmelite claim, that law is relevant only if the historical integrity of the Carmelite tradition is first accepted, and for that Baconthorpe could supply no objective source. The Carmelite historical tradition was, for Baconthorpe, itself an objective reality, a reality confirmed not so much by proof as by repetition.

To name an order was to define it: its aspirations, functions, and models. Francis's practice of the *vita apostolica* is perfectly encapsulated by the name he gave his followers, Minors.[28] Salimbene devoted considerable energy to refuting the name Segalleli had chosen for his order of 'Apostolic Friars'; a set of specific conditions regarding profession, manner of life, and aims had to be fulfilled before that name could be taken seriously.[29] The Carmelites were known to pilgrims travelling in the Holy Land in the thirteenth century as the 'Latin hermits of Mt Carmel', or some variant thereof, a purely descriptive term based on function and geography.[30] But in Baconthorpe's work the geographical labelling is made to reveal something more profound. It was inconceivable to him that Mt Carmel could have become the site of the hermitage simply because it fulfilled the practical needs of a community of hermits. The association of the mountain with Elijah and Elisha was already well known by the twelfth century, but by making a further connection between the name Carmel and the Blessed Virgin, Baconthorpe ensured that the order and its name transcended mere geography. The *Speculum* begins, indeed, with the observation that the Blessed Virgin is glorified and celebrated through Carmel, for when Isaiah prophesied the Incarnation, he foretold the birth of a virgin who would be possessed of the beauty of Carmel (*Datus est ei decor Carmeli*).[31]

[28] *Scripta Leonis*, 202–4.

[29] Salimbene, *Cronica*, cccxxiii, pp. 388–94.

[30] *Les Pèlerinages*, 89–90; *Les Sains pèlerinages que l'on doit requerre en la Terre Sainte*, in *Itinéraires à Jérusalem*, 104; *Philippi descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, lxxxvi. 7, ed. W. Neumann, *Osterreicher Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie*, 2 (1872), 76–7.

[31] Baconthorpe, *Speculum*, i, *MCH* 184. Baconthorpe has telescoped the verse prophesying the Messiah (Isa. 7: 14) with a verse describing the flourishing of desert places (35: 2). The latter verse, from which the words 'decor Carmeli' are taken, is assumed by Baconthorpe, supposedly following the *Glossa ordinaria* and St Bernard, to have a Marian interpretation; but, as Staring points out in his edition, *MCH* 185, such a meaning cannot be found in either

Moreover, the Song of Songs, which was often seen as an allegorical dialogue about Mary, uses Carmel as a referent of physical beauty (7: 6). Historical events that took place on Carmel, such as Saul's construction of a monument there (1 Kgs. 15: 12), or Elijah's slaughter of the priests of Baal (3 Kgs. 18: 23), are thus interpreted in the light of the supposed devotion of Old Testament kings and prophets to the Blessed Virgin.[32] The birth of a religious order on the mountain cannot but be seen as a similar expression on the part of Elijah's followers. The Carmelites were the first to institute devotion to the Virgin, which Baconthorpe calls 'beatae Mariae religio'.

Baconthorpe's views on the Marian origins of the order are most fully treated in *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*. This treatise exists in only a single manuscript, once owned by John Bale.[33] It begins with a compendium of meditations on the name 'Carmel' and its etymological origins, which appear to be Baconthorpe's own.[34] One such is a semantic analysis of the name *Carmelus*, which Baconthorpe says comes from Aramaic and means *laus sponse*, or 'the glory of the bride'.[35] The bride in question could be interpreted as either the Blessed Virgin or, more generally, the Church, as the bride of Christ. In either case, the importance of Carmel as part of the foundation of the faith is implicit in the very name itself. Baconthorpe is here pushing the bounds of historical antiquity. Although, as we have seen, he fully accepted the narrative of the historical traditions current within the order in his day, he wanted to go still further and show how the antiquity of the Carmelites was part of the history (and prehistory) of Christianity itself. The

---

commonly used biblical gloss, and the sermon quoted by Bernard appears not to have been authentic. For a full discussion of Baconthorpe's Mariology, see Geagea, *Maria madre e decoro*, 174–201, Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis*, 227–40.

[32] Baconthorpe, *Speculum*, i, *MCH* 185–6.

[33] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fos. 20ʳ–40ʳ. The title misattributes authorship to Claudius Conversus (William of Coventry), but elsewhere (e.g. in Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 1) Bale correctly refers to Baconthorpe as the author of the treatise, and in the margin of fo. 20ʳ of Selden supra 72, next to the title, Baconthorpe's name has been supplied as a correction to the scribal mistake. The manuscript, which also contains Bale's list of priors-general (fos. 12ʳ–19ᵛ), a Carmelite chronography by Robert Bale (fos. 5ʳ–11ᵛ), and William of Coventry's *Chronica brevis* (fos. 41ʳ–44ᵛ), is considered by Leslie Fairfield, *John Bale, Mythmaker for the English Reformation* (West Lafayette, Ind., 1976), 158, to date from Bale's time as lector at the Carmelite convent in Cambridge. If, as Fairfield surmised, the treatises were copied by novice friars as a scribal exercise under Bale's supervision, the misattribution is easily explained.

[34] The full title in Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fo. 20ʳ is 'tractatus que vocatur laus carmelitarum seu quadruplia ethimologia eiusdem'.

[35] Baconthorpe, *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*, I. ii, *MCH* 218. Baconthorpe discusses three further etymologies of the word *carmel*: I. vii, *MCH* 224–6; I. ix, *MCH* 226–7; I. xi, *MCH* 227–8.

meditation on the name 'Carmel' is followed by chapters explaining that the order stands before others in seniority, that it has Mary as patroness in a more profound sense than other orders, and that it is first and last of all religious orders. The argument for seniority is essentially an exegetical one, based on the notion that the site was peculiarly dedicated to Mary in the time of the Old Testament prophets, and thus that its eremitical inhabitants were venerating Mary even before she had been born, let alone given birth to the Messiah.[36]

This mystical understanding of the origins of the Carmelites is further supported by the identification of the Carmelites with the white horse of John's Apocalypse (Apoc. 6: 2). Again, in the image of the heavenly armies mounted on white steeds (Apoc. 19: 14) is to be understood the Carmelites, who by their prayers mediate with God on behalf of mankind.[37] Moreover, because the white horse was followed in John's vision by others of different colours, before a white horse again brought up the rear, Baconthorpe described the Carmelites as the first and last of religious, and used the words of Matthew (20: 16): 'The last shall be first and the first last.' The Carmelites were the last not in the sense of being most recently instituted, but in that they will preach in the last times, led by their founder Elijah.[38]

Baconthorpe's Carmelite writings are more engaged and more personal than his work in theology or biblical commentary. Throughout all his work, however, a coherent ecclesiology is discernible, with a sense of the Church's history and its future direction. As Thomas Turley has argued, Baconthorpe viewed Christian history as a whole as a series of developmental stages in which the changing character of the Church was necessitated by external circumstances. Thus the communal poverty characteristic of the apostolic Church was mitigated as popes came to rely on wealth and patronage to provide stability. But the ideal of poverty was never abandoned by the Church; instead, it was simply delegated to the monks. 'The impression conveyed is . . . not so much a fall from primitive practice as a controlled retreat, with the promise of return.'[39] For Baconthorpe, who took as historical fact the assumption of Carmelite antiquity, the monasticism of the early Church signified the Carmelite Order; it was the Carmelites who bore the standard of the ideals initiated in the Scriptures. This standard was

---

[36] Ibid. II. iii, *MCH* 236–7.   [37] Ibid. VI. iv, *MCH* 252.   [38] Ibid. 253.

[39] Thomas Turley, '*Ab apostolorum temporibus*: The Primitive Church in the Ecclesiology of Three Medieval Carmelites', in R. J. Castillo Lara (ed.), *Studia in honorem eminentissimi cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, Studia et textus historiae iuris Canonici, 7 (Rome, 1992), 576.

carried not in opposition to, but on behalf of, Christian society as a whole. Thus the Carmelite claim to antiquity was not simply the fanciful vanity of a mendicant order whose origins were obscure, but a vital demonstration of the continuity of the life of the Church. Carmelite history was a guarantee of the integrity of the Church's own past. At no time was this demonstration more important than in the 1320s, when, to a stalwart papalist like Baconthorpe, the Church and papal supremacy seemed under attack from the Franciscans and the imperial theologians Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun. Beryl Smalley has shown the acuteness of Baconthorpe's biblical commentary as a political statement of papal power.[40] The text 'Erunt sicut angeli Deo in caelo' (Matthew 22: 30) gives him the opportunity to set out a political theory. Discussing Pseudo-Dionysius and Gregory on the celestial hierarchy, he places good popes in the first rank of heaven, in the order of thrones, whereas good kings (even Constantine and St Louis) are placed only in the third rank. Secular power must always be subordinate to spiritual. This snub to Marsilius and the anti-papalists is compounded by his defence of ecclesiastical property in a discussion of the parable of the mustard seed. This text is used to show Christ foretelling the temporal power of the Church, which was to be effected by means of the Donation of Constantine. 'From the beginning the Church was like a mustard seed . . . but by the time of Constantine, a great tree had grown. Constantine gave to blessed Pope Sylvester and his successors the imperial palace of the Lateran, a sceptre and the crown which he wore on his head.'[41]

In his discussion of Church property, Baconthorpe surely has the Spiritual Franciscans in mind. The Spirituals were wrong, he implies, to insist on absolute poverty based on the example of Jesus. The tithes paid to Melchisedech by Abraham show that Church ownership of property and wealth was of divine institution.[42] The common ownership of property derived from secular practice among the early Christians, and thus had divine sanction. But Baconthorpe does not take refuge in the notion of communal ownership. He argues forcefully instead in favour of a hierarchical proprietary structure in the Church. Ownership may have been communal, but what counted was the right to dispense what was owned by all. Bishops needed sovereignty over

[40] Smalley, 'John Baconthorpe's Postill', 122–37. I am indebted to this discussion in the paragraph that follows.
[41] Ibid. 123–4, ed. from Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 15. 12, fo. 152ʳ.
[42] Ibid. 130.

property in order to be able to distribute goods to their flock; had the Church not owned property, this function would have been impossible.[43]

Baconthorpe's hierarchical view of the Church and its wealth was doubtless inspired by Guy Terrenus, his teacher at Paris. Writing first against the Spirituals, but then equally with Marsilius in mind, Terrenus argued that the Church's perfection was ensured by papal authority. Perfection of life was represented not by the monk or the friar, but by the prelate, whose model was Christ. The greater the prelate (by which he meant the fewer limitations on his obedience), the greater his perfection; the pope, therefore, was the most perfect. This argument made poverty an irrelevance.[44]

Terrenus was more intimately engaged than his pupil in the debate on poverty. His treatise *De perfectione vitae* was written almost as a companion piece to John XXII's bull *Cum inter nonnullos*, in which the Spirituals were condemned and the doctrine that Christ and the Apostles had owned nothing was declared heretical. An attack on the treatise by the Spirituals prompted the *Defensio tractatus de perfectione vitae* against Bonagratio de Bergamo, written in 1328 and dedicated to John XXII.[45] Terrenus also considered the question of poverty in a purely biblical context. His *Quatuor Unum*, a concordance and commentary on the Gospels, takes the opportunity provided by Matthew 10: 5–11 (the sending out of the disciples) to confront the meaning of apostolic poverty. The Spirituals' interpretation of this passage was, of course, that Jesus' prohibition of taking money or extra clothing or shoes was to be taken literally, and to form a template for the standards of the apostolate.[46] Terrenus, however, focused his attention on the words 'dignus

---

[43] Ibid. 132: 'patet quod et per legem canonicam et civilem et non solum per divinam tenentur ad decimas . . . ex quibus arguo hic: ab initio Christianitatis tota possessio christianorum fuit una communis, cuius distributio ad ecclesiam pertinebat', fos. 174ᵛ–175ʳ. This argument is reproduced in Baconthorpe's *Quaestiones canonicae*, London, BL Royal MS 11. B. xii, fo. 114ʳ.

[44] Turley, '*Ab apostolorum temporibus*', 571. A similar, if less extreme, argument had been employed by the Franciscan archbishop of Canterbury, John Pecham, in a treatise against the Dominican Robert Kilwardby, although in the context of preaching rather than property: *Tractatus*, 112. Pecham was writing *c*.1269, during a period of controversy between Oxford Franciscans and Dominicans. Baconthorpe may have been alluding to this argument when he compared the model for preaching—Jesus' Sermon on the Mount—with contemporary preachers: Smalley, 'John Baconthorpe's Postill', 112.

[45] Xiberta, *Guia Terrena*, 71–4.

[46] Terrenus, *Quatuor unum*, 275–85. Terrenus cites Peter Olivi's postill on Matthew as representing the Franciscan position, but even a moderate like John Pecham had interpreted Matt. 10: 5–11 as teaching that the Apostles were supposed to observe strict poverty: *Tractatus*, 124, 131–6.

enim est operarius cibo suo' (Matt. 10: 10), and interpreted this as meaning that the Apostles might have use of goods which had been properly earned: 'It is clear from this that the Apostles had the right and proprietorship over the goods which they used, because a person who has the capability to refrain from use of goods of necessity also has the right and proprietorship over such goods.'[47] Extending the prohibition on money in this passage to cover the entire apostolate was, moreover, entirely unjustified, for it was clear from other passages that the Apostles used money: for example, Matthew 26: 9, John 4: 8, and Acts 4: 32.[48] Terrenus also cites the example of Judas, who had charge of the money for the Passover feast (John 13: 29), quoting Chrysostom's Homily 71 in John as an authority. If this was a less than helpful example, given Judas's fall from grace, Terrenus's familiarity with Chrysostom enabled him to assert, on the saint's authority, that the Apostles were not beggars.[49]

Clarity on this point was essential for the larger framework of Terrenus's ecclesiology. For if the Spirituals were correct in their supposition, this would make heretics of the early disciples in Acts, of Pope Sylvester for accepting property from Constantine—indeed, of all early religious founders, including Basil, Ambrose, Augustine, Paulinus of Nola, and Hilary of Poitiers.[50] The issue of how indigent the Apostles were was not simply a matter of exegetical precision, for the Franciscan claim to be restoring apostolic practice to the Church stood or fell by correct interpretation of the Gospel. Opponents of the Spirituals realized that the poverty issue was in fact part of a larger ecclesiology. Did imitation of the Apostles demand a radical rejection of property ownership, as the Spirituals claimed? Or could it be proved that the primitive Church had, in fact, laid the foundations for the property ownership of the contemporary Church? For Terrenus the question was particularly acute. His writings are roughly contemporary with the early anonymous text *De inceptione ordinis*. At a time when his order that was still defining its own sense of identity, a response to the poverty debate would locate the Carmelites on one side or the other. His response, moreover, would shape his order's emerging sense of its own function and history. By coming down on the side of the papacy and property ownership, Terrenus laid the foundations for a sense of mendicancy and its historical functions that would find fruition in Ribot's identification of the sons of the prophets as mendicants. The

---

47 Terrenus, *Quatuor unum*, 285.   48 Ibid. 275, 277.
49 Ibid. 285, citing Chrysostom's Homilies 32 and 33 on Matt.   50 Ibid. 277.

conservative nature of Carmelite ecclesiology, in which mendicancy was identified with the Church's mainstream, rather than with radical reform, was in large measure determined by the exegesis of Guy Terrenus.

For both Terrenus and Baconthorpe, the overriding issue was ecclesiastical authority. By the time Baconthorpe was writing, John XXII's bull *Cum inter nonnullos* had cancelled out Nicholas III's bull *Exiit qui seminat* (1279), which had guaranteed the Spiritual position on poverty.[51] Anyone seeking to defend the papal position in the 1320s had perforce to argue that the pope's capacity to reverse previous decrees was total. This underlying assumption of Baconthorpe's has important implications for an understanding of his general ecclesiology and for his particular treatment of his own order. Beryl Smalley was impressed by John Baconthorpe's radical use of canon law, including papal decretals, in defence of papal supremacy: 'By his use of [the canonists] the fierce little man put a punch into exegesis which it had lacked since the days of the Investiture Contest . . . He made his attack on the enemy direct and up to date by quoting the canons right down to the latest papal pronouncements.'[52] It was the same tactic that he used in defence of Carmelite antiquity, with his repetitive appeal to papal confirmations. The experience of 1274 had taught the Carmelites the limitations of previous papal decisions. There was nothing odd to Baconthorpe about refuting Nicholas III's bull in order to defend John XXII's; had not Gregory X in 1274 refuted the bulls in favour of the Carmelites of every pope since Honorius III?

In supporting the plenitude of papal power as the basis of the life of the Church, Baconthorpe, like Terrenus, refuted the view of the early Church promoted by the Spirituals as having been characterized by the sharing of a common life. This 'classicizing' view—the term is Turley's[53]—entailed an understanding of the common life of the early Church as a realized ideal which Christians had subsequently betrayed. Baconthorpe, however, did not accept that the common life was ever the salient characteristic of the early Church, and thus denied that there was any need to return to it. Rather, he saw the early Church as a preliminary stage in the process of the development of Christian life, a process that necessitates evolution and diversity.[54] What had

---

[51] F. Elizondo, 'Bulla "Exiit qui seminat" Nicolae III (14 Augusti 1279)', *Laurentianum*, 4 (1963), 59–119.   [52] Smalley, 'John Baconthorpe's Postill', 142–3.

[53] Turley, '*Ab apostolorum temporibus*', 561.

[54] The opposition between 'classicizing' and 'developmental' ecclesiologies can be seen in

remained constant throughout the life of the Church was episcopal leadership. Baconthorpe did not deny the importance of the monastic virtues of poverty and communal life. But if these virtues were never wholly abandoned, they clearly did not stand in need of restoration, as the Spirituals maintained. That they were not abandoned, but continued by the institution of monasticism, is demonstrated by the history of the pre-eminent exponents of monasticism, the Carmelites. The treatises outlining and defending Carmelite antiquity are part of an overriding theory of the Church's history. The importance of defending the order's claim to an unbroken succession of hermits living on Mt Carmel in imitation of Elijah should be seen in the broad sweep of Baconthorpe's vision of the Church, in which continuity, rather than cycles of decay and regeneration, was the essence.

THE DOMINICAN CONTROVERSY

It is impossible to determine exactly when Dominicans first began to question the Carmelites' account of their history. Stephen of Salagnac, writing in the third quarter of the thirteenth century, accepted an assumed prehistory for the community on Mt Carmel that went back to the mid-twelfth century.[55] The Dominicans presumably overlooked this when they supported the proposed suppression of the order in 1274 on the grounds of novelty. There is little evidence, however, for controversy between Dominicans and Carmelites until John Baconthorpe's day. But Baconthorpe's defence of ecclesiastical wealth and his support for John XXII's position on property set him against not only the Franciscans but also sympathetic Dominicans such as Robert Holcot, who had attacked the Donation of Constantine and argued that the ownership of property was undesirable because it led to litigation and distracted the clergy from their profession.[56] Toward the end of Baconthorpe's life, Holcot challenged the Carmelite

twelfth-century debates between monks and canons over which followed the practice of the primitive Church. For the continuing importance of this debate, see Giles Constable, 'Twelfth-Century Spirituality and the Later Middle Ages', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 5 (1971), 41–50.

[55] Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor in quibus*, iv. 4, MOPH 22, 179–81. The passage in the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*, xxx. 123, 1274–5, about the Carmelite hermits was also taken by Carmelites to imply acceptance of antiquity, and was cited e.g. by Baconthorpe, *Speculum*, iv, *MCH* 192–3. But this assumption is not explicit in the text of the *Speculum*, and must be inferred.

[56] Smalley, *English Friars*, 197. Baconthorpe's polemical intent was to attack the Spiritual Franciscans, not the Dominicans.

historical tradition in an attack that was probably intended to wound Baconthorpe personally.

Holcot was regent master in theology at Cambridge after 1333/4, following Baconthorpe's presence at the university.[57] In his commentary on the *Sentences* Holcot uses the text 'Et exsiccatus est vertex Carmeli' (Amos 1: 2) to mock what he saw as the pretensions of the Carmelites. If, as they claimed, the Carmelites had been founded in Jewish antiquity, they must have been in origin Pharisees, Sadducees or Essenes, since those were the only religious orders in existence among the Israelites. In whichever case, it was nothing to boast about. Today's knights might just as well boast of their ancestry from the Roman soldiers who crucified Christ![58] Aside from testifying to the wide, retrospective application of the idea of a religious order, this is a perceptive criticism, in so far as it identifies the weakness in the Carmelite historical tradition: the transition from Judaism to Christianity. It is a critique, moreover, that operates from within the Carmelites' own linear perspective of the past, according to which the accuracy of claims about present status are verifiable by reference to historical precedent.

Holcot finds the recently developed story of Sobac's dream as a rationale for the adoption of the white *cappa* in 1287 an easy target. Figures clothed in white, he jeers, are no proof of Carmelite identity: they might just as well have been prophesying millers or bakers![59] Such criticism, though surely damaging when heard, can hardly have had a wide audience. Advanced theology students may thus have been led to doubt the validity of the Carmelite historical tradition, but it is harder to show that such an attack ever affected wider views of the Carmelites. Dominican scepticism about Carmelite antiquity, which continued throughout the fourteenth century, and Carmelite defence appear to have been expressed in exchanges between intellectuals. This is not to deny them wider currency—for, as is now widely recognized, the theology faculty was the birthplace of doctrine eventually taught by the parish priest—but rather to locate the origins of the debate in a specific context.[60]

---

[57] Zutshi and Ombres, 'Dominicans in Cambridge', 335–6; Smalley, *English Friars*, 133–202. Most of Smalley's chapter on Holcot is taken from her essay 'Robert Holcot, OP'.

[58] Robert Holcot, *Ecclus. lect. xix*, ed. from Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fos. 50ᵛ–51ʳ, in Smalley, *English Friars*, 330–1; see also 299, for Baconthorpe's criticism of Holcot's use of moralized tales from ancient history, to which Holcot may have been replying.

[59] Smalley, *English Friars*, 187–8. For the story of Sobac, see above, 59.

[60] R. W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*, 2nd

The fullest evidence for the Dominican/Carmelite debate about Carmelite history comes from the work of John of Hildesheim and John Hornby. In the case of Hildesheim's *Dialogus*, the argument pro and contra is supplied in full,[61] but the arguments of Hornby's opponent John Stokes must be inferred from Hornby's responses, and from a memorandum of them preserved by the Carmelite Robert of Ormeskirk.[62] The opening chapters of the *Dialogus*, dealing with the nature of historical evidence, establish the tenor of the Dominican criticism: how reliably can the Carmelite story be confirmed from the available evidence? In chapter 3, the detractor's simple question, by what reason do the Carmelites claim to be successors of Elijah and Elisha?, excites a response from the director that reveals the nature of the jealousies involved in such debate:

I would like to know what it is about this [claim] that so offends you and provokes you to hatred: is it the dignity of our place of origin, the promised land that flows with milk and honey, the royal land of the holy kings of Israel? Or are you upset by the foundation of our order being on the holy mountains? . . . Are you saddened because our order takes its origin from the land in which Christ chose to be born, where he trod with his feet, and which he stained red with his precious blood? Perhaps the place in which your order started is quite unlike that, and quite without dignity.[63]

Behind the polemical tone, one can see the arguments that had been deployed by Baconthorpe for taking one's name from the place of origin, but also his delight in the allegorical resources of Mt Carmel. Eighty years after the departure of the last Carmelites from the Holy

---

edn. (Oxford, 1992), 238. It is worth noting that Holcot also attacked the Augustinian Hermits' version of their historical origins, in his lectures on Wisdom: Smalley, 'Robert Holcot, OP', 87.

[61] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, *passim*. Although the detractor is never explicitly identified as a Dominican, it seems likely from internal evidence that he was. In the *Dialogus*, xv, *MCH* 377, a discussion of the status of the order in canonical decrees leads John to question whether the detractor's own order has been confirmed or merely approved, by citing the decree *Religionum diversitatem* of the Second Council of Lyons. Since this decree approved unconditionally only the Franciscans and the Dominicans, the detractor must be from one of these orders; that he was a Dominican seems the more likely, given the history of dispute between the orders, and an absence of any interest in Carmelite history shown by the Franciscans.

[62] John Hornby's treatise is in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fos. 176^r–211^r. There is no modern edition, but the article by Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', contains a translation of much of it; see also Robert of Ormeskirk, *Tractatus de confirmatione ordinis secundum libros et iura*, ed. Staring, *MCH* 419–21, from Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 38$^{r–v}$.

[63] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, iii, *MCH* 346.

Land, the appeal to the special advantages of the land itself is as strong as ever.[64] This is more than simply an emotional or spiritual attachment to the land; as in Baconthorpe, the importance lies in exploiting the use of the name of Carmel as the title of the order. The problem of title returns in chapter 9, with the detractor's demand for written evidence that the order can be named after Elijah. Familiar proofs are advanced to show that hermits are imitators of Elijah, Elisha, and John the Baptist: those of Vincent of Beauvais, Jerome, Cassian, Jacques de Vitry, Josephus Antiochenus, and Gerard of Nazareth.[65] Of these texts, only Vincent, Jacques, and 'Josephus Antiochenus' make a specific connection between eremitism on Mt Carmel and the imitation of the prophets, and Josephus's *Speculum perfectae militiae primitivae ecclesiae* can in any case be discounted—in Staring's ironic phrase, this is an 'enigmatic work . . . known only by the Carmelites'.[66] Moreover, although both Vincent and Jacques believed that the hermits of Mt Carmel had been in existence since much earlier in the crusader period, neither suggests the unbroken continuity from the early Church, let alone from Elijah, that the Carmelites had made the characteristic feature of their history. To John, the conventional imitation of Elijah in a generic sense was apparently sufficient to warrant being named after the prophet, and if the detractor remained unconvinced, his objections are not reported.

A more serious objection is raised by the detractor about the other item in the order's title—the Marian connection that Baconthorpe had so strongly promoted. Were the Carmelites the friars of Elijah or of Mary? And, if of Mary, which Mary? Perhaps, the detractor sneers, Mary the Egyptian, rather than the Blessed Virgin, was intended?[67] This was clearly a calculated insult, but a shrewd one, for Mary the Egyptian's life was indeed a model for penitents who adopted the eremitical life in the Holy Land, and the *rubrica prima* had emphasized the penitential nature of the Carmelites' profession.[68] There is no

---

[64] The reference to 'montes sancti' recalls Nicholas Gallicus's evocation of the spiritual qualities of mountain dwelling; see above, 89.

[65] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, ix, *MCH* 356–7.

[66] *MCH* 328. Ribot, *De institutione*, v. 8; *Speculum*, i. 52, also cites Joseph Antiochenus. Daniel a Virgine Maria, *Speculum*, i. 53, comments that Joseph was an ancient author who lived AD *c.*130.

[67] For Mary the Egyptian, an Alexandrian prostitute who was converted while plying her trade among pilgrims to Jerusalem, and settled as a hermit in the Judaean desert, see *Vitae patrum*, i, PL 73, cols. 673–90. In the eleventh century Hildebert of Le Mans wrote a life of her, *Vita Beatae Mariae Aegypticae*, PL 171, cols. 1177–99, 1321–40.

[68] Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 166–7; *MCH* 40.

evidence that the Carmelites ever took an interest in Mary the Egyptian, but to outside observers it was perhaps no less plausible than a connection to the Blessed Virgin; at least it would account for their eremitical origins.

John's response is allegorical, and perhaps evasive. Unlike the Templars, who were named after the man-made building of the Temple in Jerusalem, the Carmelites are named for a living temple.[69] No other order has been so named. What about the Teutonic knights, asks the detractor? That is only a modern innovation, comes the scornful response, an order still rocking in its cradle,[70] whereas the Carmelites have been carrying the standard of the Blessed Virgin for more than 1,000 years. The name Elijah is cognate with Mary, because Elijah was of the tribe of Aaron, and it was Aaron whose rod (*virga*) flowered. Moreover, Elijah was himself a virgin, as is proved by Jerome's letter to Eustochium. As the first virgin of the Old Testament, Elijah stands in relation to Mary as John the Baptist to Christ.[71]

There is more allegory to come, in particular in the etymology of Mary as synonymous with Carmel, but John does not lose sight of Carmelite history. He repeats the tradition first reported by Baconthorpe of the hermits of Mt Carmel after the Incarnation building a chapel to the Virgin near the spring of Elijah, the first church ever consecrated to the Mother of God. John has even heard that the ruins of the church can still be seen.[72] In any case, the religious who served the Virgin in this church must surely be entitled to be called 'ministri beatae Virginis'.[73] John's arguments are essentially those of Baconthorpe and Jean de Cheminot, but he also introduces evidence that had not been known to Baconthorpe. In the *Dialogus*, Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria (412–44), called by John 'a priest of the society of Carmel', whose leadership at the Council of Ephesus in 431 resulted in the anathematization of Nestorius, becomes a further witness to the connection between Carmel and the Blessed Virgin. Cyril's opposition to the Nestorian doctrine of the dual nature of Christ, on the grounds

[69] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xiv, *MCH* 369.

[70] Ibid.: 'tu mihi das religionum quae ratione iuventutis vel novitatis quodammodo vagit adhuc in cunabulis'.

[71] Ibid. 370; Jerome, *Epistolae*, ep. 22, xxi. 3.

[72] The reference to a chapel at the spring of Elijah indicates that John must be referring to the Carmelites' own church, which was built *c.*1230/60 and can still be seen in ruinous condition in the wadi ʿAin as-siah.

[73] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xiv, *MCH* 371–2, as indicated by Baconthorpe on the basis of the canon *De privilegiis: Speculum*, ii, *MCH* 189; *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, c. 11, X, V, 33; Friedberg, ii. 852.

that it devalued the place of Mary as the Mother of God, earned him the credentials of a champion of the Blessed Virgin. John shows no awareness of the theological intricacies of the Christological disputes of the fifth century. For him, Cyril was simply the defender of Mary *theotokos*, 'God-bearer', but the Cyril who promoted an extreme interpretation of the single nature of Christ (and who shipped violent monks from Upper Egypt to Ephesus to intimidate the bishops in council), and whose own interpretation of the person of Christ was overturned by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, eludes him.[74] How John acquired his knowledge of Cyril, and why he decided to associate him with Mt Carmel, is difficult to assess. In general, Western theologians' views of the Christological controversies of the early Church were second hand, since few could have read such Greek sources as might have been available.[75] John cites as his source Bede's *De temporibus conciliorum*, but this work seems to be apocryphal.[76]

   The connection between Cyril of Alexandria and the Carmelites is difficult to unravel. Cyril, who succeeded his uncle Arcadius as archbishop, was steeped in an Alexandrian theological heritage that went back to Athanasius. A connection with Palestinian monasticism seems implausible, given that the Palestinian monks, rallied by St Sabas, were to reject Cyril's Alexandrian Monophysitism in favour of the compromise eventually reached at Chalcedon. The connection cannot be traced back before the mid-fourteenth century. John of Hildesheim was the first Carmelite author to deploy Cyril as a Carmelite, but he was not the inventor of the tradition. Jean de Hesdin (d. 1378/9), an unusual figure by virtue of being a Hospitaller theologian, preached that Cyril, a Carmelite, had defended the Virgin's immaculate conception against Nestorius at Ephesus, and that this was why the Carmelites included the name of the Virgin in their title.[77] This sermon, preached on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, might have taken place in any year from 1340, when he began lecturing, until his death;[78] but Jean

[74] Timothy E. Gregory, *Vox Populi: Violence and Popular Involvement in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus, Oh., 1979), 100–6. Gregory suggests that Cyril's piety toward Mary at the Council of Ephesus was designed to win over the support of the Ephesines, who boasted the tomb of the Virgin.

[75] See below, Ch. 7. Most Western theologians took their knowledge of the early Church councils and the theology they debated from Cassiodorus's *Historia Tripartita*.

[76] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, XIV, *MCH* 374.

[77] Jean de Hesdin's sermon was also known by John Hornby: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fo. 177ᵛ: Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 89.

[78] In 1365 Jean de Hesdin was dean of the theology faculty in Paris, but he had already been lecturing in Paris and Avignon for 25 years: Beryl Smalley, 'Jean de Hesdin,

de Hesdin was almost certainly following a tradition articulated in a sermon preached by Richard Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh, on the same occasion in 1342 at Avignon. Fitzralph's sermon was given in the Carmelite convent, and not surprisingly upheld the order's traditional view of its origins.[79] He would not have been able to do so had the Carmelites' version of their history not already been disseminated quite widely. Presumably, therefore, it was the Carmelites themselves who thought of connecting Cyril to their past; but it is still curious that the first reference to the idea should be found in an external source, albeit in a sermon preached to Carmelites. It would be simplest to assume that the connection first arose through a confusion between Cyril of Alexandria and Cyril of Constantinople, the putative third prior-general of the order deployed to such good effect by Ribot. But this explanation does not quite convince. No Carmelite writing before John of Hildesheim mentions the latter Cyril, and John's knowledge appears to have come from his ownership of a Spiritual Franciscan prophetic text of the 1290s, the *Oraculum Cyrilli*, which is the first document in which such a figure is mentioned.[80] Moreover, Cyril of Constantinople's role in Carmelite historiography is quite different from that of Cyril of Alexandria, and subsequent authors who mention both keep them quite distinct.

In any case, the tradition that Cyril of Alexandria was a Carmelite had taken root by John of Hildesheim's day, for Bernard Oller and John Hornby both refer to it in their defences of the order's claims in 1374/6.[81] Oller, indeed, declared that it was the Council of Ephesus that permitted the Carmelites to take the Marian title.[82] Bernard Oller, as prior-general of the order from 1375, must have been familiar with

O.Hosp.S.Ioh.', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médievale*, 28 (1961), 285–330. See also Anthony Luttrell, 'Jean and Simon de Hesdin: Hospitallers, Theologians, Classicists', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 31 (1964), 137–8.

[79] B. Zimmerman, 'Ricardi archiepiscopi Armacani bini sermones', *AOCD* 6 (1932), 158–89; Katherine Walsh, *A Fourteenth-Century Scholar and Primate: Richard Fitzralph in Oxford, Avignon and Armagh* (Oxford, 1981), 208–9. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception divided the orders: the Dominicans opposed it, but the Carmelites and many Franciscans supported it.

[80] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, iii, *MCH* 346; Hendriks, 'Register', 116–18. For the *Oraculum Cyrilli*, see Piur (ed.), 'Oraculum Angelicum Cyrilli'.

[81] Bernard Oller, *Informatio super tribus articulis ordinis Carmelitarum*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 408–9. Bernard, confusingly, cites neither Jean de Hesdin nor Fitzralph but the *Chronica Romana*, which, if we accept Staring's analysis, is in fact the *Universis christifidelibus*. But the *UC* does not mention Cyril, so either Bernard misremembered his source, or the *Chronica Romana* known by Oller was fuller or a different text altogether from the *UC*.

[82] Oller, *Informatio*, *MCH* 408–9.

the Stokes/Hornby debate at least as early as August 1376, when he attended the English provincial chapter at Doncaster.[83] The form of Oller's *Informatio*, moreover, indicates that it was intended as a supporting document submitted in connection with a request to the pope to confirm the order's historical traditions. The *Informatio* itself is addressed to Cardinal Pietro Corsini, who from 1376 to 1381 supported Urban VI in the Schism.[84] Staring argues that the specific purpose of the *Informatio* was to provide juridical proofs to the Curia, so that the Carmelites' tradition could be seen to be supported by canon law in the form of papal decrees.[85] In fact, such supporting documentation had been an integral part of Carmelite historical writing since Baconthorpe's *Compendium*. The beginning of the Schism doubtless rendered the matter of obtaining papal confirmation more complicated, but it must also have promised the opportunity for a religious order to lend or withhold its support for one or other claimant to the papal throne. Interdependency between Hornby/Oller and Hildesheim can be proved by Oller's direct quotations at various points from Hildesheim.

If the original source of the Cyril of Alexandria tradition is murky, its purpose is quite clear: it provided the Carmelites with an early, and formidable, champion of Marian devotion. The Marian connection, and especially the title, were the points on which Dominican scepticism seemed most devastating. On the surface, there was little reason for the hermits of Mt Carmel to have called themselves 'fratres beatae Mariae', and by doing so they gave offence to other orders, such as the Dominicans, who claimed a special relationship to the Blessed Virgin. Of the four major mendicant orders, the Carmelites alone had no canonized patron (unless one numbered Elijah among the saints). For John of Hildesheim, Mary filled the role occupied by Dominic, Francis, and Augustine in the orders named for them. It was the practice, he asserts, for the cardinals of the papal Curia to visit the Carmelite convent annually on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, just as they visited the Franciscan convent on the feast-day of St Francis, the Augustinian Hermits on Augustine's feast-day, and the Dominicans on St Dominic's.[86] The practice of inviting notables (Richard Fitzralph, a celebrated preacher, and Jean de Hesdin, amongst others) to preach in their churches on that day may have grown out of such a custom; alternatively, John may have misunderstood the practice. Since he was

83 Zimmermann, *MHC* 354.
85 Staring, *MCH* 396.
84 Oller, *Informatio*, *MCH* 400.
86 John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xiv, *MCH* 374.

himself a student at Avignon under Peter Thomas in the 1330s/1340s, it is not impossible that he was repeating a tradition developed there, and older than Fitzralph's sermon.

In no sense, however, was Marian devotion a fourteenth-century innovation among Carmelites. The Carmelite lay confraternities in Toulouse venerated Mary as their patron in 1267; in 1282 the prior-general Peter de Millau wrote to Edward I that the Blessed Virgin was the patron of the Carmelites, and the constitutions of 1294 directed Carmelites to inform anyone who asked about the order that this was the case.[87] The form of Nicholas Gallicus's *Ignea Sagitta*, a lament to *mater religio*, is suggestive of Marian devotion; and Carmelite art of the late thirteenth century provides ample visual testimony.[88] John of Hildesheim asserts that the constitutions of the order enshrined this devotion in the formula for newly professed friars: 'I, N., make my profession, promising obedience to God and the blessed Virgin, and to the prior-general of the friars of the order of the blessed Virgin.' As Staring comments, this formula is found in the constitutions of 1281 (the earliest surviving), and may have been present before this.[89]

Like Baconthorpe, John eventually seeks to bolster his arguments with the authority of papal decrees. Once again, Boniface VIII's confirmation in the bull *Sacer ordo vester* of 1298 is deployed as evidence, and the *solito* variant reading dismissed, and the reissues of the bull by John XXII (1317) and Clement VI (1347) are mentioned to bring matters up to date.[90] Here John barely departs from the ground covered by Baconthorpe, though he suggests, in a discussion comparing the terminology of 'confirmation' and 'approval', that the Carmelites are in fact more firmly rooted as an order in the Church than either the Dominicans or the Franciscans.[91]

The detractor finally switches his attention away from the title adopted by the order to its rule, and accuses the Carmelites of straying outside the three approved rules of the Church: the Benedictine, Augustinian, and Franciscan. John dismisses the argument that only these

[87] *Correspondance administratif*, i. 169; Rymer, *Foedera*, 618; Saggi (ed.), 'Constitutiones Capituli Burdigalensis', 184.

[88] See above, 100–1.

[89] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xv, *MCH* 375; Saggi (ed.), 'Constitutiones capituli Londonensis', 229.

[90] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xv, *MCH* 377–8.

[91] The decree *Religionum diversitatem* of the Second Council of Lyons had described the Dominicans and Franciscans as *approbati*, rather than the *confirmatus* used in subsequent papal decrees for the Carmelites: Tanner (ed.), *Decrees*, 327.

three rules are valid. The rule of a religious order is analogous to Aristotle's 'first cause' in metaphysics; just as every physical manifestation must have a prior cause, so each religious movement must have had a cause that brought it into being. But he cannot expect the Dominican to understand this, because he is a *modernus puer*, who knows only his own age. There has only ever been one rule in the Church, he asserts: the rule first lived by Abel, given to Moses and the Jews, and then perfected by Christ; it is the apostolic rule that all true religious of whatever order follow. It is the same basic rule whether one lives according to the rule of Augustine or of Francis. John even quotes in support the bull of Nicholas III *Exiit qui seminat*: 'The rule and way of life of the Franciscans is thus: to observe the holy gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ, by living in obedience, without property and in chastity.'[92]

This response is too vague for the detractor: 'You have embraced all, and thus fixed yourself to none.' *Exiit qui seminat* cannot give the essence of all religious rules, because it does not take into account the property-owning monastic orders. John then launches into a refutation of property ownership as the basis of regular religious life. His arguments are taken from Baconthorpe: all property was originally in the hands of prelates, and was dispersed by them to the faithful.[93] The essential components of the religious life—poverty, chastity, and obedience—can be found in any genuine order, because they are apostolic in origin. Monastic predecessors like Basil of Caesarea, Benedict, even Paul the Hermit, observed these precepts because they come from the Gospels, not from human legislation. They are the backbone of the religious life.

The ecclesiological implications of John's argument are profound, and moreover reveal a distinct shift away from the position adopted by Terrenus and Baconthorpe fifty years earlier. While he retains the idea of episcopal sovereignty over property, John has moved closer to the Franciscan position. Like the author of the twelfth-century *Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia*, he shows that what

---

[92] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xvi, *MCH* 380–2. The idea of Abel as the first religious is found in the twelfth-century *Libellus de diversis ordinibus*, 4, 12. The author is himself aware of how innovatory this idea was: 'Quis unquam Abel et patriarchas Moysenque et rursum Dominum heremitis assimilavit?' John's thesis here is essentially that argued by Stephen of Muret, founder of Grandmont, when asked by the cardinals what rule he followed: Stephen of Lacey, *Vita Stephani Muretensis*, xxxii, ed. J. Becquet, CCCM 8 (Turnhout, 1968), 121; and that of St Francis himself when begged by some disciples to amend the severity of his rule: *Scripta Leonis*, cxiii. 284–6.

[93] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xvi, *MCH* 383; see above, 162–3.

appears on the surface to be diversity in the religious life consists only of following the same precepts—the tenets of the Gospels—under different guises. The test of a religious order is therefore the integrity in which the apostolic rule is held. This was an argument against the suppression of orders because of too great a diversity in 1274. Diversity was not a threat to the Church, but a demonstration of its vitality. But John's apparent tolerance of diversity conceals a hard edge. In insisting on poverty as the proof of an order's integrity, he is, as the detractor points out, dismissing the property-owning orders from consideration. This is not because he does not think the Benedictines, for example, 'genuine', but because in his view of the history of the Church the ownership of property was a gradual evolution away from the original principles of the apostolic, and therefore the monastic, life. The Rule of St Benedict, no less than other rules, had insisted upon the individual poverty of the monks. This was essentially the argument made by the Spiritual Franciscans, and it came close to the claim made by Ribot that mendicancy was the 'original' form of monastic life. The examples given by Carmelite authors of their predecessors—Elijah, Elisha, John the Baptist, and so on—were hermits who lived from begging, foraging, or gifts; a practice reinforced by the insistence on poverty in Albert's Rule and Gregory IX's *Ex officii nostri* in 1229. The Rule of Albert may have first bound the Carmelites to a formal rule, but Albert was simply confirming what had already been an established way of life.[94] The Carmelites had followed the principles of monasticism unchanged since Elijah, and therefore, by implication, could be considered the 'original', or prototype, of religious orders that followed.

John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus* was used by John Hornby in his public debate in Cambridge in 1374.[95] The debate itself has been studied extensively by J. P. H. Clark, and his paraphrase of the arguments makes repetition here unnecessary. Hornby's Dominican opponent, John Stokes, was preoccupied with the title of the Carmelite Order and its legality. Concern over the title led Stokes to consider the implications of the Carmelite claims. According to the summary of Stokes's *conclusiones* in Robert of Ormeskirk's version, Stokes argued (1) that it was untrue to assert that the Blessed Virgin had instituted the

---

94 John makes no mention of Patriarch John of Jerusalem or Basil as earlier legislators of the Carmelites. Following Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, ii, *MCH* 128–30, John declares that the rule was confirmed by Alexander III in 1180, and again by Innocent III in 1195 and Honorius III in 1216, and contrasts this with the rules of the Dominicans (1207) and the Franciscans (1211): *Dialogus*, xvi, *MCH* 384.

95 Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order' 76.

Carmelite Order; (2) that since the order adopted the Virgin's name long after its foundation, and could give no reason for such an adoption, it ought not to take her name in its title; (3) that it was in fact Mary the Egyptian who had instituted the order on Mt Carmel; (4) that the Carmelites had always been called simply 'hermits of Mt Carmel'; (5) that they had of their own initiative adopted Mary's name; (6) that if the Carmelites claimed as founders Elijah and Elisha, then priests might with the same justification claim Moses as their founder; (7) that the order was not founded by the prophets; (8) that there was no proof that the Carmelites preceded the Dominicans; and (9) that from papal decrees it was evident that even the Augustinian Hermits were older than the Carmelites.[96]

Hornby's arguments against these propositions follow closely the synthesis arranged fifty years earlier by Baconthorpe, but also include such recent evidence as had become available. Following John of Hildesheim, Hornby calls Cyril of Alexandria as witness to the order's devotion to the Blessed Virgin. It was at Ephesus, indeed, that the Carmelites were formally recognized as 'friars of the blessed Mary'.[97] There are some interesting new details in Hornby's use of source material; for instance, the explanation that Bernard of Clairvaux wrote the *Epistola ad fratres de monte Dei* (which was of course written by William of Saint-Thierry, not Bernard) for a 'queen of Syria' and other Christians whom he met in Cyprus when visiting Mt Helyos, the original *mons dei*.[98] Hornby was not afraid to use his own arguments, depending on logical proofs, to counter Stokes. When the Dominican argues that the change in Carmelite observance from the Mosaic Law to the Gospel must have constituted a break in the order's continuity, Hornby counters by citing the example of a religious who lapses into Judaism but then is converted back to Christianity: such a man has not changed his order because of his temporary *discredulitas*.[99] In response to the charge that the Carmelites are *binomines*, because they claim to be

---

[96] Robert of Ormeskirk, *Tractatus*, MCH 419–20. There are actually ten *conclusiones*, but one—that there is no reason for the Carmelites to adopt the name of Mary—is given twice. Robert of Ormeskirk was a member of the Carmelite community at Oxford in 1376, and procurator of the order at the royal court at Windsor; he died c.1382. His summary was preserved by John Bale in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 38ʳ–ᵛ.

[97] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fo. 182ʳ: 'In concilio Ephesino sunt ordinati fratres carmelitane, vocarentur fratres beate marie.'

[98] Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 85 n. 30. The association with Cyprus had originally been made by William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, MCH 274. Since this is found in no other Carmelite source, it can be supposed that Hornby took it from William.

[99] Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 88.

called after both Mt Carmel and the Blessed Virgin, Hornby gives two examples: the Apostle Peter, whose original name was Simon but who adopted the name given him by Jesus without changing his person, and Mary Magdalene, who is also known simply as Mary of Bethany.[100]

The Dominican assault on Carmelite claims raised the issue of how a religious order was to be defined. Stokes seems to have argued that the original profession of the Carmelites, to the eremitical life, does not make of them an order, and thus that even if there had been hermits living on Mt Carmel since the days of the prophets, they could not be said to have been an order founded by Elijah. Anyone could become a hermit; this did not make him—or her—a member of an order. This argument exposes to doubt the Carmelite method of using the generic as evidence of the specific, which is essentially the method employed by Jean de Cheminot and perfected by Ribot in their appropriation of scriptural models as actual predecessors. Stokes points out that the Carmelite claim to descent from Elijah on the basis of being hermits on Mt Carmel opens the way for canons, or indeed any priests, to claim foundation from Moses, the first priest of the Israelites.[101] Hornby's defence is based on the importance of Mt Carmel itself. The crucial factor, for Hornby, is the 'locus inhabitandi', which has remained the same for the Carmelites, but not for any other extant religious order. Habitation on Mt Carmel allowed the Carmelites to blur the distinction between generic and specific exemplars.

The Carmelite position rested on a wide definition of the word *religio*, so as to encompass within the contemporary understanding of the term the eremitical followers of the prophets. Philip Ribot (writing in the years immediately after the Dominican debates) devoted considerable attention to Elijah not just as an exemplar to be imitated (which would make the Carmelites generically his followers), but as the founder of a community. Stokes, following his Dominican predecessor Holcot forty years earlier, had argued that, if their supposed antiquity was accepted, the Carmelites must have been either Pharisees, Sadducees, or Essenes, those being the only religious groups (*secte*) in existence among the Jews.[102] But Hornby in response denies that *secta* and *religio* have the same meaning, because there are sects (such as Islam) that are

---

[100] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fo. 202[r]–[v]. Here Hornby cites Gerard of Nazareth's treatise *Contra Salam presbyterum*, a defence of the Western tradition of identifying the three Marys in the New Testament as one.

[101] Ibid., fos. 185[r]–186[r].

[102] Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 97, from Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica*, In Evangelia 31, PL 198, col. 1552. For Holcot's argument, see Smalley, *English Friars*, 187–8.

not religious orders.[103] The problem was that *religio* had a wider application than 'religious order'; it could refer to a way of life prescribed by an order, or to a religion (Christianity, Judaism, and so on) itself.[104] On the other hand, 'religion' in the sense of either a way of life or a discrete order, or a religious system, could also be referred to by other words, such as *lex* or *cultus*.[105] Hornby does not wish to equate in status following the Mosaic Law with being a member of a religious order in the Church of his own day, although imprecise use of the word *religio* might make this possible.

The earliest papal confirmations of the Carmelite order do not refer to them as a *religio*, not because popes did not think the Carmelites constituted an order in the Church, but because the terminology used to describe orders was so imprecise. Was a single foundation at a specific site an 'order' or simply a monastic community? If the latter, then the Carmelites could not properly be called an order until the modification to the rule in 1247–8 permitted them to expand to other sites. But implicit in the argument of Hornby—and, indeed, of John of Hildesheim—is the assumption that eremitism, a generic way of life, constituted a *religio*, and moreover that it could be historically and geographically located in the scriptural accounts of Elijah and Elisha.[106] Eremitical monasticism and the *religio* of the Carmelites were interchangeable ideas.

The Hornby/Stokes debate was a university affair conducted under the rules of disputation in the context of the academic syllabus. The chancellor of the university, who adjudicated, awarded the debate to

[103] Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 98. Hornby follows the definition of *religio* used by Isidore, *Etymologiae*, viii. 2, PL 82, col. 295. Some thirteenth-century writers—e.g. Stephen of Bourbon, described Christianity as a *fides*, but in writing about other religious systems used the word *secta*: *Tractatus de variis materiis predicabilibus*, iv. 7, ed. A Lecoy de la Marche, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon Dominicain du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1877), 275–7. The distinction between a *secta* and a *religio* in Christian polemic against Islam stems from the notion, first propagated by John Damascene, that Islam was a deviant or heretical perversion of Christianity, rather than a separate system or faith.

[104] The meanings of *religio* are discussed by Biller, 'Words and the Medieval Notion', correcting John Bossy, 'Some Elementary Forms of Durkheim', *Past and Present*, 95 (1982), 3–18, in which Bossy argued that, with few exceptions, medieval writers were unable to think about 'religion' in the sense of a system of faith, 'religion conceived as a thing rather than an attribute or relation'. Biller finds plentiful examples of just such usage in the work of encyclopaedists such as Huguccio, biblical commentators, and polemicists against Islam or Judaism.

[105] Biller, 'Words and the Medieval Notion', 362; see esp. the example cited of Alexander III (1171–2) using *fides*, *lex*, and *religio* interchangeably.

[106] This view seems to have been common in twelfth-century writing: e.g. Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, i. 1, PL 188, cols. 1141–4.

the Carmelite; but the issues raised by Stokes were so troublesome that his attack was probably discussed by the Carmelite general chapter in 1375.[107] The result was that the new prior-general, Bernard Oller, was to seek from the pope confirmation of the three points under dispute. In October 1375 a procurator representing the prior-provincial of the English province ordered from the camera apostolica of the papal curia copies of bulls 'dealing with the antiquity and title and confirmation of the Carmelite order'.[108] At the same time, Oller submitted for papal consideration his *Informatio super tribus articulis ordinis Carmelitarum*, the purpose of which was to provide an official statement from the order clarifying its disputed claims of antiquity, title, and Elianic descent. Whatever the pope thought of the last claim, in 1379 Urban VI recognized the Carmelite claim to be named after the Blessed Virgin, and offered an indulgence to anyone who referred to the order thus.[109] Powerful lay supporters of the order seem to have been mobilized: John of Gaunt, who numbered the Carmelite theologian Walter of Diss among his chaplains, petitioned the pope to declare the Dominican arguments false.[110]

Oller's *Informatio* is a synthesis taken from the 1357 and 1369 versions of the *rubrica prima*, the *Universis christifidelibus*, Baconthorpe's *Compendium*, Jean de Cheminot's *Speculum*, and John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus*. Oller's work summarizes the conclusions of his predecessors, and to an extent even suggests a retreat from some of the more far-reaching claims. Under the first article, Oller acknowledges that the origins of monasticism lay in Samuel's 'cuneus prophetarum' (2 Kgs. 4), and that eremitical monasticism was a refinement developed by one of the subsequent members of this community, Elijah.[111] This represents a modification of the Carmelite view (implied in the earliest version of the *rubrica prima*, and taken up by Baconthorpe, Jean de Cheminot, and Hildesheim), that the monastic life *per se* originated with Elijah's solitary dwelling on Mt Carmel and his foundation of a community there. The 'sons of the prophets' to whom reference was made in the *rubrica prima* as Elijah's successors on Mt Carmel appear in Oller's view to have been not Elijah's but Samuel's successors. Unlike Baconthorpe, Oller was not trying to develop a coherent ecclesiology for the order,

---

[107] Staring, *MCH* 395.
[108] Battista Cattaneis (ed.), *Speculum ordinis fratrum Carmelitarum noviter impressum (speculum antiquum)* (Venice, 1507), fos. 81ᵛ–83ᵛ.
[109] *Bull. Carm.* i. 140–2.
[110] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 185ʳ.
[111] Oller, *Informatio*, primus articulus, *MCH* 402.

but simply to solicit a papal bull that would settle the controversy with the Dominicans. His incorporation of Samuel as the 'father of monasticism' would later be adopted by fifteenth-century Carmelites in their much fuller accounts of the origins of their order.[112]

The arguments of Holcot and Stokes against the Carmelite claim to antiquity suggest the existence of sustained controversy similar to that between the Augustinian Canons and the Augustinian Hermits.[113] Beyond a rather high-minded sense of the importance of documentary proof in such claims, however, it is not immediately apparent why the Dominicans should have been so exercised about the Carmelite version. John of Hildesheim suggests envy of the Carmelites' 'occupation' of the Holy Land;[114] but it is not easy to assess how far this proved a significant attraction for Carmelite donors or supporters. The use of the title was a greater provocation. Resentment of the Carmelites' harnessing of Mary to Elijah's chariot seems to have reached a pitch of outrage in the arguments of the detractor and of John Stokes. When we consider that the Dominicans had themselves since the mid-thirteenth century deployed Mary as a patroness of their order, their resentment at the Carmelite title becomes clearer.

Anecdotes and exempla illustrating the special protection of Mary over the preachers abound in thirteenth-century Dominican writing. The story of Mary giving to the sick friar Reginald a habit, which was then adopted by Dominic and his order (a story that sought to link the Virgin to the constitutional development of the nascent order), was told by Peter Ferrandus (d. 1258) and Jordan of Saxony, and was repeated by Humbert of Romans, Galvanus della Flamma, and other Dominican writers.[115] Gerard de Frachet collected a number of stories that showed the influence of Mary on the early success of the order: for instance, a sick monk recounts a vision in which the intercessory Virgin is told by Christ of a new order of preachers; similarly, in a vision Jesus commends to the Virgin Francis and Dominic as the instruments of the Gospel.[116] An anchoress in Lombardy, visited by two Dominicans,

---

[112] See below, 218–19.

[113] See Elm, 'Augustinus Eremita—Augustinus Canonicus'.

[114] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, iii, *MCH* 346.

[115] Peter Ferrand, *Legenda Petri Ferrandi*, xxxv, MOPH 16. 234–6; also in Humbert of Romans, *Legenda S. Dominici Humberti de Romanis*, xxxv, ed. A. Walz, MOPH 16. (Rome, 1935), 395; Constantine of Orvieto, *Legenda S. Dominici*, xxxi, MOPH 16. 308–9; Jordan of Saxony, *De initiis ordinis seu vita B. Dominici*, xxxvii, ed. J. J. Berthier (Friberg, 1891), 18; Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica ordinis Praedicatorum*, xx, MOPH 2. 14.

[116] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, i. i. 2, i. i. 4, MOPH 1. 6–7, 10–11.

despairs of their youth, and doubts whether such an order can survive long, but is reassured by the Blessed Virgin that she will not abandon her servants.[117] A Carthusian asks the Virgin how he could honour her more, and is instructed to study the Dominicans, who are her brothers; subsequently he leaves his order to join the Order of Preachers.[118] The Dominicans of Leipzig had a debt of five marks paid for them by the Virgin; a Cistercian recounts how he has seen the Virgin holding up the book from which a Dominican is preaching; diabolical visitations that trouble the Dominicans at Bologna and Paris are dispelled by singing hymns to the Virgin.[119] Such anecdotes showed how the special favour of the Blessed Virgin had made the growth of the Dominican Order possible. They were told at a time when the future of the order was uncertain, and the reassurance they provided real. By the time Galvanus was repeating them in 1340–1, the idea of the Blessed Virgin as the special protector of the order had been known for a century. To find another order not only adopting the Virgin as its protector but, on the grounds of a dubious exegesis, incorporating her name into its title, was understandably galling. As Stokes argued, the hermits for whom Albert wrote his rule had been content to be known simply as hermits of Mt Carmel.[120]

The Dominican assault, as represented by Oller in his official submission, threw doubt on the very status of the Carmelite Order in canon law. That such doubts had been voiced ever since 1274 is shown by the inclusion of the papal confirmations in the later versions of the *rubrica prima* and in Carmelite literature throughout the fourteenth century. Quite apart from the objection to Boniface VIII's confirmation on the basis of reading *solito* for *solido*, confusion surrounded the constitutional change in the rule under Innocent IV. For critics, this implied discontinuity in the order, or even the creation of a new order.[121] The Dominicans had reason to be particularly sensitive on this point. Ironically, the same Dominican cardinal who had been responsible for the change to the Carmelite Rule, Hugh of St Cher, was authorized in 1255 by Alexander IV to make a single coherent whole out of the rule, constitutions, and customs adopted by Dominicans.[122] In the event, Hugh of St Cher's plan was never implemented, and there is little evidence

[117] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, i. vi. 4, MOPH i. 40–1.
[118] Ibid. i. vi. 5, MOPH i. 41–2.
[119] Ibid. i. vi. 11, 47–8; i. vi. 13, 50; i. vii. 1, MOPH i. 47–8, 50, 58–9.
[120] Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 77.
[121] Thus Stokes, in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fo. 203ᵛ.
[122] Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order*, i. 233.

that it was taken seriously by either the order or the papacy.[123] There was logic to it, however. Dominic, himself a Canon Regular, had used the Rule of Augustine as the basis of his new order; but, because this was vague and generic, the Dominicans also had their own constitutions. Outsiders might well wonder which was the rule of the Dominicans. Humbert himself observed that many friars were disrespectful of the Rule of Augustine, regarding Dominic's more specific legislation as the defining constitutional basis of the order.[124] A Carmelite engaging in debate with a Dominican in the 1250s or 1260s would have been able to exploit uncertainty over the Dominican Rule and constitutional status no less effectively than the Dominicans of the 1370s did against the Carmelites.

   The Dominican assault on the Carmelite title was part of a wider movement of questioning the roots of individual religious orders and of monasticism in general. This was not, of course, new to the friars in the fourteenth century: Cluniacs and Cistercians, canons, hermits, and monks had engaged in similar debates over novelty, tradition, and the *imitatio Christi* in the twelfth century.[125] What was different about the claims being made by friars, most easily seen in the case of the Carmelite historical tradition, was the specificity of the lineage being traced. The hermits of Mt Carmel were not simply copying the *ideal* of Elijah, but were claiming to be his actual descendants. The literalness of the Carmelite claims transformed the imagery of earlier monastic debate into historical and canonical proofs. Antiquity was essential; it alone was evidence of an order's integrity.

THE ANTI-WYCLIFITE RESPONSE

As suggested above, John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus* appears to present a shift away from the position of Terrenus and Baconthorpe on the issue of poverty. This is worth pondering. It need not, in itself, signify a decreasing sense of loyalty to the papacy. But whereas at the time of the assault on the Spirituals by Boniface VIII and John XXII, the Carmelites could scarcely afford to antagonize the papacy, by the 1370s they were a well-established order with a more secure hold on the affections of benefactors. Moreover, the position of the papacy had itself deteriorated as the century wore on, and was soon to decline still further with the beginning of the Great Schism. The Carmelite Order, indeed, was

---

[123] Ibid.   [124] Ibid.
[125] Constable, 'The Orders of Society', in *Three Studies*, 143–217.

to become moderately conciliar in outlook in the early fifteenth century. In the 1370s, therefore, a less overtly supportive stance toward papal authority is not surprising.

Guy Terrenus and John Baconthorpe had supported John XXII because the interpretation of mendicancy advanced by the Spirituals (and by some Dominicans) was predicated on a position of radical reformism. In order to be truly apostolic, according to the Spirituals, a friar had to own nothing, both as an individual and as a member of his order. Naturally, this required that the order corporately own nothing, and it was this point that John XXII took as a threat, because the logical conclusion to be drawn was that endowed wealth, tithes, and other income were incompatible with being apostolic.[126] The Carmelites already saw themselves by the 1320s as representative of the broad mainstream of the Church's history. Their own historiography would serve no purpose if they were to reject the Church's past, and that had perforce to include tithes and property.

When apostolic poverty once again became an issue of debate in the last quarter of the fourteenth century, all orders of friars found themselves defending the principle of mendicancy against the assault of Wyclif and his followers. It is in this wider context that the theory developed by John of Hildesheim and Philip Ribot of mendicancy as the 'original' form of monasticism must be understood.

Wyclif's assault on the mendicants did not come out of the blue; it was, in part, a further outbreak of the old quarrel between secular and mendicant masters at the universities. The quarrel originated with the secular masters' jealousy of their position in the theology faculties and their fear of its erosion by the advance of the mendicant theologians.[127] But the seculars, led by their champion at Paris, William of Saint-Amour, were able to present their grievances in theological terms. Jumping on the opportunity provided by the outrageous claims made for the mendicants by Gerard of Borgo San Donnino, William identified the friars instead with the Antichrist.[128] But, if the attempt failed, neither the root cause of the quarrel nor the ill feeling itself dis-

---

[126] See Thomas Turley, 'John XXII and the Franciscans: A Reappraisal', in James R. Sweeney and Stanley Chodorow (eds.), *Popes, Teachers and Canon Law in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1989), 74–91.

[127] Yves Congar, 'Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIIIe siècle et le début du XIVe', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 28 (1961), 35–151.

[128] *Chart. Univ. Paris.* i, no. 243; William of Saint-Amour, *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, ed. Edward Brown, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, ii (London, 1690), 20–2.

appeared. The Hospitaller theologian Jean de Hesdin was still responding to William's charges on behalf of the mendicants; in Beryl Smalley's characteristically vivid phrase, the quarrel 'rumbles like a retreating storm' throughout his theological works. Smalley gives as an example a passage from Jean de Hesdin's *quaestio* on Paul's letter to Titus, in which he defends the practice of mendicancy and applauds the contribution of mendicant preachers.[129]

Ironically, Richard Fitzralph upheld the Carmelite claim to Elianic origins in 1342,[130] but was later, as archbishop of Armagh, to oppose mendicancy as having no scriptural basis and as harmful to the Church.[131] There is in fact less inconsistency than might at first appear in Fitzralph's position, since he seems to have regarded the early Carmelites as a monastic order characterized by contemplation and stability, and the assumption of preaching, the pastoral ministry, and mendicancy as an abandonment of the order's profession. In this sense, he is an heir of Nicholas Gallicus.

A response to this criticism lay in the association of mendicant practices with 'original' monasticism, as 'proven' historically by John of Hildesheim and, more fully, by Philip Ribot. Roughly contemporary with these historical texts are the works of the Carmelite Richard of Maidstone (*c*.1380) written against John Ashwardby.[132] Ashwardby, who was vicar of St Mary's, the 'university church' at Oxford, was a follower of Wyclif, but his own works do not survive, and their content

[129] Smalley, 'Jean de Hesdin', 285–330, at 296, with the following passage edited from Oxford, Balliol College MS 181, fo. 114ʳ⁻ᵛ: 'Et posset dici breviter quod ex quo apparet manifesta utilitas in predicatione talium, et non apparet aliqua mala intentio eorum, non debent scandalizari homines in eis, si ex elemosinis necessaria ad vivendum accipiunt.'

[130] Benedict Zimmermann (ed.), 'Ricardi archiepiscopi Armacani bini sermones', *AOCD* 6 (1932), 158–89. The following passage is at p. 166: 'Miramini forsitan quia dixi ordo suus peculiaris et antiquus, cum veritate attenta nullatenus sit mirandum. Quoniam ut dicunt fide digne historiae a tempore Heliae et Helisei qui saepius morabantur in Monte Carmeli iuxta Nazareth civitatem Dominae nostrae ad tria miliaria, solebant homines devoti secretius habitare, usque ad tempora Salvatoris, et tunc illi heremitae praedicantibus apostolis inter ceteros sunt conversi, et in latere uno montis ipsius primo ecclesiam sive oratorium in honore beatae virginis construxerunt in illo loco sancto in quo didicerunt ipsam in vita sua cum sodalibus virginibus saepius commorasse. Et ob hoc nimirum inter omnes religiosos Dominae nostrae primitus sunt ascripti ut vocarentur fratres beatae Mariae de Monte Carmeli.' On the manuscript circulation of the sermon, and the background, see Walsh, *Fourteenth-Century Scholar*, 208–9.

[131] Walsh, *Fourteenth-Century Scholar*, 377–451.

[132] Arnold Williams (ed.), '*Protectorium pauperis*: A Defense of the Begging Friars by Richard of Maidstone, O.Carm. (d. 1396)', *Carmelus*, 5 (1958), 132–80. There is only one manuscript of the whole of Richard's work, Oxford Bodleian Library E Museo 86, fos. 160ʳ–175ᵛ, the late fourteenth-century collection known as *Fasciculi Zizianorum*, which also contains Hornby's response to Stokes.

can only be deduced from Richard's refutation. He appears, however, to have concentrated on the issue of apostolic poverty as the basis of the mendicants' profession. Unlike Fitzralph, he disregarded the issue of mendicant functions; unlike him also, he declined to resort to the apocalyptic passages that had first been identified as applicable to the mendicants by William of Saint-Amour.[133] The lines of Ashwardby's attack seem to have been that begging was sanctioned in the Gospels only for the lame, the blind, and others who were unable to work, and that begging rendered the religious incapable of work, or even of observing the Ten Commandments. In contrast, giving, rather than receiving, was the duty of religious, and in order to be in a position to give alms to the poor, they had first to have the wherewithal to give, which implied property, tithes, or other income. This latter point had, indeed, been implied in Guy Terrenus's attack on the Spiritual Franciscans; now the sandal was on the other foot.

The basis of Richard's defence was that the mendicant renounces property not in order to beg, but so as to fulfil the Gospel injunction of Luke 18: 22: 'Go and sell all that you own and give the money to the poor and come and follow me.' Mendicancy was the result of renunciation, and renunciation was a meritorious act because it fulfilled the Gospel injunction.[134] So far from mendicancy rendering the friar incapable of work, it was only as a result of renunciation that he was free to preach the Gospel. The distinction between voluntary and involuntary poverty was crucial here; for only voluntary poverty implied renunciation.[135] Richard shifts the emphasis away from the state of poverty itself to the motivation underlying that state.

Although Richard's *Protectorium pauperis* is focused narrowly on the specific issues raised by Ashwardby, it is possible to see his work in the wider context of the Carmelite ecclesiology that emerged from the historical treatises of the same period. Richard, like the Franciscans and the Dominicans, was concerned with the attempt to characterize apostolicity in order to show the correspondences between the Apostles in the Gospels and Acts and the mendicants of his own day. This interest in the quality of apostolicity clearly stems from the need to locate the Carmelites within the embryonic foundation of the Church. As we have seen, at around the same time as Richard was writing, Ribot was fitting the Carmelites into the historical narrative of Acts—the *viri religiosi* in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion and Ascen-

---

[133] Williams (ed.), '*Protectorium pauperis*', 133.
[134] Ibid. 144–5, 150–1.   [135] Ibid. 146.

sion were in fact the sons of the prophets. Converted to the Gospel by the preaching of the Apostles, these early Carmelites themselves naturally adopted the way of life of the Apostles.[136]

Richard proceeds to demonstrate by exegesis, rather than historical argument, that the voluntary poverty of the New Testament was founded on Old Testament precedents. When Elijah found Elisha ploughing a field and covered him with his cloak as a sign of the prophetic succession, Elisha left his manual work to follow the summons, and, in so doing, of necessity embraced voluntary poverty. Prophets did not have time to work with their hands; they travelled too much to grow food to feed themselves. Voluntary poverty was part of the prophetic ministry.[137]

The Wyclifite Ashwardby had, of course, attacked mendicancy only as a means of professing poverty, not poverty *per se*. Wyclif, indeed, argued that reform could only come about if the religious orders truly embraced poverty by abandoning their possessions. Responses to this could take one of two forms. The line taken by Richard of Maidstone was to show that poverty was fully achieved through mendicancy. Richard's younger colleague, Thomas Netter of Walden, chose the more radical option of subordinating poverty in importance to doctrinal orthodoxy.

Netter's ecclesiology, which has recently been the subject of two important studies, should be seen in its contemporary context.[138] His *Doctrinale antiquitatem fidei catholicae ecclesiae* (1421–8), a massive response to Wyclif and the Lollards, probably stemmed from his participation as Carmelite prior-provincial of England in the Council of Constance (1415).[139] This council had, of course, condemned Wyclif; but it had

[136] Ribot, *De institutione*, V. 5–6; *Speculum*, i. 48–51.

[137] Williams, '*Protectorium pauperis*', 174, citing St Ambrose, *De officiis ministrorum*, i. 30, PL 16, col. 74. Other texts used by Richard in this discussion are 3 Kgs. 17: 10–11 (Elijah begging from the widow of Sidon) and Jer. 35: 6–7 (the ascetic life of the sons of the prophets).

[138] Kirk Stevan Smith, 'The Ecclesiology of Controversy: Scripture, Tradition and Church in the Theology of Thomas Netter of Walden' (unpub. Ph.D thesis, Cornell University, 1983); *idem*, 'An English Conciliarist?'; see also the analysis by Turley, '*Ap apostolorum temporibus*', 578–80; and F. X. Siebel, 'Die Kirche als Lehrautorität nach dem *Doctrinale antiquitatem fidei catholicae ecclesiae* des Thomas Waldensis', *Carmelus*, 16 (1969), 3–70.

[139] Netter, Thomas (of Walden), *Doctrinale antiquitatem fidei catholicae ecclesiae*, ed. Bonaventura Blanciotti (Venice, 1757). See Smith, 'An English Conciliarist?', 293, on Netter's participation at Constance. Netter's authorship of the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* has long been rejected, but it is probable that the collection was made by Norwich Carmelites, and possibly by Netter's successor as prior-provincial, John Keninghale, as argued by J. Crompton, '*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*', *JEH* 12 (1961), 41. Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988), 52 and n. 247, argued that circulation of the *Doctrinale* was limited

also, following the start made at Pisa (1409), established an ecclesiology in which the determinants of doctrinal orthodoxy and sovereignty within the Church were articulated. Netter's purpose was to answer the charge made by Wyclif that the Church of his day lacked the doctrinal authority of the early Church. In this he found the Carmelite ecclesiology that had developed over the course of the fourteenth century particularly valuable. As Kirk Smith has noted, Netter 'showed clearly how a historic exemplar could be used not as an instrument of radical dissent, but as a buttress to orthodoxy'.[140]

The Church's past was not an enemy but a trustworthy guide. For Netter, doctrine existed independent of the activity of prelates throughout history, because doctrine had been established by the primitive Church and could not be changed.[141] The role of prelates or, more generally, of authority within the Church was to guarantee the delivery of that changeless doctrine through the sacraments.[142] Thomas Turley has remarked that Netter's ecclesiology 'classicized' the primitive Church to the extent of leaving little room for the development of doctrine.[143] This, of course, is precisely what Wyclif himself had done when he denied the validity of 'contemporary' as opposed to 'ancient' doctrines, and Netter's 'classicism' must surely be seen as an attempt to answer Wyclif on his own terms, by refusing to concede that the doctrine of the primitive Church had become corrupted.

Intriguing questions are suggested by this 'classicizing' ecclesiology about parallels with the view of authority that had always been held in the Orthodox Church. Wyclif, indeed, had asserted in his *De Christo et suo Adversario Antichristo* that the Orthodox had preserved the true faith that the Western Church had let lapse.[144] Netter, as a Carmelite, would

to the Carmelite Order, but this has been disputed by Margaret Harvey, 'The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', in L. Smith and B. Ward (eds.), *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson* (London, 1992), 281–94. As Hudson points out, however, books iii–iv are less polemical than the first two, and consist of a 'justificatory history of the various orders of monks and friars' rather than specific responses to Wyclif.

[140] Smith, 'An English Conciliarist?', 293, and *idem*, 'Ecclesiology of Controversy', ch. 4, *passim*.   [141] Netter, *Doctrinale*, i. 326.

[142] Ibid. i. 341, 384. Here Netter places the authority of general councils above that of the prelates.

[143] Turley, '*Ap apostolorum temporibus*', 579.

[144] Wyclif, *De Christo et suo Adversario Antichristo*, in R. Buddensieg (ed.), *John Wyclif's Polemical Works in Latin*, Wyclif Society, 2 vols. (London, 1883), ii. 672. It may be worth noting that the visit of Emperor Manuel II Paleologus to England in 1400–1 aroused sympathetic interest among some English clergy: Jonathan Harris, *Greek Emigrés in the West 1400–1520* (Camberley, 1995), 78 and n. 175.

of course have been familiar with the traditions that identified those defenders of Orthodoxy of the early Church, Basil of Caesarea and Cyril of Alexandria, as Carmelites. Cyril, who had defended the status of the Blessed Virgin as *theotokos* against Nestorius, was a particularly useful weapon for Carmelite apologists who wanted to demonstrate the antiquity of the Carmelite devotion to Mary. But he could equally be used to show that Marian devotion in the contemporary Church was not a recent development, but belonged to the 'original' practices of the Church. The same method that Carmelites had developed to argue for the antiquity of their order was employed by Netter on behalf of the whole Church to articulate the antiquity and continuity of contemporary doctrine.

The development of a coherent ecclesiology was the product of the evolving Carmelite historical tradition. This ecclesiology did not develop in a theoretical vacuum, however. The promotion of continuity as a theme in Carmelite historiography corresponded to the broader need to respond to the reformist ecclesiology of the Spiritual Franciscans in the 1310s and 1320s. Identification of the primitive monasticism of the Old Testament prophets as a kind of mendicancy, articulated by Ribot in the 1370s, likewise found a contemporary echo in the defence of mendicancy and apostolic poverty against the Wyclifites. Netter's *Doctrinale* summarizes and honours a century of Carmelite historiography in presenting the history of the Church as an unbroken chain whereby the contemporary Church was secured to the firm moorings of the age of the Apostles and early councils.

Hagiography and the Greek Orthodox Past: Two Carmelite Saints

The development of a corpus of Carmelite saints was implicit in the historical writing of the fourteenth century. Individuals, from the founder Elijah to Aimery of Antioch, provided a framework against which the narrative was constructed. The work of Ribot at the end of the century added further candidates: notably Berthold and Brocard. These additions to the narrative enabled the order to view its history through the lives of notable eremitical heroes who could also serve as a focus for devotion by acting as exemplars of Christian virtues. The first catalogue of Carmelite saints probably dates from the mid-fourteenth century, but a fuller tradition began to appear in the fifteenth century.[1] One of the most influential was John Grossi's *Viridarium*, which dates from *c.*1400/1411–17. This was copied later in the century by Thomas Bradley in his *Libellus de institutione fratrum Carmelitarum ordinis*.[2] Similar versions appear in a Paris manuscript which may pre-date Grossi, in a German manuscript of before 1430, and in an early fifteenth-century manuscript from the Augustinian house at Kirkstall.[3] An abbreviated

---

[1] Xiberta, *De visione sancti Simonis Stock*, 84–103, argues for an early fourteenth-century date, but Saggi, *Sant' Angelo,* 20–3, suggests that Jean de Cheminot (c.1337) may have written the first catalogue.

[2] Grossi's *Viridarium* is preserved in Bamberg, Staatsbibl. MS Theol. 218 (QV 40), fos. 78–80. It was printed in Battista Cattaneis's *Speculum antiquum* of 1507, and again in Daniel's *Speculum Carmelitanum* of 1680. Grossi has had two modern editors: Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis*, 42–53, and Graziano de S. Teresa, 'Viridarii auctore Joanne Grossi, Ordinis Carmelitarum prioris generalis, recensio Vaticana', *Ephemerides Carmeliticae*, 7 (1956), 240–86. One version was written at Avignon *c.*1400 when Grossi was prior-general of the Avignon allegiance of the order, and a second version in 1411/17, when he was prior-general of the reunified order. Bradley's *Libellus* is in Cambridge, UL MS Ff.6.11.

[3] Paris, Bib. Nat. Cod. Lat. 5615, fos. 108^r–146^r; Bamberg, Staatsbibl. MS 218 fos. 71^v–75^v; Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fos. 114^r–115^v. The Paris version was published by Daniel a Virgine Maria, *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 137–41.

version, which may be by John of Hildesheim and therefore the earliest of all, survives in a manuscript of 1471.[4]

The catalogue of Carmelite saints is a microcosm of the order's history, but it also reveals the identity which Carmelites wished to portray to the outside world. The Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722 version of 1426, for example, lists sixteen Carmelites: Elijah and Elisha; then the prophets Jonah and Obadiah, representing the 'sons of the prophets'; Patriarch John of Jerusalem, for his contribution of transmitting the written rule; Berthold, the first prior-general, and his successor Brocard, who received the rule from Albert; then Cyril, the visionary who corresponded with Joachim of Fiore; Hilarion, a noted ascetic who performed posthumous miracles; Angelo the martyr, another ascetic and visionary of the thirteenth century; Simon Stock, in whose generalship the rule was modified; then Albert of Trepano, a Sicilian; Theoderich, a German; then Albertanus, Franciscus, and Peter Thomas, the papal legate and Latin patriarch of Constantinople (1360s) who was active in the Crusade of Peter I of Cyprus in 1365.[5]

The list is a distillation of the historical narrative of the period from the *rubrica prima* to Ribot, with notable individuals whose careers were either instrumental in establishing the direction of the order or demonstrate spiritual qualities typical of the Carmelite Order. The Bodleian legendary is perhaps more obviously indebted to Ribot than to his predecessors, and must reflect the extent of his influence on a subsequent generation of Carmelite historians. Two of these Carmelite saints are discussed in this chapter. St Angelo does not appear in any of the Carmelite narratives discussed so far, but became popular in the fifteenth century. Cyril was already known as a visionary from John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus* (and ultimately from a Spiritual Franciscan source), but was developed by Ribot into a transmitter of Carmelite history through his 'letter to Eusebius'.

---

[4] Brussels, Bibl. Royale MS 2223 (20046–53), fos. 146ʳ–148ᵛ. Xiberta, *De scriptoribus Scholasticis*, 202–4, suggests that the Brussels version is a copy of a now lost legendary by John of Hildesheim, on the grounds that it repeats John's error in the *Dialogus* that Peter Thomas was patriarch of Antioch rather than Constantinople (or, as Grossi, Alexandria). Staring's edition of the *Dialogus*, however, *MCH* 350, has a reading of Constantinople.

[5] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fos. 113ʳ–115ᵛ. Bamberg, Staatsbibl. MS 218 has the same list, but with the additional figure of Andreas de Corsinis. Paris, Bib. Nat. Cod. Lat. 5615 has a complete *vita* of Peter Thomas and includes in addition Cyril of Alexandria, while Bradley, in Cambridge UL MS Ff.6.11, fos. 16ʳ–23ᵛ, adds Micah to the prophets and, after Peter Thomas, Andreas de Corsinis, Anthony of Apamea, and Henry.

ST ANGELO

The first mention of Angelo occurs in a work by Nicholas Processi, protodeacon of St John Lateran in the pontificate of Urban V (1362–70).[6] Angelo finds no place, however, in the narrative chronology established by the *rubrica* or its variants, or in the narrative work of Baconthorpe, Jean de Cheminot, John of Hildesheim, or Ribot. But he is included in an acrostic composed by John of Hildesheim on the word CARMELUS, where he, along with Abdias, Andreas, and Albert provide the letter A.[7] Our only knowledge of his career comes from the *Life* written purportedly by a contemporary disciple, Enoch, in the 1220s. As L. Saggi has established, the anachronisms and inconsistencies in the text make such an early date impossible, and a late fourteenth-or early fifteenth-century authorship must be sought.[8] Although the story of Angelo follows hagiographical conventions by describing a 'type' of holy living and dying, and contains details of ascetic holiness that are interchangeable with countless other examples of the genre, it also serves specifically Carmelite purposes. The setting—the Holy Land *c.*1184–1220—enables the author to present the order as a well-established feature of the religious life in Palestine at precisely the period when, as we have seen, the historical evidence for the order's existence is most sketchy. Moreover, by introducing, almost in parentheses to the main narrative, SS Francis and Dominic, the author taps into a particular kind of mendicant historical consciousness. Finally, the vision granted to Angelo empowers the whole order by giving it a prophetic authenticity analogous to that seen by the Spiritual Franciscans in the work of Joachim of Fiore.

The *Life of Angelo* is framed by the literary device of being, ostensibly, the report made by Enoch to a synod held in Jerusalem in 1227 to consider the case for the canonization of Angelo.[9] The report opens with a list of the thirty-six bishops present at the synod.[10] The bishoprics listed, however, do not correspond to any actual ecclesiastical hierarchy.

---

[6] Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 17–20. The manuscript, Rome, Bib. Vat. Lat. 6824, purports to be ancient, but is in fact fifteenth-century.

[7] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 176ᵛ.

[8] Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 73–142, esp. 131–3.

[9] For the manuscript tradition, authorship, and date of the *Life* see Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 37–57. The edition of the *Life* in the *Acta Sanctorum* (*AASS*, May, ii. 847–50) is that of Benedict Gononus, *Vitae Patrum Occidentis* (Lyon, 1625), 227. A different version was published by Thomas Bellorosius (1526/7). There are, in all, three manuscript versions of the abbreviated life, and twelve of the longer life. I use the critical edition by Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 150–225.

[10] Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 154–61.

They are taken instead from the sixth-century Byzantine *Notitia Antiochiae et Ierosolymae Patriarchatum* and later episcopal lists from the Orthodox tradition,[11] albeit mixed up in a fashion that reveals lack of real knowledge of the Orthodox ecclesiastical structure in the thirteenth century. Saggi demonstrated that twenty-two of the episcopal names could be corroborated from William of Tyre or Jacques de Vitry, while most of the remainder could be found in the episcopal lists compiled by Gams or Eubel.[12] But even these names do not necessarily fit with the date of 1227; for example, the closest patriarch, Athanasius of Alexandria, to the supposed date died in 1309.[13] Moreover, some of the errors in listing the sees cannot be overlooked. For example, there was no bishopric of Jaffa, because it was the possession of the canons of the Holy Sepulchre; equally, there was no bishop of Mt Tabor or of Nablus.[14] Those names that are plausible, such as Peter of Tripoli (fl. 1192) and Peter of Tarsus (fl. 1210), suggest that the author was simply inconsistent in his method of listing, taking some from reliable chronicles, but most from ancient episcopal lists.

Although for canonical purposes the original Byzantine lists continued to be reproduced in the Orthodox world, even for sees that had fallen into abeyance in the seventh century, bishops were no longer appointed to all those sees in the thirteenth century. Orthodox patriarchs were, of course, still appointed throughout the Middle Ages to Jerusalem and Antioch, but only exceptionally, and for very short periods, could they ever take possession of their sees; they lived instead in Constantinople.[15] The Latin Crusader Church had modified the ancient Byzantine structure to represent dioceses actually under Frankish control in the twelfth century.[16] Although many of these were lost after 1187, bishops still continued to be appointed to them, but those in the *Life of Angelo* list rarely conform to those whose names are known. The

[11] *Notitia Antiochiae et Ierosolymae Patriarchatuum*, in *Itinera Hierosolymitana et descriptiones Terrae Sanctae*, ed. T. Tobler and A. Molinier 2 vols. (Geneva, 1879–95), i. 339–43; Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 196–9.

[12] Saggi, *Sant' Angelo*, 154–61; P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae quotquot innotuerunt* (Ratisbon, 1873); K. Eubel *et al.*, *Hierarchia catholica medii et recensionis aevi*, 2nd edn., 6 vols. (Monasterii-Patavii, 1913–58).

[13] Gams, *Series episcoporum*, 460.

[14] Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, li, in J. Bongars (ed.), *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanau, 1611), 1078.

[15] Hamilton, *Latin Church*, 374, lists the twelfth- and thirteenth-century patriarchs. On the twelfth-century Orthodox patriarchs, see Johannes Pahlitzsch, 'Die griechischen-orthodoxen Patriarchen von Jerusalem im ersten Jahrhundert der Kreuzfahrherrschaft' (unpub. M.A. thesis, Free University, Berlin, 1993).

[16] Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, li, p. 1077.

inaccuracy of the contextual background is an important issue in discussion of the *Life*, because the narrative itself plays on a stage in which the scenery and props are all supplied by the Orthodox patriarchate of Jerusalem. Equally problematic is the silence of contemporary sources about a synod in Jerusalem in 1227. Since the *Life* asserts that the main purpose of the synod was for Enoch to present to the bishops grounds for the canonization of Angelo, the failure of documentation must cast doubt both on the synod and on Angelo himself.

Angelo's career, as told in the *Life*, can be summed up as follows. Born in 1185, Angelo and his twin brother John were orphaned young. Their parents, Jesse and Maria, were Jewish inhabitants of Jerusalem who had converted to Christianity through the guidance of Patriarch Nicodemus as a result of being granted a vision of the Blessed Virgin. The boys received catechetical instruction in the Carmelite convent on the site of the house of St Anne in Jerusalem and at the convent on Mt Sion.[17] After their parents' death the boys were brought up in the patriarch's household, but when Nicodemus sensed his own approaching death, he encouraged the boys to enter a monastery. They chose the Carmelites, who had received their rule from Nicodemus's predecessor, Albert of Vercelli.[18] They first entered the Carmelite convent at St Anne's, but after a year moved to Mt Carmel itself. At this point the author digresses in order to describe the regime of abstinence imposed on the hermits by the Rule of St Albert.[19] Angelo and John were eventually ordained priests by Patriarch Onuphrios.[20] The ceremony, which took place at the Jordan, provided Angelo with the opportunity to work a miracle when he enabled a crowd of people to cross the river dry-shod by calming the waters. This was his second miracle: he had already saved his brother from drowning in the spring of Elijah on Mt Carmel. Angelo went on to perform a miracle of healing in Bethlehem and to raise seven people from the dead.[21]

Whereas John made a spectacular entry into the ecclesiastical hierarchy by being elected patriarch of Jerusalem in succession to Onuphrios, Angelo devoted himself to a life of extreme asceticism on

---

[17] Saggi, *Sant' Angelo*, 162–70. The late fourteenth-century *Domus in Terra Sancta, MCH* 262–6, lists a Carmelite house in Jerusalem, though it does not specify the location. The Benedictine nunnery of St Anne was converted after 1187 into a Muslim *madrasa*.

[18] Saggi, *Sant' Angelo*, 170–3. This requires a gross misdating of Albert's patriarchate (1204–14).

[19] Ibid. 174–9.

[20] Ibid. 182–3. No Orthodox patriarch of this name is known from the sources.

[21] Ibid. 183–7.

Mt Quarantana for five years.[22] It was during his period of withdrawal that Angelo received a vision in which Christ told him that he was called to win a martyr's crown: he was to go to Sicily and preach against the abominations practised by Count Berengar, who had committed incest with his sister.[23] Christ then foretold the fall of the Holy Land and the whole of the Near East to the Muslims, the schism that would split the Church, and the damage that would be caused to the papacy.[24]

Angelo set out for Sicily with three companions: Joseph of Emmaus, Peter of Bethlehem, and Enoch.[25] They travelled via Alexandria, where they collected from the patriarch some of the relics that Christ had specified must accompany them: a bone from the arm of St Athanasius, a hand of Jeremiah, an arm of St Catherine, a leg of St George, and the icon of the Blessed Virgin painted by St Luke. After a close encounter with Muslim pirates that ended in miraculous deliverance, the party landed in Italy.[26] They found the pope in Orvieto, and sought from him the remaining necessary relics, then proceeded to Rome, where Angelo met Francis and Dominic in St John Lateran.[27] Finally, Angelo arrived in Sicily, where he preached for fifty days, healed paralytics, and exorcised demons. The target of his mission, Count Berengar, denied Angelo's public allegations of incest, but his sister was shamed into repentance. As foretold, Angelo was murdered—by the count himself—while preaching to a large crowd.[28]

In the main outline of the story, Angelo's life follows patterns established for sanctity in his pursuit of ascetic perfection: miracles of healing, receipt of a vision of Christ, and acceptance of a martyr's crown. In certain specifics, notably the raising from the dead, the fast on Mt Quarantana, and the foreknowledge of his martyrdom, he resembles Christ himself. His parentage, too, suggests a conventional type, rather than historical fact. There is little doubt that it is an apocryphal story based on the application of standard Christian virtues to a set of situations, rather than a historical person, that lies behind the St Angelo of the *Life*. Saggi has pin-pointed four specific errors of historical detail that render the story implausible: first, 'Enoch''s topography of the Holy Land is flawed (he describes the journey from Mt Carmel to Jerusalem as involving a crossing of the Jordan); second, he confuses

[22] Ibid. 188–92. [23] Ibid. 190–3. [24] Ibid. 194–7.
[25] Ibid. 198–9. These were presumably also Carmelites. Peter of Bethlehem was one of the bishops listed at the synod of 1227.
[26] Ibid. 198–202. [27] Ibid. 204–5. [28] Ibid. 206–18.

Orvieto, which was not a port, with Civitavecchio; third, neither Dominic nor Francis was in Rome at the time specified by the *Life*; and fourth, Godfrey, the archbishop of Palermo healed by Angelo, did not exist.[29]

The sources for the *Life* are not exclusively Carmelite, though many of the details are. The *Rule of St Albert* is mentioned a handful of times, and the ascetic practices ascribed to Angelo and John are an accurate reflection of what Albert prescribed for the hermits of Mt Carmel. The 'letter of Cyril' in Ribot's *De institutione* must have been the basis for the date 412 given by Angelo for the composition of the rule.[30] The Carmelite convent at the house of St Anne had been known since the mid-fourteenth century, when Jean de Cheminot and Jean de Venette mentioned it.[31] The prophecy given to Angelo, the details of which, incidentally, also confirm the *Life* as a later work than it purports to be, betrays various influences. Apart from the details of the Muslim occupation of the Holy Land, many other elements of the prophecy simply reflect the situation in the author's own day, and the general Ottoman advance through Greece and the Balkans. The idea of a Carmelite being entrusted with a prophecy of this nature, relating the future trials of the Church, must have its origin in the *Oraculum Cyrilli* and the absorption of Cyril into the Carmelite historical narrative. Saggi identified additional influences, all dating from the fourteenth century: the south Italian *Visio seu prophetia fratris Iohannis* (1302–3), the commentary on the *Oraculum Cyrilli* by John of Rupescissa (1345–9), and the *Libellus de causis* of Telesforus (1356–65).[32]

---

[29] Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 97–103. Carmelites are known to have made occasional pilgrimages to the Holy Land, but their geographical knowledge seems not to have filtered through the order, and there was no reason to suppose that fourteenth–fifteenth-century Carmelites would be better informed about the geography of the Holy Land than anyone else. William of Coventry, *De adventu*, *MCH* 282–6, is similarly careless over the topography of the Holy Land. Saggi supposes that the phrase 'ad portum Romanum Urbis Veteris', which should refer to Orvieto, was meant to indicate Civitavecchio, which, unlike Orvieto, has a port. As he points out, the pope was in Rome between late April and June 1219, then from June to October in Rieti, and October till December in Viterbo. The meeting of the saints could not have taken place in 1219–20, since the only date at which Francis is known to have been in Rome is 1209–10, whereas Dominic was there in 1215. Francis was in Assisi at Pentecost in 1219, before travelling to Damietta to visit the crusader army, returning to Italy in 1220.

[30] Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 172.

[31] Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, iii, *MCH* 125. Saggi, *Sant'Angelo* 110, finds the *Life of Angelus* version closest to Grossi's *Viridarium*, 267.

[32] Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 117–19. For John's *Visio seu prophetia*, see E. Donckel (ed.), 'Visio seu prophetia fratris Iohannis: Eine sud-italienische Prophezieung aus dem Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts', *Römische Quartalschrift*, 40 (1952), 361–79. Donckel also edited Telesforus of Cosenza's *Libellus de causis*: 'Studien über die Prophezieung des Fr. Telesforus von Cosenza,

Other sources identified by Saggi, whose influence is reflected in linguistic borrowings or in general stylistic similarities, include the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great (for Angelo reviving a dead boy), the *Life of St Maurus*, and the *Life of St Placidius*.[33] Perhaps more telling are the comparisons with the *Life* of the Dominican martyr Peter of Verona (d. 1252). Common elements here include preaching, the named companions on the journey to martyrdom, the celebration of Mass on the morning of the martyrdom, the murder caused by five blows, the martyr's pardon for the killer modelled on Christ and Stephen, and the honour shown to the body by the archbishop. In addition, the idea of a 'frame' story, in which the life of Angelo is related by Enoch, patriarch of Jerusalem, may have derived from the *Life* of Peter written by the thirteenth-century Dominican patriarch of Jerusalem, Thomas of Lentini.[34]

The influence of Dominican sources on the *Life* is striking in the light of the mendicants' critiques of each others' historical narratives, and their rivalry over historical priority. In this context the most fruitful part of the *Life of Angelo* is the episode in which the saint meets Dominic and Francis in the church of St John Lateran. This was not so much a Carmelite invention as the appending of a Carmelite saint to an already established mendicant tradition. In the story first told by Gerard de Frachet, Dominic, while in Rome at the time of the Fourth Lateran Council, had a dream in which Christ held out before him three lances, saying, 'I have one faithful servant named Dominic, and another called Francis, who are converting the sinners of the world to repentance.' The next day Dominic was praying in St Peter's when Francis entered. Dominic recognized him from his dream by the habit he wore, and said to him, 'You are the companion who runs alongside me; if we are equally strong no enemy shall prevail against us.'[35]

Gerard was writing at a time when the heads of the two major mendicant orders, Humbert of Romans and John of Parma, had cooperated in order to counter the attack on the mendicants by the

---

OFM (1365–86)', *AFH* 26 (1933), 29–104, 282–314. For John of Rupescissa see J. Bignami-Odier, *Etudes sur Jean de Rocquetaillade* (Paris, 1952), esp. 53–112.

[33] Saggi, *Sant' Angelo*, 121–5; Gregory, *Dialogi*, ii. 32; *Vita S. Mauri*, *AASS*, Oct. ii. 1039–40; *Vita S. Placidii*, ibid. iii. 114–38. The latter work dates from the first half of the twelfth century: U. Berlière, 'Le Culte de S. Placide', *Revue Bénédictine*, 33 (1921), 19–45.

[34] Saggi, *Sant' Angelo*, 126–8. S. Orlandi (ed.), *S. Pietro martire da Verona, leggenda di Fra Tommaso Agni da Lentini* (Florence, 1952).

[35] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, i. i. 4, MOPH 1. 10–11; also told by Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica*, xi. 7, MOPH 2. 7.

secular masters at Paris.[36] The combination of Francis and Dominic in his narrative legitimizes both orders in their perceived role as apostles of the new age, commissioned not only by the papacy but by Christ himself. The persons of Dominic and especially Francis were powerful weapons in the mendicant orders' assertions of legitimacy. Charismatic and indubitably saintly founding fathers could not easily be dismissed by critics, and the body of literature produced by each order's hierarchy relating to their respective founders reveals the importance of the institutional devotion to them in the promulgation of the orders' ideals.[37] The Carmelites had no such obvious candidate as a charismatic founder. Albert of Vercelli, who might reasonably be identified as such, was of course a contemporary of Francis and Dominic. But although the Carmelites honoured him for his role in giving the order a new structure, they were ambivalent about his significance. As we have seen, he vied with Aimery of Limoges for this role in the work of some fourteeth-century Carmelites. To place too much weight on Albert was to minimize the pre-Albertian history of the order, and it was this historical continuity that Carmelite writers wanted above all to emphasize. If Albert had met Francis and Dominic in a Carmelite version of Gerard's popular story, the assumption would be that Albert, like Francis and Dominic, was the founder of his order.

The author of the *Life of Angelo* escapes this predicament by introducing into the established tradition on behalf of the Carmelites a figure who was indisputably a member of a long-established order, rather than its founder. The appearance of this episode in the Angelo narrative toward the end of a life which has been spent almost entirely as a Carmelite makes the point that the Carmelites as an order pre-dated the Dominicans and the Franciscans. This is all the clearer when one compares the occurrence of the story of the meeting of the saints in the careers of Francis and Dominic: in the case of both, it happens at a critical moment in the early career of the saint, when the establishment of their orders was not yet assured.[38]

---

[36] E. T. Brett, *Humbert of Romans* (Toronto, 1984), 27–9. On the conflict, see D. L. Douie, *The Conflict between the Seculars and the Mendicants at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1954).

[37] The *Legenda Maior* of Francis by Bonaventure was authorized by the general-chapter of the Franciscan Order in 1260: 'Definitiones capitulorum generalium ordinis Fratrum Minorum', ed. A. G. Little, *AFH* 7 (1914), 678; Humbert himself wrote the prologue to Gerard de Frachet's chronicle, *Vitas fratrum*, prol., MOPH I. 3–5.

[38] On the Dominicans' status in 1215, see Tugwell, 'Friars and Canons'.

In the *Life of Angelo* the meeting of the saints is told in a way that assumes equality between the three. On recognizing Angelo, Francis prostrates himself before the Carmelite, but Angelo in his turn reveres Francis for his gift of the stigmata; he then turns to talk with Dominic.[39] A common purpose, set of ideals, and destiny is assumed for all three orders. Two conclusions are thus presented to the reader: first, that the Carmelites were fellow-workers with the Dominicans and the Franciscans in the task of converting the world to repentance; in addition, unlike the newly formed orders, they were not the recent fulfilment of an ancient prophecy, but had a venerable history of such work behind them.

This assumption is, indeed, the subtext of the whole first part of the *Life*. The context in which the saint's early life is told is that of the Greek Orthodox Church in the Holy Land. The Carmelites are not specifically categorized as Orthodox religious, or, by virtue of being natives of the Holy Land, as members of an ethnic group whose religious allegiance was to the Orthodox Church. Nevertheless, such a conclusion is inescapable. The two young boys, Angelo and John, choose the Carmelite Order over a Basilian monastery, which is presented as the alternative.[40] The patriarch of Jerusalem has a Greek name, Nicodemus, and is succeeded by another obviously Orthodox monk, Onuphrios; the convent where the boys' mother receives instruction is Basilian; Angelo raises the boy from the dead in the presence of Orthodox bishops; the names of bishops and their sees in the introduction to the story are taken from Orthodox ecclesiastical lists— in short, to be a religious in the Holy Land in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries is to be part of a Greek Orthodox milieu.[41] There is no place for a Latin Church with its own hierarchy of bishops and its own monasteries, although at the date at which the story opens in 1184, the bishoprics and patriarchate were in reality in the hands of the Latins.[42] This does not make the story *exclusively* Greek rather than Latin; it simply overlooks the problem altogether by failing to recognize the historical situation in the kingdom of Jerusalem as it really was. The purpose of the *Life of Angelo*, after all, was not to relate 'accurate' history in the sense understood by modern scholarship, but to

[39] Saggi, *Sant' Angelo*, 204–7.
[40] Ibid. 172: 'Regula sancti patris Basilii perfecta est et laudabilis, sed nos animo nostro statuimus observare regulam quam sanctus Albertus fecit.'
[41] Ibid. 167–8, 186–7.
[42] Albert of Vercelli is mentioned as a predecessor of Nicodemus, although his nationality is not mentioned: ibid. 170–3.

convey certain saintly characteristics illustrative of the Carmelite Order.[43]

The impression given by the context of the *Life* is one of unchanging ecclesiastical rhythms, following patterns established centuries earlier. Carmelites educate new recruits in Jerusalem before sending them to Mt Carmel; the best are chosen to be ordained priests by the patriarch; they follow a rule laid down in the fifth century; they travel throughout the country preaching and healing. This latter function emphasizes the sense of continuity, for it had been Ribot's conviction that the mendicant profession adopted by the order in the mid-thirteenth century was not an innovation but the restoration of a proper balance within the order. Until the meeting with Francis and Dominic in Rome—in other words, until the narrative leaves the Holy Land—nothing ties the story to the period in which it is set. The details might as easily relate to the Orthodox Church in the sixth century as in the twelfth or thirteenth. There is no mention of crusading, of the Frankish presence in the Holy Land, or of chronic war with the Muslims. This is deliberate. The effect is to show an essential continuity with the traditions of the early Christian Church. Thus the question that troubled earlier Carmelite historians about how the Franks became absorbed into the existing Carmelite Order, and what nature the order took as a result of this influx, is irrelevant to the *Life of Angelo*. The author is concerned with antiquity only in so far as he needs to demonstrate the smooth adherence to ancient tradition of the Church in Jerusalem, and the place of the Carmelite Order in that Church. The salient feature of the order, in the story of Angelo, is its rootedness in the religious life of the Holy Land. The fact that Angelo and his companions must have been Orthodox does not disturb the smooth passage from East to West. Of course, Sicily had a large Orthodox population, so the notion of Orthodox monks establishing a following while preaching there is not implausible.[44] Nor, to a fifteenth-century audience, was the picture of a celebrated Orthodox monk in Rome meeting the pope and Western

---

[43] See below, 326, for discussion.

[44] The classic study of Greek Orthodoxy in Sicily under Norman rule is still Lynn White, Jr., *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), 38–46; see now A. Pertusi, 'Aspetti organizzativi e culturali dell' ambiente monacho greco dell'Italia meridionale', in *L'eremitismo in occidente nei secoli XI e XII*, Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Medievali, 4 (Milan, 1965), 382–426; E. Patlagean, 'Recherches récentes et perspectives sur l'histoire du monachisme italo-grec', *Rivista di storia della chiesa italiana*, 22 (1968), 146–66; and useful remarks by Henri Bresc, 'L'Eremitisme franciscain en Sicilie', in *Francescanesimo e cultura in Sicilia (saec. XIII–XVI)*, *Schede Medievale*, 12–13 (1987), 37–44.

religious leaders.[45] In 1219–20, however, this would indeed have been strange. Such concerns do not trouble the story because it describes a world in which the division between Orthodox and Catholic simply does not exist. The mind-set of the story has not moved from the timeless early Christian framework in which it begins, even if the introduction of specific details have forced the reader into the thirteenth century.

The precise setting of the story between 1184 and 1227 is, nevertheless, important. From the standpoint of a whole polemical tradition of Carmelite historiography, this is the crucial period for proving that the order existed before 1215. Angelo's life bestrides this date, yet at the same time withholds recognition of its significance. In 1215, when Dominic and Francis were manœuvring to gain recognition for their followings as orders, lest they be absorbed or dissolved, the Carmelites were living peacefully as they had always done on Mt Carmel. The silence of the *Life* about events that later Carmelites (and modern-day historians) knew to have been taking place—the gathering of the hermits into a single group, the rule, confirmation by Honorius III—is eloquent. All this had happened long in the past, and the career of a Carmelite at the turn of the thirteenth century was no different from what it would have been in any previous age. It is the juxtaposition of timelessness with chronological precision that makes the *Life* so interesting as a historical source. It does not offer the handholds of the historical narratives discussed in previous chapters, because its concerns are different, as, to a large degree, is its audience. Yet it contributes to the general picture being created by Carmelite writers of the late Middle Ages, and in doing so helps to show the unity of Carmelite literature of all genres.

CYRIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE

Philip Ribot's genius for making inventive use of material lying to hand but previously unexploited in the cause of Carmelite historiography is nowhere better seen than in the case of Cyril. A figure associated only with the prophetic tradition of Joachim of Fiore through Spiritual Franciscan literature, Cyril was transformed by Ribot into a linchpin of the thirteenth-century development of the Carmelites.[46] Ribot's

---

[45] See, e.g., N. G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1992), 54–85.

[46] Cyril's first appearance was as the prophetic correspondent of Joachim: Piur (ed.), 'Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli'. The *Oraculum Cyrilli* was owned at one stage by John of Hildesheim: ibid. 226.

seventeenth-century editor, Daniel a Virgine Maria, introduces Cyril as a Byzantine monk who joined the Carmelites after becoming convinced of the error of the Orthodox view of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and served as prior-general on Mt Carmel from 1231 to 1234.[47] By the end of the Middle Ages, therefore, Ribot's Cyril had displaced the prophet of the Spiritual Franciscan tradition. There can be little doubt that Ribot was responsible for this transformation. John of Hildesheim, writing only a few years before Ribot, mentioned Cyril only in his prophetic role.[48] Ribot's deployment of Cyril to relate the history of the Carmelite habit and the prehistory of the rule, purportedly in a letter to the prior of a Carmelite daughter-convent, is the first indication of a new role as a figure of authority in the order.

Ribot's development of Cyril's role, however, seems initially not to have been influential. The most reliable early catalogue of priors-general, that of John Trisse (*c.*1360), begins with Ralph of Fryston (1270), and thus avoids the problem of the dates—and indeed authenticity—of the first to hold the office.[49] John Grossi's list of priors-general, similarly, omit Cyril.[50] Where Cyril does appear—for instance, in the legendary in Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722—it is as a visionary, rather than a prior-general. The confusion may have arisen from a blurring of the distinction between the functions of the two different types of list. Bale's list of priors-general, which appears to derive from fifteenth-century sources, begins with Berthold (following Ribot), and proceeds with Brocard, Berthold II, and Cyril, none of whom can be substantiated from external evidence. These names must

---

[47] Daniel, *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 14. Daniel published a separate version of the 'letter of Cyril' to Eusebius of the Black Mountain, from Ribot's *De institutione*, in *Vinea Carmeli seu historia Eliani ordinis beatae virginis Mariae de Monte Carmeli* (Antwerp, 1662), i. v. 21–3. Some twentieth-century Carmelite scholars have been inclined to treat Cyril's authorship of the letter as authentic: e.g. Gabriel Wessels, 'Epistola S. Cyrilli III prioris generalis et historia antiqua ordinis nostri', *AOC* 3 (1914), 267–86. Zimmermann, *MHC* 295, accepted Cyril as genuine, but not his Byzantine origins.

[48] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, iii, *MCH* 346.

[49] Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis*, 39–42. An older edition of Trisse's catalogue, from Paris, Bib. Univ. MS 791, fos. 75–7, is H. Denifle, 'Quellen zur Gelehrtengeschichte des Carmelitenordens im 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts', *ALKG* 5 (1899), 365–84. Bale's transcription, in London, BL Harley MS 1819, fos. 57–8, is in Zimmermann, *MHC* 231–4.

[50] Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis*, 42. Grossi's first version (*c.*1400) passes straight from Berthold II (a similarly unverifiable character) to Alan the Breton, the predecessor of Nicholas Gallicus; the second (1411/17) begins with Alan in 1265. In the later catalogues transcribed by Bale, Cyril appears between Brocard and Berthold II: London, BL Cotton Titus D X, fo. 129ᵛ; Oxford, Bodleian Library Selden supra 72, fos. 12ʳ–20ᵛ (where Cyril is given a date of 1169 for his assumption of office); and supra 41, fo. 150ᵛ (where his dates are 1208–35). In the latter instances he is known as Cyril 'de Grecia' or 'grecus'.

have been grafted on to the list of priors-general from the emerging legendary. This may have been a quite accidental process, whereby prominent Carmelites of the crusader period (up to the migration to the West) were retrospectively considered to have been not only saintly but also leaders of the order.

By the end of the fifteenth century, Cyril was known outside the Carmelite Order as both prior-general and visionary. John Trithemius's *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiae*, published in 1492, lists Cyril as 'priest and monk of Mt Carmel, and third prior-general of that order, said to have been a Greek, a holy man blessed with the spirit of prophecy', and relates the visitation to Cyril of an angel bearing silver tablets that contained the future, some of which Cyril communicated to Joachim of Fiore.[51] Cyril was also celebrated as a prophet by Trithemius's Carmelite friends John Paleonydorus and Arnold Bostius.[52] John Bale's miscellany, Bodleian Library MS 73, contains a *Life of St Cyril the Greek Doctor of the Carmelite Order*, which probably dates from the fifteenth century.[53] This is the fullest account of Cyril's supposed origins and connection with the Carmelite Order. In particular, it deals with many of the issues about the Orthodox involvement in the early stages of the order that had already been raised by Ribot's *De institutione*.

According to the Bodleian Library MS 73 *Life*, Cyril was born in Attica, at an unspecified date early in the twelfth century, and educated in the liberal arts and theology in Constantinople. He conceived the idea of converting the Seljuk sultan of Iconium, having heard rumours that the sultan inclined toward Christianity. Before he could embark on this mission, however, he was sent by Emperor Manuel Komnenos as a legate to Pope Hadrian IV. The pope was interested in a military alliance with Constantinople against Frederick Barbarossa, the terms of which would also entail union between the Latin and Greek Churches. By the

---

[51] John Trithemius, *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiae*, in J. A. Fabricius (ed.), *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Hamburg, 1718), 103.

[52] John (Oudewater) Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus anaphoricus panegyricus de principio et processu ordinis Carmelitici*, iii. 4 (Morguntina, 1497), no pagination; Arnold Bostius, *De illustribus viris ordinis fratrum beatissime virginis Mariae de monte Carmelo*, in Christine Jackson-Holzberg (ed.), *Zwei Literaturgeschichten des Karmelitenordens* (Erlangen, 1981), 127–9.

[53] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 143ʳ–147ʳ. This manuscript notebook in Bale's own hand contains notes from his reading in Carmelite libraries in England, Flanders, and the Netherlands. In my view it unlikely that the life was written by Bale, since all the rest of the material, other than listings of Carmelite notables, consists of transcriptions of the work of previous authors; on the other hand, it has been pointed out to me that Bale's usual practice was to attribute works that he copied to their original authors.

time Cyril arrived in Italy, Hadrian had died and been succeeded by Alexander III, who, acting on Cyril's information, sent letters to the sultan of Iconium encouraging his conversion.[54] On his return to Constantinople, Cyril was made professor of theology and philosophy, but immediately became embroiled in an argument with the patriarch on the question of the Holy Spirit, as a result of which Cyril was expelled from the city. At this stage in his theological studies Cyril was working purely from Greek patristic sources, since he could not read Latin. One night, however, the Blessed Virgin appeared to him and exhorted him to be strong in his defence of what he had reasoned in his quarrel with the patriarch to be the correct view of the procession of the Holy Spirit, which corresponded in fact to the Latin position. She advised him to seek refuge among the Latin hermits on Mt Carmel, so Cyril set out for the Holy Land.[55] After a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Cyril went to Mt Carmel and obtained permission from the prior, Brocard, to join his community.

On his first night on the mountain the Blessed Virgin appeared to Cyril again, to assure him that he had arrived at a safe place. Cyril now proceeded to imbibe Carmelite monastic wisdom: he learnt that Mt Carmel was the head and origin of the monastic profession, and read daily the lives of the founder-prophets and their successors.[56] He excelled in the ascetic virtues, avoiding meat in his diet, keeping the vow of silence, rarely leaving his cell, and eschewing sleep. One night in 1147, he was granted a vision of St Basil, the bishop of Caesarea who had once been a monk of Mt Carmel.[57] In this vision Basil entrusted Cyril with the task of preaching to the Armenian people. Cyril, who had learnt Armenian as part of his education in Constantinople, was an ideal candidate for such a mission, and after ten years' preaching succeeded in converting the whole Armenian nation to the true faith of Christ. In 1181 the Armenian king and clergy formally submitted to the authority of Pope Lucius III.[58]

Cyril returned to Mt Carmel with his disciple Eusebius (who, according to Ribot, later became prior of the Black Mountain). He proceeded to perform miracles, such as the cure of a blind beggar, first healing him of blindness and subsequently, after the beggar had joined

[54] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 143ʳ.   [55] Ibid., fo. 143ᵛ.

[56] Ibid., fo. 144ʳ.

[57] Ibid., fo. 144ᵛ. The dates are all askew: Hadrian was pope 1154–9, but according to the *Life*, Cyril left Constantinople for Mt Carmel after his return from Rome in 1139. On Basil as a Carmelite, see fos. 147ʳ–148ᵛ, and below, 227–33.   [58] Ibid., fo. 144ᵛ.

the community, raising him from a coma. The news of this feat induced the pope to offer Cyril the patriarchate of Jerusalem, but this Cyril refused, preferring instead to put his scholarship at the service of the order, writing biblical exegesis and a historical account of the Carmelite Order, and translating his works into Latin. In 1200, on the death of Brocard, Cyril was elected prior-general.[59]

The *Life* concludes with the part of the legend that derived from a non-Carmelite source: the prophetic ministry. Cyril was visited by a flame-haired angel appearing in a cloud and holding out two silver tablets; it was the Carmelite's task to transcribe the tablets that the angel deposited on an altar. Cyril showed the tablets to his monks, seeking particular advice from one of them, an English theologian called Gilbert. Those prophecies that still eluded him he sent to Joachim of Fiore for interpretation, using as courier a Carmelite called Telesforus. The content of the prophecies related mostly to the future of the order itself. Although the Carmelites would be eradicated from Mt Carmel and the Holy Land by the Muslims, they would enjoy the protection of the Blessed Virgin and multiply throughout the whole of Europe.[60]

The career of Cyril as depicted in the Bodleian Library MS 73 *Life* is susceptible to interpretation on various levels. As in much of the Carmelite legendary, the dating is awry. Cyril's legation to Rome is said to have taken place at the end of Hadrian IV's pontificate and the start of Alexander III's, which must mean the year 1159; yet it is in 1139 that he is then made to leave Constantinople for Mt Carmel.[61] Some dates, however, are accurate—for example, the Armenian settlement of 1181. More significant than the dating is the general context of Cyril's career. The author knew enough about the ecclesiastical and political situation in the Mediterranean in the mid-twelfth century to make the story convincing in some details, if implausible as a whole. The Byzantine–papal alliance against the Hohenstaufen of Alexander III's pontificate has been transposed to that of Hadrian IV; but, since Hadrian's tenure of office was dominated by poor relations with the German emperor, this is not outlandish. The story of the sultan of Iconium who wished to convert to Christianity may be fantasy, but it was not one unique to the *Life of Cyril*, since a similar story occurs in the chronicle of Nicholas Canteloup.[62]

[59] Ibid., fo. 145^r.   [60] Ibid., fos. 145^v–146^v.

[61] Ibid., fo. 143^r–v. While 1139 may be a scribal error, the vision of Basil is said to take place in 1147, which would be consistent with 1139.

[62] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 61^v. This is Bale's transcription; the original does not survive.

The Armenian preaching mission, though unsubstantiated, is likewise the reflection of a real enough situation. Approaches to the Armenians were made not only by the Latin Church—which eventually succeeded in a formal statement of union—but also by the Greek Orthodox in the 1160s–1170s. The reunion of the Greek and Armenian Churches had been part of Orthodox religious policy for over a century. In 1171 the Byzantine theologians Theorianus and John Atmanos travelled to Hromgla to debate issues of doctrinal difference and custom between the Churches with the Armenian *catholicos* Nerses.[63] Nothing came of either Greek or Latin approaches, since ultimately the Armenians and the papacy diverged again; nevertheless, missionaries and diplomats from both Churches were active in Armenia in roughly the period covered by Cyril's life.[64]

The Armenian adventure raises what is perhaps the most intriguing question about Cyril as he is presented in this late Carmelite tradition. Why do the Carmelites make use of a figure so obviously Orthodox, albeit a convert to Catholicism, as witness to the authority placed in the order by God? Here, once again, the figure as presented may be implausible to the modern reader, but the underlying principle is not. Cyril's challenge to the Orthodox position on the Holy Spirit, based on personal study of patristic literature, is reminiscent of the theological controversies in Constantinople during the 1150s and 1160s over the persons of the Trinity. Under the patriarchs Constantine IV (1154–7) and Luke Chrysobergos (1157–69), the reign of Manuel Komnenos became, in Chalandon's expressive phrase, 'un temps de véritable débauche théologique'.[65] Three councils, in 1156, 1157, and 1166, split the Orthodox Church on the question of the relationship between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. In 1156 a traditional interpretation was promulgated that resulted in the deposition of a prominent theologian; in the following year the intervention of the emperor resulted in the condemnation of the *soterichon* resolving the dispute and

[63] Andrew Jotischky, 'Manuel Comnenus and the Reunion of the Churches: The Evidence of the Conciliar Mosaics in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem', *Levant*, 26 (1994), 220.

[64] On Armenian—Latin relations, see Hamilton, 'The Armenian Church and the Papacy at the Time of the Crusades', *Eastern Churches Review*, 10 (1978), 61–87; James Ryan, 'Toleration Denied: Armenia between East and West in the Era of the Crusades', in J. Powell and M. Gervers (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance: Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades* (Syracuse, NY, 2001), 55–64.

[65] F. Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène* (Paris, 1912), 640. For more recent assessments, see Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–80* (Cambridge, 1993), 287–92.

the convening of a new council at the Blachernae palace.[66] The question was reopened in the 1160s by the teaching of a monk, Demetrios, who had travelled widely in the West. Influential Orthodox prelates subscribed to his views, and even the patriarch of Constantinople was sympathetic.[67] Manuel once again intervened personally, convening a council in 1166 and compelling the participants to subscribe to his own formula.

The issues of theological debate do not correspond exactly, but Cyril, like Demetrios, had developed 'dangerous' views after returning from the West. If one disregards the erroneous dating in the Bodleian *Life*, and thinks of a putative Cyril in the reign of Manuel Komnenos, rather than the 1130s, then the story of a theologian in Constantinople going into exile (voluntarily or not) as a result of doctrinal differences is not unusual. Niketas Choniates names, among those engaged in the debates of the 1150s–1160s, the deposed Michael of Thessaloniki, who taught theology at Hagia Sophia and was master of the rhetors, and Nikephoros Basilakes, another theologian at Hagia Sophia.[68] Moreover, debate over rival Latin and Orthodox doctrines was clearly part of the cultural ambience of the reign of Manuel, who, as Niketas tartly observed, reckoned himself something of an expert.[69] Although he took a hard line against the deviance of Demetrios, he also patronized the Pisan theologian Hugo Eteriano, whose brother Leo held office in the imperial palace.[70] When one learns that Eteriano's major achievement was his attempt to disprove Orthodox doctrine on the Trinity from a study of Greek patristics, one can understand the origins of the Cyril story.[71]

The connection to Mt Carmel is more difficult to make. The Carmelites were not noted, until the fourteenth century, for their contribution to formal theology. There is no indication of any interest in

---

[66] V. Grumel (ed.), *Les regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople* (Paris, 1972), nos. 1039, 1041, 1043.

[67] *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, vii. 5, ed. J. Van Dieten, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, XI/1 (Berlin, 1975), 210–12.

[68] Ibid. vii. 5, p. 211.

[69] Ibid. vii. 4, p. 209; 6, p. 213. See also Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 282–92, on the theological debates of the 1150s–1160s, and 481–2 for useful remarks on Niketas's criticism.

[70] A. Dondaine, 'Hugues Eterien et le concile de Constantinople de 1166', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 77 (1958), 473–83; P. Classen, 'Reichersberger Exzerpt aus einem Bericht des Hugo Etherianus uber das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 48 (1955), 64–8.

[71] A. Dondaine, 'Hugues Eterien et Léon Toscan', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, 27 (1952), 67–134.

theology or doctrinal debate in the early stages of the Carmelite foun-
dation. Indeed, Albert's Rule was written for pious laymen who may
not have been literate enough to say the Office.[72] On the other hand,
theological discussion may be assumed to have formed part of the in-
evitable communication between the informal groups of indigenous
and Frankish monks gathered in different parts of Mt Carmel in the
last quarter of the twelfth century. The composition of the Carmelite
community in its early stages has been discussed elsewhere; at present,
all that can be said is that an element of mixing between Franks and
Orthodox is possible.[73] Philip Ribot, building on the work of Jean de
Cheminot and the anonymous texts of *c*.1290–1320, developed this no-
tion into an essential component of Carmelite history; indeed, the
standard Carmelite version of the twelfth-century history of the site
makes sense only if such mixing is assumed.[74] Although there is no evi-
dence that any medieval Carmelite author knew this, the spring of
Elijah had been settled by a Calabrian Orthodox monk and his com-
panions in the 1180s, and the figure of Cyril may derive from a mem-
ory of this pre- (or proto-) Carmelite foundation.[75]

Not all Carmelites were so ready to let Orthodox and Frank mix
retrospectively: William of Coventry, for example, was hostile to any
notion of Orthodox influence on the 'Latin' Carmelite Order.[76] At first
sight the fifteenth-century Bodleian *Life* seems closer in this regard to
William than to Ribot. If an Orthodox monk were to be posited as a
crucial member of the order, he must first be 'cleared' of Orthodox
taint by the device of making him reject his theological heritage of his
own volition, and as the result of independent study, subsequently
confirmed by the appearance of the Blessed Virgin. Greeks were ac-
ceptable so long as they were convinced of their errors. Polemically,
therefore, the Bodleian *Life* functions as a testimony to the correctness
of the Latin and the error of the Orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit.
Perhaps—if the *Life* is dated to mid-century—this is a reflection of the
reappearance of this issue in the reunion debates at the Council of
Florence. The Bodleian *Life* is not polemical in intent, however, and
there is none of the overt hostility to Orthodoxy that characterizes the
writings of William of Coventry. Indeed, Cyril is used to tie together
very neatly the different strands of monastic tradition that contributed

---

[72] *Rule of St Albert*, ix, pp. 82–3.
[73] Jotischky, *Perfection of Solitude*, 132–42, and above, 11.
[74] Jotischky, 'Carmelites and Greek Orthodox Monasticism'.
[75] John Phokas, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, PG 133, cols. 961–2.   [76] See above, 121–38.

to the Carmelite Order. It is worth noting the high respect in which Cyril, as a potential recruit, was held by the prior, Berthold, who, in the *Life*, assumed from his appearance that Cyril was a prophet or a theologian, and was overjoyed when he asked to join the community. Cyril impressed the hermits by his austerity and his gift of healing, and it could be argued that his prophetic vision is a further testimony to the Orthodox contribution to the order.

The purpose of the Bodleian *Life* is to bolster further the Carmelite perception of its history. Thus the recruitment of Cyril, a highly regarded theologian with wide experience of ecclesiastical diplomacy, reflects well on the order, the more so because the recommendation was made by the Blessed Virgin. As Brocard explains to Cyril, Mt Carmel is the 'capud et principio' of all religious.[77] Just as, in the Angelo legend, the meeting with Dominic and Francis serves as legitimation of Carmelite claims by associating the little-known Angelo with founder-saints of greater fame, so Cyril's dream of St Basil has the same function. The connection between the Carmelites and Basil had been made as early as the 1290s in the *Universis christifidelibus*, and was followed by Jean de Cheminot and John of Hildesheim. In Cyril's dream, Basil is explicitly said to have been a hermit on Mt Carmel before becoming bishop of Caesarea.[78] A monk who has already been counselled in a dream by the Blessed Virgin herself was perhaps not likely to be over-awed by the appearance of Basil. Yet, in some ways, Basil serves the purpose even better than the Virgin, for he allows the author to associate the Carmelites with the whole tradition of Greek Orthodox monasticism. This association would be carried still further in the course of the fifteenth century, in the *Life of St Basil* that was also copied by Bale into Bodleian Library MS 73 and in the appropriations of early Christian martyrs and saints on behalf of the Carmelites represented in Bale's other notebooks.

The Bodleian *Life* of Cyril, by merging the earlier prophetic figure with the monastic leader created by Ribot, gives shape to an otherwise shadowy character. Past and future are united in a single figure: the prior-general who transmitted the history of the order's habit to Eusebius in Ribot's *De institutione* is now also responsible for transmitting the future through the prophecy entrusted him by God. The content of the prophecy itself is rather bland, but the context again shows the 'appropriating' tendency in Carmelite authorship. A further prophetic

---

[77] Oxford Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 144^r.   [78] Ibid., fo. 144^v.

tradition, the fourteenth-century apocalyptic of Telesforus, is absorbed into the Carmelite repertoire by making the author a Carmelite hermit who acted as courier for Cyril's correspondence with Joachim of Fiore. In Bale's catalogue of Carmelites, Telesforus would later appear as a disciple of Cyril, along with Eusebius, prior of the Black Mountain.[79] The Bodleian *Life of Cyril*, like the *Life of Angelo*, shows an increasing interest by fifteenth-century Carmelites in prophecy as a legitimation for the order. The gift of revealing the future was a mark of an individual's intellectual capacity and personal sanctity, but it can also be seen as confirmation of the whole order's maturity. To those who had mastered the past, the future would also be entrusted.

---

[79] London, BL Harley MS 3838, fo. 160ʳ, where Telesforus appears as Cyril's emissary to Joachim of Fiore and as the author of a work entitled *De causa scismatis*.

The Carmelite Historical Tradition, *c*.1400–1530

The Catalan prior-provincial Philip Ribot created, in the last years of the fourteenth century, a complex and sophisticated 'historia' for the Carmelites. The development of hagiographies in the fifteenth century deriving from the *Catalogus sanctorum*, such as those discussed in the previous chapter, is a further indication of the increasingly literary and narrative qualities of Carmelite historical writing. These qualities continued to dominate Carmelite historical writing in the fifteenth century and beyond. Important new contributions were made to the presentation of the history developed in the fourteenth century, and the outlines of the story told by Ribot were embellished by the addition of new characters. Yet, despite the intensification of the mythic quality of Carmelite history, the fundamental shape changed little.[1] The following brief survey of Carmelite historical authors between *c*.1400 and the mid-sixteenth century will set the scene for discussion of the important themes in early Carmelite history that emerged in this period.

The first Carmelite historical work after Ribot was Grossi's *Viridarium de ortu religionis et floribus eiusdem*, written in two versions, one *c*.1400 and another, in Italian, in 1411/17.[2] This is really little more than a formulaic statement of the tradition familiar from fourteenth-century historians. Grossi, indeed, may not even have been familiar

---

[1] A full catalogue of Carmelites who wrote about Elijah's role as founder of the order has been compiled by Emanuele Boaga, *Nello spiritu e nella virtù di Elia: antologia di documenti e sussidi* (Rome, 1990). The following brief survey is based on this, and on the unpublished typescript by Richard Copsey, 'Historical Writings on the Carmelite Order: From *Medieval Carmelite Heritage* to John Bale' (1994), for a copy of which I am indebted to the author.

[2] Grossi's term of office as prior-general (1389–1430) coincided with the papal schism. Grossi was prior-general of the Clementine allegiance within the order from 1389, and from 1411 of the whole order.

with Ribot.[3] Thomas Scrope of Bradley, an English Carmelite who wrote in the mid-fifteenth century (1441–57), certainly was. His *Chronicon de institutione, successione, intitulatione et propagatione ordinis fratrum beate virgine Dei genetricis Mariae de monte Carmeli* (after 1446), *Tractatus de fundatione, intitulatione, antiquitate, regula et confirmatione ordinis beatae Mariae de monte Carmeli*, and *Libellus de institutione fratrum Carmelitarum ordinis* rely on the part of Ribot's work attributed to John of Jerusalem (the *De institutione primorum monachorum*) in explaining the Elianic tradition. Scrope himself also translated Ribot's *De institutione* into English; a copy of this translation was later owned by John Bale.[4]

Around 1460 a German Carmelite, Jean de Malines, wrote a *Speculum historiale* that begins with the prophet Elijah, and follows the chronology and themes established by the earliest anonymous texts.[5] The Sicilian Carmelite Nicholas Calciuri wrote in 1461 a derivative hagiographical text, *Vita fratrum del sancto monte Carmelo*, and around 1471 Gerard de Edam produced a treatise called *De institutione, habitu, titulo et regulae ordinis Carmelitarum*; both of these followed the now traditional version of the order's history.[6] Gerard's work owes a considerable debt to John Baconthorpe.

In the last third of the fifteenth century historical works were written by Carmelites in large numbers. Among the most important of these were the works of the humanist Arnold Bostius, the *De illustribus viris ordinis beatissime virginis Mariae de monte Carmelo* (1475), the *Breviloquim tripartitum de institutione, intitulatione et confirmatione ordinis* (before 1484), the *Speculum Historiale* (before 1491, which is the date of the first known copy), and a treatise on the Marian devotion of the order, *De patronatu et patrocinio beatissime Virginis Mariae* (1479).[7] In the hagiographical

[3] Thus Saggi, *Sant'Angelo*, 31; but he also says that Thomas Netter requested a copy of the *De institutione* from Grossi. The *Viridarium* includes Berthold, which suggests that Grossi at least knew the same traditions as Ribot.

[4] Scrope, a Norwich Carmelite, had previously been an anchorite. He became bishop of Dromore in 1446, and papal legate to Rhodes in 1449. The *Chronicon* and *Tractatus* were edited by Daniel a Virgine Maria in *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 172–86, 190–4. The *Libellus*, still unedited, is in Cambridge, University Library MS Ff 6.11, fos. 16–23. In addition to these, Xiberta edited Bradley's *Catalogus sanctorum eiusdem*, from the *Tractatus*, in his *De visione sancti Simonis Stock*, 280–4. The translation of Ribot's *De institutione* is in London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 192, fos. 1–44^r.

[5] Jean de Malines, *Speculum historiale*, fos. 42^r–49^v, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 211–19.

[6] Nicholas Calciuri, *Vita fratrum de sancto Monte Carmelo*, Graziano de S. Teresa, *Ephemerides Carmeliticae*, 6 (1955), 336–531; Gerard de Edam, *De institutione habitu, titulo et regulae ordinis Carmelitarum*, in Daniel (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 318–19.

[7] Bostius, *De illustribus*; *idem, Breviloquium tripartitum de institutione, intitulatione a confirmatione*

tradition of Grossi are the works of Laurence Burreau, the Carmelite provincial of Narbonne who wrote, *c*.1490, the *Catalogus de illustribus Carmelitis* and *Heliadem Thesbe*.[8] Something of a curiosity in the catalogue of Carmelite historical works is the *Liber de ortu et progressu ac viris illustribus ordinis* of John Trithemius, written in 1492—curious because its author was not a Carmelite, but the abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Spanheim in Germany, who wrote his history at the request of Bostius.[9] Trithemius was a member of a circle of humanist scholars that included Bostius and another Flemish Carmelite, John Oudewater, better known as Paleonydorus, who between 1495 and 1497 wrote three works with historical content: *Liber trimerestus anaphoricus panegyricus de principio et processu ordinis Carmeliticae*; *Manuale de inicio, titulo et confirmatione ordinis Carmelitici*, and *Dialogum inter Carmelitarum et Carthusianum*. Paleonydorus's influence was assured by the publication of the most important of his works, the *Liber trimerestus*, in printed form, the first Carmelite historical work to attain this distinction.[10]

Carmelites continued to produce historical *apologiae* in the sixteenth century. Little of this work, however, is original, at least in the sense of contributing genuinely new material to the historical tradition. More important than new historical writing was the work of printing existing treatises. In 1507 Battista di Cattaneis, Carmelite prior-provincial of Venice, published the *Speculum ordinis fratrum Carmelitarum noviter impressum*, containing, amongst other works, Grossi's *Viridarium* (although it is mistakenly attributed to Ribot), a chronicle of *c*.1450 known as *Pseudo-John de Venette*[11] and Jean de Malines' *Speculum historiale*. A large body of historical literature from the fifteenth and sixteenth

ordinis Deiparae Virginis de monte Carmelo, in Daniel (ed.), *Vinea Carmeli*, 49–81; *idem, Speculum Historiale*, in Daniel (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 274–80 (extracts); *idem, De patronatu et patricinio beatissime Virginis Mariae indictatum sibi ordineim*, in Daniel (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 375–431.

[8] Laurence Burreau, *Catalogus de illustribus Carmelitis*, in Jackson-Holzberg (ed.), *Zwei Literaturgeschichten*, 170–205.

[9] Daniel, *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 291–304.

[10] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus anaphoricus* (Morguntina, 1497), ed. Daniel, in *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 220–72 (as *Fasciculus tripartitus historiarum prophetici, et Eliani ordinis betaae virgine Mariae de monte Carmelo*). The *Manuale* survives only in the transcription by Bale in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fos. 75–85.

[11] Cattaneis (ed.), *Speculum antiquum*, fos. 57–9. *Pseudo-John*, an untitled treatise, is so called because it begins with the same words as Jean de Venette's *Chronica* of the fourteenth century. The English origin of the treatise is confirmed by the insertion of William of Coventry's *De adventu Carmelitarum ad Angliam*, which was apparently unknown on the Continent, at fo. 59, where it is followed by a list of the English Carmelite foundations.

centuries, moreover, is known only by reference from compilers and editors, or from extracts transcribed by compilers. The most important of these compilers was John Bale. Writers such as Battista di Ferrara (before 1497), Giovanni Polucci (1499), Robert Bale (before 1503), John Gerbrand (before 1504), Giles Smet (or Faber, before 1506), Nicholas of Harlem (before 1511), and Julian Hassart (before 1525), all of whom Bale used in his compilations, are known only from his transcriptions. Detailed discussion of his Carmelite work is worthwhile, if only because his compilations enable us to see the culmination of the increasingly mythical quality of Carmelite history at the close of the Middle Ages.

Bale's work, like that of many of his fifteenth- and sixteenth-century predecessors, was not very original, in the sense that the historical tradition assumed as a starting-point had already been established in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The importance of Bale's contribution lies in demonstrating the vigour of that tradition and its widespread dissemination throughout the Carmelite provinces. Both the nature of Bale's work—his magpie-like compilation of historical material—and the nature of its survival, in unpublished copy-books and notebooks, show not only what Carmelites knew of their corporate history, but also how local traditions and variations developed alongside the 'official version' of the order's history as promulgated in the rubrics of the general chapters and the works of prior-generals, and how the combination of both 'official' and 'unofficial' versions contributed to the formation of a systematic history by Bale himself.

John Bale is best known as a polemicist of the Protestant Reformation in England, as a dramatist of indifferent reputation, and as a literary antiquarian of considerable importance. Before developing any of these roles, however, he was a Carmelite friar. Born in Suffolk in 1495, he entered the Carmelite priory in Norwich in 1506. Norfolk had already produced a number of distinguished Carmelites, amongst them John Baconthorpe of Blakeney, Thomas Netter of Walden, Thomas Scrope, and the confessor of John of Gaunt, Walter Disse, who became notorious for his role in Despenser's Crusade. Although the Norwich Carmelites were not as well endowed as their Franciscan or Dominican counterparts, they attracted able recruits.[12]

___

[12] Norman Tanner, *The Church in Late Medieval Norwich 1370–1532*, PIMS Texts and Studies, 66 (Toronto, 1984), 18–21, estimates that at the time of the dissolution there were fourteen Carmelite friars in Norwich, as against ten Dominicans, twenty-one Franciscans, and seventeen Augustinian Hermits.

Bale's literary output began with a collection of offices compiled while he was at the Carmelite *studium* in Cambridge, between 1514 and 1523.[13] The manuscript comprises six Carmelite liturgical offices: the solemn commemoration of Mary as patron of Carmel; the office of Cyril of Constantinople, which contains essentially the same details of his life as were later copied by him from manuscripts he read while travelling in the 1520s; the office for the feast of Berthold, together with a brief biography of the saint that repeats the information in Ribot's *De institutione*; the office of St Angelus; the office of St Albert of Trapani; and finally, the office of St Elijah, copied from Robert Bale, a Carmelite from the priory at Burnham Norton, and author of the *Historia raptus sanctissimi Helie prophete* (before 1503). A second manuscript in Bale's collection, Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, is similar in composition, and consists of a catalogue of priors-general of the order and the three known works by the fourteenth-century Carmelite William of Coventry. The manuscript, which is in four hands, can be dated by the list of priors-general to before 1523.[14]

During the 1520s Bale travelled throughout England, France, and the Low Countries, visiting Carmelite libraries and copying texts relating to the order's history. Two extant notebooks, Bodleian Library MS 73 and BL Harley MS 1819, contain his notes, assembled between 1520 and 1527, from these travels. The extensive nature of the historical research represented by the notebooks suggests that this was a deliberate attempt to compile and compare local historical traditions in the Western provinces of the order. Bale made lists of individual Carmelite scholars and priors-general, transcribed *vitae* in whole or in part, and made notes on the history of the order and its members from existing works by Carmelite writers that were presumably unavailable in England, among them Gerard de Edam, Julian Hassart, Nicholas of Haarlem, and Giles Faber. The organization of the notebooks follows Bale's itinerary, as indicated in the marginalia in both notebooks recording the priory where he was at the time of making particular entries.

Bale's subsequent literary activity reflects the development of his career. During the 1530s, probably in or after 1536, Bale left the order to become a Protestant. Consequently, he went into exile on the

---

[13] Cambridge, University Library MS Ff. 6. 28. I am grateful to Richard Copsey for help in correcting my earlier errors regarding this manuscript: the following brief description is based on his suggestion.

[14] Fairfield, *John Bale*, suggests that these represent scribal exercises set by Bale for his own students.

Continent in 1540. In Edward VI's reign, he returned to England and was appointed bishop of Ossory in 1552, but the early death of the king and the popularity of Mary in Ireland resulted in a second period of continental exile from 1553 to 1560, first in Frankfurt and later in Basel. On his return to England under Elizabeth, he was made a canon and prebendary of Canterbury Cathedral. Correspondence between Bale and Archbishop Matthew Parker reveals the extent of the damage caused to his work by his unsuccessful ministry in Ireland, for by 1552 he had already accumulated an important private library, mostly of historical works, much of which he was forced to leave behind and which he suspected had been destroyed by the hostile Irish.[15] Bale continued to write history throughout his life. Although the notebooks containing Carmelite history certainly change in tone after his conversion, it is all the more remarkable that they continue at all. Bale's primary commitment seems to have been to historical research, rather than doctrine. He continued to research and write on the history of the Carmelites, and to use the extensive knowledge of English bibliography he had absorbed through his research for the development of a new historical project, a survey of English historical scholarship that would eventually result in the work for which he is now best known, the *Scriptorium maioris Britanniae catalogus* (1544–7).

One of the manuscripts most representative of his Carmelite writing is Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, originally consisting of five separate notebooks that were later bound together. In chronological order—though not the order of current pagination of the manuscript—the book comprises extracts from Carmelite hagiography, letters and poems by Carmelite humanists written before 1523, the *Manuale* of Paleonydorus, the *Dialogus* of John of Hildesheim, transcriptions from Bostius, a list of priors-general, some poems of Laurence Bureau, and, compiled *c.*1530/6, Bale's own highly derivative *Cronica seu fasciculus temporum ordinis Carmelitarum*. Bale's personal religious evolution is indicated in the Protestant bias in his treatment of the history of the order in his own lifetime, and particularly in the entries dealing with the breach of the English Church with Rome.[16]

The *Cronica* was not written in systematic fashion, but piecemeal, with new material being added as it became available. It seems, indeed,

---

[15] Honor McCusker, *John Bale, Dramatist and Antiquary* (Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1942), 66–7, has published some of this correspondence. See now the most recent biography: Peter Happé, *John Bale* (London New York, 1996).

[16] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fos. 193–5.

to have been a draft version of what Bale would eventually extend into three separate works surviving in manuscript form in London, BL Harley MS 3838. The first of these is the *Anglorum Heliades*, a history in two parts of the English Carmelite province, comprising general history and biographical extracts on notable English Carmelites, written in 1536, but including corrections up to 1539/40. The second is the *Perpaucorum Carmeli scriptorum ab Helia Thesbite ad Bertoldum*, written 1536–7, and comprising brief biographies of the figures associated with the order from its putative earliest days. It is this work in which the mythical tendency of Carmelite historiography is best represented and developed. The third work in Harley 3838 is historiographical in character, entitled *De praeclariis ordinis Carmeli scriptoribus ac theologis catalogus* and comprising a history of Carmelite historical scholarship, written after 1536. This work was probably the basis of the *Scriptorum maioris Britanniae catalogus*. Further historiographical work by Bale in manuscript form is found in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 64, comprising notes on early English authors from 1549/50–7. Bale's transcript of Leland's *De viris illustribus*, made 1552–7, further indicates the direction of his interests. The manuscript in which it survives, Cambridge, Trinity College R.7.15, also contains notes on the history of the papacy later published separately as *Acta Romanorum pontificum*. A final manuscript, London, BL Cotton Titus D. X, fos. 101–94, consists of various notes and transcriptions of Bale's correspondence, including letters to Matthias Flacius Illyricus, that demonstrate the extent of Bale's involvement with the Protestant ecclesiastical history by the Centuriators of Magdeburg.[17]

As a historian, Bale was neither a chronicler nor a romancer; his bent lay rather in archival research and the compilation from it of a systematic narrative based on available sources. For the most part he used Carmelite writings, particularly those dating from the fifty years or so before his birth onward. These were themselves largely based on Philip Ribot, Jean de Cheminot, and ultimately the anonymous *De inceptione ordinis* and *Universis christifidelibus*. The mythical accretions to this chronology discussed in this chapter were not Bale's own; he was simply the codifier and bearer of Carmelite tradition.

---

[17] Andrew Jotischky, 'Gerard of Nazareth, John Bale and the Origins of the Carmelite Order', *JEH*, 46 (1995), 214–36, discusses textual similarities and the nature of Bale's influence on the Centuriators.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CARMELITE MYTH *C.*1450−1550

The Early Church

Philip Ribot's *De institutione* had, in a sense, reached as far as was possible in establishing the origins of Carmelite monasticism. Undeniably, Ribot had left gaps in the order's history. These were particularly noticeable in the transitional period during which the proto-monks of Mt Carmel who followed the traditions handed down by Elijah and the sons of the prophets became followers of Christ. Fifteenth-century Carmelites attempted to fill these gaps by identifying known historical characters from the Jewish and early Christian past as Carmelites. The result was what might be termed a 'genealogical' history of the order, represented in its fullest form by Bale's *Perpaucorum Carmeli scriptorum ab Helia Thesbite ad Bertoldum primum eorum magistrum generalem catalogus*, and in draft form in his *Cronica seu fasciculus temporum ordinis Carmelitarum*. Bale, however, was himself dependent on his fifteenth-century predecessors, particularly Scrope and Paleonydorus.

Scrope's *Chronicon* begins by considering monastic origins in general. In common with exegetes since Augustine, he derives the word *monastic* from the Greek *monos*. Less interesting than the etymological point is the further use to which he puts the citation from Augustine.[18] 'Monk' and 'friar', he asserts, are one and the same, for Augustine uses *monachus* and *frater* as though they are indistinguishable terms. This being so, Scrope finds no difficulty, from a Carmelite perspective, in associating the first monastery, the 'school of prophets' established by Samuel, with Carmelite history. According to Scrope, Elijah, a graduate of Samuel's school, revived the prophetic tradition that had lapsed in the time of Ahab. To this end he established his own followers, first at Carith, by the Jordan, and then on Mt Carmel. At this point Scrope seeks to distinguish between categories of Old Testament monasticism. The followers of Elijah were not simply monks who followed the communal life that had first been established by Samuel, but monks who had been taught the prophetic tradition by Elijah; the Carmelites were, therefore, *duces monachorum*, the leaders of the monks.[19] As such, they not only lived a cenobitic life at their house in Jerusalem, but followed Jesus as he preached in Galilee, Samaria, and Judaea, and,

---

[18] Scrope, *Chronicon*, i; *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 173: 'Quare ergo, et nos nonappellatis monachos: cum dicit psalmista: ecce quam bonum, et quam iucundum habitare fratres in unum; monos enim Graece, latine dicitur, unus, sive singularis, aut solus.'

[19] Ibid., p. 174.

moreover, worked miracles.[20] Scrope's version was further extended by Jean de Malines *c.*1460, who thought that Mt Carmel became the resort of those sons of the prophets who wanted an exclusively anchoritic life, while for the others monasteries were built at Galgala, Bethel, and Jericho. Elijah had begun his career as 'governor' of the cenobitic houses, before founding monastic solitude on Mt Carmel.[21]

Scrope traced the prophetic/monastic line from Elijah through Elisha, Jonah, Abdias, and Micah to John the Baptist, whom he, like Ribot, thought of as a Carmelite. By the 1530s, Bale was able to include in addition as Carmelites Odidas son of Azariah, Aleodemus (also known as Malchus), Isaiah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, and Daniel.[22] The question of whether the sons of the prophets could be called monks had already been addressed by Ribot, who thought that the scriptural texts bore sufficient witness to the cenobitic life. The Benedictine John Trithemius, writing at the end of the fifteenth century, agreed that what mattered was correspondence of function, rather than precise form. Thus he was content to allow even the Druids of Celtic antiquity to be called monks.[23] The logical conclusion to the argument was that not only all the prophets, but also the Essenes, who were certainly ascetic in their way of life, should be included among early Carmelites. The Essenes were retrospectively granted Carmelite status by Arnold Bostius, and here too Bale duly followed. For his entry on the Essenes in the *Perpaucorum Carmeli scriptorum*, he cites not only Bostius but also two ancient authorities, Philo and Josephus. According to both, the Essenes had enjoyed the gift of prophecy, lived in communal solitude, abstained from sexual activity (and in fact barred women altogether from their society), mortified the flesh, and engaged in manual labour. In addition, they wore white, the colour adopted by the Carmelites in 1287.[24]

[20] Ibid. ii, p. 176, iii, p. 177, vii, p. 182.

[21] Jean de Malines, *Speculum Historiale*, ii–iii; *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 212–14.

[22] Bale, *Perpaucorum,* fos. 118ʳ–122ʳ. Cf. *idem, Cronica*, fos. 108ᵛ–113ᵛ, for some variants.

[23] Trithemius, *Liber de ortu et progressu*, ii; *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 295.

[24] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 123ʳ; London, BL Harley MS 1819, fo. 123ʳ; also Bale, *Anglorum Heliades*, i. i, fo. 7, where the Baptist is numbered among the Essenes. Trithemius, *De ortu et progressu*, ii, p. 295, had also referred to the Essenes from the accounts of Philo and Josephus, though not by name. Philo's main account of the Essenes is included in a discussion of ascetic virtue in *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, lxxv–xcii, trans. F. H. Colson, *Philo*, 10 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), ix. 54–63, supplemented by additional details in his *Hypothetica*, xi. 1–18, trans. Colson, *Philo*, ix. 436–43. A Latin edition of some of Philo's works, including the extracts on the Essenes, was published in Basel in 1527, although a late Roman translation had survived in manuscript. Josephus, in a long account in the *Jewish War*, ii. 119–62, treats the Essenes as one of the three branches of Jewish 'philosophy', and describes their communal life, their

Inclusion of the Essenes was logical on geographical grounds. As Scrope had known, the monasticism of Elijah had to be located near the Jordan as well as on Mt Carmel. John the Baptist, claimed since Ribot as a Carmelite, was incontestably associated with the Jordan. Bale deals with the problem by asserting that John had been brought up on Mt Carmel by the prophet Enoch, but in an appendix argues that the place need not be taken literally. Early Christian tradition had given the name Carmel not only to the hilly range on the coast, but also to a section of the Judaean desert south of Hebron, thereby reconciling the biblical accounts of Elijah's activity in the desert with the mountain. Elisha, Bale explains, had built cells for the prophets in this desert region, and it was here that the Essenes had lived, and where the Baptist had himself been brought up.[25] This explanation had, in fact, been given by Jean de Malines *c*.1460. Jean's picturesque version of Old Testament monasticism has the sons of the prophets based in Galgala, Bethel, and Jericho as well as on Mt Carmel, and it was those in Galgala who settled by the Jordan, on the grounds that their convent was too small.[26]

Thus far the historical tradition of Carmel's remote past has followed an interior logic. From the moment of the Incarnation, however, two themes become apparent in the development of the Carmelite *historia*: the appropriation into Carmelite history of historical characters known from the New Testament and early Christian sources, and the influence of romance on the development of that history. An example of the latter is the inclusion of the story of Agabus the Nazarene.

asceticism, abnegation of both women and money, and their craftsmanship. It is from this account that the detail of their white clothing derives. There are further references to the Essenes in Josephus's *Antiquities*, xiii. 171–4, xviii. 18–22. Manuscripts of both the *Jewish War* and *Antiquities* were known throughout the medieval period. The *Antiquities* was translated into Latin under the direction of Cassiodorus at Vivarium, and became one of the most often cited books in the Middle Ages. A Latin version of the *Jewish War* was known to Cassiodorus, and commonly ascribed to Rufinus in the late fourth century. Ambrogio Traversari and his circle in fifteenth-century Florence had also translated Josephus and Philo. In addition there was the Latin version of 'Hegessipus' (a corruption of Josephus), misattributed to Ambrose and dating from *c*.370. The first printed edition of Josephus was not published until 1544.

[25] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 126ᵛ. Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Orientalis*, lii, ed. F. Moschus (Douai, 1597; repr. Farnborough, 1971), 86, gives the name 'Carmel' to the region near the Jordan. Byzantine sources identify a settlement south of Hebron as *Carmel*, and there was certainly a church there, and in the crusader period a fortress as well. The desire to transpose putative Carmelite practices to the Essenes led to a misreading of the original Jewish sources; for both Philo and Josephus describe the Essenes as inhabiting villages and towns, but living a communal life within these conurbations. Neither mentions individual cells; indeed, they are at pains to stress the communal nature of their life: e.g. Josephus, *Jewish War*, ii. 124.

[26] Jean de Malines, *Speculum Historiale*, iii, pp. 213–14.

This story Bale takes from the *Life* of St Anne by the Carthusian Peter Dorland, which he read and noted while travelling on the Continent in the 1520s.[27] According to this source, Agabus was a Jew from the tribe of Judah who fell in love with Mary before her marriage to Joseph, but was rejected by her. In despair he dedicated himself to an anchoritic life on Mt Carmel, and became first a disciple of John the Baptist, and then one of the seventy disciples of Jesus. He preached Christ's kingdom in Antioch and Caesarea, and retired first to Mt Carmel, and finally to the Black Mountain.[28]

Agabus was a figure verifiable from Scripture, where he appears as an early disciple of Christ who was gifted with prophetic powers.[29] The Carmelite legend is quite different. Elements of the story—an unrequited love finding its eventual satisfaction in the spiritual, the sacrifice of carnal desire, the superiority of spiritual love—echo themes of courtly love familiar from secular romances. Use of scriptural narratives as *mises-en-scène* for romances was well established in this genre.[30] The story sounds as though it had been developed as a preaching exemplum rather than as exegesis. For Bale, however, it had further value, in that it established a line through the person of the Nazarene Agabus from Jewish religious practice to Christian. Furthermore, in the story of Agabus, the Blessed Virgin plays the vital role, for it is her rejection of carnal desire that accomplishes the conversion of the protagonist from the Old Law to the New. Mary is the fulcrum on which the transition from Jew to Christian rests. For an order claiming the special patronage of the Blessed Virgin, it was a story too rich in symbolism to be ignored.

The appropriation of known figures from early Christian history to the Carmelites had begun with the claim that the rule given to the order by John of Jerusalem was in fact that written by St Basil for his monastic foundations.[31] In Bale's catalogue of early Carmelites, drawn from the writings of his fifteenth-century predecessors, this tendency to appropriate takes on almost obsessive proportions. A few examples must suffice. Following Paleonydorus, Bale included St Martial of Limoges and St Fronto alongside biblical figures such as Cleophas and Silas, the companion of St Paul, and characters unknown outside Car-

---

[27] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 59ᵛ–60ʳ. Peter Dorland's *Historia perpulchra de Anna sanctissima* was published in Antwerp in *c*.1490.

[28] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 127ᵛ. [29] Acts 11: 27–8.

[30] In the *Roman d'Auberon*, e.g.; see Norman Daniel, *Heroes and Saracens: An Interpretation of the Chansons de Geste* (Edinburgh, 1984), 65.

[31] *Universis christifidelibus*, *MCH*, 83–4; Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, v, *MCH* 130.

melite sources such as Gratian and Simon Niger, among the seventy disciples of Christ.[32] The connections of saints such as Fronto with the Holy Land and with Christ's ministry had already been established; all the Carmelite writers were doing was claiming them as members of the order, on the grounds that the religious life in the Holy Land was by definition the Carmelite life. Paleonydorus had listed as Carmelites Mary and Martha (because after the Passion they adopted a solitary life), Helenus bishop of Alexandria (the first Carmelite martyr), Serapion bishop of Antioch, St Antony (who, as Athanasius said, was an imitator of Elijah), Macarius, John Cassian, and Spiridion, the fourth-century bishop of Cyprus.[33] In notes Bale made at the Carmelite convent in Antwerp, probably from Paleonydorus's *Liber trimerestus* and associated material, he similarly listed early Christian Carmelites, including Silas, Helenus, Serapion, Pope Dionysius (d. 260), the Egyptian hermit Onuphrios, the monks who discovered Mary of Egypt in her solitude by the Jordan, Melania, and several of the Roman ladies who lived in the convent established by Paula and Eustochium in Bethlehem.[34]

Little discrimination was shown by Bale in cataloguing important historical figures in the Church from the first to the fifth centuries. Paleonydorus had already borrowed Eutychianus for the Carmelites from Isidore of Seville. Spiridion, who was familiar from the *Historia Tripartita*, and the Egyptian monk who settled in Palestine, Hilarion, are also claimed by Paleonydorus.[35] Narcissus, one of the seventy disciples, and the martyr Helenus are mentioned in Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which must have been the source used by Paleonydorus

---

[32] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fos. 129ᵛ–130ᵛ; Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 2, for Silas, Martial, Saturninus, Fronto, and Nathaniel. Bale also cites Peter Dorland, Bostius, and James of Bergamo; and, for Gratian, Nicholas Bertrandus and Nicholas Cantilow. The tradition of naming the seventy disciples of Christ goes back to Eusebius, who names five of them himself; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, i. xii. 1. Various recensions of the list of seventy were current in medieval Europe: e.g. the *Chronicon Paschale* (*c*.600/50), ed. L. Dindorf, Corpus Scriptorum Historiorum Byzantinorum, 1 (Bonn, 1832), 400–3, 420–1; see Bruce M. Metzger, 'Names for the Nameless in the New Testament: A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition', in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quarten*, 2 vols. (Munster, 1970), i. 79–99. The Western tradition seems to have derived from the family identified as 'Greco-Syrian': M. R. James, 'An Ancient English List of the Seventy Disciples', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 11 (1910), 459–62, describes two English manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries and a twelfth-century manuscript of Florence of Worcester, in which the full list is given. The names include Agabus, Cleopas, Nathaniel, Silas, and several Simons, though none called 'Niger'.

[33] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 2–3.

[34] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 22ʳ–23ᵛ. This list also includes John the Baptist, Hilarion, Cyril of Alexandria, Pelagia, and Anastasius the Persian.

[35] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 4–5.

and Nicholas of Haarlem, whom Bale cites. Donnius the Syrian must be Domnus of Antioch, the third-century bishop who succeeded the heresiarch Paul of Samosata.[36] Antony was claimed by Paleonydorus as a follower of Elijah, and hence a Carmelite, but Bale was more circumspect about him—he is mentioned, but not definitively as a Carmelite. Pachomius appears elliptically, as a correspondent of the 'abbot' of Mt Carmel.[37] Other Egyptian monks besides Hilarion who appear in Bale's list are Paphnutios, John Climacus, and Heraclides of Alexandria.[38]

Reconstructing early Carmelite monasticism was not simply a matter of appropriating individuals. Paleonydorus sought to rewrite the history of early Christian monasticism as a chapter of Carmelite history. Thus, in the *Liber trimerestus*, the monastery on the site of the house of St Anne in Jerusalem (which had been claimed as a Carmelite foundation since the early fourteenth century) is said to have been founded by the Empress Helen after the discovery of the cross, while Jerome's foundation in Bethlehem also figures as a Carmelite house.[39] This perception opened the way to seeing the whole of the Palestinian monastic tradition as Carmelite, and Bale duly records as among his predecessors Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem; Epiphanius of Cyprus; John, bishop of Jerusalem (an old notion, of course); Cyril of Alexandria, who was allegedly a disciple of John and a hermit on Mt Carmel for eleven years before becoming patriarch of Alexandria; Rufinus of Aquileia; Palladius; Anastasius the Persian; and Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem.[40] It is perhaps surprising, given these excesses, that Palestinian monks such as Sabas, Euthymius, Gerasimos, Cyril of Scythopolis, and John the Hesychast are not also found in Bale's list. Indeed, it is something of a puzzle why certain figures, such as Anastasius the Persian, who must have been rather obscure to Western audiences, or Cyril of Alexandria, who had no obvious connection with Mt Carmel, were chosen, when others were not.

In some cases, a connection may be supposed between local cults and the Carmelite presence in the eastern Mediterranean. The Cypriot bishops Epiphanius and Spiridion, both listed by Bale as Carmelites (following, respectively, Julian Hassart and John Trithemius, and

---

[36] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fos. 135ʳ–137ʳ. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, vii. xxx. 13, ed. and trans. H. T. Lawler and J. E. L. Oulton, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), ii. 222–3.

[37] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fos. 138, 139ᵛ–140.

[38] Ibid., fos. 139ʳ, 138, 143.   [39] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 4.

[40] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fos. 141ᵛ–142ʳ, 144ʳ, 144ᵛ–145ᵛ, 146ᵛ, 150ʳ⁻ᵛ.

Bostius and Paleonydorus), were represented in frescos in a number of Cypriot monasteries of the twelfth–thirteenth centuries. Epiphanius also appeared in Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome, along with other early Christian figures from the Orthodox tradition.[41] Spiridion would have been known to readers of Eusebius and the *Historia Tripartita*, but also to anyone familiar with Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*.[42] None of these sources, of course, associate him with Mt Carmel; nor does Spiridion appear in any Carmelite literary source before the late fifteenth century. Yet a curious wall-painting depicting his miracles, now much mutilated, survives in the church of St Mary at Upchurch, in Kent, and it seems most likely that the cult of Spiridion was spread from Cyprus by Carmelites settling in Aylesford in 1242.[43] The occurrence of Spiridion in Paleonydorus's *Liber trimerestus* and in the Flemish historical notes made by Bale, suggests that it was the Carmelite devotion to the saint that inspired the painting at Upchurch, rather than the other way around. The argument for a physical connection with Cyprus and the Orthodox tradition, rather than mere familiarity with the literary tradition, is further supported by the selection of scenes depicted at Upchurch, which are miracle stories taken from Symeon Metaphrastes rather than Sozomen or Socrates. There was no Latin translation of Symeon's *Menologion* in the Medieval West. It seems that either a Carmelite from Cyprus knew enough Greek to be able to read

[41] For example, at Panagia Amasgou at Monagri, at Asinou, at the monastery of Neophytus at Paphos, at Pantaleon in Nerezi, and at Holy Apostles at Perachorio.

[42] Cassiodorus, *Historia Tripartita*, i. x, II, ed. W. Jacob and R. Hanslik, CSEL 71 (Vienna, 1952), 30–3, 85; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, xiii. 65, p. 528. See also P. Courcelle, *Les Lettres grec en occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, 2nd edn. (Paris, 1948).

[43] Cumberland Woodruff, 'Thirteenth-Century Wall-Painting at Upchurch', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 25 (1902), 88–96, with schematic drawings of the paintings, but no explanation as to how they came to be there. E. W. Tristram, *English Medieval Wall-Painting: The Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1950), 282–4, argues that this painting must have been associated with a relic of the saint brought back to Kent by an English crusader, and suggests as a possible source of transmission Odo de Grandison, who settled in Cyprus after the fall of Acre in 1291, and whose family held lands in Kent. The manor of Upchurch, however, was held by Roger de Langbourne between 1267 and 1297, and the advowson of the church was held by the Premonstratensian abbey of L'Isle Dieu in Normandy: Edward Hasted, *History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, vi (Canterbury, 1798), 24–33. In any case, the Grandison thesis, would necessitate a very late thirteenth-century date for the painting. This seems implausible, given that the cycle was damaged by the cutting of a new window into the south wall, which is dated by an inscription to 1300. Would a cycle so recently painted have been mutilated in this way? I suggest instead as a source of transmission John de Grey, who founded the first Carmelite house in England at Aylesford, near Upchurch. John was a crusader with Richard of Cornwall (1239–41). There is no evidence that he went to Cyprus, but he must have known the Carmelite house on Mt Carmel, and might have been given a relic of, or at least learnt of, Spiridion while there.

Symeon, or had seen similar representations in an Orthodox church in Cyprus.

The association of Cyril of Alexandria with Mt Carmel is documented in the fourteenth century. Oddly enough, it does not derive—at least, in the available evidence—from a Carmelite source. The first direct mention of Cyril as a Carmelite is by the Hospitaller theologian Jean de Hesdin, preaching on the feast of the Immaculate Conception at some point in the third quarter of the fourteenth century. John of Hildesheim, writing *c.*1370, mentioned Cyril as 'presbyter societatis Carmeli', and John Hornby (1374) and Bernard Oller (1375/6) also knew of Jean de Hesdin's sermon.[44]

The aspect of Cyril's work that probably had most resonance to a Western theologian in the fourteenth century was his Mariology, and it is indeed in this context that John introduces him. The tradition is repeated, with the same source, in John Hornby's defence of Carmelite history against the Dominican John Stokes, in 1374.[45] Although Cyril appears in Bale's *Perpaucorum* by virtue of his supposed eremitical life on Mt Carmel, there can be little doubt that Carmelite interest in him in the later Middle Ages centred on his fame as a theologian, and particularly on his role in the Christological controversies of the fifth century in which the doctrine of Nestorius was discredited. Fifteenth-century Carmelites knew about this, for Scrope and Paleonydorus both allude with some accuracy to the Council of Ephesus (431)—though the latter seems to have thought that the council confirmed the Carmelite Order's title.[46] In one of his travel notebooks, Harley 1819, Bale copied a *History of St Anne*, purportedly written by Cyril himself in 428 as part of his research on the genealogy of Mary, in order to use it in dispute against the Nestorian claim that Mary had given birth to Christ's human nature and was thus not *theotokos*, the bearer of God.[47] No such *History of St Anne* is attested from the fifth century, and it is clear that this is a fifteenth-century document, moreover one written by a Carmelite.

---

[44] Smalley, 'John de Hesdin, O.Hosp', 285–330; Oller, *Informatio*, *MCH* 408–9; Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 89.

[45] Clark, 'Defense of the Carmelite Order', 89, 99.

[46] Scrope, *Chronicon*, iv, p. 179; Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 5. Both cite Jean de Hesdin's sermon on the verse 'Datus est ei decor Carmeli'. Paleonydorus, in addition, notes that Thomas Netter had cited Cyril against Wyclif.

[47] London, BL Harley MS 1819, fos. 17^r–40^r. Extracts from the same life are found in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 125^r–130^r; the same manuscript also has parts of an earlier life at fos. 76^v–77^v, 93^v–94^r.

Carmelites had long been interested in St Anne. The idea that the 'house of St Anne' in Jerusalem (the site of the crusader Church of St Anne, which had been turned into a madrasa by Saladin in 1187) was a Carmelite priory is found in the *Universis christifidelibus* (1290s) and quoted by Jean de Cheminot and John of Hildesheim.[48] This interest surely reflects the increasing popularity of the cult of St Anne in the West in the later Middle Ages, as part of a wider interest in the Holy Family. The attention paid to the humanity of Christ as a devotional focus led to an interest in the human kin of Christ, and thus in the parents of the Blessed Virgin, Anne and Joachim.[49] Carmelites, however, had a special interest in St Anne as the mother of their own patron. They had been the first among the religious orders to celebrate the feast of St Anne, as early as the thirteenth century.[50] The order's claim to the patronage of the Blessed Virgin was subject to scepticism in the last quarter of the fourteenth century, as John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus* testifies,[51] and the *History of St Anne* attributed to Cyril, who was himself regarded as a Carmelite, is doubtless intended to demonstrate the devotion that the order had always shown to the Blessed Virgin.

The textual development of the Carmelite legend of St Anne is paralleled in works of art commissioned by the order. The 'Carmelite Missal', a late fourteenth-century missal from the Carmelite convent in London, illustrates the feast of the Immaculate Conception with scenes from the marriage of Joachim and Anne.[52] The fraternity of St Anne in Frankfurt, which met at the Carmelite convent, commissioned a St Anne altar-piece from a Flemish painter around the turn of the sixteenth century, in which the child Anne is introduced to the

[48] *Universis christifidelibus*, *MCH*, 82; Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, iii, *MCH* 125; John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xiv, *MCH* 374.

[49] Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn (eds.), *Interpreting Cultural Symbols: St Anne in Late Medieval Society* (Athens, Ga., 1990), 6–63. St Anne first appears by name in the *Protoevangelion of St James* of *c*.150. See also T. Brandenberg, 'St Anne and her Family: The Veneration of St Anne in Connection with Concepts of Marriage and Family in the Early Modern Period', in C. H. H. Sion and R. M. J. Van der Wilden (eds.), *Saints and She-Devils: Images of Women in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (London, 1987), 101–28.

[50] Ashley and Sheingorn (eds.), *Interpreting Cultural Symbols*, 21. The Carmelites, along with the Franciscans and the Dominicans, had defended the *trinubium*, according to which the kinship of Jesus could be explained by Anne having married three times. Devotion to St Anne gave the Carmelites special advantages in Denmark, where the Hanse merchants had adopted Anne as their patron: G. Mestens, 'The Carmelite Province of Denmark, 1410–*c*.1450', *Carmelus*, 3 (1956), 217–42.

[51] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xiv, *MCH* 368–74, where the detractor suggests that the order might have been named for Mary the Egyptian rather than Mary the Mother of God.

[52] London, BL Add. MS 29704–5; Margaret Rickert, *The Reconstructed Carmelite Missal*, (London, 1953), 113–14.

Carmelites by her parents. According to the tradition in Bostius's *Speculum Historiale*, Anne's mother Emerentiana sought advice from the Carmelites whom she was accustomed to visit from her home in Nazareth, when her parents wanted her to marry against her will. A Carmelite elder, however, was granted a vision in which the granddaughter of this union was revealed as the mother of the Messiah, and Emerentiana was persuaded to contract the marriage.[53] Another image in the altar-piece shows—uniquely—the Holy Family visiting the Carmelites on Mt Carmel, yet another the miracles of Elisha.[54] In this altar-piece, designed for the instruction of pious laity, the Carmelite *historia* of St Anne is woven into the existing fabric of the Carmelite foundation account. With a similar purpose in mind, Filippo Lippi, who was a better artist than a Carmelite, painted for his order the stunning panel now in Bamberg depicting St Anne accompanied by SS Angelo and Albert.[55]

In the *Perpaucorum*, and even more so in the *Cronica*, Bale had room to do little more than provide the briefest of biographical notes. For Basil of Caesarea, for example, the *Perpaucorum* says only that he travelled to Palestine from Greece, was baptized in the Jordan, and became a Carmelite under Eutychianus, before returning to his native Cappadocia.[56] Bale's sources are given as Trithemius and John Soreth, though in fact Trithemius has little to say about Basil. Soreth, the reforming prior-general of the order, wrote his *Expositio* on the Carmelite Rule in 1455. In the notebook made while visiting libraries in the 1520s, Bale copied extracts from Soreth's *In expositione regulae* relating to Basil. According to Soreth, Basil was a monk at the Carmelite house by the Golden Gate in Jerusalem (that is, the 'house of St Anne'). Later, when bishop of Caesarea, Basil was recognized by Ephrem the Syrian as a monk of the order of Elijah by his white vestment, since, as Ephrem knew, Elijah's father had seen a vision of white-clad angels before his son's birth.[57]

This anecdote Soreth took from a *Life* of Basil purportedly by Amphilocius. Later in the notebook, Bale transcribed fuller extracts

[53] Bostius, *Speculum Historiale*, iv; *Speculum*, i. 284.

[54] Bruno Borchart, 'L'Imaculée dans l'iconographie du Carmel', *Carmelus*, 2 (1955), 99. John Trithemius wrote *De laudibus sanctae matris Annae tractatus* for the confraternity. See also, for another relevant St Anne panel, Guy de Ferrareur, 'Sur un tableau du Musée Saint Sauveur à Bruges', *Revue Belge d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art*, 6 (1936), 301–4.

[55] R. Oertel, *Fra Filippo Lippi* (Vienna, 1942), 11–12. See also Lippi's panel of *c.*1452 in the Pitti Gallery, Florence, in which the birth of the Blessed Virgin is shown in the background of a conventional Madonna and Child composition.

[56] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 140ᵛ.   [57] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 16ᵛ.

from this work.[58] Amphilocius also appears independently as a disciple of Basil in Bale's *Perpaucorum*, as attested by Trithemius and Julian Hassart.[59] Amphilocius, bishop of Iconium (373/4–398/404), was indeed a friend of Basil, and may even have had first-hand experience of Basil's monastic experiments in Cappadocia.[60] The work that bears his name, however, was a product of the late eighth or early ninth century, and is devoid of any accurate historical content.[61] The tradition of Amphilocius's authorship of the *Life* became established in the West, nevertheless, for he is listed as the author of the *Life* of Basil in the *Catalogus de viris illustribus* of Sigebert of Gembloux (1030–1112). His work was well enough known in the medieval West to have been used as a source for exemplary stories about Basil by, for example, Hroswitha (*c*.1000), Gerald of Wales, Vincent of Beauvais, and Jacobus de Voragine.[62] Through the last the *vita*—and thus a rather peculiar version of Basil himself—must have reached all corners of Western Christendom. The Pseudo-Amphilocius version of Basil's life and its variants seem, indeed, to have eclipsed the account in Rufinus's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.[63]

The miraculous anecdotes from Pseudo-Amphilocius picked up by later medieval authors include stories about the Jew who converted to Christianity after receiving the eucharist from Basil, the young man who made a pact with the devil in order to seduce the girl he desired, and the confrontation between Basil and the Emperor Julian the Apostate.[64] The Carmelite *vita* in Bodleian Library MS 73 bears superficial

---

[58] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 147ʳ–149ᵛ.   [59] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 141ʳ–ᵛ.

[60] Basil wrote three 'canonical letters' to Amphilocius, nos. 188, 199, 217. Another letter in the Basilian corpus, ep. 150, from Heraclides, invites Amphilocius to join Basil's new foundation at Caesarea. Amphilocius's works, *Amphilochii Iconensis opera*, ed. C. Datema, CCG 3 (Turnhout, 1978), contain no biography of Basil.

[61] John Wortley, 'The Pseudo-Amphilocian *Vita Basilii*: An Apocryphal *Life* of Saint Basil the Great', *Florilegium*, 2 (1980), 217–39. Wortley argues convincingly, 221–3, that the *Vita* derives from the circle of Greek monks in and around Rome who had fled from the iconoclasts, and that it was translated into Latin at Rome before 886. The Greek text was edited, with a Latin translation, by François Combefis, in *Sanctorum patrum Amphilocii Iconiensis, Methodii Patarensis et Andreae Cetensis opera omnia quae supersunt* (Paris, 1644), 155–225.

[62] Sigebert of Gembloux, *Catalogus Sigeberti Gemblacensis monachi de viris illustribus*, ed. Robert Witte (Bern and Frankfurt, 1974), 54; *Hrotsuithae monialis Gandersheimensis historia de conversione desperati adolescentis per sanctum Basilium*, PL 173, cols. 1109–16; Gerald of Wales, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, dist. I, 26, ed. J. S. Brewer, in *Giraldi Cambriensis opera*, xxi (London, 1862), ii. 74–96; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, XIV. lxxviii–lxxx, pp. 570–1. Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, xxvi, ed. T. Graesse (Leipzig, 1890), 121–6.

[63] Rufinus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ii. 9. For variants of Pseudo-Amphilocius and other Latin treatments of Basil, see *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1898–1901), 1022–7m.

[64] Wortley, 'Pseudo-Amphilocian *Vita Basilii*', discusses these stories and possible sources.

similarities to the Western retellings of Pseudo-Amphilocius, and it seems probable, because of its wide circulation, that the author was also familiar with the *Legenda aurea* version. A comparison between the Bodleian and *Legenda aurea* versions, however, reveals marked differences. The Carmelite version gives a fuller account of the early career of Basil, whereas the extracts taken by previous Western authors from Pseudo-Amphilocius focus on miracles performed by the saint while already a bishop. The departures in the Carmelite version from the story as known in the West are simply attempts to link Basil to Carmelite monasticism, and their ultimate source is the whole set of assumptions about Carmelite history already prevalent in the fifteenth century. There would be no need, indeed, to suppose that the Carmelite author of the Bodleian *vita* relied on anything other than the stories about Basil known from the *Legenda aurea* and Vincent of Beauvais, were it not for the explicit mention of Amphilocius as a source at the beginning of the *vita*.[65]

According to the Carmelite *vita*, Basil studied in Athens, but after a vision converted to a life of monastic penance. He went first to Egypt to learn from a monk called Porphyry the precepts of monastic living, and from him heard about the hermits on Mt Carmel. With a companion, Eubolus, he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and was baptized in the Jordan by Cyril, later bishop of Jerusalem, but at that time still a deacon under Bishop John. Cyril was himself a Carmelite, and Basil learnt more of Carmelite monasticism from him and from another Carmelite monk, Meletius, patriarch of Antioch, on the Black Mountain. It was on the Black Mountain, a Carmelite community founded in apostolic times, that Gregory Nazianzus had also become a Carmelite. Basil and Gregory were sent to Cappadocia to spread Carmelite monastic traditions, and Basil eventually became bishop of Caesarea. He founded Carmelite monasteries on Mt Didymus and in Pontus with the help of the Emperor Valentinian, and for a while under the Arian Emperor Valens lived in retirement as a Carmelite monk in Pontus.[66]

The Carmelite *vita* is based, very loosely, on Basil's own testimony of his travels in Syria, Egypt, and Palestine in 357–8. In epistle 223 Basil

[65] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 147ʳ.
[66] Ibid., fos. 147ʳ–149ʳ. The companion Eubolus appears to have been an invention of Pseudo-Amphilocius. The Carmelite *vita* follows Pseudo-Amphilocius's account of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem and baptism in the Jordan, but the identification of the bishop as Cyril is a Carmelite invention.

recounts his experiences of monastic life, particularly in Egypt, in search of guidance as to the most appropriate form of monasticism to adopt in his own country. The Carmelite *vita* is correct in so far as Basil did indeed study in Athens, and on his return to Cappadocia experienced a conversion to asceticism. In Basil's own memoir of his travels, however, Egyptian monasticism appears to have made more of an impression than Palestinian. There is, moreover, no mention of Mt Carmel as a monastic site. On his return to Cappadocia, Basil instituted a form of monastic life in foundations in Pontus and Caesarea based on his own precepts, which have been characterized as a middle way between the extremes of anchoritism and the tight organization of the cenobitic life.[67] Basil certainly incorporated into his monastic rules elements of the monastic practices he had studied in 357–8; but there is no direct evidence that these were Palestinian traditions. Further, Basil was not the first to introduce monasticism in to Asia Minor. According to Sozomen, the foundation of monastic houses in Pontus had been begun by Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, Basil's own mentor.[68]

Although the most important elements in the story from the Carmelite point of view were the putative connections with Mt Carmel, the miraculous is also present. The Bodleian *Vita* reproduces, in rather garbled form, the miracle with which the *Legenda aurea* version of Basil's life opens, which is also told by Gerald of Wales. In this anecdote, the hermit Ephrem, initially sceptical after seeing him in a liturgical procession that Basil can truly be the saint he had been assured in a previous vision, is convinced when Basil appears to him with a tongue of flame that the Holy Spirit speaks through him. The Carmelite version grants the vision instead to Eubolus, Basil's companion, and mentions Ephrem as one of the congregation. In both versions, though more fully in those deriving directly from Pseudo-Amphilocius, Ephrem is then miraculously granted by Basil's prayers the ability to speak Greek. This Ephrem is of course, as Vincent of Beauvais's retelling of the story clearly states, Ephrem the Syrian. In the Bodleian *Vita* Ephrem himself becomes a hermit on Mt Carmel.[69]

---

[67] See Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism*, 194, and Y. Hirschfeld, *The Judean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period* (New Haven, 1992), 102–11, on the specific function of caring for pilgrims developed by the Palestinian monasteries of this period.

[68] Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, cxi. 14. It may have been Eustathius who had encouraged Basil to study monasticism in Egypt and Palestine.

[69] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 148ʳ; Gerald of Wales, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, dist I, 26 xx; Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, xxvi, p. 121; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, xiv, 86, p. 572. Bale's *Perpaucorum*, fos. 142ᵛ–143ʳ, also lists Ephrem as a Carmelite and disciple

Another important element of the Pseudo-Amphilocius *Vita* is Basil's resistance to the Arian Emperor Valens. In both the *Legenda aurea* and Bodleian Library MS 73, allusion is made to the miracle by which ownership of a church disputed by Catholics and Arians is decided in favour of the Catholics when the doors of the church open by themselves in response to Basil's prayers, when they had stayed firmly shut in response to Arian prayers.[70] It was Basil's role as defender of orthodox religion against unbelief that was seen as his primary characteristic in later medieval visual culture. Naturally, Basil appears in Orthodox iconography as a bishop and theologian, and there are also Western representations of Basil as a Father of the Church.[71] Narrative scenes, however, are broader in their use of Basil. A thirteenth-century Spanish manuscript of the Cantigas of Alfonso X depicts Basil praying for the the defeat of Emperor Julian the Apostate in his Persian campaign, and this episode is also found, as one of the miracles of the Blessed Virgin, in the sculpture of the Lady Chapel in Ely (*c*.1300–50).[72] It is curious that the material copied by Bale in Bodleian Library MS 73 should have omitted this evidently well-known feature of Basil's life, which it would have been easy to use to promote the role of the Carmelites in the struggle against paganism in the fourth century; surprising also, perhaps, that Bale himself, an East Anglian, did not appear to remember the Ely sculpture.

of Basil and Cyril of Jerusalem. The connection between Ephrem and Basil was much older, and came about as a result of the mistaken attribution of an encomium in honour of Basil to Ephrem.

[70] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 148$^{r–v}$; Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, xxvi, pp. 121–2.

[71] Among Western representations, Basil appears in the frescos at Santa Maria Antiqua and St Sabas in Rome, but these are all pre-tenth century, when Greek influence in Rome was still apparent. More significant are Basil's appearances in the early twelfth-century fresco at Berzé-la-ville, a Cluniac chapel in Burgundy, and in the thirteenth-century fresco at Brixen. In Italy he was depicted in fresco cycles at San Francesco in Pisa (1342) and at San Nicolo ai Celestini (1393). This would appear to reflect an interest in Basil as a monastic founder by the Spiritual Franciscans. As one would expect, there are also many south Italian representations, such as the frescos at Mottola (Grotta di San Nicola) and Taranto (Grotta d'Onufrio). An early fourteenth-century panel of St Nicholas apparently made for a Cypriot monastery, and now in the Archbishop Makarios III Museum, Cyprus, depicts Basil being rescued from the Saracens by St Nicholas, and a Venetian panel of 1325–35, now in the Royal Ontario Museum, shows Basil's son being returned from captivity. I am grateful to Dr Achim Timmermann of the Index of Christian Art, Princeton, for bringing these panels to my attention.

[72] Escorial, Real Biblioteca MS T.i.i, fos. 11^v, 12^r; San Marino, Huntingdon Library MS H.M 3027, fo. 25^r, a fourteenth-century illuminated *Legenda aurea*, depicting Basil's conversion of the Jewish doctor Joseph.

Basil had been an important figure in Carmelite historiography since the *Universis christifidelibus*, written probably in the 1290s. His significance for Carmelite history, however, centred on the use of his rule, allegedly given to the Carmelite monks by John, bishop of Jerusalem. Neither the *Universis christifidelibus* nor any subsequent work of the fourteenth century based on it—as most were—attempted to draw Basil directly into the Carmelite fold. It should be apparent, nevertheless, that it was greatly in the interests of the Carmelite historians so to do. The Carmelites might have been instituted by Elijah, but in the absence of a written rule or constitutions, where was the proof of this antiquity? As the Dominican detractor in John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus* had observed, the *sine qua non* of a religious order was a rule. The Carmelite historians had given ground in acknowledging the lack of a written rule until the time of John of Jerusalem. John of Hildesheim's defence, that written evidence could not be expected at such a great distance in time, may sound reasonable, but it is hardly convincing proof of the antiquity claimed by the Carmelites.

The choice of Basil as legislator was inspired. There was scarcely a more ancient monastic exemplar from whom precepts could have been retrospectively adopted. It is true that an intimate link between Basil and Palestinian monasticism was more difficult to determine, and in this respect it is surprising that the Carmelites did not seek the influence of Sabas, Euthymius, or Chariton, for example. But although the Sabaite *typikon* eventually attained a pre-eminence in Orthodox monastic liturgical customs, it was the 'Basilian rule' that was regarded in the West as fundamental to Orthodox monasticism. Basil was the Orthodox equivalent to Benedict in the West, in the sense that his 'rule' was accepted as the normative form of Orthodox monasticism, and as one of the standard monastic rules in existence, along with those of Benedict and Augustine.[73] The fact that what was known in the West as 'the rule of Basil' was in fact an adapted translation by Rufinus of Aquileia of two separate texts, the Longer and Shorter Rules, neither of which survive in their original form, was not understood, and may not, even if it had been known, have carried much weight.[74] Carmelite historians were arguing not simply that monasti-

[73] For example, *Stephani Muretensis Regula*, prologue, PL 204, cols. 1135–6. Canon law reflected the idea of Basilian monasticism as a generic form of Eastern monasticism, as Jean de Cheminot, who quotes the decree against women living according to the rules of either Benedict, Basil, or Augustine, knew: c. 25, C. XVIII, q. 2, Friedberg, i. 836. Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, v, pp. 202–3.

[74] Rufinus's translation is in PL 103, cols. 485–554. He himself refers to the translation in

cism on Mt Carmel was an older tradition of religious life than any other, but that it was the normative form of monasticism. Moreover, from the time of the *Universis christifidelibus*, most Carmelites (with the exception of William of Coventry) had appreciated the need to identify their pre-twelfth-century predecessors with generic Orthodox monasticism, since any community of monks on Mt Carmel from the fifth to the twelfth centuries must by definition have been Greek Orthodox, and therefore Basilian. If such an identification were to be plausible, Basil's Rule was essential. In fact, in the hypothetical case of such a community having existed on Mt Carmel before the late twelfth century, it is just as likely that the monks would have adopted a Palestinian model for living, such as the Sabaite, or developed their own *typikon*, rather than using the Basilian. For one thing, the Sabaite model was by this period beginning to enjoy wide circulation within the Orthodox world.[75] The Carmelite insistence on the Basilian Rule in fact betrays ignorance of Orthodox monastic practice, for although it is true that the Basilian Rule was taken as a model by some communities in the Orthodox world, it was in no sense binding on monasteries in the way that the Benedictine Rule was in the West. There was, indeed, no equivalent in Orthodoxy to the idea of a 'monastic order' upon which Western monasticism was based. Yet, ironically, the Carmelite claim that the pre-Albertian monks on Mt Carmel followed the Rule of Basil has the ring of truth. The Orthodox monks who are known to have lived on Mt Carmel in the 1180s were, according to John Phokas, Calabrians, and the Orthodox monks of southern Italy generally followed the 'Basilian Rule'. The Carmelite writers did not know this, because Phokas's pilgrimage account was unknown in the West. Nevertheless, it seems certain that from the 1180s until the end of the

his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ii. 9. It consists of 203 separate chapters, taken from the 313 chapters of the Longer and 55 chapters of the Shorter Rule of Basil. Because of the absence of an original version, the authenticity of Basil's Rule is still subject to some doubt, but comparison of Rufinus's translation with Basil's epistles 2, to Gregory of Nazianzen, and 22, 'On the perfection of the life of solitaries', suggest that Basil was indeed the author of the work known to Rufinus. The translation, moreover, was made soon after Rufinus returned to Italy from the East, in 397. Basil's entire ascetic corpus, including the rules, was known by Photius in the tenth century.

[75] Examples of Orthodox monastic foundations inspired by the Sabaite *typikon* include Christodoulos's monastery on Patmos and Neophytos's 'Nea Sion' in Cyprus. On the diffusion of Sabaite influence in medieval Orthodox monasticism, see Svetlana Popovic, 'Sabaite Influences on the Medieval Church in Serbia', and John Thomas, 'The Imprint of Sabaite Monasticism on Byzantine Monastic *typika*', both in J. Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present: Monastic Life, Liturgy, Theology, Literature, Art, Archaeology* (Leuven, 2001), 385–407, 73–83.

separate Orthodox eremitical settlement, the Basilian Rule was indeed followed on Mt Carmel.

Knowledge of the Early Church in the Late Middle Ages

The use by fifteenth-century Carmelites of early Christian monastic figures raises the question of what medieval friars understood of the history of the early Church, and how such knowledge was acquired. Great monastic figures like Antony, Pachomius, and Basil had always been known in the Western tradition from Latin translations of the major sources; Antony, Pachomius, and Macarius, indeed, crop up frequently in the rhetoric of twelfth-century monastic reformers.[76] This does not mean, however, that the reforming monks knew much about, or indeed were much interested in, the circumstances of early Christian monasticism. The major sources continued to be read. Dominicans in the thirteenth century were familiar with the monastic traditions of the *Vitae patrum*, and in the fourteenth century a similar reliance is found in the works of Augustinian Hermits.[77] A late fourteenth-century Benedictine treatise on the origins of monasticism cited the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates, and Sozomen, as well as Latin sources.[78] Bale cited Socrates on St Basil in his travel notes.[79] Medieval lists of patristic sources, such as Sigebert of Gembloux's *Catalogus de viris illustribus*, were well known, and must have formed the backbone of works like Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*.[80]

In almost all cases, however, familiarity with early Christian sources came through Latin translations, most commonly the *Historia Tripartita*. From the thirteenth century, largely through the works of the Dominicans Jacobus de Voragine and Vincent of Beauvais, the early monastic founders reached a wider audience in the West. Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda aurea* includes chapters on Macarius, Antony, John the Almsgiver, Mary of Egypt, Abbots Moses, Arsenius, and Agathon, and Hilarion, all of whom were already known from the *Vitae patrum*.

---

[76]   Constable, *Reformation of the Twelfth Century*, 160–1.

[77]   See below, Ch. 8; on Dominicans, Alain Boureau, *L'Evenement sans fin: Récit christianisme au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1993), 60–4; Jotischky, 'Some Mendicant Views', 31–8.

[78]   *De prima institutione monachorum*, in Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, i. xxi.

[79]   Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 148ᵛ.

[80]   Vincent, for example, cites as frequent sources for his own synthesis of early Christian history the *Catalogus de illustribus viris* and letters of Jerome, the *Vitae patrum*, and Rufinus.

Vincent's *Speculum Historiale* uses as exempla of monastic virtue Ammonius, Moses the Ethiopian, Macarius, and others, such as Spiridion, who were less well known from the Latin patristic sources but who also feature in Carmelite literature. A stock of early Christian monastic figures seems to have been available to Latin readers in the later Middle Ages, though the uses to which they were put means that—as in the case of Basil—accurate knowledge of their lives was limited. Such accurate knowledge, of course, was not the point. Both the *Speculum Historiale* and the *Legenda aurea* were intended to provide exempla, and, in so doing, to demonstrate continuity between the monastic practices of early Christianity and of the friars.[81] Continuity, however, was spiritual rather than actual. Only the Carmelites wanted to incorporate early Christian monks into a genealogical history of their order.

For those with a deeper interest in early Christian monasticism, the possibility of reading the works of the monks themselves was becoming available from the early fourteenth century. Vincent of Beauvais had followed the earlier tradition represented by Sigebert of Gembloux in listing the works of Basil, Ephrem, and others, but of course he knew their content only in summary form.[82] A few of Vincent's contemporaries, however, were beginning to learn Greek, and to acquaint themselves with the foundations of Orthodox spirituality. The translation of John Climacus's *Scala Paradisi* into Latin by Angelo Clareno in the early fourteenth century, and the subsequent translations into vernacular languages, indicate an increasing interest in early Christian and Byzantine mystical writing. The nature of medieval libraries, in both East and West, was such that exposure to one author of a particular genre often meant an introduction to others whose works had been copied into the same codex. Thus the ascetic works of Basil, Isaac the Syrian, Ephrem, and others became available through direct translation rather than, as earlier, in summary extracts or quotations.[83]

[81] Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, xv. lxxix–c, pp. 613–17. One aspect of early Church history in which the mendicant borrowers seemed less interested was the question of theological orthodoxy. There is, for example, no awareness in the Carmelite appropriation of Cyril of Alexandria that the Christological doctrine he defended so vigorously at the Council of Ephesus in 431 was considered after the Council of Chalcedon to be unorthodox, or that the Churches that relied on this Christology—viz. the Coptic and Syrian Orthodox Churches—were regarded as heretical and not in communion with Rome.

[82] Ibid. xiv. lxxxi, lxxxvii; pp. 570–1, 573.

[83] On translations into Latin generally, J. T. Muckle, 'Greek Works Translated Directly into Latin before 1350', *Medieval Studies*, 4 (1942), 33–42, and 5 (1943), 102–14; on Climacus, R. G. Musto, 'Angelo Clareno, OFM: Fourteenth-Century Translator of the Greek Fathers:

Compilations taken from the *Historia Tripartita* and the works of Jerome and Rufinus made available to Carmelites not only monastic exemplars, but a narrative of the Church's history. In Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*, for example, this narrative meanders around and between the lives of saints and martyrs. To the Dominican preacher, examples of monastic virtue were more useful than accounts of councils and their decrees. The history of the Church as mediated to the medieval West was anecdotal and selective, revolving around individuals rather than theological currents or institutional developments. Thus a writer such as Vincent, taking as his sources the *Vitae patrum*, Jerome, and Sigebert of Gembloux, was able to compile a tolerably accurate picture of the narrative sources for early Christian history; but the synthesis created from this compilation was of necessity based on the activities of individual saints and martyrs. The peculiar character of the early Church thus transmitted to the West is well exemplified by the medieval career of St Basil. Although his *Hexaemeron* had been translated into Latin in the fifth century and was to be translated again in the thirteenth, what was known of him came largely from the Pseudo-Amphilocian stories, rather than from his own theological or pastoral writing. Perhaps an even more striking example is Cyril of Alexandria, whose vital influence on the theological development of early Christian doctrine is reduced in the *Catalogus* of Sigebert of Gembloux to a remark on his labours in dating Easter.[84]

Yet knowledge of Greek had never been entirely absent from western Europe. In the twelfth century the Pisans Burgundio, Hugo Eteriano, and his brother Leo the Tuscan maintained a trickle of Greek patristic works in Latin translations. The Norman and Hohenstaufen rulers of Sicily maintained Greek as a living language in their lands, and even under the less tolerant Angevin dynasty of Naples, Greek monasteries such as Casole and Rossano and translators such as Nicholas of Reggio continued to keep alive traditions of Orthodox scholarship.[85] A revival of Greek studies in Florence under the patronage of Coluccio Salutati (1375–1406) was characterized by the import of Byzantine scholars such as Manuel Chrysoloras to Italy, a trend that

An Introduction and a Checklist of Manuscripts and Printings of his "Scala Paradisi"', *AFH* 76 (1983), 215–38, 589–645.

[84] Sigebert, *Catalogus*, 58.

[85] Roberto Weiss, 'The Translators from the Greek at the Angevin Court of Naples', *Rinascimento*, 10 (1950), 195–226, and *idem*, 'The Greek Culture of Southern Italy in the Later Middle Ages', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 37 (1951), 23–50.

continued more famously and with more substantial results in the fifteenth century.[86] Some friars learnt Greek, either for pragmatic reasons such as diplomacy, or, like the Dominican William of Moerbeke, to be able to read Aristotle. Greek was known by a handful of English scholars in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, particularly Franciscans who came under the influence of Robert Grosseteste, himself a considerable Greek scholar, or his followers.[87] Nevertheless, most of the Greek books in England before the fifteenth century were psalters or bibles, rather than ascetic works or history,[88] and no systematic use seems to have been made of the library of Greek books bequeathed by Grosseteste to the Oxford Franciscans.

Another pocket of Greek knowledge in the mid-fourteenth century may have been Norwich. Peter Philargus, the Cretan Franciscan who was later to become Pope Alexander V (1409–10), was sent by his order to lecture at the Norwich *studium*, and thence to Oxford. Either in Norwich or, perhaps more likely, in Oxford, he must have encountered Adam Easton, a monk of the Cathedral Priory in Norwich, who certainly at some point learnt Hebrew and possibly Greek, and who was in Oxford for ten years in the mid-fourteenth century.[89] The influence of such individuals remains for the most part uncertain. Easton is known to have preached against the activities of the mendicants in Norwich; on the other hand, he was sympathetic to hermits, and knew the *Remedies against Temptations* of the Augustinian Hermit William Flete, so he may have been favourable to the Carmelites as well.

[86] Roberto Weiss, 'Greek in Western Europe at the End of the Middle Ages', *Dublin Review*, 119 (1955), 68–76, repr. in *Medieval and Humanist Greek: Collected Essays by Roberto Weiss*, Medioevo e Umanesimo, 8 (Padua, 1977), 3–12, esp. 5–6; Deno Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, Mass. 1962); Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*.

[87] Grosseteste quoted extensively from Basil's *Hexaemeron*, from Pseudo-Dionysius, John Chrysostom, and especially John Damascene; for discussion of his use of Greek patristic exegesis see R. W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 1986), 195–9, 203–7. One of Grosseteste's canons at Lincoln, Nicholas the Greek, was a Sicilian who translated Aristotle. In the later thirteenth century Gregory of Huntingdon, prior of Ramsey, owned a Greek grammar, and the fourteenth-century bibliophile Richard of Bury owned Roger Bacon's Greek grammar.

[88] M. R. James, 'Greek Manuscripts in England before the Renaissance', *The Library*, new ser. 7 (1926–7), 337–53.

[89] Easton was in Norwich before 1356 and in Oxford *c*.1356–66: Pantin, *Documents Illustrating the Activities . . . of the English Black Monks*, iii. 28–9; Roberto Weiss, 'The Study of Greek in England during the Fourteenth Century', *Rinascimento*, 11 (1951), 209–39. Easton's writings betray an eclectic influence, including Pseudo-Dionysius and the Jewish scholar David Kimhi as well as the Victorines. See Leslie J. MacFarlane, 'The Life and Writings of Adam Easton, OSB', unpub. Ph.D thesis, University of London, 1955). M. Harvey, *The English in Rome 1362–1470: Portrait of an Expatriate Community* (Cambridge, 1999), 188–237, has found no evidence that Easton knew Greek.

If Greek patristic studies had only a precarious hold in the four-teenth century, after 1400 the seeds sown by Petrarch and his followers in Italy bore rich fruit. Fifteenth-century humanism is generally associated with the rebirth of classical studies, but not all the humanists were of the anticlerical stamp of Leonardo Bruni. A circle of reform-minded scholars gathered around Ambrogio Traversari at the Camaldolese monastery of Santa Maria degli Angeli in Florence in the 1420s. Traversari himself translated Climacus, John Chrysostom's *Against the Vituperators of the Monastic Life*, the *Vitae patrum*, and the ascetic works of Ephrem the Syrian; his protégé Guarino da Verona translated Basil's *Homilies on Fasting* and the works of Cyril of Alexandria. As Traversari's biographer, Charles Stinger, has pointed out, these translators saw their patristic studies as central to the work of reform in the Church, and they were particularly drawn to writings on the ascetic life.[90] The discovery and preservation of hundreds of patristic manuscripts by Traversari's circle ought to have amplified knowledge of the early Church more generally, thereby reducing the dependence on Vincent of Beauvais and the medieval encyclopaedists.

There is some evidence that Carmelites were attracted to the same enterprise; for example, the Carmelite Battista Panetius translated John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* and Basil's *De baptismo*.[91] In general, however, the humanist interest in patristics and early Church history was the preserve of enclosed religious—such as Traversari himself—or the laity, who had not been shaped by the assumptions of the scholastic method, rather than of the friars.[92] The mendicant interest in, and appropriation of heroic figures from, the early Church followed a historical agenda; the humanists were interested above all in philological accuracy as the key to reform.[93]

The disjunction between the philological research into patristics in fifteenth-century Italy and the contemporary work of Carmelites such as Scrope or Paleonydorus is revealed by the continued reliance on

[90] Charles L. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany, NY, 1977), 196: 'The patristic Church, as revealed . . . in the lives of the Fathers and their works, was the model of faith and holiness and the inspiration to reform.'

[91] Irene Backus, 'John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa*: Translations by Burgundio (1153/4), Grosseteste (1235/40) and Lefèvre d'Etaples', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 49 (1986), 211; A. Borgelleri-Severi, 'Due Carmelitani a Ferrara nel Rinascimento: Battista Paneti e Giovanni M. Verrati', *Carmelus*, 8 (1961), 63–131.

[92] Stinger, *Humanism*, 25.

[93] Thus, e.g., Traversari disparaged Angelo Clareno's literal translation of Climacus: ibid. 110–11.

Pseudo-Amphilocius and the Dominican encyclopaedists by the author of the Bodleian life of Basil. Yet the careful listing of such figures as Spiridion, Anastasius the Persian, Isaac the Syrian, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Cyril of Alexandria by fifteenth-century scholars surely owes something to new advances in the understanding of the early Church. The Carmelite appropriation of the early Church was not as crude as simple annexation or relabelling; rather, it must be seen in the context of a wider interest in and understanding of the roots of Western spirituality and of the Church itself.

Medieval Accretions

All Carmelite histories become sparser for the period between the early Church and the crusades. The addition of John of Damascus to the corpus of early Carmelites by Paleonydorus is really an extension of what has gone before, since Paleonydorus apparently thought John was a contemporary of Basil.[94]

A more surprising inclusion is Leander the Carthaginian, whom Bale took from Paleonydorus and Faber, and who is credited with the conversion of the Arian Visigothic king to Catholicism *c.*590.[95] The Persian and Arab invasions of the Holy Land gave Bale the opportunity to present the early Carmelites as martyrs. In the entry for Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem at the time of the Persian conquest (614), Bale simply mentions—apparently confusing the Persians with the Arabs—that the Carmelites were afflicted with great tyranny from the time of Sophronius to 1099.[96] Nevertheless, the Carmelites do not seem to have achieved a consensus about the putative effect of the seventh-century conquest of Palestine. Ribot appeared to think that the only noticeable consequence of the invasion was the Arabs' prohibition on the white worn by the Carmelites.[97] Jean de Malines, imaginatively if inaccurately, used the Persian and Arab invasions to explain the spread of monasticism from East to West. The result of the Arab occupation, he argued, was that the Eastern Church became infected

---

[94] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 5.

[95] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 150ʳ. Leander is not in the *Liber trimerestus*. Reccared I (586–601) converted to Catholicism in 587, and at the Third Council of Toledo (589) the Goths adopted Roman dogma: K. Schaeferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen bis zur Erichtung der Westgotischen katholischen Staatskirche*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 39 (Berlin, 1967), 194–6, 205–33.

[96] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 150ʳ.

[97] Ribot, *De institutione*, vii. 1, *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 64; see above, Ch. 3.

with lasciviousness and love of luxury, and thus virtue found a refuge in the West.[98] Trithemius, however, wrote that the Carmelites had been forced to abandon their other monasteries as a result of the invasiom, with the result that when the crusaders arrived, they found the hermits restricted to Mt Carmel.[99]

Paleonydorus located the troubles rather later than the initial invasion, to the ninth century. One example of this was the career of John of Galilee in the late eighth and early ninth centuries. The Byzantine Emperor Constantine VI sent John as an ambassador to Charlemagne to appeal for help against the Arabs, but when the 'king of the Persians and Saracens', Aaron, heard of this, he immediately sent Charlemagne presents of the bodies of SS Cyprian and Spirates, the head of St Pantaleon, and many other relics, in an attempt to placate the fearsome Frank. While Charlemagne lived, the condition of the Holy Land improved, but after his death it worsened again.[100] The versions in the *Perpaucorum* and *Cronica* differ. In the *Cronica*, Bale lists John as prior of Mt Carmel *c.*780, who became patriarch of Jerusalem in 802. Exiled by the Muslims, he went to Constantinople, but was restored to Jerusalem after the intervention of Charlemagne.[101] In the later *Perpaucorum* the exile is not mentioned, but John's presence on an embassy sent by Constantine VI to Charlemagne offers an opening for knowledge of the Carmelites to enter the West. The Muslim occupation as a whole presented Carmelite writers with a dilemma. Naturally, the invasion provided great opportunities for the martyrdom of Carmelites. On the other hand, any acknowledgement of disruption to Carmelite monasticism might jeopardize the unbroken thread of continuity that was the underlying theme in all Carmelite apologetic writing. Trithemius's position had the merit of being both judicious and plausible.

Bale continues the Carmelite genealogy with Stephen the Syrian, Theophylactus, a Syrian monk who became bishop to the Bulgars, and the martyr Magnivadus, all located in the mid-ninth century.[102]

[98] Jean de Malines, *Speculum Historiale*, vi, pp. 215–16.

[99] Trithemius, *Liber de ortu*, viii, p. 299.

[100] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 10. Here Paleonydorus appears to have confused John of Galilee with his fifth-century predecessor John of Jerusalem, and Bale repeats the confusion when he refers to John as having given the Carmelites the rule of Basil and Paulinus. The story was also told by Robert Bale, *Chronica ordinis Carmelitarum*, Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fo. 8[r].

[101] Bale, *Cronica*, fo. 142[r].

[102] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fos. 151[v]–152[v]; *idem*, *Cronica*, fos. 142[v]–143[r]. Stephen the Syrian is presumably Stephen the Sabaite. The only Theophylactus who had a Bulgar connection was

Chronologically, the next Carmelite was Symeon of Syracuse (b. 990s), a monk of Mt Sion who lived for a while as a solitary in Sinai before being sent by his community to raise funds for the monastery in the West, and who ended his life as an anchorite enclosed in a cell on the city walls of Trier.[103]

The Carmelite connection with a monk of Mt Sion, though fanciful, is easily explained; less so is the stretch of the imagination by which Gerard of Csanád was made into a Carmelite. According to a twelfth-century *Life*, Gerard, a Venetian, was persuaded in the 1020s either to defer his proposed pilgrimage to Jerusalem in favour of missionary activity among the newly converted Hungarians, or to make his pilgrimage by way of the land route through Hungary. In any case, he never reached the Holy Land, remaining in Hungary instead as tutor to King Stephen's son, and subsequently living as a hermit before being appointed bishop of Csanád, a region newly annexed to Stephen's kingdom from its Greek Orthodox ruler. Gerard, revered by Hungarians under the name Gellert, was murdered in 1046 during a succession dispute between Stephen's Christian dynasty and its pagan rivals.[104] At the end of the fifteenth century this career was changed almost beyond recognition in Paleonydorus's *Liber trimerestus*.[105] Bale's entries for Gerard in both the *Cronica* and the *Perpaucorum* are essentially abridgements of this version, which he also copied into Bodleian Library MS 73. The circumstances of transmission of the original to Paleonydorus are unclear, for Gerard was not a saint well known in the West. In 1371,

the archbishop of Ochrida who died in 1108. He seems to have had no Syrian connection, however. A student of Michael Psellus, he wrote theological and exegetical works and letters. See V. G. Vasilievsky, 'Byzantium and the Patzinaks', repr. in *Works of V. G. Vasilievsky*, 4 vols. (St Petersburg, 1908–30), i. 134–49. The Carmelite interest in him must result from confusion over dating. I have been unable to identify Magnivardus.

[103] *Vita sancti Symeonis*, *AASS*, June, i. 87–8; Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 152ᵛ; *idem*, *Cronica*, fo. 145ᵛ.

[104] F. Banfi (ed.), 'Vita di S. Gerardo da Venezia nel codice 1622 della Biblioteca Universitania di Padova', *Benedictina*, 2 (1948), 262–330, with edition of the twelfth-century *vita* at 288–318; but see also C. A. MacCartney, 'Studies on the Earliest Hungarian Historical Sources,' *Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis*, 4 (1938), 456–507, and Edith Pásztor, 'Problemi di datazione della *Legenda maior S. Gerhardi episcopi*', *Bollettino dell' Istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo*, 73 (1961), 113–40. On Gerard's career, see Jean Leclercq, 'Saint Gerard de Csanád et le monachisme', *Studia Monastica*, 13 (1971), 13–30; Zoltan J. Kosztolnyik, *Five Eleventh-Century Hungarian Kings: Their Policies and their Relations with Rome*, East European Monographs, 79 (Boulder, Colo., 1981), 14–65. On the Carmelite version of the *Vita*, Andrew Jotischky, 'St Gerard of Csanád and the Carmelites: Apocryphal Sidelights on the First Crusade,' in M. Balard, (ed.), *Autour de la première croisade*: *Actes du Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East 1995*, Byzantina Sorbonensia, 14 (Paris, 1996), 143–55.

[105] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 10.

however, his body was translated to a new royal foundation in Buda, and the *Vita* was extended.[106] It may have been through Austrian or Bohemian Carmelites that the figure of Gerard entered the Carmelite legendary in the fifteenth century.

According to Paleonydorus, Gerard began his career as a disciple of Symeon of Syracuse, and under his tutelage became a hermit on Mt Carmel. Sent to Rome to seek aid for the Holy Land in the 1030s, he was then appointed patriarch of Antioch by Benedict IX, and dispatched as the pope's legate to Emperor Henry III. Subsequently he proselytized in Hungary, and was martyred by being strapped to an open wagon which was then pushed from the top of a hill in Buda into the Danube.[107] Gerard's significance for Carmelites lay in a further addition to the *Vita* in which, during his residence at the court of Henry III, he befriended a knight, Guy, and encouraged him to marry, having foreseen that his sons would further the Carmelite Order in Palestine. This they certainly did, for they turned out to be—with the help of some imaginative chronology!—none other than Berthold and Aimery, patriarch of Antioch.[108]

The inclusion of Gerard ranks as one of the more baroque of Carmelite legends. There is method even here, though. For Gerard, by establishing a link between pre-crusader Mt Carmel and the West, further refines the explanation of the process whereby Orthodox Palestinian monks became Catholic Carmelites. It is perhaps surprising that the Carmelite *historia* contains little of relevance to crusading. In the story of Gerard, however, the Carmelite order is retrospectively given crusading credentials. The original *Vita* of Gerard clearly showed signs of crusading influence,[109] and this is simply taken a stage further in the Carmelite version, in which Berthold and Aimery, already, since Ribot, firmly established as instrumental figures in the transformation of the order into Catholics, are also identified as crusaders.

A further crusading connection was made with the identification in the fifteenth century of Peter the Hermit as a Carmelite. The original

[106] Banfi, 'Vita di S. Gerardo', 317–18. The fourteenth-century *vita maior* of Gerard is in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, ed. E. Szentpetery, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1937–8), ii. 480–506.

[107] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 10; Bostius, *Speculum Historiale*, VI. i–iv, (chapter headings in Daniel, *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 278); Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 20ʳ, 31ʳ, 63ʳ; Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fos. 152ᵛ–153ʳ; *idem, Cronica*, fo. 145ʳ.

[108] Jotischky, 'St Gerard of Csanád', 151–2.

[109] The original twelfth-century *vita minor* makes Gerard's father a crusader: Banfi, 'Vita di S. Gerardo', 289; see Jotischky, 'St Gerard of Csanád', 144–5.

source of the tradition seems, again, to have been Paleonydorus.[110] Robert Bale included Peter in his *Chronica ordinis Carmelitarum* (before 1503), the manuscript which we know that John owned.[111] Paleonydorus, followed by John Bale, identified Peter as a Frank who became a Carmelite before the First Crusade and returned to the West to warn Christendom of the dangers posed by the Muslims. He is credited with having introduced Berthold to Mt Carmel. The *Perpaucorum* version differs slightly in making Peter a pilgrim who became a Carmelite only after the crusade.[112] In any case, the Carmelite Peter is derived from the legendary Peter in Albert of Aachen's *Historia Hierosolymitana*.[113] The appeal of the story for Carmelites lay in the implication—assuming that Peter had a Carmelite connection—that the crusade itself had been brought about by Carmelite influence.

Another case of appropriation concerns Sibyl, wife of Thierry, count of Flanders. In Bodleian Library MS 73 Bale noted that in 1159 the count and his wife had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and that Sibyl had stayed behind and joined the Carmelites under Berthold, and subsequently founded the convent of St Lazarus in Bethany.[114] The *Cronica* in Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41 gives a slightly different version: here Sibyl, the daughter of Fulk of Anjou, and countess of Flanders, took the habit at Bethany under the guidance of Berthold. She is not, however, claimed to have been a hermit on Mt Carmel, or to have founded the convent at Bethany.[115] A version with some differences in detail occurs in another place in Bodleian Library MS 73. According to this, Sibyl returned to Jerusalem after thirty years of marriage to Thierry to become a nun in the hospital of Lazarus, and died in 1161.[116] All three versions have a basis in reality. The connections

---

[110] Paleonydorus, *Liber trimerestus*, ii. 11.

[111] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fo. 11ᵛ.

[112] Bale, *Cronica*, fo. 147ᵛ; *idem, Perpaucorum*, fo. 153ʳ.

[113] Albert of Aachen *Historia Hierosolymitana*, I. ii–v, RHC Occ iv. 272–4, retold by William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, i. 11, pp. 124–9. In this story Peter met Patriarch Symeon II of Jerusalem and conveyed his appeal to Urban II: see E. O. Blake and Colin Morris, 'A Hermit Goes to War: Peter and the Origins of the First Crusade', in W. Shiels (ed.), *Monks, Hermits and the Ascetic Tradition*, Studies in Church History, 22 (1985), 79–109, and Colin Morris, 'Peter the Hermit and the Chroniclers', in J. Phillips (ed.), *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact* (Manchester, 1997), 21–34. Another Westerner with crusading connections retrospectively to become a Carmelite was Gerard of the Hospital, who is credited by Bale with having founded the Hospital as well as being a lay brother of Mt Carmel: *Cronica*, fo. 148ʳ. This appears to be a case of simple appropriation, the source of which is unclear.

[114] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 70ᵛ. No previous Carmelite historian seems to have mentioned Sybil.

[115] Bale, *Cronica*, fo. 148ᵛ.   [116] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 117ᵛ.

between the family of Thierry and the kingdom of Jerusalem were intricate, and Sibyl was herself the half-sister of King Baldwin III.[117] Thierry not only took part in the Second Crusade, but made subsequent armed expeditions to the Holy Land in 1157–8 and 1164–5. The idea that Sibyl had stayed behind in the Holy Land after Thierry left for Flanders in 1158 to become a nun at Bethany is not a Carmelite invention, but derives from Robert of Torigni.[118] According to William of Tyre, however, Sibyl accompanied Thierry on the 1164–5 expedition as well, which suggests that she returned to the West with her husband.[119] That Sibyl died in the Holy Land seems certain, probably in 1165.[120] At any rate, no connection with Mt Carmel can be established, but the Carmelite tradition claiming Sibyl, probably one that Bale picked up in Flanders, derives from a non-Carmelite source.

The substance of the Carmelite *historia* in the crusader period, as it had been developed by Ribot, was not markedly altered. Credit for the organization of the hermits under Berthold had initially been assigned to Aimery, patriarch of Antioch, by the Dominican Stephen of Salagnac in the thirteenth century, and it was Aimery, rather than Albert of Vercelli, who played the major role in Ribot's account of the twelfth-century transformation of the order. But variations on Ribot's chronology appeared in some Carmelite works. William of Coventry's *Chronica brevis* (1340/60), conflated Daimbert of Pisa with Albert of Vercelli in inventing 'Albert of Pisa, first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem'.[121] Berthold's office as prior-general is dated from 1121—a variation from Ribot repeated by John Bale[122]—and he is said to have

---

[117] Sibyl was the daughter of Fulk of Anjou's first marriage in the West, Baldwin the son of his second, to Queen Melisende of Jerusalem.

[118] *Le Chronique de Robert de Torigni, abbé du Mont Saint-Michel*, ed. L. Delisle, 2 vols. (Rouen, 1872–3), i. 325, 348. See also N. Huyghebaert, 'Une Comtesse de Flandre à Bethanie', *Les Cahiers de Saint-André*, 21 (1964), 3–15; Jonathan Phillips, *Defenders of the Holy Land* (Oxford, 1996), 274–5.   [119] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, xix. 10, p. 876.

[120] Sigebert of Gembloux, *Continuatio Aquicinctina*, MGH (SS), vi. 412. Robert de Torigni, *Chronique*, i. 510, gives 1163 as the date. The story of Sibyl entering the cloister at Bethany is certainly plausible. Her sister Matilda, after the death of her betrothed, on the *White Ship* in 1120, had become a nun at Fontevrault: William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, xiv. 1, p. 633: H. E. Mayer, 'Fontevrault und Bethanien', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 102 (1991), 14–44, has argued that a connection existed between the two convents. The convent at Bethany was founded by Melisende in the 1130s, and the first abbess was Yveta, her sister; it was well endowed, and evidently attracted aristocratic patronage.

[121] William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, MCH 273–4. He was followed in this error by Robert Bale, *Chronica*, fo. 8ᵛ, who gives 1129 as the date of the death of 'Albert of Pisa'. Daimbert died in 1109, and the first Latin patriarch was in fact not Daimbert, but Arnulf of Choques, who was deposed by Daimbert in 1099.

[122] John Bale, *De praeclariis ordinis Carmeli scriptoribus*, Harley 3838, fo. 157ʳ. The early date of

taken an oath of obedience to Aimery rather than to the patriarch of Jerusalem, who would have been his ecclesiastical superior. But the role of the patriarch of Jerusalem is recognized in the entry for 1199, when Albert is credited with giving the Carmelites the Basilian Rule in Latin.[123]

Further interesting supplements to the details of the Carmelite *historia* emerge from Bale's notebooks. The story of how the Carmelites reached western Europe had been told in the mid-fourteenth century by Jean de Cheminot, who attributed the transplanting of the hermits to the patronage of St Louis after the pious king had been impressed by a visit to Mt Carmel in 1250.[124] This was noted by Bale in two places in his travel notebook Harley 1819, but in his later *Anglorum Heliades* a further detail was added: to the effect that Louis, having visited Mt Carmel and learnt of the hermits' devotion to the Blessed Virgin, was delivered from a storm at sea off Mt Carmel through the intercession of the Carmelites with Mary.[125] As an Englishman familiar with William of Coventry, a source less well known to continental Carmelites, Bale disagreed with Cheminot's conclusion that the Carmelites' first Western settlement was that made by Louis IX in France. In the *Anglorum Heliades* he traces, using William of Coventry as a source, the history of the English Carmelite settlement.[126] That the English settlement was in any case of older date than the French is verifiable from documentary sources; but in one place Bale, still following William of Coventry, pushes the first Carmelite presence in England further back even than Richard de Grey and William de Vescy in 1240/2. William's *De duplici fuga* had, uniquely, introduced Richard I into Carmelite history by attributing to him the settlement of Carmelites in Cyprus in 1190.[127]

1121 fits well with the assumption in the Gerard of Csanád legend that Berthold was old enough to take part in the First Crusade. But this dating fails when applied to Aimery of Limoges, who became patriarch only in 1142.

[123] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fos. 8ᵛ–9ʳ. The dating given for Albert's Rule varies from one source to another. An *epithalmium* of 1511, copied by Bale in France, giving a list of the foundation dates of the religious orders has Albert (rather than Aimery) supplying the rule in 1200: London, BL Harley MS 1819, fo. 115ʳ.

[124] Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, vii. *MCH* 138–9.

[125] London, BL Harley MS 1819, fos. 13ʳ, 62ʳ; Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 16ᵛ. Jean de Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis*, cxxix, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 1868), 233, tells the story of the king's ship running aground, then almost being destroyed when a sudden storm arose during his passage home from Palestine. But this took place off the coast of Cyprus, not near Mt Carmel, and the king's delivery was attributed to the queen's promise to visit the shrine of St Nicholas at Varangeville.

[126] Egan, 'An Essay', 71–86, discusses the *De adventu* tradition.

[127] See above, 128–9.

This connection with the king of England led to the tradition, as re-
peated by Bale, that Carmelite hermits had since 1194 (the date of
Richard's return to his own lands) been visiting England, where they
inhabited caves and trees in Kent, Norfolk, and Northumberland—
precisely those places, of course, where the first English settlements
would take place in 1242. The reason given is that the hermits were ei-
ther visiting friends—presumably English crusaders who had returned
with Richard I—or collecting Holy Land subsidies; even more im-
plausible is the suggestion that they were attracted to England by the
climate![128] In 1212 an English hermit, Simon, already middle aged, set-
tled under the influence of visiting Carmelites at Hulne, one of the wil-
dernesses chosen by Carmelites on their English retreats. In 1240
William de Vescy built the first house at Hulne for the Carmelite Ralph
Fresburne, whom he had brought back with him from the Holy Land.
Fresburne found a deserted place not unlike a mountain. While resting,
he planted his staff in the ground, and on waking found a well bubbling
from the ground where the staff was: 'Helie fonticulo persimilem
vident.' Simon, who was of course already living there, at once became
a Carmelite. In 1245 he was elected prior-general at the Aylesford gen-
eral chapter, and began a programme of new foundations throughout
Britain.[129]

   This story is not easy to trace in previous Carmelite literature.
Simon Stock (assuming that his historical existence is proved), had al-
ready been attributed with mythical qualities before Bale, largely be-
cause of the scapular legend. The story as Bale tells it, however, must
be of English provenance. He lists as his English sources William of
Coventry (who mentions Richard I, but does not connect him to an
English settlement), John Hornby, and Nicholas Cantelow. Hornby in
fact has nothing to say on the matter, and Cantelow's *Encomium sui
ordinis* is known only from the brief extracts preserved by Bale himself.
Nevertheless, it is unlikely that Bale, who was a compiler rather than an
originator, invented the story. The retelling by Bale must surely demon-
strate the diversity of local traditions growing up in Carmelite prov-
inces.[130]

[128]   Bale, *Anglorum Heliades*, fo. 10ᵛ.
[129]   Ibid., fos. 10ᵛ–16ᵛ; Egan, 'An Essay', 81–3. The name 'Fresburne', though making its
first appearance in the Carmelite literature in Bale, has much older associations with the de
Vescy family.
[130]   Bale also recorded the tradition, which must be French, that de Vescy and de Grey had
imported their Carmelites not from the Holy Land but from Paris: Oxford, Bodleian Library
MS 73, fo. 139ʳ.

Another crusading legend in Bodleian Library MS 73, taken from the now-lost *Encomium sui ordinis* of Nicholas Cantelow, is much more the stuff of medieval romance. In this story, the heir of Nur al-Din, who succeeded his father as ruler of Aleppo in 1174, was the son of a Frankish princess, the count of Saint-Gilles's sister, who had been captured while on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and married to Nur. The princess, who had maintained in secret a special devotion to the Carmelites, revealed to her son on her deathbed that she had remained a Christian, despite the outward show of Islamic piety required of her. She asked her son to put a cross on top of her tomb, but at night, for fear of the Muslims. The son was implicated in the impiety, however, and escaped death only through the protection of the cross. The miracle caused many Muslims to believe in Christ.[131]

This story is only tangentially Carmelite, and looks like the adoption of an already popular romance by a member of the order. There is no basis in fact for the idea that Nur married a Frank; indeed, William of Tyre spoke admiringly of Nur's widow's spirited defence of Banyas against the Franks in 1174.[132] Its significance lies in the nature of the interest it reveals on the part of Carmelites in the Holy Land and crusading. For later medieval Carmelites, the Holy Land was a distant, if not mythic place, the land of the order's origins, but no longer of its mission. Carmelite spirituality, though distinctive, relied on the typological significance of Mt Carmel rather than its earthly presence.[133] The Carmelites probably owed their origins to the political circumstances of the crusader states, and to the safety offered by the Mt Carmel region after the Third Crusade; but to later Carmelites interested in the past, such an admission would have been tantamount to disavowing a *historia* that had become the root of the order's identity. In later Carmelite perception, the crusades were not the crucible of the Carmelite Order, but merely a backdrop to a stage in the order's development.

Consistent with this perspective are the two letters inserted by Thomas Scrope in his *Chronicon* (after 1446). The point at issue is the antiquity of the Carmelites, who are located by the evidence of the letters firmly within the context of crusading and the crusader states. The first

[131] Ibid., fo. 61^{r–v}.

[132] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, xx. 31, p. 956. Nur's widow married his successor, Saladin. Nur's heir, as-Salih, who was eleven years old when his father died, eventually gained control of Aleppo from his guardian, but by 1175 was virtually Saladin's vassal; he died in 1181.

[133] e.g. John Baconthorpe's *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*, known to Bale in the single manuscript in Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fos. 20^{r}–40^{r}.

letter, dated 1282, purports to have been written by Richard, arch-bishop of Nicosia, William, bishop of Hebron, in his capacity as vicar of the patriarch of Jerusalem, and William, bishop of Tiberias. The second, dated a year later, is apparently by Nicholas Lurginus, master of the Hospital, and William of Beaulieu, master of the Temple. Both are addressed to the pope. The message in both is identical. The orders originating in the Holy Land number six: the order of Samuel the prophet, the Rechabites, the Carmelites, the Hospitallers, the Temp-lars, and the Teutonic Knights. The Carmelites are recognized by everyone in the East to have been instituted by the holy fathers at a time beyond human memory (*a tempore cuius non extat memoria*). The order now faces, for the first time in its venerable history, the prospect of being forced into exile from Mt Carmel itself.[134] In 1282/3 the Carmel-ites were, indeed, confronted by the prospect of the loss of the Holy Land. Exactly what could have been achieved for the order in the Holy Land by an appeal to the papacy is hard to fathom, however, and it seems more likely that the timing of the letters is designed as a response to the threat posed by the pope himself at the Second Council of Lyons (1274) than to the threat of the Muslims. The testimonials of the Car-melites' colleagues in the East, an unlikely alliance of the Hospitallers, the Templars, and the leading prelates of the crusader states, were of course a strategy to demonstrate the universal recognition of some kind of hegemony exercised by the Carmelites among Christians in the East. These letters appear in no contemporary record: neither in the papal registers nor in the surviving archives of the Hospitallers. Nor do they occur in any Carmelite work before Scrope, though this need not mean that he was their author. Whoever was responsible for the letters did at least strive for historical accuracy, making only minor mistakes with the names of the grand masters.[135]

Among fifteenth-century Carmelite authors the premiss that Cyril of Constantinople was a historical figure—a premiss promoted by Ribot's use of his 'letter to Eusebius' as a source for his *De institutione*—became generally accepted. He is found throughout Bale's notebooks and in the sources Bale used. The *Life* of Cyril transcribed by Bale into Bodleian Library MS 73 has already been discussed.[136] Cyril was not originally a Carmelite invention, but a product of the Spiritual

---

[134] Scrope, *Chronicon*, ix. pp. 185–6.
[135] The grand master of the Hospital was Nicholas Lorgne, and of the Temple, William of Beaujeu.
[136] See above, Ch. 6.

Franciscan interest in apocalyptic prophecy around the end of the thir-
teenth century. Since he is described, in this first appearance, as *Cyrillus
carmelitus*, he could hardly be ignored by Carmelites interested in their
past. In general, Carmelites showed little tendency toward Joachimism
or the extremes of apocalyptic revelation. Where prophecy is used as a
tool for affirming Carmelite historical traditions, as in the *Life* of Cyril
or the *Life* of Angelus, it is coupled with assurances of orthodoxy. Yet
pockets of interest in apocalyptic literature are evident. Bale, for ex-
ample, noted in Harley 1819 the work of the Franciscan John of
Rupescissa on the Cyrilline prophecies.[137] In Bodleian Library MS 73
he made notes on the vision of Telesphorus of Cosenza in the 1380s re-
garding the schism in the Church, which itself is based on the *Oraculum
Cyrilli*.[138] A fourteenth-century manuscript, now in the Archivio
Generale of the Carmelite Order, contains the *Oraculum Cyrilli* along
with Arnold of Villanova's *De adventu antichristi* and his commentary on
Matthew, extracts from Joachim of Fiore, and other Joachimist works
of Spiritual Franciscan provenance.[139] John of Hildesheim, the first
Carmelite historical writer to have demonstrated knowledge of the
prophet Cyril, owned a manuscript of the *Oraculum Cyrilli*, which must
have been the inspiration for the Carmelite *Vita* in the Bodleian manu-
script.[140]

From the early fourteenth century onward, lists of papal confirma-
tions of the order appear embedded in Carmelite historical literature.
One variant of the continuation to the *Universis christifidelibus* dates the
first such confirmation to 1180.[141] The *De inceptione ordinis* (1324) also
gives this date, followed by a second confirmation by Innocent III in
1198. The papal role in authenticating the order was obviously crucial
in making the case that the order pre-dated 1215. This made the am-
bivalence of Gregory X toward the Carmelites in 1272 particularly
painful, and, as we have seen, fourteenth-century Carmelites insisted
that, far from threatening the order with suppression, Gregory had in
fact confirmed it at the Second Council of Lyons.[142] It must have been

---

[137] London, BL Harley MS 1819, fo. 118ᵛ.

[138] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 41ʳ⁻ᵛ.

[139] Selge, 'Un codice quattrocentesco'. The manuscript was probably written in Florence
in the late fourteenth century. Selge suggests (167 n. 3) that Carmelite interest in Cyril may be
explained by confusion with Cyril of Alexandria. I have argued, however, that interest in
Cyril of Alexandria arose from quite different sources and in different circumstances. Al-
though both Cyrils were known, and identified as Carmelites, by John of Hildesheim, he
does not appear to have thought they were the same person.

[140] Hendriks, 'Register of the Letters', 118.

[141] *MCH* 84–90.   [142] See above, 155.

from this that a tradition developed according to which Gregory had visited Mt Carmel before becoming pope.[143] The visit to Mt Carmel is quite plausible, since Gregory had, as archdeacon of Liège before being elected pope, taken part in the Lord Edward's Crusade of 1270–2. If he was impressed by what he found, he did not let this stand in the way of the imperatives of ecclesiastical reform in 1272.

If it was more difficult for Carmelites to appropriate the recent past than the early Church, it was also less desirable. Since the underlying premiss of all Carmelite historical apologetic was continuity, the areas in need of greatest attention were the periods about which Carmelite claims could be least substantiated. The crusader period was of crucial importance, to be sure, because the twelfth-century settlement of Mt Carmel by Frankish hermits was needed to explain the seamless continuity between Orthodox and Latin worlds. But the essentials of this tradition had already been laid out by the fourteenth-century texts, culminating with Ribot. Carmelites between Ribot and Bale had little to add, other than the random inclusion of figures such as Sybil of Flanders. The most ambitious medieval addition to the tradition was the attempt to create a link between Gerard of Csanád and Berthold, but one wonders how convincing this could have been to contemporaries. The errors of dating are too obvious, the plot too romantic, for readers to whom William of Tyre and the chroniclers of the First Crusade were readily available. The reticence of Carmelites for crusading can be seen reflected in the comparatively weak tradition of medieval accretions to Carmelite history in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. For one thing, crusading itself had changed; the campaigns against the Turks were now fought in the Balkans, not Palestine. Then again, the early Church offered greater possibilities for establishing the Carmelite *legenda*. In a time of new philological discoveries about patristic authors and their age, it was to the Apostles, the early Church, and the Fathers that fifteenth-century Carmelites looked to bolster their credibility, rather than to the long periods in between.

OBSERVATIONS ON CARMELITE HISTORICAL METHOD: JOHN BALE AND THE APPROPRIATION OF THE PAST

The appropriation of some figures from the early Christian past, and the apparent invention of others, to create a chronology of monasticism

---

[143] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 61ᵛ. A papal privilege of the 1260s granted an indulgence to pilgrims visiting the Carmelites' house on Mt Carmel: *Bull. Carm.* i. 28–9.

on Mt Carmel, can appear so fantastic as to discredit in our eyes the whole Carmelite enterprise. Yet it was a natural development of Carmelite historical writing up to that point. The wider historiographical implications of the enterprise are addressed in the final chapter; here the more limited question of how that process was carried out, and how it ended up in the form that we find in Bale's unedited works, is addressed.

The form of the *Cronica seu fasciculus temporum ordinis Carmelitarum* is indicative of Bale's own perception of the work he was attempting. In essence the *Cronica* is a list or catalogue of individuals, arranged chronologically from Elijah onward, who were either themselves Carmelites or had some association with Mt Carmel. The names of the individuals are encircled on the page in red, sometimes with relevant dates. Further entries at the foot of most pages fill out details of the encircled names, and sometimes add new names of figures not considered to be Carmelites themselves but to have enjoyed some connection with Mt Carmel or the order. The form of the *Cronica* thus appears to imitate genealogical rolls of dynasties or families. A closer parallel might perhaps be made with the fifteenth-century genealogical 'world chronicle' now in the Brotherton Library in Leeds (MS 100), in which parallel columns of text are threaded through by a network of red circles containing the names of prominent people featuring in the chronicle.[144]

The implication of using this genre for a history of a religious order is that monasticism on Mt Carmel was a kind of non-biological dynasty, maintained unbroken from one generation to the next. A proven dynasty was a guarantee of continuity, which was of course what Carmelite writers had sought to establish as the corner-stone of their historical writing since the thirteenth century. Bale's method, though in some ways crude—and, indeed, abandoned in the final form of his history—reveals clearly the prevailing mentality in Carmelite self-perception. Carmelite history could be, and sometimes was, reduced to an essential list of names and dates.[145]

[144] Neil Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, iii: Lampeter–Oxford* (Oxford, 1983), 60–2. Oliver Pickering, 'The Crusades in Leeds University Library's Genealogical History Roll', in Alan V. Murray (ed.), *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095–1500*, International Medieval Research, 3 (Turnhout, 1998), 251–66, compares Brotherton MS 100 with John Rylands University Library MS Fr. 99, another fifteenth-century manuscript roll with roundels.

[145] e.g. William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*.

The *Cronica* does not purport to be an original composition. The full title cites as sources Giles Faber, Laurence Burreau, John Paleonydorus, Arnold Bostius, Nicholas Haarlem, and Julian Hassart—all authors whom Bale had encountered on his searches in Carmelite libraries in the Low Countries and France. With the exception of the Frenchman Burreau, they are all Flemish or Dutch, though of course they were themselves dependent on a range of sources representing a wider geographical diversity. In Bodleian Library MS 73, Bale lists other Carmelite writers whose works he used. For example, in Antwerp he read the *Catalogum sanctorum et virorum illustrium aliquot ordinis Carmelitarum* by John Currifex, a German Carmelite writing in 1510. This work—which no longer survives—was itself a compendium of Carmelite writers, including John of Jerusalem, Cyril of Constantinople, Sibert de Beka, and William of Sandwich (in other words, Ribot's *De institutione*), Grossus, Baconthorpe, Jean de Cheminot, Jean de Venette, Bostius, John Gluel, Jean de Malines, and John Soreth. The same names crop up regularly in lists throughout the Bodleian manuscript. Access to one author thus opened up a range of material from other authors.

The reader of Bale's notebooks is often confronted by lists: of priors-general, of Carmelite graduates from the University of Paris, of notable Carmelite writers, or simply of notable Carmelites, even of patriarchs of Jerusalem.[146] In some cases the lists seem to overlap, so that, for example, a list of priors-general includes many of the same names as in lists of Carmelite writers. In this way the functions of some Carmelites about whom very little was known came to be amplified; so, for example, Cyril of Constantinople is first encountered in Carmelite literature as a prophet (and therefore a writer), but comes to be included among the early priors-general, and is treated as such by Ribot. The fifteenth-century *Life* found in Bodleian Library MS 73, in which Cyril's election to the prior-generalship is assumed, is thus a develop-

---

[146] e.g. priors-provincial of England in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fo. 161, and London, BL Harley MS 3838, fo. 43^{r-v}; priors-general in BL Cotton Titus MS D X, fo. 129^v; Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fos. 12^r–20^v; Harley MS 1819, fos. 107^r–108^r; Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722, fo. 116^v; foundations of English Carmelite houses in Cotton Titus MS D X, fos. 127–8; Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. iii^v; Carmelite provinces in Cotton Titus MS D X, fo. 129^v; priors-provincial of Germany in Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 36^r; foundations outside England in ibid., fo. iii^v; Carmelite authors in ibid., fos. 1^r–8^r; Cotton Titus MS D X, fos. 129^r–130^v; patriarchs of Jerusalem in Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 16^r; people buried in English Carmelite convents in ibid., fos. 51^r–52^v; priors of the Cambridge convent in ibid., fo. 79^r; early popes in ibid., fo. 136^r; Carmelite graduates in theology at Paris in Harley MS 1819, fos. 54^v–57^r.

ment from the early habit of simply naming significant figures in the corporate memory of the order. Similarly, Berthold appears simply as a prior-general in lists post-dating Ribot's *De institutione*, but also becomes a theologian in Bale's *Cronica*, because of the same tendency to borrow, or cross-fertilize, from one list to another.[147] The list of Carmelite students who graduated in theology in Paris between 1295 and 1360, in Harley MS 1819, probably served as notes for Bale's *De preclariis ordinis Carmeli scriptoribus ac theologis catalogus*, written in 1536–7/40. The final version of the *De preclariis*, however, also includes Berthold, whose initial significance was as a monk with gifts of leadership rather than a scholar.[148] But it also includes Gerard of Nazareth, the twelfth-century bishop of Laodicea, who was not a Carmelite, but whose account of eremitical monasticism in the Holy Land in his own day was known to fourteenth-century Carmelites, and whom Bale recorded in his *Cronica* as a figure connected with Mt Carmel.[149]

Carmelite historians, naturally, used and quoted from non-Carmelite sources. Bale notes as early sources Jerome's *De illustribus viris*, Philo (which he certainly did not read in the original), the *Historia Tripartita*, Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History* (cited separately but almost certainly known to Bale through the *Historia Tripartita*), Hegesippus's *De clavibus Iudeorum*, which is probably a bastardized version of Joesphus's *Jewish Antiquities*, cited separately, John Cassian's *De vitis patrum*, Epiphanius's *In suo paradiso*, and Priscian's *Cosmographia*.[150] More recent sources noted by Bale include Jacques de Vitry's *Historia Orientalis*, John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*, William of Tripoli's *De statu Sarracenorum*, Otto of Freising's *De origine mundi* and *De gestis Frederici*, and the chronicles of Henry of Huntingdon and Florence of Worcester.[151]

[147] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fo. 147^v, where Berthold is called 'sacra pagine doctor'.

[148] Bale, *De preclariis*, fo. 157^r.

[149] Ibid. Gerard was mentioned by Ribot, John of Hildesheim, and Bernard Oller, all writing in the 1370s: Kedar, 'Gerard of Nazareth', 74–7. Bale evidently knew a different manuscript of the *De conversatione*, since his list of hermits differs; see Jotischky, 'Gerard of Nazareth', John Hornby also knew two further works by Gerard, the *De una Magdalena contra Grecos* and the *Contra Salam presbyterum*, which he cites in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86, fo. 202^r, on which see Jotischky, 'Gerard of Nazareth, Mary Magdalene and Latin Relations with the Greek Orthodox in the Latin East in the Twelfth Century', *Levant*, 29 (1997), 217–26.

[150] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 27, 156$^{r–v}$.

[151] Ibid., fo. 156$^{r–v}$. John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* vii. 21 (*Eremitae Baptistam Salvatoris, et filios prophetarum sue institutionis habent Autores*) was cited by Scrope, *Chronicon*, ii, p. 175, as a reference to the early Carmelites. In this passage, John, discussing true and false religious, mentions by

The Greek sources, of course, presented a problem, both in terms of availability and the ability to read them. Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, for example, was not available in a printed edition before 1544, and few manuscript copies are known in the West before that date, even supposing that Carmelite scholars could have read them. Eusebius was instead known from the Latin translation made by Jerome and Rufinus in the fourth century. But Eusebius, once known even in a translation, was a Pandora's box, for the *Ecclesiastical History* cites portions of authors known to Eusebius but now lost, as part of the process of memorializing Christian martyrs and heroes.[152] Thus a fourth-century Latin translator could provide Carmelite scholars with otherwise unknown sources which could themselves be appropriated as Carmelites. This happened, for example, with the late first-century author Hegesippus, whose *Acts* was used extensively by Eusebius. Bale's *Perpaucorum* lists Hegesippus as a Jew who became a Carmelite and wrote a history of the early Church and other works on the pseudo-prophets, the Persian wars, and the Maccabees.[153] Similarly, Carmelite careers are established retrospectively for Telesphorus, Agabus, Ignatius, Narcissus, and Serapion. Other apparent indications of a knowledge on the part of Bale or his sources of early Christian history in Greek must also be explained through intermediary Latin sources. The list of patriarchs of Jerusalem in Bale's notes presumably derives from the list in William of Malmesbury rather than from the Orthodox tradition.[154]

Two kinds of borrowings, or appropriations, are discernible. First, Carmelites who were already established as pivotal figures in the order's history are given an authorial function that was not part of their original biography. Second, non-Carmelites whose works had a bearing on the history of monasticism, particularly in Palestine, are linked to the order because of their literary functions. This process indicates

name the Carthusians, Cistercians, and Cluniacs, but, naturally, not the Carmelites, who did not yet exist. The generic *eremitae* serves instead to identify the Carmelites. The list of books owned by Bale and lost in his flight from Ireland in 1553 includes the English chroniclers Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury, Gerald of Wales, Ralph Diceto, Roger of Howden, Roger of Wendover, Matthew Paris, Rishanger, Ranulph Higden, Nicholas Trivet, and John Capgrave, as well as the *Flores Historiarum* and copies of most of the Carmelite authors and some patristic works. The complete list is given in McCusker, *John Bale*, 32–47.

[152] See Robert Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford, 1980), 22–32.

[153] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fo. 134ᵛ.

[154] Oxford Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 16ʳ. After Simeon II (d. 1098) the Latin patriarchs are given until Ralph de Merencourt (1220s), when the Greek name Nicodemus, taken presumably from the *Life of St Angelo*, is given, followed by two other spurious patriarchs, Honorius and John, the latter of whom was presumably Angelo's brother.

the importance in the creation of the Carmelite *historia* of textual memory. A textual source that could be used to testify to the putative history of the Carmelites was presumably more authoritative if a tangible connection to the order could be made. Carmelite scholars understood the need for sources to support their version of history, even if their use of the source material does not always employ the logic of modern historical objectivity. Of course, those who wrote monastic history tended to be monks themselves, so appropriations did not necessarily lack plausibility. Just as Gerard of Nazareth anachronistically became a Carmelite in Bale's *De preclariis*, so Rufinus of Aquileia, who had been a witness to Eastern monasticism in an earlier age, is listed not just as a source in support of the general picture of a thriving monastic institution in Palestine in the fourth century, but as himself a Carmelite. Underlying these appropriations lies the literary genre represented by Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, a copy of which was owned by Bale and which he cited as a source. The textual tradition of listing *viri praeclarii* was taken up by Isidore of Seville, and subsequently, in the eleventh century, by Sigebert of Gembloux in his *Catalogus*. The evolution of the Carmelite *catalogus sanctorum* in the fourteenth century represents a Carmelite version of this genre. Bostius and Burreau, writing in the late fifteenth century, were the fullest exponents of the tradition within the order. The exclusively Carmelite form of their *viri praeclarii* emphasizes the tendency of Carmelite writers to see the history of monasticism as, in essence, a history of their own order.

The use made of such witnesses to the antiquity of monasticism on Mt Carmel appears at first sight puzzling. As an example, let us take the 'order of prophets' mentioned by Eusebius in a reference to Philo, and known to medieval Carmelites through Jerome. The passage in question nowhere mentions Mt Carmel itself, but simply the prophetic activities of the early followers of Christ. The connection to Mt Carmel comes from Ribot's historical synthesis, in which prophecy as an activity was linked to the 'monastic life' lived on Mt Carmel by Elijah, Elisha, and subsequent prophets. The link is entirely self-referential, and follows an internal logic established by the corporate memory of the order. Because the prophets from Elijah onward were 'Carmelites', all persons who demonstrate prophetic abilities, just as all those who lived a monastic or proto-monastic life, are demonstrably Carmelites. Bale and his immediate sources for the *Perpaucorum*, such as Hassart, Paleonydorus, and Scrope, were following the historical assumptions of earlier generations.

The survival of Bale's travel notebooks enables us to see how the diverse traditions making up the Carmelite *historia* could be codified into a single unitary structure. For example, Gerard, the Venetian monk who became bishop of Csanád in the early eleventh century, appears in several places in Bale's works. In the *Perpaucorum* of 1536–7 he is listed as the disciple of Symeon of Syracuse, a hermit of Mt Carmel and later patriarch of Antioch who went to Rome in 1037 to appeal for military aid from the pope against the Saracens, but was sent by Benedict IX as legate to the German emperor. He foretold the birth of Berthold, and was martyred preaching to the Hungarians in 1042.[155] In his draft version of the *Perpaucorum*, the *Cronica*, written *c*.1530 but incorporating additions up to 1536, Bale had also mentioned Gerard's literary activity and given fuller details of the martyrdom.[156] The dates also differed slightly: in the *Cronica* Gerard is said to have flourished *c*.1037 and died in 1045, whereas in the *Perpaucorum* 1037 is specified as the date of his departure for Rome, and 1042 for his martyrdom. The material for both works came from Bale's extensive reading of previous Carmelite historians. Bale encountered Gerard—probably for the first time—on his continental travels in 1520–8. In the Carmelite convent at Toulouse in 1527, for example, he read and copied an *Oracio de sancto Gerardo episcopo et martire*.[157] This seems to indicate that Gerard's feast was celebrated by Carmelites, at least in south-west France. In Bruges, Bale saw a painting in which Gerard was represented among many other saints of the Church, including exclusively Carmelite ones such as Berthold and Brocard, but also St Francis, St Louis, St Andrew, and others.[158] At Malines, Bale copied a list of Carmelite notables that begins with Archos and the Essenes, includes Hilarion, Pope Telesphorus, John of Jerusalem, and Gerard, though here no further information about Gerard is given.[159] The Carmelites of Antwerp, who celebrated a very full list of early Church figures as members of their order, listed Gerard chronologically between Anastasius the Persian and Peter the Hermit.[160] Gerard was also known at Angiens, where Bale notes his

---

[155] Bale, *Perpaucorum*, fos. 152ᵛ–153ʳ.

[156] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fo. 145ʳ. Gerard was author of the *Deliberatio supra hymnum trium Puerorum*, ed. G. Silagi, CCCM 49 (Turnhout, 1978); see G. Morin, 'Un Théologien ignoré du XIe siècle: l'évêque martyr, Gérard de Csanád, OSB', *Revue Bénédictine*, 27 (1910), 517; also E. Nemerkényi, 'Latin Classics in Medieval Hungary', in M. Baumbach (ed.), *Tradita et Inventa: Beiträge zur Rezeption der Antike* (Heidelberg, 2000), 49–52.

[157] London, BL Harley MS 1819, fo. 99ᵛ.

[158] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 9ᵛ.

[159] Ibid., fo. 20ʳ.

[160] Ibid., fo. 23ᵛ.

authorship of homilies on the Assumption, as well as his martyrdom,[161] and he appears a further five times in Bale's travel notes for 1526–7.[162] The cult of Gerard among Carmelites—a cult quite distinct from that in Hungary—was therefore widespread, at least in those provinces in which Bale travelled. The final version of Gerard's story as it appears in Bale's catalogue of Carmelites was culled from a variety of local observances.

Another example of Bale's scholarly method demonstrates his knowledge and use of non-Carmelite sources. Immediately after the entry for Gerard in his *Cronica*, Bale mentions a hermit called Gunther. The entry is squeezed on to the bottom of two successive folios, so that in fact it appears below Symeon of Syracuse on one folio and below Gerard on the next.[163] All that Bale tells us about Gunther is that he was a German who lived a solitary life of contemplation for about thirty years from 1008 until his death in 1047. There is no mention of his having been a Carmelite or having had any connection to the Holy Land. Bale does, however, mention his source as 'Lambert'. Lambert of Hersfeld does indeed tell the story of Gunther the hermit.[164] There is no mention of Gunther in any other work by Bale, nor does he appear to have encountered him on his continental travels. The entry for Gunther must be a later addition to the *Cronica*, inserted as Bale discovered him in Lambert's chronicle. But why was he reading Lambert? And why was this German hermit with no apparent Carmelite connection included in the *Cronica*? In Lambert's chronicle, the passages immediately preceding the story of Gunther mention Gerard of Csanád. Bale must have come across Gunther while reading Lambert's chronicle in order to check details of the life of Gerard from this eleventh-century source, and then inserted him into his own *Cronica* near Gerard of Csanád because of his appearance near him in Lambert's text. It is true that there was no connection to Mt Carmel; but the same could be said, after all, about Gerard, if one used Lambert as the only source. Gunther may represent an attempt, abandoned in the final version of the Carmelite catalogue, to appropriate another Western hermit as a Carmelite, simply on the grounds that he lived a solitary—and thus a 'Carmelite'—life.

[161] Ibid., fo. 29[r].

[162] Ibid., fos. 63[r], 110[r], 137[v], 140[v]–141[v], 162[r].

[163] Bale, *Cronica*, fos. 144[v], 145[v]. There is a blank page, fo. 145[v], in between.

[164] Lambert of Hersfeld, *Annales*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, in *MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicorum* (Hannover, 1894), 50–61.

Bale's historical notebooks are confusing documents. This is doubtless in part because they were never intended to be read as a whole. Yet to do so is to see the scaffolding of the Carmelite historical enterprise—not simply the edifice completed by Bale, but the entire process, from the composition of the *rubrica prima* onward. From the repetitive and sometimes contradictory notes—some historical, some geographical, some historiographical, some relating to particular houses and comprising little more than necrologies, others to the English province alone, and all interspersed with observations on Elijah, on the history of monasticism, on the papacy—emerges a genuine sense of how a corporate history was composed. There is no apparent system: Bale selects, like a magpie, what attracts him. Yet a consistent theme is discernible throughout the notebooks, as too in more finished form in his catalogue of Carmelite writers: namely, the relationship between the Carmelite Order—the idea of monasticism as developed by Elijah and passed on to the prophets—and the Church as a whole. At times, Bale appears to be implying that all monastic activity is equivalent to, or derives from, the monasticism of Mt Carmel. Yet the *Perpaucorum*, for example, does not claim all early Christian monks as Carmelites. Some figures are merely placed alongside 'known' Carmelites as reference points, as if to show how the Carmelite strand of monasticism operated within the wider Christian society. This is apparent also from Bodleian Library MS 73 and BL MS Harley 1819. The bulk of Bale's notes relate to Carmelite themes. Yet there are other notes filling in, as it were, the background of Christian history. The list of the patriarchs of Jerusalem is one such example. Another is the note explaining how, in 471, monks and virgins from Palestine sailed to Rome to seek refuge from Saracen attack; still another the series of notes from Jacques de Vitry's *Historia Hierosolymitana*, in which the Black Mountain is discussed.[165] Many others could be chosen. These notes show the historical mind at work, compiling background material relevant to the main theme. The questionable accuracy of the material does not detract from its purpose and what it shows us of Bale's method, which was to assemble all available material relating to Palestinian monasticism and the Carmelite Order, so as to demonstrate how the history of the order reflected the continuum of Christian history outside it.

To see in Bale's notes an ecclesiology of the Carmelites may be attributing to them too much sophistication. Yet Carmelite historiog-

---

[165] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 16ʳ, 46ʳ; London, BL Harley MS 1819, fo. 103ᵛ.

raphy differed from that of the other mendicant orders, not only in the sheer length of the chronology developed by Carmelite scholars, but also because, unlike the other orders, Carmelite history was based on the principle of narrative continuity, rather than reform and renewal. Carmelite scholars came to see their order as the bearer of a particular strand of Christian living, throughout the vicissitudes of the history of the Church.[166] Bale's notebooks demonstrate amply his debt to this tradition of ecclesiology.

This may appear a strange apprenticeship for a scholar who was to leave his order, and the Catholic Church, to embrace the Reformation. An ecclesiology of reform in which the historical identity of the order was defined by its symbolic identity as the 'type' of the ideal Christian life, might have provided a more suitable school in which to receive the theological arguments of the Protestant reformers. Continuity, after all, was hardly the ideal which Bale brought to his own ministry after his conversion. Bale's biographer observed that '[T]he new wine of Bale's radical theology had not yet burst these old wineskins of convention'.[167] A change is discernible, however, in Bale's growing criticism of the Carmelites of his own day from the 1530s onward. One sign of his dissatisfaction with Catholicism was his rejection of clerical celibacy, but he also attacked other, specifically Carmelite traditions.[168]

Bale's later work on English historiography lost its Carmelite focus, but remained substantially the same kind of scholarly endeavour in which he had been engaged since early adulthood. Indeed, his researches on behalf of the Carmelite Order, never published in his lifetime, bore fruit in the great *Scriptorium Maioris Britanniae Catalogus*, published in 1544–7 and supplemented by a second part in 1557–9. Some of Bale's Carmelite research was published, ironically, in a Protestant historical encyclopaedia, the *Ecclesiastical History* of the Magdeburg Centuriators. The surviving correspondence between Bale and the leading figure behind the Centuriators, Matthias Flacius Illyricus, demonstrates the importance of Bale as a source for the history of the medieval Church, and particularly for portions of the *Ecclesiastical History* bearing on monastic history.[169]

[166] Jotischky, 'Some Mendicant Views', 38–47, and see Ch. 8 below.

[167] Fairfield, *John Bale*, 50–1; see also London, BL Harley MS 3838, fos. 4^r–5^r, 15^r, for continued adherence to Catholic conventions.

[168] The last two chapters of *Anglorum Heliades*, e.g., are critical of contemporary Carmelites.

[169] London, BL Cotton Titus MS D X, fo. 181^v; McCusker, *John Bale*, 68–71, for text of letters exchanged between Bale and Illyricus; see also Jotischky, 'Gerard of Nazareth', 223–4.

It is not very surprising that the Centuriators should have made use of the scholarship of a Carmelite who had become a Protestant and was in exile on the Continent. Its significance, however, lies in the underlying historical sense that was common to both enterprises to which Bale lent his scholarship, the Carmelite and the Protestant. Both sought legitimation from the past: first, in establishing that the roots of their profession must be sought in the distant past, and second, in re-telling a complete narrative to justify such a claim. Protestant reformers argued that they were not innovating, but simply dismantling an edifice that should never have been built, in the desire to return to an apostolic form of Christianity. They rejected the accretion of doctrine in the intervening centuries since the apostolic age. For a man trained in Carmelite history and historical method, the search for doctrinal integrity in the distant past, and particularly in the age of the apostolic Church, was no revolution. Bale, after all, knew that real monasticism—Carmelite monasticism—took its origin from the 'order of prophets', and straddled the Old and New Law. He may, on turning Protestant, have abandoned much of what his Carmelite predecessors—Baconthorpe, Terrenus, Jean de Cheminot, and others—had held dear: namely, a fierce papalism and the understanding that continuity implied adapting to external circumstances without compromising fundamental ideals. But he never abandoned the historical method that had sustained generations of Carmelite scholars in maintaining those cherished ideals. To the end, some part of John Bale remained Carmelite, if only in remembering that present realities cannot be explained without a sense of the past, and that the search for truth is in essence a quest for origins.

Patterns of Historical Thinking in the Mendicant Orders

The patterns of thought expressed by Carmelites about their own history were part of a much broader process of enquiry by religious into the question of the origins and purpose of the monastic profession. Carmelites' reflections on their corporate past amount to a series of related discussions on the function and identity of the order to which they belonged, and how that order fitted into a schematic understanding of God's direction of the history of humanity. These ideas were not conceived in a vacuum. The historical consciousness of Carmelite writers developed alongside that among Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinian Hermits. It is no coincidence that similar trends in the corporate memories of these orders emerge at roughly the same period, from the mid-thirteenth century to the mid-fifteenth. Sometimes, indeed, they developed in dialogue with, or in reaction against, each other—as, for example, in the debates between Carmelites and Dominicans in the fourteenth century.

Equally, these broadly analogous patterns of thinking might be seen as ways of responding to the same external forces. Just as the Carmelite Order was galvanized by the Second Council of Lyons into developing its historical identity, so the Augustinian Hermits reacted to the council in similar ways, albeit more slowly. Classed by Gregory X, along with the Carmelites, as 'doubtful', with their status in need of resolution, the Augustinians in the fourteenth century began to develop an authoritative narrative of their history. Many Franciscans were also troubled by the council. Although the reasons for Franciscan discontent stemmed from problems brewing within the order itself, the effect was broadly similar—an attempt by certain Franciscans to scrutinize their corporate memory in order to present a particular

interpretation of the past according to which their view of what it meant to be a Franciscan might be confirmed.[1] The Dominicans, who of all the mendicants emerged from the council with the greatest enhancement to their status,[2] had already by the 1270s long been engaged in the same business, albeit in subtler and less confrontational ways.

This chapter will examine three themes in the treatment of the past by the other mendicant orders: ecclesiology (by which I mean the understanding of the history and function of the Church and of particular institutions within it), hagiography, and prophecy. Of necessity, this will take the form of a sketch rather than a landscape. The intention is not to compare like with like, but rather to show how the Carmelites' rivals wrestled with similar intellectual problems.

The theme of how the Church and its history were to be understood runs throughout this book, for of course this question was inseparable from those that the Carmelite writers were trying to answer about their own order. In developing their corporate memories, the Carmelites and Augustinians in particular relied upon the context of a wider historical continuum. Both orders developed historical narratives, rather than relying on typological exegesis, to explain their pasts. For them, narrative was essential to explaining where they fitted into the Christian family. Their identities, and thus their functions, depended on establishing not simply a particular starting-point in time but a verifiable continuity. To put it in deliberately oversimplified terms, one might say that whereas the Dominicans used the Church's past to demonstrate that they were traditional monks adapting to new requirements, and the Franciscans opted for Scripture as the sole basis of historical authority, the Augustinian writers I shall examine here relied, like the Carmelites, upon a linear narrative.[3]

---

[1] For a recent survey of Franciscan historiography, see B. Roest, *Reading the Book of History: Intellectual Contexts and Educational Functions of Franciscan Historiography 1220–c.1350* (Groeningen, 1996).

[2] D-A. Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs 1263–1323*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1903–20), ii. 86–7, 97–8, highlights the role of the Dominicans in preparing the ground for the council, and argues that the order's prominence in setting the agenda provoked further the hostility to the mendicants of the secular clergy.

[3] By way of a caveat, I should explain that I do not intend to suggest that *all* Dominicans or Franciscans invariably followed the same patterns of thought. As I will show, Dominicans also saw themselves as fulfillers of scriptural prophecies, and some Franciscans also looked to the Church's past to locate the origins of their ideals. For an introduction to the problem of

The Augustinian Hermits

The Augustinians shared with the Carmelites the problem of having no specific founder-figure around whose memory a cult might develop. The order was created in the Great Union engineered in 1256 by Cardinal Ricardo Annibaldi. The Hermits had constituted a number of diverse eremitical groups in Italy, with varying degrees of canonical status but all following the Rule of St Augustine or a close variant.[4] The title 'Augustinian' thus referred to the manner of living rather than—as in the case of some of the new order's constituent groups such as the 'John Bonini' or the 'Williamites'—the memory or ideals of an individual. Such, at least, was the intention. But the need to establish a historical identity that would enable the Augustinian Hermits to clear the hurdle of the Second Council of Lyons seems to have pushed Augustine himself into the forefront. The Hermits' struggle for legitimacy came to centre on the claim that they had been founded by Augustine of Hippo immediately after his conversion, and had maintained a continuous and parallel existence in Italy as eremitical communities since then. This claim provided the Hermits with a focus for unity and a historical identity in the guise of a single person. By claiming Augustine of Hippo as their founder, they were combining two of the themes found in the writings of the Dominicans and the Franciscans on the one hand and the Carmelites on the other. Augustine provided the order with a founder of immense prestige, while the claim that Augustine had founded the order rested upon proving an unbroken continuity between the age of the Fathers and the Great Union.

The Augustinian claim was complicated by the prior existence of the Augustinian Canons, who not unnaturally felt that the new arrivals had little right to infer the person of Augustine as founder simply because they followed his rule. The Canons protested that they alone had been founded by Augustine in his capacity as bishop. In response, the Hermits argued, variously, that the Canons had been founded not by Augustine but instead by Rufus, the initiator of the community of St Ruf at Marseille, and that since the Canons did not constitute a distinct

Carmelite, as opposed to Franciscan, ecclesiology, see Thomas Turley, '*Ab apostolorum temporibus*'. For comparison of Augustinian and Carmelite method, see Kasper Elm, 'Elias, Paulus von Theben und Augustinus als Ordensgründer', in Hans Patze (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstein im später Mittelalter*, Vorträge und Forschungen, 31 (Sigmaringen, 1987), 371–97.

4 Elm, 'Italienische Eremitengemeinschaften'. See also Roth, 'Cardinal Richard Annibaldi'.

order in the same sense as the Hermits, their claim to have been founded by Augustine was historically invalid.[5] The argument was in essence a variant of that over the qualities of different forms of the monastic life that had been so prevalent in the twelfth century.[6]

In 1327 the Hermits appeared to have won recognition for their claim when they were granted custody by John XXII of the tomb of Augustine in the church of San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro in Pavia.[7] This victory inspired a corpus of apologetic literature in the mid-fourteenth century comparable to, but on a smaller scale than, that undertaken by the Carmelites. The tone had already been set by the claim made by the order's prior-general, William of Cremona, in a document of 1326, in which the Augustinian Hermits were described as the third pillar supporting the edifice of the Church.[8] The first apologetic treatise was the *Treatise on the Origin and Development of the Order of Hermit Friars and its True and Real Title* by Henry of Friemar (*c.*1245–1340). Henry's treatise was written in 1334, and is thus contemporaneous with Baconthorpe's later Carmelite work, with which it shares many common preoccupations. Although his was the first outline of the origin and development of his order, Henry understood, like Baconthorpe, the need to do more than simply write a narrative history of the order. The treatise is a threefold defence of the title 'Augustinian'. Augustine is proved to be the order's founder by analysis of his mode of conversion to Christianity, the act of conversion itself, and by deeds and sayings authenticated by tradition.[9] Briefly, Henry's case is that Augustine was converted by the example of Simplicianus, a hermit who had established a small community in Milan. After baptism, Augustine lived in this community

---

[5] The background to the controversy, and a dramatic moment in the conflict, are described by Kaspar Elm, 'Augustinus Canonicus—Augustinus Eremita'. The Hermits' argument was summed up in Paolo Ulmeo's *Libellus de apologia religionis fratrum heremitarum ordinis S. Augustini contra falso imaginantes* (Rome, 1479), but the dispute was temporarily silenced by the bull *Quia apostolus praecepit* of 1484.

[6] Constable, *Reformation of the Twelfth Century*, 128–35.

[7] *Veneranda sanctorum patrum* was promulgated on 20 Jan. 1327: L. Empoli, *Bullarium ordinis Eremitarum ab Innocentio III usque ad Urbanum VIII* (Rome, 1628), 195–202. The Hermits were permitted to establish a convent adjoining the church of San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro, and to celebrate offices inside the church, which had long been reserved for Regular Canons alone.

[8] 'Litterae prioris generalis fr. Guilelmi da Cremona', *Analecta Augustiniana*, 4 (1911–12), 29–32.

[9] Richard Arbesmann, (ed.), 'Henry of Friemar's *Treatise on the Origin and Development of the Order of Hermit Friars and its True and Real Title*', *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956), 37–145. The Canons' immediate response was an anonymous treatise, *Correctorium tractatus de origine et processu ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augustini, vero ac proprio titulo eiusdem*, a copy of which precedes Henry's treatise in one of its seven extant manuscripts: Rome, Bibl. Vat. Reg. Lat. 565, fos. 1–28ᵛ.

for a year before setting up with companions of his own in Tuscany. He gathered together several hermits at a place he called Centumcellis, the first conventual site of the order, and handed down to them a rule and a formula for living. He lived there himself for two years before returning to Africa, where he brought to his new episcopal duties the ideals forged in Centumcellis.[10] The implication is clear: Augustine was first and foremost a hermit, and whatever regulations for his priests he may have made as bishop (from which the Canons Regular claimed direct descent) derived from his prior leadership of eremitical communities. The Hermit friars, in other words, preceded the Canons both chronologically and in spiritual significance.

Fruitful parallels can be found between Henry's method and that of John Baconthorpe. Like Baconthorpe, Henry rested his case on the authority of canon law. The three grounds on which Augustine can be said to have been a hermit (his companionship with Simplicianus while still a catechumen, his pursuit of the same manner of life in Tuscany after his mother's death, and his eremitical foundations in Italy and Africa) are first proved by accepted authority,[11] then further bolstered by papal confirmation. John XXII's declaration in consistory in 1327 that the Augustinian Hermits were the true sons of Augustine, and he their father, in effect settled the matter.[12] Papal decretals passed into the domain of canon law, and thus sat in judgement on the reliability of the historical narrative. In Henry's treatment of the order's origins it is not simply the Augustinian claim that is judged by canon law, but the narrative process, and indeed the historical method itself. The process by which papal decisions are reached, and the significance of the context in which bulls are promulgated, are of little relevance in this treatment of the past. To Henry, as to Baconthorpe, canon law had the power to verify a version of the past, and thus to sanctify the tradition of one particular order.

---

[10] Arbesmann (ed.), 'Henry of Friemar's *Treatise*', 90–7. See P. Monceaux, 'Saint Augustin et saint Antoine: contribution à l'histoire de monachisme', *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, 2 (1931), 72–86, for discussion of Augustine's foundations.

[11] The authorities Henry calls upon are Ambrose's *Sermo de baptismo et conversione* and Augustine's own *Sermo de passione*. The first of these, found in Rome, Bibl. Angelica MS 501, is now attributed to an imitator of Ambrose. The *Sermo de passione*, of uncertain authorship, is part of a collection of ten homilies to monks attributed by Migne to Caesarius of Arles: PL 67, cols. 1056–9. Homilies in similar form are also found attributed to Eusebius Gallicanus (*Collectio Homiliarum*, ed. Fr. Gloire, CCSL 101–101a (Turnhout, 1970–1), *passim*) and Eucherius of Lyons (PL 50, cols. 841–3). For discussion of authorship, see *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones*, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 103 (Turnhout, 1953), pp. xxxi–xxxii.

[12] Arbesmann (ed.), 'Henry of Friemar's *Treatise*', 101–2.

In the third chapter of his treatise, Henry departs from his narrative to prove from canon law the proposition that 'the order of hermit friars of St Augustine . . . is truly and rightly the sons of the blessed August-ine, and he is their true father'. This is shown by the fact that 'to no other order is ascribed the title "of Augustine" but this alone, although several other orders use his rule'.[13] Henry then takes issue with the standard usage for his order of 'hermits of the order of St Augustine', for the true title is 'order of hermit friars of St Augustine'. Anyone can be said to be 'of the order of Augustine' as long as they follow the Au-gustinian Rule, as do the Servite Friars, Dominicans, and Canons Regular. But the Hermit-Friars are so distinguished because among re-ligious living the eremitical life, they alone follow the Rule of August-ine and were founded by him. The title must reflect the fact that they are unique among hermits; thus one should speak of 'a friar of the order of hermit friars of St Augustine', but not of 'a friar of the hermit friars of the order of St Augustine'. 'For the [words] "of the order of" should not be taken to refer to [the words] "St Augustine", but to "her-mits".'[14] The Rule of Augustine was used by many religious who were not, properly speaking, members of the 'order of St Augustine' be-cause that form of words could be used only to describe the Hermit-Friars. Other orders might follow the Rule of Augustine, but did not enjoy the unique privilege of his name because they had, so to speak, adopted Augustine retrospectively, rather than been founded by him.

This last contention might seem rather an unconvincing piece of sophistry when one recalls the circumstances of 1256. Indeed, the Her-mits' argument must still rest on the notion of historical continuity: namely, that Augustine had founded communities of hermits who had remained faithful to his tradition during the intervening centuries. The Augustinian Hermits, like the Carmelites, found that historical narra-tive was necessary to establish canonical status, because it could ex-plain the reasons why a particular title had been given or adopted. In the 1270s, papal privileges were useful, but not sufficient, for an order that wanted to stand out from the large number of existing institutions, houses, and confraternities, and thus to survive in a competitive world. What one pope decreed could be undone or relaxed by a successor.

---

[13] Arbesmann (ed.), 'Henry of Friemar's *Treatise*', 99. Henry cites Gratian, *Decreta*, secunda pars, causa XIX, q. 3. c. 2 (ed. Friedberg, i. 840); *Decretalia Gregor IX*, lib. I, tit. XIV, c. 12 (ed. Friedberg, ii. 129–30), tit. VI, c. 52 (ii. 92), lib. V, tit. XXXI, c. 17 (ii. 842–3); *Sexti Decretal*, lib. III, tit. XVII, cap. un (ii. 1054).

[14] Arbesmann (ed.), 'Henry of Friemar's *Treatise*', 100.

Indeed, the survival of the Carmelites and Augustinian Hermits was due precisely to the confirmation of their status by Boniface VIII twenty years or so after the Second Council of Lyons had threatened to suppress them, in an action that could be construed as one pope undoing a predecessor's policy.

Henry's treatise was a start, but it left important lacunae in the Augustinians' case. His argument rests on whether Augustine of Hippo can plausibly be agreed to have been a hermit; if he was recognizably a hermit who founded eremitical communities in Italy, then the Augustinian Hermits were his successors. It is obvious why Henry took this line; for the order could not convincingly claim to have been founded by Augustine if Augustine himself could not be shown to have been involved in eremitism. But this was only half the story. Augustine may have founded eremitical groups, but this did not necessarily make the Williamites, Johnbonini, and other Italian groups in the Great Union of 1256 his foundations. What was necessary in order to complete the Augustinians' demonstration of antiquity was proof of the link between Centumcellis and the thirteenth-century hermits who became the Order of St Augustine.

This link was provided by a younger contemporary of Henry of Friemar, Jordan of Saxony or Quedlinburg.[15] Jordan, born probably in the 1290s, studied in Bologna and Paris between 1317 and 1322, and while lector at the Augustinian house at Erfurt in 1327, wrote a postill on the gospel of St Matthew. By 1343, however, he seems to have been actively collecting material for a history of his order. Some time after 1334 he completed a *Collectanea Augustiniana* which included a *Life* of Augustine.[16] Between 1346 and 1351 Jordan was provincial minister for Saxony-Thuringia, and the last record of him dates from 1365.[17] His *Liber vitasfratrum* survives in fourteen manuscripts, the earliest of which date from *c*.1360–80.

Jordan was fully aware of the tradition in which he was writing. The title is a deliberate echo of the fourth-century collection known as the *Vitas patrum*, and indeed much of the work seeks to draw parallels between Augustinian Hermits of Jordan's own day and the Desert

---

[15] Although he is more often known as Jordan of Saxony, I shall refer to him here as Jordan of Quedlinburg in order to avoid confusion with the Dominican Jordan of Saxony.

[16] Jordan of Saxony, *Liber vitasfratrum*, ed. R. Arbesmann and W. Hümpfner (New York, 1943), p. xxiv. The unedited *Collectanea* is in Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal MS 251, and contains, as well as the *Vita* of Augustine, some sermons purporting to be by him. These are found as a collection for the first time in the Arsenal MS, but were much older and probably Benedictine in origin.   [17] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, p. xx.

Fathers. To this end Jordan relied on the familiar stock of patristic literature on early monasticism: Jerome, John Cassian's *Conferences* and *Institutes*, Sulpicius Severus's *Life of St Martin*, and Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*. There is an even more pointed reference in the title chosen by Jordan to the thirteenth-century *Liber vitasfratrum* by the Dominican Gerard de Frachet, in which such parallels between present-day friars and the heroes of the desert are first developed.[18] Jordan states at the outset that his purpose is to make explicit the examples of the Desert Fathers followed by members of his order, lest they remain unjustifiably obscure.[19] This is much more than simply a hagiographical collection, however, and Jordan has surpassed his exemplar in the sophistication and analytical vision with which he treats his material.

Jordan begins with a discussion of the origin and types of monasticism. Quoting Peter Comestor and Jerome, he locates the first cenobitic community in the *conventus* established for his followers by the prophet Samuel in the Old Testament.[20] Christ's apostolic mission was also conventual in nature, as shown by the gathering—as it were in chapter—of the Apostles in the upper room after the Resurrection. As a consequence of the apostolic mission, however, different variations emerged in the cenobitic tradition, so that, for example, Mark's establishment of the conventual life in Alexandria, as recounted by Philo, differed from that in Jerusalem described in Acts.[21] The perfection of the cenobitic ideal proved too difficult to sustain, however, as the Church spread numerically and geographically. The practice of monastic solitude, which Jordan identifies as the third manifestation of the apostolic communion, developed as a response to the loss of fervour in cenobitic life.[22] Jordan then proceeds to a discussion of the kinds of monks, taken from Cassian's *Conferences*: cenobites, anchorites, and sarabaites.[23] Jordan agrees that the state of anchoritism is more perfect than that of cenobitism, but cites Jerome to argue that a surer path to perfection is offered by the community in which the monk's will is relinquished.[24] Augustine, Jordan declares, was undoubtedly a cenobitic

[18] For discussion of Gerard's work, see below, 285–6.

[19] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, prologue, p. 3: 'ne exempla sanctae religionibus a patribus et praecendentium temporum fratribus in oblivionibus nubilum deducantur, sed potius in aeterna memoria recordantur, idcirco studui patrum ac fratrum singularium gestorum et notabilium meritorum eiusdem ordinis vitam gestaque'.

[20] Ibid. I. ii, pp. 9–10; Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica*, I Reg. 11, PL 198, col. 1304; Jerome, *Epistola ad Rusticum*, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 56 (Vienna, 1996), 125.

[21] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, I. ii, p. 11.   [22] Ibid. p. 12.

[23] Cassian, *Collationes*, XVIII. vi. 2; also XVIII. iv. 2 and XIX. viii. 4.

[24] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, I. ii, pp. 15–18, citing Jerome, *Epistola ad Rusticum*, 127.

monk rather than an anchorite—though here one must distinguish be-
tween the solitary hermit and the 'cenobitical hermits', those who live
'in congregatione fratrum . . . in eremo'.[25] Canon law, as well as patris-
tic example, allows for fluidity between states of monastic living.[26]
Moreover, the cenobitic life does not require one's constant presence
within the confines of a community. This is proven by scriptural
example; for although the Apostles lived in a *collegium* in Jerusalem,
they were not invariably together at all times, because they dispersed in
order to preach.[27] Further, Augustine himself, while bishop, remained
joined in spirit to the monks of his foundations. This last point is essen-
tial for Jordan's purpose, because it allows him, by detailing the condi-
tions under which Augustinian Hermits may leave their convents, to
make a specific connection between 'apostolic monasticism', August-
ine, and his own order. Thus far in Jordan's argument, the connection
has been one of type: the kind of monasticism practised by Augustin-
ian Hermits is not only scriptural in derivation, but in fact represents
the 'original' and true type of religious community established by God.
Jordan avoids mention of the more commonly evoked exemplars Eli-
jah, John the Baptist, and Antony, and argues instead that the eremit-
ism that had always been practised by Augustinian Hermits derived
from cenobitic monasticism. This was necessary if the Augustinian
claim was to be taken seriously, for they were recognizably a group,
whether they took their beginnings from Augustine himself or from the
collective communities united in 1256. It was also, necessary, as Jordan
realized, in order to validate current Augustinian practice. The transi-
tion from *eremum* to city, from contemplation to ministry, which had
caused upset among the Carmelites in the thirteenth century, was also
difficult for some Augustinian Hermits.[28] Jordan's use of Augustine as
an example reminds his brethren that their own founder had com-
bined the two roles without compromising the first.[29] Had Jordan

[25] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, i, vii, p. 22. On the notion of 'eremitical community' and the
distinctions drawn in the twelfth century between hermits and monks, see H. Leyser, *Hermits
and the New Monasticism* (New York, 1984). 'Monastic types' are also discussed by G. Penco, 'Il
capitolo *De generibus monachorum* nella tradizione medievale', *Studia Monastica*, 3 (1961), 241–57.

[26] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, i. viii–ix, pp. 27–30, citing Gratian, *Decretum*, secunda pars,
causa XVIII, q. 2, c. 14 and causa XX, q. 4. c. 3.

[27] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, i. xii, p. 37. For use of the example of the Apostles as a *collegium*
by Carmelite writers, see above, 144.

[28] Ibid. i. xvi, p. 58, where Jordan says that hermits who did not want to leave their *eremum*
were exempted from the new order by Pope Alexander IV.

[29] Ibid. i, xiii, pp. 42–3. Jordan also cites the example of the prior-general of the order,
William of Cremona, who became bishop of Novara.

emphasized the eremitical tradition favoured by, for example, the Carmelites, he would have had greater difficulty in justifying the transition from community to ministry; for, as he had already argued, anchorites were not permitted to leave their solitude for the active life.[30] As it was, the way was open to claim that the Augustinians' mendicancy came directly from Augustine—or, turning this on its head, to claim that Augustine, rather than Francis or Dominic, was the first friar.

Thus far, Jordan has concerned himself with defining and placing in context the type of monasticism followed by his order. He then turns to the question of making the link between Augustine and the present-day friars not only conceptual but also linear. After the death of Augustine, he explains, those monks for whom he had founded communities in Africa were forced to flee by the Vandal invasion. They settled in Italy, where they remained undisturbed in their *coenobia eremitica* until the time of Innocent III. There are suggestive parallels here with the Carmelite narrative developed later by Philip Ribot, which portrayed the hermits of Elijah being forced not to flee but to concentrate on Mt Carmel in the face of the Arab invasions.[31] One might well ask how it was that monks fleeing the Vandals in Africa were able to remain undisturbed during the Lombard invasion of Italy, but of course no part of the Roman Empire was free from barbarian threat, and Italy might be argued to have been an obvious place of refuge for monks in the tradition of Augustine.

Jordan realized that such a grand claim as he was making for continuity required some defence. In particular, he anticipated the charge that there was no documented evidence for the continued existence of Augustine's foundations in Italy. To expect such evidence, seemed to Jordan unrealistic, however: 'we have found nothing written down on this matter because it all took place so long ago, and because of the holy simplicity of the monks themselves.'[32] The question of the monks' simplicity can be taken in two ways. Jordan is of course referring to the simplicity of their way of life, which did not lend itself to the recording of events, and perhaps even to the fact that the monks may have been illiterate. Beyond this, however, he is also suggesting that the anonymous monks following Augustine's Rule during the long period of silence had no need of such records to confirm their existence; after all, they

---

[30] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, i. x, p. 33. Jordan gives the examples of Mary Magdalene (customarily identified in the West with Mary the sister of Martha) and the abbot Apollo described by Cassian, *Collationes*, xxiv. ix. 2.

[31] See above, 146.

[32] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, i. xiv, p. 45.

knew who they were, and that was all that mattered.[33] The failure to obtain or produce documentation stemmed simply from a lack of need, as is made clear by comparison with the early Franciscans, for whom Francis, content to rely upon the pope's verbal assurances, did not attempt to obtain papal confirmation.[34] The crucial question in terms of canon law was, of course, whether the order was in existence before the Fourth Lateran Council, and on this point Jordan is quite clear. This council, he declares, confirmed the order of Hermits of St Augustine, but without providing a solemn confirmation of status.[35]

Much of the third book of the *Vitasfratrum* is taken up with Jordan's discussion of voluntary poverty and his order's position with regard to the ownership of property. By the time he was writing, this fraught question had of course been settled so far as the canonical application of it was concerned, but it continued to exercise friars. For Jordan it was an opportunity not to engage in polemics (as it was, for example, for the Carmelite Guy Terrenus earlier in the century), but rather to position his order in the context of the Church's unfolding history. Here, again, a linear treatment of the past was crucial. Jordan begins from the assumption that the Church originally practised 'apostolic poverty'. This principle was extended to embrace the common possession of property by the whole Church under the administration of bishops. After the conversion of the Roman world to Christianity, however, the Church's practice of poverty was modified. In the period from Pope Silvester I (314–35) to St Augustine (354–430), the Christian laity began to include the wealthy, and the priesthood tended to emulate them. The consequence of this was that the priesthood began to divide up tithes among themselves rather than among the needy laity, and ultimately the formal division of tithes was abandoned as prebends were established for canons and parochial clergy.[36] Into this rough scheme Jordan now inserts the Augustinian Hermits, by arguing that Augustine's Rule—the first rule to have been written—was designed to restore the practice of apostolic poverty to a Christian society that had abandoned it.[37] The Augustinian Rule, alone among early monastic rules,

[33] Compare John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, I. *MCH* 339.

[34] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, I. xiv, p. 45.

[35] Ibid. p. 46: 'in eodem etiam concilio, quia ibi de ordinibus singulis tractabatur, ordo Eremitarum sancti Augustini registratus et annotatus fuit, absque tamen solemnitate confirmationis, ut habetur ex registro pontificum Romanorum'.

[36] Ibid. III. ii, pp. 326–30.

[37] Ibid. III. iii, pp. 331–2. Jordan recognizes three monastic rules: those of Augustine, Benedict, and Basil. Benedict's was clearly later than the other two, but Augustine's must

forbids ownership of property, and is thus more faithful to the apostolic tradition of Acts.[38] Jordan concludes his treatise with examples of genuine poverty among his brethren.[39] His purpose in entering into the debate over poverty was to show that his order conformed in its practices to the state of the Church in the apostolic age, which he calls the 'second age' of the Church.[40] According to Jordan's scheme of Church history, in which the different stages are determined by reference to attitudes toward property ownership, Augustine figures as a reformer attempting to return the Church to the original purity it had enjoyed under the Apostles but had since lost. Thus, although Jordan employs a linear narrative to demonstrate the continuity of the Augustinian Order itself, when it comes to locating the order in the scheme of the Church's past, this idea of continuity is abandoned in favour of a rather different notion, that of cyclical reform and retrenchment.[41]

Writing about John Baconthorpe and Guy Terrenus, Thomas Turley characterized Carmelite ecclesiology as one of pure continuity of ideal and practice, in contrast to a 'classicizing' ideal according to which the apostolic age was seen as a historic peak of accomplishment from which the Church had fallen.[42] Seen at least through the lens of

have pre-dated Basil's because, although they were contemporaries, Augustine wrote his in youth, while Basil was already an old man when he wrote his rule. Jordan admits that Basil's Rule was based on earlier examples such as that of Pachomius, but makes a distinction between the Greek tradition of purely cenobitic monasticism ('regula tamen Basilii est tota monachalis') and the derivation of Augustine's from the practice of the Apostles.

[38] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, III. iv, pp. 332–6. Jordan cites Hugh of St Victor, *Expositio in regulam sancti Augustini*, i (PL 176, col. 846) in support of this. It was apparent to Jordan, however, that Augustine's Rule did not expressly forbid communal possession of property, and he therefore bases his argument in large measure upon the *practices* of Augustine as an individual, as reported by Possidius, *Vita sancti Augustini*, iii, PL 32, col. 36.

[39] Jordan, *Liber vitasfratrum*, III. xi–xv, pp. 359–86.

[40] Ibid. III. x, pp. 355–7. The only difference Jordan admits is that the Hermits do not, like the early Christians, number women among them.

[41] Compare the scheme developed earlier by Ubertino da Casale, deriving from Peter Olivi and ultimately Joachim of Fiore: Gian Luca Potestà, *Storia ed eschatalogia in Ubertino da Casale* (Milan, 1980), 64–6; Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford, 1969), 196–7. According to Ubertino, the first age of the Church was that of the preaching of Christ and the Apostles; the second the age of the martyrs, beginning with Stephen; the third the age of the fighters against heresy; the fourth the age of anchoritism exemplified by Antony and the Desert Fathers; the fifth the period when monks began to own temporal goods; the sixth the *renovatio* of ascetic life beginning with Francis; and the seventh the age to come of universal resurrection in the new Jerusalem. The Cistercians and other reform monks would doubtless want to claim that the sixth age had begun before Francis.

[42] Turley, '*Ab apostolorum temporibus*', 561–76.

Jordan's *Liber vitasfratrum*, the Augustinians must surely fall into the latter category.

The Franciscans and the Primitive Church

The debates between Franciscans and Dominicans, and, more detrimentally, among Franciscans themselves over the question of poverty, were fundamentally about ecclesiology—how Franciscan ideals were to be understood in the wider context of the Church as an institution with a past. Francis himself, though no theorist, located his practice firmly within a historical context; as the *Regula non bullata* proclaimed, 'This is the life of the Gospel of Jesus Christ which brother Francis asked to be permitted to him by the lord pope Innocent.'[43] It was left to later followers, most of them university-trained, to draw out from Francis's simple principle a theory of living. Malcolm Lambert has argued that the difference in this respect between Francis and his successors was in the emphasis his followers put on the *vita apostolica*, as opposed to the *vita Christi*.[44] This was to prove a crucial distinction, for Francis never articulated in material terms his precise understanding of Christ's poverty, and the Gospels themselves provided only clues; on the other hand, the Apostles' practices were outlined clearly in Acts, and could be read almost as a rule for living. The apostolic practices of the early Christians had long been a bench-mark for theorizing the monastic life;[45] but in the hands of the university friars, the exegesis of the text came to determine the quality of mendicant observance being claimed. One of the most striking examples of this tendency is the

[43] *Regula prima*, prologus, ed. H. Boehmer, *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi* (Tübingen, 1904), 1. The principle was underscored by minor points of detail: e.g., the greeting that Francis enjoined on his followers, 'Peace be on this house', was borrowed from Luke 10: 5.

[44] Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 58–9. Felice Accrocca, 'Angelo Clareno, testimone di S. Francesco: Testi sulla vita del santo e dei primi Fratri contenuti nell "Esposito Regulae Fratrum Minorum" e sconosciuti alle primitive fonti francescani', *AFH* 81 (1988), 225–53.

[45] The terminology *ecclesia primitiva* to refer to the Church of Acts is found as early as Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, i. 27, quoting from the instructions of Pope Gregory I to Augustine of Canterbury on the communal ownership by bishop and clergy of offerings to churches. The Carolingian Pseudo-Isidorian decretals also associated the primitive Church with the practice of communal living, PL 130, cols. 243–9, and this was repeated by Burchard of Worms in the 1020s: PL 140, cols. 673–5. In the twelfth century there are numerous examples of Acts being used as a pattern for communal living, among them Robert of Bridlington and Hugh of St Victor; see G. Olsen, 'The Idea of the *ecclesia primitiva* in the Writings of Twelfth Century Canonists', *Traditio*, 25 (1969), 61–89; Gordon Leff, 'The Apostolic Ideal in Later Medieval Ecclesiology', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 18 (1967), 58–82.

treatise by the Dominican Thomas Sutton, *Contra aemulos fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum*, in which the questions of whether or not the Apostles had worn sandals, whether they had eaten meat when it was served to them, and whether they had handled coins are points on which the integrity of a religious order is made to turn. The Franciscans, according to Sutton, assert that the Dominicans are not really like the Apostles because they do all three; Sutton argues in response that scriptural evidence shows that the Apostles did likewise.[46] The same kind of argument was used by a near-contemporary friar writing in a rather different context. Salimbene accuses the apostolic friars of flouting the Scriptures at every turn: by not having a head, by ministering singly rather than in pairs, by moving constantly without retaining any permanent bases, by doing no useful work.[47]

  These arguments assume a use of Scripture as historical text that seems worthy of note in the context of what we have seen of Carmelite methods. Conformity with described practices must be exact to the letter, because Sutton is saying, essentially: 'we are no different from the Apostles in our manner of living'—or, to put it another way, 'we, rather than they, are the Apostles of the contemporary world'. The integrity of this claim rested on the principle of renewal or restoration, because the force of the argument depended on the perceived contrast between one's own 'apostolic' practices and the debased practices of the rest of Christian society, clerical and lay. This principle of renewal is not, of course, a startling proposition for any reader familiar with trends in twelfth- and thirteenth-century religious life. But it must be seen in the context of how contemporaries in other orders were articulating their own identities. The Dominicans and the Franciscans could not argue, like the Augustinian Hermits and the Carmelites, from the basis of continuity. The great benefit to them of charismatic and saintly founders was in this respect a disadvantage. Francis would hardly have aroused such interest had he merely been bringing into prominence an existing group of hermits. There could be no question but that Francis and Dominic were founding new orders, albeit on the basis of traditional values. The very quality of novelty precluded any

---

[46] Sutton, *Contra aemulos ordinis Praedicatorum*. Angelo Clareno, *Expositio regulae fratrum Minorum*, i, ed. Livarius Oligier (Quaracchi, 1912), 21, in contrast, argues that Christ sent out his disciples barefoot.

[47] Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica* cccxxiv, pp. 388–94. The scriptural references are, respectively, Prov. 11: 3 and 1 Macc. 12: 54, Luke 10: 1 and Eccles. 4: 9–12, Luke 10: 7, Jer. 14: 10, and Hosea 12: 1.

claim of antiquity.[48] What they could claim, however, was that the *practices* they were introducing were not novel, but hallowed by the best tradition possible: that of the Scriptures themselves. Franciscans and Dominicans were led by the very public nature of their foundations to a self-promotion based on reform, for there could have been no reason to found the orders had there been no need for the reintroduction of those scriptural principles.

Francis is the most outstanding example of the attempt to follow the *vita Christi* in the decade on either side of 1200, but he is certainly not the only one. The Rule of St Albert, which was contemporary with the beginning of Francis's mission, may be seen as Christocentric in orientation. The subsequent divergence between the ideals of Franciscans and Carmelites has more to do with the different weight given, in reconstructing the 'primitive Church', to pursuing the active elements of the life described in the Gospels and Acts than in establishing the communal status of that life itself.

Angelo Clareno and the Orthodox Tradition

Franciscans were not limited to Jesus' instructions to his disciples, or to the description of the apostolic Church in Acts in finding their place in the Christian order. The defection of disaffected Italian Spirituals from the order in 1294 gives us an opportunity to see through a specific episode how friars understood their profession.[49] The dissidents sought not only the authority but also the protection of Celestine V; moreover, they saw themselves as part of a new dispensation within the Church. But were they to be thought of as a new order? Angelo Clareno insisted in his autobiographical writings that he was always a 'true' Franciscan; the argument was about what 'Franciscanism' meant. Some clue as to what Angelo himself thought it meant is

[48] The question of whether the Franciscans were introducing something novel or reintroducing something forgotten lured Bonaventure into inconsistency. Defending his order from the attack of William of Saint-Amour, he seems to embrace the idea of novelty: 'Dicit "ordo fictitius est, de novo institutus . . ." Carissimi! quantumcumque sit ordo fictitius et novus, tamen bonus': *Opera*, v. 492; but in the *Expositio super regulam*, he insisted: 'ergo non est haec regula aut vita nova res, sed procul dubio renovata': *Opera*, viii. 393. On the question of novelty more generally, see below, Ch. 9.

[49] Peter Herde, *Cölestin V (Peter von Morrone) Der Engelpapst* (Stuttgart, 1981), 112–13. For this section I found the following to be particularly useful guides: L. von Auw, *Angelo Clareno et les spirituels italiens* (Rome, 1979); Potesta, *Angelo Clareno*; P. Herde, 'Celestino V e le spiritualità francescana,' in *Francescanesimo e cultura in Sicilia (saec. XIII–XVI)*, Schede medievale, 12–13 (1987), 11–24.

provided by his account of the communal life he shared with the other Celestinians on the isle of Trixonia, in the gulf of Corinth, for two years between 1295 and 1300. In the letter to Pope John XXII known as the *Epistola excusatoria* (1329–30), he described the dissidents as *pauperes eremitas*, following the dispensation of Celestine V. They built no houses for themselves, but relied instead on hospitality; they neither preached nor heard confessions.[50] This sounds like abandonment of the mendicant ideal in favour of a regulated eremitism like that of the early Carmelites, although the reliance on hospitality suggests both a willingness to associate with society, as long as it was sympathetic, and a reluctance to go to extremes of anchoritic solitude. Indeed, the manner of life adopted by Angelo and his companions may have been a case of making a virtue out of necessity, for it is clear that they wanted above all to live peacefully out of the reach of ecclesiastical authorities. The idyll on Trixonia came to an end when the Celestinians were driven out by an alliance of the Franciscan provincial Jerome of Catalonia, the Latin bishops in Greece, and certain Frankish magnates.[51] The charges against the Celestinians, according to Angelo, were of two kinds: that they were Manichees (by which he means Cathars) who did not eat meat or say Mass or believe in the sacraments; and that they were rebels who had fled authority because they did not believe in the institution of the papacy or even in the Church.[52] These points are of course related, but they should be considered separately. The Celestinians were not innovating in their manner of living; one can find countless examples of eremitical withdrawal from the eleventh and twelfth centuries that conform to the picture Angelo paints. What appears to have been different about the hermits of Trixonia was their insistence on a personal adherence to Celestine V rather than to any rule or order. This might not have been remarkable two centuries earlier, when plenty of hermits withdrew from the world without bothering the ecclesiastical authorities about their status first. Almost 200 years earlier Norbert of Xanten had done something rather similar to the Celestinians when he asked Pope Gelasius II for a personal bond of loyalty in place of membership of a canonical order.[53] In the last years

---

[50] *Angeli Clareni Opera*, i: *Epistolae*, ep. 49, p. 240. For the dating of Angelo's sojourn on Trixonia, see von Auw, *Angelo Clareno*, 61–2, and for Angelo's career in the East in general, Raoul Manselli, 'Spirituali missionari: l'azione in Armenia e in Grecia: Angelo Clareno', in *Espansione del francescanesimo tra occidente e oriente nel secolo XIII: atti del VI convegno internazionale* (Assisi, 1979), 271–91.

[51] *Angeli Clareni Opera*, ep. 49, pp. 245–9.   [52] Ibid. p. 245.

[53] F. Petit, *Norbert et l'origine des Prémontrés* (Paris, 1984), 49–50, 68–9. Gelasius gave Norbert

of the thirteenth century, however, such a situation was anomalous. Angelo and his companions may have been regarded (as they were by the Franciscan authorities) simply as vagabond friars, a common enough phenomenon,[54] but this is too legalistic a solution to explain what was a highly complex situation.[55]

Angelo himself was ambivalent about his status. In the *Epistola excusatoria* he asserts that he was released from his Franciscan vows by Celestine V, but this sits uneasily with his known preoccupation with the Franciscan Rule, demonstrated so clearly in his own commentary, the *Expositio regulae fratrum Minorum*.[56] Angelo appears to have made a distinction between the rule he observed—which, throughout his eremitical sojourn could easily have been, for all that anyone knew, Francis's *regula bullata*[57]—and the order to which he belonged, which was created especially for him and his companions by Celestine V. Lydia von Auw has quite naturally seen the inconsistency of his attempt to solve the dilemma of obedience to authority—in which he believed—and his insistence on following the rule and testament of Francis, regardless of where it led.[58]

---

licence to preach wherever he desired, but his canonical status was in doubt because he had resigned his benefices without attaching himself to any order or rule. Attention was drawn to this irregularity at the Council of Rheims in 1119, where William of Champeaux argued that while Norbert's deeds were in themselves virtuous, his practices were dangerous, because they opened a loophole that could be exploited by other 'unattached' clergy: PL 170, cols. 1282–3.

[54] See, e.g., F. D. Logan, *Runaway Religious in Medieval England, c.1240–1540* (Cambridge, 1996).

[55] In canon law it was possible for monasteries to receive a monk from another monastery or order, even without the consent of the monk's abbot, in cases where the monk had moved in order to improve the quality of his monastic observance. This privilege was granted to Fleury in 938 (PL 132, cols. 1075–7) and by Urban II to Cluny (PL 189, cols. 137–8). Peter the Venerable, defending Cluniac practices against Bernard of Clairvaux in the 1120s, cited Urban's privilege as 'legitimately open to all', on the grounds that 'no monk is forced to remain if his abbot fails to perform his function of father and shepherd in matters spiritual and bodily . . . with the result that he is in fact unable to perform his vow': PL 189, col. 13; J. W. Gray, 'Stability and Enthusiasm: A Twelfth-Century Monastic Dilemma in the Writings of St Bernard of Clairvaux', in John Bossy and P. Jupp (eds.), *Essays Presented to Michael Roberts* (Belfast, 1976), 5.

[56] *Angeli Clareni Opera*, ep. 49, p. 240. Angelo wrote his *Expositio regulae fratrum Minorum* in the 1320s, long after he had ceased to be bound by vows to the order. Von Auw, ibid. 240 n. 1, points out that the situation of religious of one order observing the rule of another was not unknown, and cites as an example women's Augustinian houses observing the Rule of St Clare.

[57] Except, of course, for clause viii, on obedience to the minister-general.

[58] *Angeli Clareni Opera*, 134 n. 3. Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 123, remarks, with tolerance and astuteness, that 'Angelo's particular brand of illogicality reflects not opportunism or stupidity but life itself'.

It is tempting to see Angelo simply as a man unconstrained by any historical awareness of his status, but this will hardly do as a characterization of the author of the *Historia septem tribulationum*. Nor, indeed, of the translator of Greek patristics. It is in this field of activity that we see a growing understanding of his position and its wider significance in the history of monasticism. In the *Epistola excusatoria*, Angelo defends himself against the intriguing charge that he thought that 'the eastern Church was superior to the western'.[59] While in Greece Angelo learnt Greek—according to tradition, by angelic gift one Christmas night[60] —and subsequently translated several Greek patristic works: most famously, the *Scala paradisi* of John Climacus, but also the Rule of Basil and other works on asceticism by Basil, Macarius, and possibly Isaac of Syria.[61] The influence of early Greek monasticism on his own thinking about his profession is undeniable. The themes of *renovatio, reformatio*, and *imitatio* that underlie the *Historia septem tribulationum* are constant in Greek patristic writing. In the *Expositio*, the debt is clear. Angelo attributes Francis's insistence on the denial of personal property by his friars to Basil's Rule. Similarly, it was Basil who first insisted on monks living by manual labour and on owning only a single cloak, and Basil who had declared that Christ owned nothing.[62] As Gribomont observed, if Angelo considered Francis to have been *alter Christus*, Basil was *alter Franciscus*.[63] Angelo's definition of the 'true monk' is derived from numerous examples taken from Basil, Macarius, Cassian,

---

[59] *Angeli Clareni Opera*, ep. 49, p. 240.

[60] The miraculous tradition derives from the preface to Gentile da Foligno's Italian version of Angelo's translation of John Climacus, for which see F. Tocco, *Studii francescani* (Naples, 1909), 293–4; also Bernardino of Aquila, *Chronica fratrum minorum observantiae*, ed. L. Lemmens (Rome, 1902), 4.

[61] On Angelo's translation of the *Scala paradisi*, see Jean Gribomont, 'La *Scala Paradisi*, Jean de Raithou et Ange Clareno', *Studia monastica*, 2 (1960), 345–58, in which the Latin glosses customarily published with the *Scala Paradisi* and once attributed to a contemporary of Climacus are definitively shown to be Angelo's own work. A letter by Angelo records his gift to Robert of Mileto of his translation of Basil's Rule: *Angeli Clareni Opera*, ep. 42, pp. 201–3. Musto, 'Angelo Clareno OFM', has identified over 200 manuscripts of Angelo's translations. He concludes (pp. 223–7) that Angelo also translated the Basilian collection known as the *Constitutiones asceticae* (PG 31, cols. 1315–428, 1513–628) and Macarius's *Questiones CL* (also known as the *Verba S. Macarii*, PG 34, cols. 841–968), and probably also Isaac the Syrian's *Collationes* (PG 86a, cols. 811–86). Angelo knew and cited, but did not translate, the standard works of Pseudo-Dionysius and Gregory Nazianzen's *Contra Iulianum*, and may also have translated Chrysostom's *Epistola 125 ad Cyriacum*.

[62] Clareno, *Expositio*, proem. 19–20; cf. Basil, *Consuetudines monachorum*, xviii, PG 31, cols. 1381–8.

[63] Gribomont, 'L'Expositio d'Ange Clareno', 424; see also Potestà, *Angelo Clareno*, 163–5.

Climacus, and the *Vitae patrum*.[64] If the Greek Fathers seemed to confirm what Angelo had already learnt from St Francis, they also helped him to define his own uncertain status after 1295. Angelo must have found inspirational the traditional Orthodox acceptance of fluidity between states or types of monastic life. In Orthodoxy, one could be a monk without being a member of an order approved by the highest ecclesiastical authorities, so long as one observed a rule or set of practices recognized by the tradition. Orthodox monasticism, indeed, did not know the concept of an 'order' in the sense that had become prevalent in the West, since Orthodox monasteries were largely auto-cephalous.[65] It was perfectly acceptable for monks to drift away from the physical confines of the monastery to engage in periods of ascetic life, while still remaining members of the community.[66] According to Orthodox custom, he could regard himself as a monk following a rule, but temporarily living in an eremitical community. Moreover, Angelo's highly personal adherence to Celestine V, and his insistence on that adherence even after Celestine's resignation, recalls the loyalty of monks in the early Orthodox tradition to individual founders. Angelo could only have learnt Greek, and been introduced to Greek patristics, by Orthodox monks, either in the earlier phase of his eastern sojourn in Armenia and Cyprus or in Greece itself. Exposure to Greek patristics by Orthodox monks could only have lent support to his refusal to recognize the authority of the pope who succeeded Celestine V to dictate to him the terms of his profession. Indeed, his loyalty to Celestine seems to have been dependent less on the nature of Celestine's office than on Angelo's perception of him as a monastic leader and founder of a new order.

That Angelo continued to be influenced by Orthodox monastic practices after his return to Italy is clear from a letter he wrote to Robert of Mileto to accompany the loan of his translation of Basil's Rule. He begs Robert to look after the text because there exists no other copy, and 'there are other servants of God in these parts who would like to have a copy of it'.[67] It was not only other Spiritual Franciscans who thirsted for the teachings of the Orthodox Fathers. Angelo's translation of John Climacus was itself translated into Italian by the Augustinian Hermit Gentile da Foligno. R. G. Musto's researches have shown

---

[64] Clareno, *Expositio*, i. 31–3. See also vi. 138–48.

[65] Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (Harmondsworth, 1963), 47.

[66] e.g. the dependence of Euthymius on Sabas: Patrich, *Sabas*, 162–3; Gribomont, 'La Scala Paradisi', 356. [67] *Angeli Clareni Opera*, ep. 42, pp. 201–3.

that the transmission of Angelo's translations from the Greek was both rapid and wide, and that by the end of the fourteenth century John Climacus could be read in Latin not only in Italy but in Flanders and the Rhine Valley. In all, more than 200 manuscripts of the translation have been identified in various medieval collections, by no means all of them Franciscan.[68]

The affinity felt by many friars for Orthodox ascetic works is hardly surprising given the eremitical origins of two of the major mendicant orders and the strong ascetic leanings in Franciscan practice following the example of Francis himself. In one part of Western Christendom, the kingdom of Sicily, mendicant preaching dovetailed with the existing traditions of the Orthodox population.[69] It is not surprising that Angelo Clareno retired to Subiaco, where between 1318 and 1334 he made full use of Greek patristics in his own writing.[70] The kingdom of Sicily may have guaranteed Angelo a refuge from papal anger, but it also provided the ambience in which to work that was closest to what he had enjoyed in Greece. Perhaps for the same reason, Sicily was among the first Western settlements made by the Carmelites.

If Angelo Clareno's interest in Greek patristic literature can be seen as part of a growing awareness on the part of the friars of the wellsprings of their eremitical ideals, nowhere is this tendency more profound than among the Carmelites. At about the same time that Angelo was living in Greece and learning the language, the Carmelite text *Universis christifidelibus* was claiming the Rule of Basil as the basis for Carmelite observance.[71] The history of the Carmelites as represented by fourteenth-century writers—notably Jean de Cheminot, John of Hildesheim, and Philip Ribot—was inextricably linked with the history and traditions of Orthodox monasticism. The hermits living on Mt Carmel and gathered into a *collegium* in the twelfth century must have been, as Ribot explained, Orthodox. Ribot understood the significance of this, and sought to exploit the Orthodox contribution to Carmelite monasticism through the figure of Cyril, the Greek-speaking prior-general. This process was taken still further in the anonymous fifteenth-century *Vita S. Cyrilli*, in which Ribot's Cyril of Constantinople is provided with a full Byzantine background and

[68] Musto, 'Angelo Clareno, OFM', 233–4, and 589–645 for a catalogue of the manuscripts.

[69] Bresc, 'L'Eretisme franciscain en Sicilie'.

[70] Musto, 'Angelo Clareno, OFM', 218; Potestà, *Angelo Clareno*, 163–7.

[71] *UC, MCH* 84, and above, Ch. 4.

made into a bridge between the Orthodox and Catholic worlds of the twelfth century; and it reached its apogee in the extraordinary *Vita S. Angeli*, in which the Carmelite saint living in Palestine in the 1180s–1220s inhabits an entirely Orthodox milieu.[72]

Angelo Clareno articulated a preoccupation among certain mendicants from the end of the thirteenth century onward with the Eastern origins of monasticism. In Angelo's case the interest was sparked by his personal struggle to live by what he understood to be the tenets of the Franciscan Rule. For the Carmelites, it was the very process of historical enquiry that brought about an awareness of the debt which the order putatively owed to Orthodox monastic tradition. What emerged from this interest, whatever the agenda, was the realization of the place occupied by one's own profession in a larger continuum.

The Dominicans and the Cistercian Heritage

The Dominicans may be said to have owed their opportunity, if not their origins, to the Cistercians. Dominic inherited the preaching mission against the Cathars of southern France that had been entrusted by the papacy to the Cistercian Order. In Jordan of Saxony's account of the formation of the order, the moment of conception was the invitation by the Cistercian abbots to Diego of Osma, Dominic's bishop, to advise them on how to make their mission a success.[73] The canonical status of Dominic and his followers in the early stages of their work in Languedoc is still under debate,[74] but the question centres on Dominic's affiliation to the Rule of Augustine rather than to the Cistercian Order.

Dominican historians were nevertheless aware of a legacy from the Cistercians. Gerard de Frachet, whose chronicle self-consciously seeks to locate the new order within the historical tradition of monasticism, uses the Cistercians to foretell, and thereby validate, the newcomers. A Cistercian of Vienne told the Dominican master-general Humbert of Romans that during the Cistercian preaching mission against the Cathars, a monk near death had a vision in which Christ confided to his mother the future arrival of the preaching friars.[75] The Cistercian bishop of Arles announced the coming of the new order in terms

[72] See above, Chs. 4, 6.
[73] Jordan of Saxony, *Libellus de principiis ordinis Praedicatorum*, xix–xxviii, ed. H. C. Scheeben, MOPH 16 (Rome, 1935), 35–9.
[74] Tugwell, 'Friars and Canons'. [75] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, i. i. 3, p. 8.

reminiscent of John the Baptist foretelling Christ's coming.[76] The Cistercian monk James of St Galganus was told by Jesus before the formation of the order to pray for the Dominicans' success in preaching.[77] By the time that Galvanus della Flamma was writing his chronicle, *c*.1340/1, the Cistercian affinity had taken deep root. Galvanus went so far as to claim that Bishop Diego had himself received the Cistercian habit, although Innocent III refused to release him from office.[78] Galvanus associated the Cistercians directly with Dominic's mission: for example, on an early preaching tour that necessitated a miracle to open the doors of a locked church, Dominic was accompanied by a Cistercian conversus.[79] Stephen of Salagnac's account of Dominican history, written in the last quarter of the thirteenth century, associates two Cistercians, Aimery de Solemniaco and Gerald de Cardalhaco, abbot of Obazine, with Dominic's preaching; Aimery is called 'antiquus socius et fidelis amicus beati Dominici'.[80]

Dominican chronicles demonstrate a preoccupation with the prehistory of the order. The order did not spring new-formed into being at the whim of Dominic himself, but evolved from an existing order whose reforming credentials were themselves firmly established. It is curious, perhaps, that the early Dominican writers did not make more of the Augustinian heritage; Dominic, after all, was a canon regular, and the relationship between the founder and his mentor, Diego of Osma, ought to have suggested rich echoes from the past. In the picture drawn by Dominican chroniclers, Diego, as the best kind of reforming bishop, whose canons lived the regular life, and who was so stalwart a fighter against heresy, recalls Augustine of Hippo. Yet it is the Cistercians, and thus the Rule of Benedict, who seem to have provided the Dominican writers with the continuity of monastic tradition that they sought in looking back to the origins of their own order.

This is in one sense entirely natural. Like the Franciscans, the Dominicans represented reform rather than continuity. In the work of Gerard de Frachet especially, Cistercians appear in the wider context of a prophetic tradition; they are used to predict as well as to validate the new Order of Preachers.[81] The early Cistercians had themselves

---

[76] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, I. ii. 2, pp. 11–12. See also I. v. 9, pp. 34–5, where a Cistercian abbot is assured by Christ that two horses will arrive at the monastery; the horses represent the preachers.

[77] Ibid., I. v. 7, pp. 32–3. Other visions ascribed to James relating to the new order are at I. vi. 12, p. 49; I. vi. 13, p. 50; and I. vi. 16, p. 51.

[78] Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica*, iv, MOPH 2/1, 2.   [79] Ibid. viii, p. 5.

[80] Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor*, ii. 5, iii. 7, MOPH 22. 118, 149.   [81] See below, 290.

articulated their profession in terms of return and renewal, of the re-
vival of a pure monastic tradition. In a well-known passage that pene-
trates to the heart of the eleventh-century reform movement, Orderic
Vitalis shows Robert of Molesmes urging his monks to copy the ex-
amples of Antony, Pachomius, Macarius, and the Desert Fathers.[82]
The *Exordium Magnum ordinis Cisterciensis* traced the origins of the Cis-
tercian cenobitic ideal back to the primitive Church of Antioch and Je-
rusalem, through Antony and the Egyptian and Palestinian monks to
Benedict.[83] William of Saint-Thierry similarly compared the Carthu-
sians of Mont-Dieu to the early Egyptian monks, maintaining that
their way of life was that founded by Christ and, before that, foretold
by John the Baptist. Legitimation was sought, and provided, in Scrip-
ture.[84] What was being introduced was not novelty or change (as Rob-
ert of Molesmes's monks protested) but the genuine, 'original' strain of
monasticism. In using Cistercians to transmit reforming principles to a
subsequent generation, Gerard de Frachet is laying claim to the trad-
ition of 'original' monasticism.

HAGIOGRAPHY

This claim to the continuity of a genuine tradition is nowhere more
evident than in the use of the Desert Fathers as exemplars in the Do-
minican narrative and hagiographical writing of the thirteenth cen-
tury. Jordan of Saxony's account of the order's origins includes a story
about Dominic's miraculous resistance to sexual temptation, in which
the saint stands in the middle of a fire, that can be found in parallel de-
tail in an early Eastern tradition.[85] Dominic's legacy from the ex-
amples of early monastic asceticism supplied by John Cassian is an
important part of Jordan's treatise.[86] As significant as the use of the

[82] Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, viii. 26, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1973),
iv. 312–14.

[83] *Exordium Magnum ordinis Cisterciensis*, dist. i; PL 185, cols. 997–9. This tendency was not,
of course, limited to the Cistercians; cf. Peter Damian's reference to Romuald's foundation of
Sitria as 'a new Nitria': *Vita Romualdi*, ed. G. Tabacco, 104–5.

[84] William of Saint-Thierry, *Epistola domni Willelmi ad fratres de Monte Dei*, i. xi–xiii, ed. J.
Déchanet, SC 223 (Paris, 1975), 144, 150–2. For discussion of the significance of this, see
Benedicta Ward, 'The Desert Myth: Reflections on the Desert Ideal in Early Cistercian Mo-
nasticism', in M. Basil Pennington (ed.), *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West*
(Kalamazoo, Mich., 1976), 183–99; Jean Leclercq, 'Saint Antoine dans la tradition
monastique médiévale', *Studia Anselmiana*, 38 (1956), 229–47.

[85] Jordan of Saxony, *De initiis ordinis seu vita beati Dominici*, xxxii. 16–17; Jotischky, 'Some
Mendicant Views', 31–2.

[86] Jordan of Saxony, *De initiis ordinis*, viii. 5, lx. 33, and esp. x. 6: 'librum quemdam qui

early monastic examplars is the direct hagiographical link that Jordan makes. The title of the treatise itself, *De initiis ordinis seu vita beati Dominici*, emphasizes the personal and heroic role of Dominic; the story of the order's history is also the story of Dominic himself.[87] There may be an element here of Dominicans responding to the central place played by Francis in the construction of his order's traditions, but there is surely a larger point to be made than simply emulation of another order. The 'cult of the founder' was linked, in Dominican writing, with the attempt to *locate* that hagiographical cult in reference to earlier monastic tradition.[88] Attention has recently been drawn to the increasing use of the sayings of the Desert Fathers in the exempla collections of thirteenth-century preachers.[89] This tendency extended to Dominican treatments of the order's history. Like the *vitae* of Francis composed by Thomas of Celano and the anecdotal collection known as the *Legend of the Three Companions*, Dominican memorials of their founder were organized from the centre. Humbert of Romans's preface to the *Vitas fratrum* presents Gerard de Frachet's work as a collection of *facta* and *dicta* of the friars, who were by analogy the new 'desert fathers'.[90] Gerard's *Vitas fratrum* is based structurally on the *Vitae*.

Collationes Patrum inscribitur, tractantem de vitiis, et omni spiritualis perfectionis materia, hunc, inquam, legens et diligens in eo salutis rimari semitas easdemque tota anima virtute studuit imitari'; Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica*, xvi, xxxvii, xlviii–lvii; MOPH 2. 12, 24–5, 29–33.

[87] Boureau, *L'Evenement sans fin*, 67, 69, argues that it is the group consciousness that predominates in Dominican hagiography, pointing to the contrast between the lives of monastic founders as traditionally told from the relics and cult of a particular individual, and the collective nature of the Dominican enterprise in which the memory of the saint is part of a larger phenomenon. Here Gerard de Frachet's *Vitas fratrum* may be cited, as also Stephen de Salagnac's *De quatuor et in quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignavit*. C. N. L. Brooke, 'St Dominic and his First Biographer', *TRHS*, 5th ser. 17 (1967), 23–40.

[88] John Van Engen, 'Dominic and the Brothers: *Vitae* as Life-Forming *Exempla* in the Order of Preachers', in Kent Emery, Jr. and Joseph P. Wawrykow (eds.), *Christ among the Medieval Dominicans: Representations of Christ in the Texts and Images of the Order of Preachers*, Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies (Notre Dame, Ind., 1998), 7–25, has recently used Jordan and Gerard de Frachet to resist a view of Dominican historiography as anti-hagiographic.

[89] Boureau, *L'Evenement sans fin*, 60–4: whereas Peter Comestor used only one example from the *Vitae patrum*, and Peter of Blois two, Jacques de Vitry used twenty-five, and in the anonymous homiletic collection Paris, Bib. Nat. MS Lat. 15912, 270 out of a total of 800 exempla are taken from this source. The Dominicans Vincent of Beauvais, Stephen de Bourbon, and Thomas de Cantimpré all relied heavily on the *Vitae patrum* for *exempla*. Boureau finds that Dominicans were able to look beyond the *Vitae patrum* for 'desert exemplars': e.g., Barthélemy de Trente's *Epilogus in gesta sanctorum* included chapters on Barlaam and Josaphat, who appeared not in the *Vitae patrum* but in John Damascene. James of Voragine included standard Desert Fathers like Arsenius and Agathon, taken from the *Vitae patrum*, but, as Boureau remarks, even his treatment of Jerome and Mary Magdalene has 'une coloration désertique'.

[90] Gerard of Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, 2nd prologue, 3–4. Humbert invokes in comparison

After the account of origins, in which the Cistercians played such a role, come the biographies of Dominic himself and Jordan of Saxony, followed by passages dealing with the development and spread of the order, and finally a collection of illustrative *dicta* of friars, grouped thematically. The same method is used even more obviously in Jordan of Quedlinburg's *Liber vitasfratrum*, which, after placing the Augustinian Hermits in the ecclesiological context supplied by the claim of Augustine as their founder, proceeds to a series of direct comparisons between the Hermit-Friars of his day and the exemplars of the *Vitae patrum*.[91]

Jordan is aware that a crude collection of miracle stories, which does nothing more than list the virtues of friars, will not suffice, and he draws attention to his use of John Cassian to understand how the miraculous can be used to render a more theoretical account of the religious life.[92] This sounds rather as though Jordan expected some criticism for the parallels he draws, so defends against it by explaining how the hagiographical elements in his history of the order are intended to function within a narrative framework. Specifically, the exempla are designed to teach: thus, explaining how the friar, on entering the order, is to forsake all possessions, Jordan lifts from the *Vitae patrum* the example of the old monk who, asked by his younger brethren how to attain salvation, simply took off his clothes and stood with arms raised to heaven.[93]

Gerard de Frachet's *Vitas fratrum* similarly functioned as a collective teaching aid, but with the crucial difference that the Dominicans had a single founding father, whereas the Augustinian Hermits had several, or none. Boureau has characterized it as 'communal hagiography';[94] but in fact, this is truer of Jordan of Quedlinburg than of Gerard. For in Gerard's work, as Boureau shows, Dominic figures as a type of the holy man, sometimes in analogy with Antony in the *Vitae patrum*. Dominic and Francis began a movement of reform independent of one another, and were made aware of each other (according to Dominican

Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, John Damascene's *Liber Barlaam*, Cassian's *Collationes*, and the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great, as well as Jerome, Bede, and Gregory of Tours.

91 Jordan of Quedlinburg, *Liber vitasfratrum*, iii. 11, p. 362, iii. 12, pp. 365–6, for the story of Paul the Hermit in a contemporary anecdote; iii, 12, pp. 367–9, for comparison between Nicholas of Tolentino and Abbot Arsenius (*Vitae patrum*, iii. 37; PL 73, cols. 762–3), iii. 14, pp. 376–81, for examples of renunciation of property from the *Vitae patrum*, and iii. 15, pp. 382–6, for examples of similar virtues from contemporary friars.

92 Jordan of Quedlinburg, *Liber vitasfratrum*, prologue, 4–5.

93 Ibid. iii. 11, p. 359, from *Vitae patrum*, V. vi. 16, PL 73, col. 891.

94 Boureau, *L'Evenement sans fin*, 67.

tradition) by heavenly mediation, just as Antony was led by an angel to the hermit Paul.[95] Dominic, like Antony, pursued heresy, and suffered demonic visitations.[96] Group virtues, however, may be said to take precedence over those of an individual, to the extent that the virtues of an individual are those of the community of friars; in both Gerard's and Jordan's reworkings of the *Vitae patrum*, inclusion in the collection of examples entailed conformity to the models of behaviour of the whole order. Thus Gerard's opening section, in which the order's origins are recounted, dispenses in large measure with the names of individual friars, preferring, for example, to speak of 'two young friars'.[97]

In a further way the thirteenth-century *Vitae fratrum* echo the principles of the Desert Fathers. The hagiographical literature of regular monasticism was typically rooted in a sense of place: the centre of a relic cult, or a new foundation. To take one example from among many, the story of the reform monk Stephen of Obazine would have had no substance without the monastery he founded: Stephen's story is Obazine's story. This was not true of Dominican, Augustinian, or Franciscan hagiography. As Boureau has argued, the narrative in Gerard's *Vitas fratrum* is interior, and the institutional development of the order has little place.[98] Individual convents are barely mentioned, just as in the *Vitae patrum* the desert is a place described imprecisely because it exists as a psychological as well as a topographical reality, and it is the interior space that is crucial to understanding the exempla rather than the physical locations. In this context the significance of the preaching mission of the Dominicans and Franciscans stands out. The profession of mendicancy depended on mobility—lack of rootedness—and on the word. Dominic's concern to found a dedicated Order of Preachers rather than simply remaining a canon regular with a licence to preach in specified dioceses can also be seen to reflect something of the peculiar status of the Desert Fathers, at least in medieval perceptions.[99] Accustomed as they were to precise formulations of canonical status, the thirteenth-century preachers must have found the Desert Fathers puzzling—and perhaps admirable—in their capacity to drift free of the

[95]   Boureau, *L'Evenement sans fin*, 67–9. James of Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. W. G. Ryan, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1993), ii. 84–5.

[96]   Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, ii. 14–17, and iv. 15, 4–8, and iv. 23, for other friars attacked by demons.

[97]   Ibid. i. v. 9, pp. 34–5, i. vi. 6. 4, pp. 40–1.   [98]   Boureau, *L'Evenement sans fin*, 73.

[99]   On the significance of the Dominicans' titular status, see M. Vicaire, 'La Bulle de confirmation des Prêcheurs', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 47 (1952), 176–92, and on the terminology of orders, Tugwell, 'Friars and Canons', 197–202.

moorings of the institutional Church. They presented a model of communal poverty within the Church; they were orthodox in doctrine and faithful to the Church; yet they belonged to no order, and thus appeared quite distinct from the fixed institutions within the Church. They did not exactly preach, yet it was by their *verba* that they were remembered. And, of course, they did not own property, or even, in some cases, live in proper buildings. A friar choosing a model of sanctity could hardly have done better than an Abbot Arsenius, a Macarius, or a Paphnutios.[100]

It is perhaps surprising that so little use was made of early Christian exemplars—before Angelo Clareno, at any rate—by the Franciscans. In contrast, the hagiographical tradition established in the order by Celano was *sui generis*. Francis was indeed a type, but the type of Christ, rather than of any human precursor. This was Francis's own doing rather than his biographers'. Francis took fulfilment of Christ's instructions to attain human perfection as a norm. Franciscan theory, to paraphrase Gordon Leff, was inseparable from the practice of striving for apostolic perfection. As Leff has observed, 'all St Francis' injunctions were concerned with establishing its requisites'.[101] As the example of Bonaventure shows, one did not have to be a Spiritual to regard Francis as the unique incarnation of Christ's life. Bonaventure's prologue to the *Legenda Maior*, the biography of Francis authorized by the order's general chapter of 1260, and intended to abrogate all previous biographical accounts, provides an epitome of views of their founder then current among Franciscans. Although he adopts the language of Joachimist prophecy in describing Francis as the angel of the sixth seal of the Apocalypse, Bonaventure's characterization of

---

[100] This is a deliberately selective reading of the *Vitae patrum*, and one might equally cite the example of Pachomius to argue that not all the Desert Fathers lived in such freedom from institutional structures. But the category itself is an inexact one, and medieval readers might choose what they pleased from their reading of a number of examples. The most commonly read collections of exemplars were probably Cassian's *Collationes*, Rufinus's *Historia monachorum*, and book iv of Gregory's *Dialogues*. In addition, the *Liber geronticon* of Paschasius of Dumi, the *Regula magistri*—itself a model for Benedict's Rule—and the *Vitae sanctorum patrum Jurensium* were also known from the sixth century onward. Some 112 manuscript collections of such material have been counted for the period between the seventh and fifteenth centuries, and a further 257 partial manuscripts and 400 or so citations of the *Vitae patrum* in catalogues. In addition, there are of course the individual *vitae* of Antony by Athanasius and Paul the Hermit by Jerome, known from the fourth century.

[101] Gordon Leff, 'The Franciscan Concept of Man', in Ann Williams (ed.), *Prophecy and Millenarianism: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves* (London, 1980), 220. It is worth pointing out that Angelo Clareno's *Expositio*, proem., pp. 4–5, makes explicit parallels between the twelve Apostles and Francis's twelve principal followers.

Francis shows a profound response to the saint's human qualities demonstrated, simply, by imitating Christ. 'That this messenger, lovable to God and capable of being imitated by us . . . was God's servant, St Francis, can firmly be believed when we consider the perfection of the holiness with which he lived among humans with angelic purity.'[102] The confirmation of Francis's imitation of Christ was the bestowal of the stigmata on him.

Yet the theme of fleeing to the desert, specifically linked to attaining salvation, is everywhere present in Franciscan spiritual writing, and Francis was himself the author of a rule for hermits.[103] The sentiments of return to an early ascetic ideal shine through the pages of writing about Francis, but they are scarcely articulated in the context of the Church's history. In the passage in the *Speculum perfectionis* where Francis describes his friars as being 'concealed in deserts and wilderness places', the obvious parallel is not drawn. Even Francis's inner conflict over the virtues of eremitism over preaching fails to draw the author; Francis, it seems, is comparable to Christ or to nobody.

The characterization of Francis by his later followers is obviously an immense topic of study in itself, since it forms the necessary groundwork for any understanding of the movements for change within the Franciscan Order.[104] Perhaps one reason why Francis remained in the eyes of his biographers *sui generis* was because his memory was itself the battleground between the rival claimants to his ideals within the order he founded. As Gian Luca Potestà has commented, a double preoccupation lay behind the Spirituals' portrait of Francis: first, to provide an alternative image to that in the 'official' hagiography, and second, to trace the continuity from Francis to themselves along lines different from those followed by the order itself.[105]

This 'alternative image', however, contains some familiar elements. In his commentary on the rule, for example, Angelo Clareno presented

[102]   *Legenda Maior*, prologue. Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*, 179–81, thought of Bonaventure as a Joachimist, but Leff, 'Franciscan Concept of Man', 229, takes issue with this. See below, 283–6.

[103]   Edith Pasztor, 'Falsi e tradizioni apocrife nella "questione francescana"', in W. Setz (ed.), *Fälschungen im Mittelalters*, v (Hannover, 1988), 443; for Francis's Rule, C. Esser (ed.), *Opuscula sancti patris Francisci Assisiensis*, Bibliotheca Franciscana ascetica medii aevi, 12 (1978), 295–8.

[104]   See in general J. H. Moorman, *The Sources for the Life of St Francis of Assisi* (Manchester, 1940); Edith Pasztor, 'Le fonti biografiche di S. Francesco', in *Francesco d'Assisi nella storia*, i (1983), 9–20; *idem*, 'San Bonaventura: biografo di San Francesco? Contributo alla questione francescana', *Doctor Seraphicus*, 27 (1980), 83–107; Nimmo, *Reform and Division*, 78–100.

[105]   Potestà, *Angelo Clareno*, 158–9.

Francis as a prophet.[106] The prophecies themselves related, of course, to the tribulations undergone by the Spirituals since the abdication of Celestine V: the uncanonical elevation of a hostile pope, the turning away of the friars from the road of simplicity and true poverty, the persecution of the faithful few by human and demonic agency.[107] If the prophetic power itself suggests the model of John the Baptist or even one of the Old Testament prophets, the substance of the third prophecy could be read as an echo of the heroes of the desert, or of the early Christian martyrs: '[Francis' true followers would] hide away, abandoned by all, in deserted and solitary places, or wander among the faithless, forced to wear the secular habit, to lead an itinerant life, to disguise themselves among the non-believers or else to suffer death from innumerable calumnies and insults.'[108]

In the *Expositio*, moreover, Angelo reveals the depth of his immersion in Greek patristics. Francis, he declares, was restoring the life of an earlier and lost generation of the Church, which he characterizes as that of the 'holy men who were the teachers and servants of evangelical perfection'; he cites as witnesses Pseudo-Dionysius, Philo, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, and Basil.[109] Basil's Rule, Angelo thinks, was a blueprint for friars who wanted to live according to the Gospel.[110] We are not so very far, perhaps, from the Carmelite appropriation of Basil's Rule: what Carmelite authors did explicitly by insisting on continuity between the age of Basil and their own, Angelo achieves by the idea of the template. Francis is 'another' Christ, Basil, or whomever else one might choose; the link cannot be, as in the case of the Carmelites, one of spiritual genealogy, but it is there none the less.

PROPHECY

Prophecy about future events played an important role in validating perceptions of the past, and particularly so in the presentation of a

---

[106] Clareno, *Expositio*, 45–8.

[107] *Verba fratris Conradi*, x. 12, in *Verba fratris Conradi: Extrait du MS 1/25 de S. Isidore*, ed. P. Sabatier, *Opuscules de critique historique*, 1 (1903), 370–92; Pasztor, 'Falsi e tradizione apocrife', 445–50.

[108] *Verba fratris Conradi*, 12.

[109] Clareno, *Expositio*, i, pp. 18–19. Cf. the remark of Gribomont, 'L'Expositio', 424: 'Pour Clareno, François est un *alter Christus*, mais . . . Basile est un *alter Franciscus*.'

[110] Clareno, *Expositio*, ii. p. 67. For fuller discussion of the patristic background to the *Expositio*, see Potestà, *Angelo Clareno*, 163–7.

communal history where no 'biological' link or progression could be established between two points in time. Thus, for example, one way in which Dominican writers attempted to overcome the potentially problematic lack of canonical status for the order before 1215 was to put prophecies of the order's future status in the mouths of credible witnesses. The best-known of these is the vision in which Dominic, while praying in St Peter's, saw Christ brandishing three fiery lances. The voice of the Blessed Virgin was heard to announce the names of Christ's faithful servants Dominic and Francis. The very next day, Dominic recognized Francis by his habit as he entered the church, and told him 'You are my companion, who runs alongside me; if we stand strong together, nobody will be able to overcome us.'[111]

   Gerard de Frachet had been commissioned to compile material for his history by the Dominican general chapter of 1252, and Humbert himself wrote a prologue. The whole of the first part, *De pertinentibus ad inchoacionem ordinis*, is a compilation of prophecies foretelling the order. Scriptural testimony is provided by the careful exegesis of appropriate texts: the Dominicans are foretold, for example, by the example of David protecting Jerusalem while Joab ravaged the Ammonites; by Mardocheus protecting the king against his treacherous doorkeepers; by the brothers Simon Peter and Andrew; by the servants who invite the people in from the street in the parable of the feast.[112] Gerard then proceeds to prophecies from the recent past. From a Dominican of Bologna he learnt that, before the order's establishment in the city, Dominicans were foretold by the appearance of vine-dressers on the spot where the convent would later be built. A similar prophecy told of an angelic choir singing to a father and his son on the spot later settled by Dominicans.[113] A citizen of Montpellier, on his deathbed, saw a procession of white-clad religious in his garden, which after his death the Dominicans would inherit.[114] Visions of future prosperity continued to

---

[111] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, I. i. 4, pp. 10–11; retold by Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica*, xi, 7. See also Galvanus, *Cronica*, xi, p. 6, where Dominic applies to the pope at the Fourth Lateran Council for formal recognition of his order but is denied; the pope subsequently has a vision of St John Lateran borne on Dominic's shoulders, and tells Dominic that his new order will sustain the weight of the Church.

[112] 1 Chr. 20: 1, Esther 2: 12–14, Matt. 4: 18, Luke 14: 17. For other examples cited by Gerard, see 3 Kgs. 4, 10, S. of S. 7: 1, Ecclus. 38: 29, 32, and 50: 11, Jer. 38: 7, Ezek. 2: 9, and Amos 9: 13.

[113] Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum*, I. iv. 3–4, p. 21.

[114] Ibid. I. iv. 9, p. 23, and I. iv. 10, p. 24, for a similar incident in Limoges. See also I. vi. 16, for an incident in Viterbo in which white-clad monks process to the spot where the Dominican church was later built, led by a finely dressed lady.

serve the order in times of trouble; for example, when the Dominicans of Macon were being persecuted by William of Saint-Amour, who was a canon of the cathedral, over outstanding debts, the brothers were granted a vision in which St Louis and Hugh of St Cher, the Dominican cardinal-priest of St Cecilia, were standing together in a corner of the dormitory. Soon afterward both king and cardinal donated books to the convent as alms, which more than covered in value their debts.[115]

These stories derive from local traditions built up by the oral memory of individual communities; in the case of the Montpellier vision, the Dominicans who eventually occupied the dying man's property heard the story from people who themselves had heard it from the man who inherited the house. Greater authority was provided by prophecies originating from or concerning famous individuals; thus, for example, Gerard records the tradition that the béguine founder Mary of Oignies had been inspired by the Dominicans, through the medium of the Holy Spirit, ten years before the order existed.[116] Similarly, well-known prophecies could be adapted or reinterpreted to fit the Dominican case. Hildegard of Bingen was said to have foretold the coming of 'strong men' who would educate the laity and convert them to a good life, but in the process suffer martyrdom.[117]

Behind all these individual prophecies lies a theory of understanding and interpreting events based on an assumed relationship between the historical past and the future. In its most rigorous form, such an understanding produced a commentary on human history in which past, present, and future could be seen to follow a complex pattern determined by God apparently without relation to human endeavour. The influence of Joachim of Fiore is a subject too large to encompass in this survey, but some account must be given of the ways in which the texts we have discussed borrowed Joachimist ideas, if not directly his writing.[118]

Gerard de Frachet's identification of the Dominicans' mission with that of the Franciscans, in the story of Dominic's vision of Christ and

---

[115] Ibid. i. v. 5, pp. 31–2.   [116] Ibid. i. ii. 3, p. 12.   [117] Ibid. i. ii. 7, p. 14.
[118] The fullest treatment is still Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*. For a brief exposition of Joachim's prophecies about two new orders, see esp. 138–52, and now Marjorie Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future* (Stroud, 1999). Joachim's ideas on the new orders are most fully expressed in the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* (Venice, 1527), 175–6, commenting on Apoc. 14. See also Reeves, 'The Abbot Joachim's Sense of History', in *1274: Année charnière: Mutations et continuités* (Paris, 1977), 781–96; *idem*, 'History and Prophecy in Medieval Thought,' *Medievalia et Humanistica*, new ser. 5 (1974), 51–75; B. McGinn, 'Joachim of Fiore', in *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, trans. and intro. by B. McGinn (London, 1980), 97–113.

the lances, was not mere literary fancy, but reflects the closeness be-
tween the heads of the two orders between 1254 and 1263 in the face of
the assault against mendicant ideals by the secular masters of the Uni-
versity of Paris. In 1255–6 the Dominicans' convent in Paris was at-
tacked by a mob, and the friars were for a while prisoners, unable to
leave the enclosure to preach, hear confessions, or receive alms.[119] In
1256 William of Saint-Amour's *De periculis novissimorum temporum* ac-
cused the mendicants of being gyrovagues pretending to poverty out of
idleness, of having no right to the cure of souls, of being the false
prophets of Antichrist. Mendicancy, he argued, was neither preached
nor practised by Jesus.[120] In 1255 Humbert and the Franciscan master-
general, John of Parma, issued a joint encyclical in which they asserted
the divine origins of their orders in language heavily imbued with the
prophetic. The Franciscans and the Dominicans, they declared, repre-
sented the two trumpets of Moses, the two cherubim, the breasts of the
bride in the Song of Songs. The Sibylline prophecies had referred to
two stars that would shine in the sky in the days of the Lamb, calling all
in the direction of humility and voluntary poverty.[121]

Dominican writers in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were
prepared to use Joachimist imagery, and sometimes the words of Joa-
chim himself, in representing the prehistory of their order. The *Brevis
Historia*, a Dominican chronicle of 1367, shows how a pseudo-
Joachimist text had come into being as a defence of the order. The
abbot Joachim, the author declared, had prophesied the coming of an
order of teachers who would illuminate the world. A single head would
preside over the order with the assistance of twelve deputies, corres-
ponding to the twelve sons of Jacob. This prediction was followed by
Dominic when he arranged the division of the order into provinces.[122]
This is, in a sense, a more striking use of Joachim than the joint encyc-
lical, or the Spiritual Franciscans' appeal to an apocalyptic vision. The

[119] *Chart. Univ. Paris.*, i, no. 273, pp. 310–12, in which Humbert compares the friars to Peter imprisoned by the Romans.

[120] William of Saint-Amour, *De periculis*, 20–2. The secular masters' first attack on the mendicants, *Chart. Univ. Paris.* i, no. 243, pp. 272–6, was a refutation of the extreme Joachimist *Introductorius in evangelium aeternum* of Gerard of Borgo San Donnino. See now Christine Thouzellier, 'La Place du "De Periculis" de Guillaume de Saint-Amour dans les polémiques universitaires du XIIIe siècle', *Revue Historique*, 156 (1927), 69–82.

[121] L. Wadding, *Annales*, iii. 380; Humbert, *Opera*, ii. 496–9. Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*, 146–7, has pointed out the similar use of such imagery by Joachim of Fiore.

[122] *Brevis historia . . . anonymus*, ed. E. Martène and V. Durand, Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio, 6 (Paris, 1724–33), 335. Thirteenth-century examples include Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor*, i. 6, MOPH 22. 9–10, quoting the supposed words of Joachim.

Brevis Historia did not arise out of a struggle for the heart of the order. Precisely because its purpose is more straightforward, and less determined by the agenda of an ideological debate, the use of Joachim stands out as testimony to the need to validate the order retrospectively. Here it is not Joachim's controversial scheme of history that is important, but the fact that Joachim was well known—if notorious—as a prophet, and had lived before the Fourth Lateran Council. The Dominican Order could not be shown to have existed as an approved order before 1215 (though one could, of course, point to Dominic's adoption of an existing rule, the Augustinian), but the institutional arrangements subsequently adopted by the order could be demonstrated to have been predicted and explained before 1215 in line with scriptural typology.

The prevalence of Joachimist ideas in thirteenth-century ecclesiology is further demonstrated by the commentary *Super Hieremiam*, in which Joachim's 'new orders' formula was prominent. This work had long been assumed to derive from Franciscan circles on this account, until Marjorie Reeves argued that it was written in a Cistercian house in Calabria in response to the condemnation of Joachim at the Fourth Lateran Council. The *Super Hieremiam* speaks of 'spiritual men' who are forced to flee Herod, hide in Egypt, and finally take refuge in Galilee, which is itself identified symbolically as the Cistercian profession.[123]

In his attack on the Apostolic Friars, the Franciscan Salimbene de Adam revealed his debt to Joachimist ideas by contrasting the Dominicans and Franciscans, whose mission was foretold in Scripture and interpreted by Joachim, with the Apostolic Friars, who, because no prophecy about them can be found in Scripture, have no validity as a religious order.[124] To be sure, prophecy alone was not enough; but Salimbene could explain the incontinence and sloth of Segalleli and his followers by reference to the fact that they were not genuinely 'apostolic'—they were not sent by God but only by themselves, in contrast to Dominic and Francis, whose missions were genuine in so far as they were part of a predetermined historical plan of human salvation.

Salimbene's notion of an order's—or individual's—integrity as being guaranteed by scriptural prophecy shows the extent of such ideas among thirteenth-century friars. Salimbene was neither a scholar nor particularly influential among Franciscans in his own day,

---

[123] Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*, 151–2, discussing *Super Hieremiam* (Venice, 1516), fos. 43–4.
[124] Salimbene, *Cronica*, ccclxxiii–ccclxxiv, pp. 393–4. The scriptural prophecies relating to the Dominicans and the Franciscans are Num. 18: 1–4 and Jer. 16: 16.

but he was able to assimilate Joachimist teaching in 1247 simply by rejecting the more regulated path of theological study prescribed for him in favour of another. A few years later, of course, this course of action would have been more difficult, but Salimbene never abandoned wholly the underlying philosophy of Joachimism.[125]

Joachimist ideas about the *novi ordines* could be interpreted by friars in different ways. At one level, he seems to be referring to a general *ordo* characterized by the third age of history, the age of the Holy Spirit.[126] At another level, he characterizes the *viri spirituales* as spiritual agents of the transition from the sixth to the seventh ages.[127] Then there are the prophecies of the two parallel orders developed in pseudo-Joachimist works of the thirteenth century, which obviously used hindsight to indicate that Joachim had prophesied the coming of the friars.[128] It was not only Franciscans and Dominicans who were preoccupied with finding references to their own mission in prophetic literature. Because Franciscans and Dominicans tended to utilize the third category of prophecies found in pseudo-Joachimist writing, those referring to the *viri spirituales* at the transitional point between the sixth and seventh ages tended to be neglected.[129] In the *Liber concordiae*, Joachim had identified two groups of religious, following Moses and Elijah respectively, as *viri spirituales*. The 'order of Moses' fulfils its role by the solitary life in the wilderness, whereas the 'order of Elijah' is actively engaged in preaching, while still rooted in ideals of the solitary life.[130] The Augustinian Hermit Henry of Friemar adapted this prophecy to serve his order, by reference to Joachim's exposition of the four angels of the Apocalypse, in which 'the hermits, whose father was Paul the first

[125] Salimbene was chosen to attend the *studium* of his order at Paris, but apparently left after only two weeks, choosing instead to study with the Joachimist Hugh of Digne at Hyères. In 1255 the Papal Commission of Anagni denounced the fundamental doctrines of Joachim, but Salimbene may in any case have begun to reject elements of his teaching as early as 1250; see D. C. West, Jr., 'The Education of Fra Salimbene of Parma: The Joachite Influence', in Williams (ed.), *Prophecy and Millenarianism*, 193–215. Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*, 184–5, argues, however, that Hugh of Digne was preoccupied largely with the question of Antichrist rather than the 'third order' foretold by Joachim.

[126] Joachim, *Liber concordiae* (Venice, 1519). Among many such references, see fos. 8ᵛ–9ᵛ, 67ʳ–70ᵛ, 83ʳ–85ʳ.

[127] Ibid., fos. 19ʳ–21ᵛ; *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, fos. 184ᵛ–187ʳ.

[128] *Super Hieremiam*, fos. 1ᵛ, 12–13ᵛ, 23ᵛ–28ʳ, 44ᵛ–45ʳ. See also *Vaticinium Sybillae Erithae*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Neues Archiv für deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 15 (1889), 165, and P. Piur (ed.), 'Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli, nebst dem Kommentar des Pseudojoachim', in K. Burdach (ed.), *Von Mittelalter zur Reformation*, iv (Berlin, 1912), 292, 294, 309, 318–27.

[129] M. Reeves, 'Joachimist Expectations in the Order of Augustinian Hermits', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 25 (1958), 114.   [130] Joachim, *Liber concordiae*, fo. 67ᵛ.

hermit', are characterized as leading an angelic life.[131] Marjorie Reeves has demonstrated that other Augustinian Hermits were also influenced by Joachimist ideals: notably Agosto Trionfo (d. 1328), whose own commentary on the Apocalypse opens with a reference to Joachim's scheme of the seven ages.[132] The close relations between certain Augustinian Hermits and fraticelli in central Italy made transmission and cross-fertilization of Joachimist ideas easy. Among Angelo Clareno's disciples were the Augustinians Simon of Cassia, who was sympathetic to Spiritual Franciscan views on poverty, and Gentile de Foligno, the translator of Angelo's Latin *Scala Paradisi* into Italian.[133] Angelo wrote to one of his correspondents on the subject of Joachim's *viri spirituales*,[134] and in the middle of the fourteenth century there is evidence of a circle of Augustinian Hermits at Florence with Joachimist preoccupations. The letters of one of them, Luigi Marsilio, quote from the *Vaticinium*, a text produced by fraticelli but which Marsilio believed to be genuinely by Joachim.[135]

   The Franciscans' use of Joachim is well-trodden ground. Joachim, indeed, seems to lie at the root of much of the Franciscan literature of the thirteenth century. The Joachimist affiliations and assumptions of many on the Spiritual wing of the order should not lead us to equate 'Spiritual' and 'Joachimist' as defining terms in a conflict of ideas. As Gordon Leff has noted, not all those who were convinced of the sanctity of poverty were receptive to Joachim.[136] General assertions, such as that of Marjorie Reeves comparing the 'Joachimist view of history' in its pervasive effect to the world-view and mood of early Marxism, or that of David Burr, writing of Peter Olivi's Joachimism: 'one is struck by the extent to which Olivi and his targets share a common apocalyptic perspective',[137] set the tone. Joachim assumes a role in the intellectual society of the age not dissimilar to that occupied, perhaps, by

[131] Arbesmann (ed.), 'Henry of Friemar's *Treatise*', 109; Joachim, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, fo. 120ᵛ.

[132] Reeves, 'Joachimist Expectations', 117–18. The English Augustinian John Erghome is supposed to have composed a *Compilationes Vaticinorum* (1361/72). He certainly owned copies of the 'prophecies of Merlin', the Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli, John of Rupescissa, and the Sybilline books: M. R. James, 'Catalogue of the Library of the Augustinian Friars at York', in *Fasciculus J. W. Clark dedicatus* (Cambridge, 1909), 9.

[133] Tocco, *Studi francescani*, 412.

[134] F. Ehrle, 'Die Spiritualen, ihr Verhältuiss zum Franciscanerorden und zu den Fraticellen', *ALKG* i (1885), 559–60, quoting portions of the letter.

[135] Reeves, 'Joachimist Expectations', 120.

[136] Leff, 'Franciscan Concept of Man', 219.

[137] Reeves, *Influence of Prophecy*, 175; Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 172–83.

Freud in our own: relatively few, even among intellectuals, are intimately acquainted with Freud's works themselves, but scarcely any can escape his indirect influence.[138]

Even conservative biblical scholars such as the Franciscan John Russell (fl. 1290s), whose Apocalypse commentary influenced William of Nottingham, admired Joachim as a prophet and interpreter of Scripture, while rejecting his doctrine of the third age of the Holy Spirit. In Beryl Smalley's words, Russell treated Joachim as an expositor of Scripture rather than as a guide to understanding the past.[139] This, indeed, tended to be a common attitude among Apocalypse commentators.[140] Russell and others may have rejected Joachim's Trinitarian doctrine, but, as Smalley has observed, this still left his more orthodox dual pattern of interpretation. 'Careful followers could fall back on the latter and escape censure; thus much of Joachim passed into the mainstream of teaching on the Apocalypse.'[141] An example of this 'mainstream' use of the prophetic tradition can be seen in Russell's exposition of the seven trumpet-blowing angels of the Apocalypse. Bede had suggested that the angels should be interpreted as seven hypothetical orders of preachers who upheld the Church against persecution, with the fourth characterized as 'good Christians', and the fifth as 'the faithful few' battling against the Antichrist. Russell substituted for Bede's fourth and fifth orders a single order that he identified as *ordo Christi pauperum*; in other words, the Franciscans.[142]

This conservative use of Joachim stands in contrast to the apocalyptic note struck by the Spiritual Franciscans in their articulation of a distinctive Franciscan identity. The Spirituals, and perhaps especially Angelo Clareno and Ubertino da Casale, reflected a tendency to see their order in terms of Joachim's theology of history. Thus the *viri spirituales* of Joachim come to have not a generic application but a

---

[138] An example of the kind of influence enjoyed by Joachim on erudite Franciscans in the thirteenth century is the letter of Adam Marsh to Bishop Grosseteste, which accompanied the gift of a copy of Joachim's prophecies (or perhaps a pseudo-Joachimist work), and in which Adam professes ignorance as to the value of Joachim's work while still recognizing its probable significance: *Adae de Marisco Epistolae*, xliii, in Monumenta Franciscana, ii, ed. J. S. Brewer, RS (London, 1858), 146–7.

[139] Beryl Smalley, 'John Russell OFM', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 23 (1956), 296–302. The Apocalypse commentary survives in a single manuscript: Oxford, Merton College MS 172. Admiration for Joachim's prophetic gifts is expressed on fo. 133^r.

[140] Smalley, 'John Russell', 302. Other examples cited here are John Ridewall's *Lectura in Apocalypsim* (*c*.1330) and the anonymous postill *Vidit Jacob in somniis*, dating from the second half of the thirteenth century: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 444, fos. 28^r–177^v.

[141] Smalley, 'John Russell', 304.   [142] Ibid. 308–9.

highly specific one referring to the new orders founded by Francis and Dominic. This is the same technique, albeit in a different textual context, as the method used by Carmelite writers such as Jean de Cheminot to show that the *viri religiosi* of Acts were in fact Carmelites.

The Spirituals' self-perception was, of course, dominated by their preoccupation with the 'true' Francis and 'genuine' Franciscanism. The context in which prophecy played its part was thus an adversarial one in which the persecuted followers of Francis clung to the comforts offered by an apocalyptic vision. Angelo Clareno's *Epistola excusatoria* and Olivi's *Letter to the Sons of Charles II* can be read as, on the one hand a personal, on the other a theological exposition of the importance of present suffering.[143] This suffering would have no meaning were it not to be redeemed by what was to come. Angelo can explain the suffering he has undergone only by reference to a larger historical scheme in which the faithful remnant are persecuted in the present in order to share in redemption. The individual is caught up in the horrors that must perforce darken the whole world before humanity itself can be restored with the return of Christ. It has been said that 'the apocalypticist's thought is intensively *historical*'.[144] Angelo was conscious that his own generation lived at a critical moment for humankind in general. The fact that previous generations had thrown up apocalypticists who had said identical things about their own age does not invalidate this perception, for the imminence of the end-times operated in a psychological rather than a purely chronological way. Since God operates outside the time scale in which humans are constrained, hindsight does not operate in his reception of the prayers of the faithful, and the individual apocalypticist's actions, and the perceptions on which they are based, are judged each on their own merit, rather than by reference to previous generations.

This underlying perception of the significance of a particular moment of human history does not necessarily require that the use of the prophecy follow the adversarial ecclesiology so typical of the Spiritual Franciscans. The Carmelite use of prophecy encountered in this study does not generally assume such an adversarial relationship between the agents of prophecy and the 'faithless many' upon whom judgement will fall. Prophecy, rather, was a device for projecting on the

---

[143] McGinn, 'Introduction: Apocalyptic Spirituality', in *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, 12. Olivi's letter was edited by F. Ehrle, *ALKG*, 3 (1887), 534–40.

[144] W. Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement: Introduction and Interpretation* (Nashville, 1975), 35.

Carmelites of the present the values and aspirations articulated in Scripture.[145] This did not prevent Carmelite authors from appropriating apocalyptic texts whose original intent had been quite different. The *Life of Angelo*, for example, incorporates a prophecy about the future of the Church that seems to derive from the Spiritual Franciscan tradition, and specifically from Telesphorus and other fourteenth-century apocalypticists.[146] Yet the use of the text in the *Life of Angelo* is rather tame when set against its original context. Other than demonstrating the spiritual authority of a particular Carmelite—Angelo himself—by making him the recipient of the prophecy from Christ, there is little need for the prophecy in its full form in the story of Angelo's life. All that is needed is for the martyr to be told of his imminent death, and this could have been achieved without recourse to the extravagant apocalyptic borrowed from existing texts.

In another Carmelite appropriation, Ribot's use of Cyril of Constantinople, it is not the text that is anomalous but the prophet himself.[147] Cyril's prophecy about the future status of the order is important in so far as it appears to justify the changes made to that status in the course of the thirteenth century by establishing certain 'historical' truths about the order's origins. Prophecy is not essential for Ribot's purpose—the same result could have been achieved in other ways. Once Ribot had determined upon Cyril as the vehicle for the message, however, prophecy was an obvious and recognizable means for driving the vehicle. Cyril as a Carmelite was an innovation of Ribot's (possibly deriving from a confusion with Cyril of Alexandria), but Cyril the prophetic hermit of Mt Carmel was already, by Ribot's day, a well-established character in Spiritual Franciscan apocalyptic thought. John of Hildesheim had owned a copy of the anonymous—but almost certainly Franciscan-derived—*Oraculum Cyrilli*, which purports to be the text of a vision enjoyed by a prophet living on Mt Carmel, Cyril, and communicated to Joachim of Fiore. It may have been his interest in the obscure prophet of Mt Carmel that led Ribot to appropriate Cyril for a more prominent role in the order. To Ribot, not unnaturally, a prophet living on Mt Carmel and corresponding with Joachim of Fiore must surely be a member of the Carmelite Order. Moreover, since Ribot was trying to demonstrate the continuity between the original prophetic ministry of Elijah and the Carmelites

---

[145] As, for example, in the use of the prophecy of Sobac by John of Hildesheim: see above, 59. An exception may be made for the apocalyptic passages in the *Ignea Sagitta*.
[146] See above, 196.   [147] See above, 137.

living on Mt Carmel up to 1291, the opportunity to add a prophetic ability to the monastic profession of the Carmelite hermits was welcome. The elevation in status of Cyril to prior-general was Ribot's own addition.[148]

[148] See above, 137. The fifteenth-century *Vita Cyrilli* further embellished the story of Cyril, while preserving at its heart the hermit's prophetic qualities; see above, 204. In general, see Adrian Staring, 'Cirillo di Constantinopoli', in *Santi del Carmelo* (Rome, 1972), 189–90. Carmelite interest in Joachim and in the prophetic tradition can be demonstrated by the existence of a manuscript of the 1480s, itself a copy of a fourteenth-century original, in the Archivio Generale of the Carmelite Order. The codex comprises twenty-six different prophetic texts, including extracts from Joachim and Arnold of Villanova: Selge, 'Un codice quattrocentesco'.

Antiquity, Truth, and Historical Method: Carmelites and Others

ORIGINES ORDINUM, FAMILY HISTORY, AND *ORIGINES GENTIUM*

All mendicants who wrote about the history of their own order had to confront the problem of a founder. The Augustinian Hermits had no single founder, while the Carmelite historical account tried to side-step Albert of Vercelli, who was the obvious candidate, in order to reach further back into the past. The Franciscans and the Dominicans boasted charismatic founders, but developed strategies to show how the essence of their profession pre-dated Francis and Dominic. Similarly, the Benedictines became dissatisfied with the idea of Benedict as their founder. A group of late fourteenth-century Benedictine treatises on the origins of monasticism seeks to demonstrate that Benedict—like Albert for the Carmelites—was not so much a founder as a codifier of an existing tradition. These texts offer by means of historical synthesis what W. A. Pantin calls a 'theory of the religious life'.[1] The intent is to reflect on the meaning of monasticism by tracing the historical origins of a way of life; the result, at least in some versions, is to promote the place of the Benedictines as the 'first monks' within a historical hierarchy.

One treatise from this genre, the *De prima institutione monachorum*, versions of which Pantin has located as emanating from the English

---

[1] William A. Pantin, 'Two Treatises of Uthred of Boldon on the Monastic Life', in R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (eds.), *Studies in Medieval History Presented to F. M. Powicke* (Oxford, 1948), 382. Uthred (*c.*1315/25–1397) was a monk of Durham who took a doctorate in theology at Oxford in 1357, and from 1367 was resident either in Durham or the dependent cell at Finchale, where he was periodically prior. He also wrote treatises on Church–State relations, against the friars, and on the sacraments.

Benedictine centres of Bury St Edmunds, St Albans, Durham, and Glastonbury, is polemical and outward-looking in intent.[2] One version of the treatise begins from the philosophical premiss that, since 'there is one single cause and principle of all things', monasticism must have had a single source.[3] The unspoken issue therefore is to find the monastic tradition that can be shown to have emanated most closely from that source. The author's agenda, however, appears simply to lie in countering the argument of the Canons that because Benedict, the initiator of monasticism, had lived a century after Augustine, their own form of life was older than that of the Benedictine monks. The author accepts the argument on its own terms, and seeks to disprove it by rational objective proof. Such a proof can be located in an authoritative text, the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great, from which it is clear that Benedict was not himself the initiator of monasticism, but only the codifier and interpreter of an existing tradition.[4] This argument for historical priority rests on establishing a clear linear narrative of the transmission of the monastic tradition. But the consequence is that the meaning of Benedictine monasticism itself comes into question. The St Albans manuscript demonstrates that Augustine was himself a monk in the tradition of even earlier predecessors: Antony, Hilarion, Macarius, 'and others whom it would take too long to enumerate'.[5] Just as Philip Ribot rejected Albert of Vercelli as a founder because he was too firmly locked into a narrative context from which the Carmelites wished to escape, so the Benedictine author sought to side-step St Benedict.

In the fullest version, the Durham *De prima institutione*, the Benedictine argument for priority comes to resemble the Carmelite legend even more closely. The originator of the monastic life was Samuel, who was followed by the sons of the prophets, whose example in turn was taken up by the Apostles, Antony, and Macarius. Like Ribot, the author cites Jerome on the sons of Rechab and John Cassian on Elijah, Elisha, and John the Baptist. 'The order of monks had its beginning in Elijah the prophet in the Old Testament, when he held government and headship over the sons of the prophets who fled from the world to

---

[2] Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises'. Versions of the *De prima institutione* occur in Rome, Vat. MS Reg. Lat. 127, fo.164ᵛ, the preface of which ascribes the authorship to a monk of Bury; London, BL MS Cotton Claudius E.IV, fo. 346ᵛ, written before 1394 at St Albans; and BL MS Cotton Vitellius E.XIII, fo.85, a mid-fifteenth century Durham text that Pantin associates with Uthred of Boldon's *De institutione monachorum*. The latter manuscript was edited by W. Dugdale, in *Monasticon Anglicanum*, i, pp. xix–xxii.

[3] Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises', 211–12. This is the Vatican version.

[4] Ibid. 212. [5] Ibid. 202.

live under his rule by the Jordan, when he withdrew to the brook Carith at the Lord's command.'[6] And so the progression of monks continues, through the Essenes, the Apostles, and the first Christian monks established by St Mark in Alexandria, and from them to Antony, Pachomius, Hilarion, Serapion, and the Egyptian Fathers, Basil, Cassian, Jerome, and others, finally to reach Benedict, that mighty warrior in God's army, 'the most assiduous hearer and executor of the Gospel precepts'.[7]

Benedict was thus the culmination of a movement, his monasticism the tidal reaches of a great river that had begun centuries ago by the brook Carith. The whole passage might have been taken from a Carmelite treatise, save perhaps for the siting of Elijah's monastic life by the Jordan rather than on Mt Carmel. The only difference between the Carmelite version of the history of monasticism and the Benedictine one is that for the Carmelites the spring of Elijah on Mt Carmel replaces Carith. Yet this is a huge difference. For the Benedictines, it did not much matter where Elijah practised monasticism, and his successors were accepted wherever they lived: in Egypt, Syria, Gaul, or Italy. What mattered were the fundamental attributes of the monastic life. For the Carmelites, however, one of those attributes was Mt Carmel itself. Thus, in the fifteenth-century development of the Carmelite legend, either early monastic founders such as Basil were themselves brought to Carmel, or Carmel was extended geographically beyond the mountain itself.

The *De prima institutione monachorum* argued for historical priority by demonstrating that Benedict was the bearer of tradition. The St Albans treatise *De ortu et prioritate ordinis monachorum* (*c*.1394) seeks, in addition, to refute the specific claims of other orders.[8] The Dominicans' claim to descent from the patriarch Jacob is exposed as fraudulent, and the name 'Jacobiti' that they have adopted is shown instead to derive from the name of the hospital in Paris where they had their first convent.[9] The Carmelite claim to descent from Elijah is likewise rejected, because begging was forbidden to the Jewish people, and to

---

[6] *De prima institutione*; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i, p. xix.

[7] Ibid., i, pp. xx–xxii.

[8] Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises', 202–6. Pantin argues that this is the work of Thomas Walsingham; it is preceded in the manuscript in which it survives, London, BL Cotton Claudius E.IV, by Walsingham's *Gesta Abbatum*.

[9] *De ortu et prioritate ordinis monachorum*, in Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i, p. xxii. This seems to be a response to the claim by Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor*, i. 7, 10, that the Dominicans' preaching role derives from the example of the patriarch Jacob.

assert such a descent is therefore to impute unlawfulness to the prophet.[10] Likewise, the Augustinian Hermits' claim to descent from Paul the Hermit is untenable, because Paul was no mendicant but a proper hermit.[11] Only the Franciscans, who do not try to prove their antiquity, escape the St Albans monk's censure.

The St Albans argument rejects the claims of other orders to pre-Benedictine origins, but it does not thereby reject the plausibility of such origins in principle. The rejection is rather of other orders' pretensions to represent the mainstream tradition of monasticism, a position that belongs to the Benedictines. The dismissal of ancient origins, however, is based upon what we might identify as 'rational' or even 'objective' arguments about such claims. The rejection of the Carmelite claim, for instance, is a rejection of the idea that the varieties of monasticism as it subsequently developed can be identified with virtuous attributes and behaviour displayed in the Old Testament. There is an inherent contradiction here, for, of course, if Elijah did not beg, nor did he live a cloistered life, eat in a refectory, or observe a monastic liturgy. Anachronism seems to be permitted to the Benedictines seeking the spiritual sources of their profession, but not to other orders.

In one late fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscript from central Europe, the *De origine, fundatoribus et regulis monachorum et monacharum*, the evolution of monasticism is illustrated by visual images as well as by text.[12] The father of monasticism here, surprisingly, is Abraham, who is shown as a teacher faced by rows of monks sitting on benches apparently learning astronomy. He is followed by Samuel, also a teacher, and then Elijah, who appears as a father of monks and administrator of a great abbey. A further image shows the Essenes in monastic dress and holding books.[13] The characteristics of monasticism in these representations appear to be, first, teaching and learning, and then the self-sufficient nature of the monastic community. From Abraham to the Essenes, all these images of proto-monasticism feature warehouses or wagons full of grain. The intent is clearly to project the typical aspects of late medieval Benedictine monasticism back on to an Old Testament past. It is a series of images that, with a slightly different focus, could easily have been read as an illustration of a Carmelite historical treatise of the period.

[10] *De ortu*, in Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i, p. xxiii. The same argument had been deployed by Holcot in the 1330s. [11] Ibid.

[12] *De origine, fundatoribus et regulis monachorum et monacharum*: Vienna, Nat. Bib. 341. The provenance is probably the Benedictine monastery of Brewnow, near Smichow.

[13] *De origine . . . monachorum*, fos. 1ᵛ, 2ʳ⁻ᵛ, 8ᵛ.

One characteristic of this late medieval Benedictine genre was the attempt to assign precise dates to the foundation of orders and houses. The St Albans *De ortu et prioritate ordinis monachorum* lists the rule of St Fructuosus *c*.245, St Basil in 350, Pachomius *c*.400, Aurelius in 460, Ferreolus in 470, Aurelian in 478, Egippus, John of Gerona, and Vigilius (undated), Benedict *c*.516, all the way to Gilbert of Sempringham in the twelfth century.[14] As Pantin has shown, this whole treatise must be seen in the context of the *Gesta Abbatum* that precedes it, and indeed the last section is on the miraculous foundation of the abbey of St Albans itself.[15] There is thus a greater degree of particularity than at first appears in the author's intent from the *De ortu* alone. The desire to identify and date foundations and rules, however, and to use a catalogue of foundation dates as proof of greater antiquity than a rival order, is common to a wider group of writings. Nor did the tendency begin as late as the end of the fourteenth century. Stephen of Salagnac's *De quatuor in quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignavit* (*c*.1278/1305) sought to justify his claim to priority on behalf of the Dominicans on the grounds that the Augustinian Rule was older than any other rule in use by religious.[16] Stephen lists the non-Augustinian religious orders chronologically: the Benedictine Rule was taken from Basil and Pachomius, the Grandmontine (1076) from the example of Egyptian and Calabrian hermits; next come the Carthusians (1086) and the Cistercians (1098); then the Hospital of St John, which claims foundation by St John the Almsgiver but should really be dated from 1100, the Templars (1122), and the other arms-bearing orders founded in the Holy Land. They are followed by the Carmelites, whose foundation date is uncertain but lies in the twelfth century, in contrast to their rule, which dates only from 1247. The Franciscan Rule was written in 1223; but then Stephen doubles back to list the twelfth-century foundation of the Poor of Monte Maurilii under Pope Lucius III, the Hospital of St Gerald of Limoges, founded in 1158 but given a rule by Innocent III, and finally the Humiliati, likewise regulated by Innocent III from existing rules.[17] Stephen is not oblivious to pretensions to greater antiquity, such as the Hospitallers' claim to have been founded before the Incarnation, but he deals with them firmly.[18]

[14] *De ortu*, in Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i, pp. xxiii–xxiv.
[15] Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises', 205.
[16] Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor*, iv. 2, p. 172.   [17] Ibid., iv. 4, pp. 174–83.
[18] Ibid., 177–8: 'Iohannes vero Hyrcanus longe etiam ante adventum Christi in carnem fecerat cenodochia in Ierusalem, id est domos ad recipiendum pauperes Iudeos, sed ibi tunc nullos erat ordo nec regula nec habitus.' On the Hospitaller legend, see K. V. Sinclair, 'The

This kind of listing could obviously be adapted to suit the purposes of the author. Thus Bale's miscellany, Bodleian Library MS 73, offers different versions of the same kind of foundation list made by Stephen and the St Albans monk. One of these is preceded by the assertion that the Carmelites began living on Mt Carmel in 937 BC.[19] The implication is clearly that bandying dates around was a dangerous game, for at times when the other orders of monks were just beginning, the Carmelites were already venerable. The precision of these lists—even where the dating is in fact incorrect—indicates a need to fix a location in the past and thereby to establish a strict hierarchy. Such a hierarchy, in turn, suggests that the authors saw each order as qualitatively different from others. There is no recognition, for example, that the Cluniacs followed the Benedictine Rule; and, whereas the Dominican Stephen of Salagnac dates his order from the time of Augustine because the Preachers followed his rule, in the Carmelite lists they were a separate order with a distinct foundation. In the kind of shorthand history of monasticism produced by such lists, any developmental sense of the past such as is conveyed by the *De prima institutione* is lost. What remains, instead, is a contested tradition of the *origines ordinum* that might be seen as analogous to the traditions of *origines gentium* and aristocratic family history in the secular world.

Claims to an invented or imagined antiquity were not unique to religious orders in the Middle Ages. As much attention has been paid by historians and scholars of literature to mappings of the past in the secular sphere as in the religious.[20] Perhaps the first point to be made is

Anglo-Norman Miracles of the Foundation of the Hospital of St John in Jerusalem', *Medium Aevum*, 55 (1986), 102–8, and for the relevant texts, *The Hospitallers' Riwle: Miracula et Regula hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani*, ed. K. V. Sinclair, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 42 (London, 1984).

[19] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fo. 43ᵛ. The list is as follows: Pachomian Order (*c.*250), Basilian (366), Canons Regular (400), Benedictines (530), Cluniacs (912), Carthusians (1094), Cistercians (1098), Templars (1098–1310), Premonstratensians (1120), Hospitallers (1140), Teutonic Knights (1190), Williamites (1198), Dominicans (*c.*1200), Franciscans (1210), Augustinian Hermits (1300). Another list, fos. 46ʳ–48ʳ is: Rechabites (4240 BC), *ordo crucisferorum* (314, abolished by Emperor Julian, then reinstituted 1212), *ordo Thebenensium* (380), Augustinians (418), Canons Regular (424), Benedictines (518), Cluniacs (890), Grandmontines (1076), Carthusians (1084), Hospitallers (1179), Dominicans (1203), Franciscans (1223). A further example of the genre of listing monastic foundations and houses occurs in a fifteenth-century manuscript from the monastery of St John in Cismaria, now Copenhagen, Roy. Lib. MS Gl. kg. Saml. 3401, fos. 1010ᵛ–1015ᵛ: 'omnes ordines sanctorum monachorum et sanctimonialium'. I am grateful to Erik Drigsdahl for this information.

[20] Examples from recent literature include Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley, 1993); Emma Mason, 'Fact and Fiction in Crusading Tradition: The Earls of Warwick in the Twelfth Century', *Journal*

an obvious one: namely, that these were not really separate spheres. It goes without saying that friars might themselves be also members of families with their own historical traditions, and they were certainly subjects of rulers who wanted to use historical traditions to legitimate their own authority. Moreover, the *origines gentium* were themselves concocted by scholars, which meant clergymen, who were sometimes members of religious orders. Susan Reynolds has argued that such traditions began as intellectual exercises, but that they became a feature of vernacular entertainment in the twelfth century, and by the end of the thirteenth had entered political discourse.[21] Their first articulators, therefore, were clerics.

This should cause no surprise. The articulating of historical traditions was one product of reform and uncertainty within the religious life. Among the severest critics of mendicant ideals and practice in the thirteenth century were cloistered monks, whose predecessors had already confronted the question of historical identity in debates with each other and with the Canons in the twelfth century. In a sense, the relationship between tradition and innovation is what the monastic 'reformation of the twelfth century' was about. The *rubrica prima* of the Carmelites is in some ways simply an analogue of the *Exordium magnum* of the Cistercians, in which the unique claims made by the Cistercians are authorized by the historical lineage of the monastic profession.[22] Each wave of reform within Christian society brought in its wake historical authentication, its appeal to texts and traditions. Monks were

of Medieval History, 14 (1988), 81–95; David Anderson, 'Mythography or Historiography? The Interpretation of Theban Myths in Late Medieval Literature', *Florilegium*, 8 (1986), 113–39; Jean Blacker, *The Faces of Time: Portrayals of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman Regnum* (Austin, Tex., 1994); Monika Otter, *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1996). Among works that deal with remembered pasts of religious communities, I have also found useful Gabrielle Spiegel, *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, 1997), 138–62; J. Beer, *Narrative Conventions of Truth in the Middle Ages* (Geneva, 1981); Janet Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge, 1992); Amy Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca, NY, 1995). In general see Bernard Guenée, 'Histoires, annales, chroniques: Essai sur les genres historiques au moyen age', *Annales*, 28 (1973), 997–1016; *idem* (ed.), *Le Metier d'historien au Moyen Age: Etudes sur l'historiographie médiévale* (Paris, 1977); Nancy Partner, 'The New Cornificius: Medieval History and the Artifice of Words', in Ernst Breisach (ed.), *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1985), 5–59.

    [21] Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900–1300* (Oxford, 1984), 258.
    [22] *Exordium magnum ordinis Cisterciensis*, i. 2–6, PL 185, cols. 997–1000; Conrad d'Eberbach, *Le Grand Exorde de Cîteaux ou récits des débuts de l'ordre cistercien*, trans. A. Piebourg and B. McGuire (Turnhout, 1998), 8–10.

accustomed to the demands of providing historical justification for their praxis and status.

It was natural that this kind of historical expertise should be sought from monks by governments, not only because monks were literate, but because kings understood that the techniques of negotiating the past that had been developed by monasteries and religious orders for their own protection and enhancement could equally well be deployed by them in the service of royal claims. An obvious example is the scouring of English monastic archives by Edward I for historical proofs of the English claim to the throne of Scotland, on the grounds that Britain had originally been a single kingdom.[23] Whether or not he had intended it, Geoffrey of Monmouth's fictions about the origins of Britain could provide a powerful ideology for use in the political arena. The danger of such a strategy for national policy was the impossibility of monopolizing history; thus in the Declaration of Arbroath (1320) the Scots took their own turn at inventing the past.[24] The Capetians also, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, found a political use for their own myth of descent from the Trojans in the conflict with the papacy.[25] As Susan Reynolds points out, references to 'mythical collective ancestries' proliferated in the political discourse at precisely the time when government was becoming effective over new areas for which those myths could be made to apply.[26] Thus the Capetians began to promote the tradition of descent from Charlemagne at a time when royal government was beginning to extend itself over areas in which it had previously been absent.[27] But was political policy influenced by what one could find in monastic archives or fashion from a common stock of vernacular folklore and romance? Or did the policy itself shape the fashioning of such traditions and the reading of the archives? The Declaration of Arbroath is a magnificent, imaginative piece of historical reconstruction, but it can be argued that its language and ideas were plausible to its audience in 1320 only because of events in Scotland since 1296.[28]

[23] E. L. G. Stones and G. G. Simpson (eds.), *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland 1290–1296: An Edition of the Record Sources for the Great Cause* (Oxford, 1978), 137–48.

[24] A. A. M. Duncan, *The Nation of Scots and the Declaration of Arbroath*, Historical Association Pamphlet (London, 1970); G. W. S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 3rd edn. (Edinburgh, 1988), 302–11.

[25] Jean Leclercq (ed.), *Jean de Paris et l'ecclésiologie du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1942), 176–8.

[26] Susan Reynolds, 'Medieval *origines gentium* and the Community of the Realm', *History*, 68 (1983), 381.   [27] Spiegel, *Past as Text*, 111–37.

[28] Alexander Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness in Medieval Scotland', in Claus

   This line of argument suggests that both the search for mythical pasts and the content of those pasts were governed by political circumstances. Similar imperatives appear to lie behind the increasing popularity of aristocratic vernacular family history in the thirteenth century. Spiegel, analysing the pseudo-Turpin tradition in France in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, suggests that vernacular history served to promote aristocratic identity at a time of political crisis. The barons who opposed the advance of royal authority found justification for their resistance in a glorious past in which their ancestors supposedly figured as companions of the ideal ruler, Charlemagne.[29] A political incentive also lies behind the construction of the crusading legend of the Beauchamp earls of Warwick in the thirteenth century. As Emma Mason has shown, the Beauchamps assiduously collected mythic episodes in the lives of different branches of the family: thus, an eleventh-century Tosny ancestor who fought in the Reconquista, and a twelfth-century crusading tenant of the earls of Warwick who was miraculously restored to his own woodlands when taken captive in the East, came to be associated in a complex of myths with the Beauchamp family. The mosaic of family crusading traditions was assembled into the romance *Gui de Warewic* in the early thirteenth century.[30]

   The timing of the *origines ordinum* traditions studied in this book would appear to fall into the same pattern, according to which appeals to the past were usually responses to political conditions. The Carmelite invention of tradition was clearly a response to the Second Council of Lyons (1274). The Benedictine *origines ordinum* genre represented by the writings of Uthred of Boldon was at least in part a defence of monasticism in response to Wyclif's writings.[31] As we have seen, the development of Carmelite ecclesiology also bears the marks of involvement in this controversy. It is surely no coincidence that this was also the period of the most intense debate between Carmelites and Dominicans over origins, and the point when the Carmelite historical tradition

Bjorn, Alexander Grant, and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past* (Copenhagen, 1994), 72–3.

   [29] Gabrielle Spiegel, 'Pseudo-Turpin, the Crisis of the Aristocracy and the Beginnings of Vernacular History in France', *Journal of Medieval History*, 12 (1986), 208.

   [30] Emma Mason, 'Legends of the Beauchamps' Ancestors: The Use of Baronial Propaganda in Medieval England', *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984), 25–40; *idem*, 'Fact and Fiction'. The story of Hugh Fitzrichard, founder of Wroxall, is told in Dugdale, *Monasticon*, iv. 88, 90–1. The Beauchamps had at least one genuine crusading forebear in Hugh, who died at Hattin in 1187. For further examples and discussion, see Spiegel, *Romancing the Past*.

   [31] Pantin, 'Two Treatises', 382.

found its most creative exponent in Philip Ribot. Equally, these years saw the reception of the mature historical legend of the Augustinian Hermits, and the final flourishing of the prophetic tradition among Spiritual Franciscans.

On the surface it seems obvious, then, that political aspirations and imperatives determined the occurrence and content of the discourse about collective origins, in both secular and ecclesiastical spheres. But the political context of the examples cited above, however plausible they seem in the particular, should not mislead us into assuming that the search for origins was invariably a response to *immediate* events. For one thing, the formulation of the *origines gentium* tradition developed slowly from the sixth century onward, and the myths themselves answered different needs in the sixth from those in the thirteenth.[32] By the twelfth century, indeed, the Trojan descent of the French was already regarded by some in France as a myth, just as William of Newburgh dismissed Geoffrey of Monmouth's account of the Trojan origins of the British as fiction.[33]

Political circumstances, moreover, did not invariably suggest the value of appealing to ancient progenitors, whether 'national' or familial. For example, crusading as an endeavour and an ideal fostered the search for ethnic identities. Recent studies by Marcus Bull and Alan Murray have shown that the process of crusading itself—the logistics of armed travel, the encounter with new customs and languages among co-religionists even before the confrontation with Islam began —served to articulate new identities on behalf of the participants.[34]

[32] Reynolds, 'Medieval *origines gentium*', 375, 381, argues that the initial construction of the myths derived from the desire of clerical writers to find 'honourable origins' for their people, and contrasts this with the political use made of them by, e.g., Edward I or the Scots in the period *c.*1290s–1320s. On the origins of the Trojan descent myth, which appears initially in the chronicle of Fredegar and is appropriated by Widukind of Corvey for the Germans and Dudo of St Quentin for the Normans, see ibid. 375–7. Arno Borst, *Der Thurmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und vielfalt der Sprachen und Volker*, 4 vols. (Stuttgart, 1957–63), surveys them comprehensively; see also E. Lüthgen, *Die Quellen und der historische Werthe der frankischen Trojsaga* (Bonn, 1876); M. Klippel, *Die Darstellung der fränkischen Trojanersaga in Geschichtsschreibung und Dichtung vom Mittelalter bis zur Renaissance in Frankreich* (Marburg, 1936); Herwig Wolfram, 'Einleitung oder Uberlegungen zur Origo Gentis', in Herwig Wolfram and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bayern*, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1990), i. 19–33, and *idem*, 'Le Genre de l'*origo gentis*', *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 68 (1990), 789–801.

[33] Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, ed. H-F. Delaborde, *Œuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, historiens de Philippe-Auguste*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1882–5), i. 55; William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, i, in R. Howlett (ed.), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, 2 vols., RS (London, 1884–5), i. 10–18.

[34] Marcus Bull, 'Overlapping and Competing Identities in the Frankish First Crusade', in

These new identities sought legitimation not from the distant past, but from recent shared experience. However the crusaders had defined themselves in their homelands—as Normans, Provençals, Burgundians, and so on—the experience of the crusade created a new corporate identity, a new meaning for the term *Francus*. The crusader states were perhaps anomalous in medieval society, in that the new *Franci* formed a ruling class based on their ethnic identification, in distinction to the ethnicity of the indigenous people; consequently, social origins became less important as a determinant of political authority.[35] An equation of noble virtues and, as a concomitant, the right to rule, with antiquity, moreover, is too crude a formula for understanding the interest in family history. Alexander Murray observes that chroniclers and romancers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries often sought to portray their heroes as descended from 'newcomers' to the aristocratic classes; the romance *Hugues Capet*, for example, makes its protagonist the grandson of a butcher.[36] Virtue might equally repose in the capacity to identify with the *miles* class as in the ability to prove that an ancestor fought with Charlemagne.

Another problem arises when we try to understand what I have called the *origines ordinum* as a simple analogy of the *origines gentium* tradition. The *origines gentium* tradition produced a synthesis from different sources. Throughout the Middle Ages, this genre of writing mixed biblical and classical sources indiscriminately. Thus, for example, Fredegar saw no difficulty in making the Trojans and Greeks descendants of Noah; and the Scots would sometimes claim descent from Pharoah's daughter Scota, while at other times emphasizing their unbroken line from the Scythians.[37] The result, however, provided a cohesive version of who the British, or French, or Saxon people were—in Reynolds's words, they reflected 'belief in the natural, *given* existence of collective groups with their own customs, laws and cultures'.[38] In the same way, religious orders sought to foster internal unity by presenting

Le Concile de Clermont de 1095 et l'appel à la croisade, Collection de L'Ecole Française de Rome, 236 (Rome, 1997), 195–211; Alan V. Murray, 'Ethnic Identity in the Crusader States: The Frankish Race and the Settlement of Outremer', in Simon Forde, Lesley Johnson, and Alan V. Murray (eds.), *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages*, Leeds Texts and Monographs Series, 14 (Leeds, 1995), 59–73.

[35] Joshua Prawer, 'Social Classes in the Crusader States: The Franks', in K. Setton (ed.), *History of the Crusades*, v: *The Impact of the Crusades on the Near East*, ed. Norman P. Zacour and Harry W. Hazard (Madison, 1985), 120–1.

[36] Alexander Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1978), 91–4.

[37] Reynolds, 'Medieval *origines gentium*', 377.   [38] Ibid. 389.

a single, inclusive, unchallenged version of their origins. The *Legenda Maior* of Francis by Bonaventure is perhaps the most obvious example. But in fact the *Legenda Maior* went further than any single use of *origines gentium* myths in this period. So 'official' was this version of Francis's life intended to be that dissident versions, or memories that conflicted with the official version, were discarded, even destroyed.[39]

The imagined pasts created by religious orders rejected, either implicitly or explicitly, other versions of that same past constructed by other groups. The *origines ordinum* tradition could not tolerate a multiplicity of pasts. Thus the Benedictine treatises of the late fourteenth century seek to locate a single moment for the origin of monasticism and a single route to the present, by means of which a hierarchy of foundations can be established. A century earlier, Stephen of Salagnac had identified the different orders in the Church according to foundation dates. The subtext of Stephen's chronicle, as of the St Albans *De ortu et prioritate ordinis monachorum* and Bale's foundation lists in Bodleian Library MS 73, is, 'we are the true monks because we were here first'. The validity of an order's claim is based not simply on provable antiquity, but on greater antiquity than any other order. Yet this sense of contesting the past, rather than simply occupying it, is alien to the *origines gentium* genre. As Susan Reynolds concludes, nobody was worried that two kingdoms might both share a supposed common descent from the Trojans: 'the whole set of ideas was too unsystematic to create claims to authority which would not have been made otherwise'.[40] The Declaration of Arbroath, for example, does not claim that the Scots are an 'older' people than the English, but simply that they have always been independent of them. As long as their original occupation of the territory in question can be established, the question of whether other peoples, even those from the same root stock, had occupied other territories earlier, is not relevant.

One cannot say that there was never any overlap between the two genres, or that their purposes did not on occasion resemble each other. The Declaration of Arbroath, for example, resembles the Augustinian Hermits' foundation myth in the sense that it assumes a shared past on behalf of a collectivity that was itself fictional—the inhabitants of Scotland in the 1320s did not even share a common language, just as the Augustinian Hermits had not shared a single rule for living before

[39] 'Definitiones capitulorum', ed. Little, 678, but see Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 119, for a more charitable view.

[40] Reynolds, 'Medieval *origines gentium*', 389–90.

1256. Aspects of the foundation traditions developed by the Carmelites appear to share the concerns and purposes of the *origines gentium* genre current in the same period. One might even argue that the fundamental purpose behind both was similar: to explain how a particular piece of territory had first come to be occupied by the people claimed as the ancestors of the current occupants.

   To argue, however, that monks and friars developed historical myths about their origins simply because they were subject to challenges from one another, from the papacy, or from secular theologians is to lose sight of the springs from which such myth making arose. We need to ask, in the first place, why challenges to an order's integrity and status were themselves framed within a discourse about the past; why the functions and attributes of a particular religious profession were viewed in terms of conformity to, or departure from, a historically authenticated model. A reading of Carmelite historical claims that also takes into account the sensibilities of Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican, and Augustinian writing on the history of monasticism suggests that a deeper cultural concern with antiquity informs the ways in which all religious sought to validate their professions.

THE TASTE FOR THE OLD AND THE PROBLEM OF THE NEW

From the anthropological perspective, the recollection and writing of history affirms the structural need within communities to preserve social memories.[41] A shared history is an essential component in the survival of dominant groups. The capacity to recall and, in a literate society, to record the past was in itself empowering, because those who can describe the way things have happened can also to some extent arbitrate the way they should happen in the future.[42] Even the capacity to identify groups using a vocabulary based on textual authorities could convey power.[43]

[41] Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman (New York, 1992), 55, with explicit reference to pre-literate societies: 'The physical domain in which the collective memory of peoples without writing crystallizes is that which provides an apparently historical foundation for the existence of ethnic groups of families, that is, myths of origin.'

[42] In the context of canon law and authority, see Gerhard Ladner, 'Two Gregorian Letters: On the Sources and Nature of Gregory VII's Reform Ideology', *Studi Gregoriani*, 5 (1956), 236.

[43] Lucy Bosworth, 'A Thirteenth-Century Genealogy of Heresy', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church Retrospective*, Studies in Church History, 33 (Woodbridge, 1997), 135–7; Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, 1983), 105.

Reaching back to the past could be a means of explaining how the present had come into being. Readers of romances knew that ancestry was the index to personal identity; those who, like Perceval, did not know who they were, had no place in aristocratic society. The question asked of Carmelites throughout the fourteenth century was not simply 'Who are you?', but 'By what right do you claim to be the friars of the Blessed Virgin and the descendants of Elijah?' Sometimes the response had to be taken on trust. Thomas Scrope's *Chronicon de institutione . . . de monte Carmeli* (after 1446) presents letters written on behalf of the Carmelites in 1282 and 1283, in which the masters of the Temple and the Hospital and notable bishops in the Holy Land attest that the order has been in existence beyond living memory.[44] Similarly, documentary proof was required of landowners by Edward I in order to prove title to franchises and privileged jurisdictions. But social memory did not invariably yield to literate records, and the Carmelites' proof according to the criterion of 'beyond living memory' was analogous to the kinds of proofs of title that had been offered for hundreds of years in law courts. Walter Map tried to translate the notion of living memory into more precise terms, estimating that the period of time in which the past remained present in living memories was a hundred years.[45] The demands of royal governments for documentary title are echoed by the demand of John of Hildesheim's detractor for evidence that the Carmelites were founded by Elijah. The director's response is that the categories of documentary evidence operating in the present cannot be expected of the distant past, in which habits of recording events had not yet become engrained.[46] In a well-known anecdote told by several chroniclers, an English earl had made the same argument by brandishing the ancestral sword that represented his family's original conquest of the land to which he claimed the title.[47] Occupying the past might also mean laying claim to the values represented by antiquity. That medieval literary culture aspired to antiquity, in both formal and substantive terms, has long been recognized as one of its most characteristic features. At one level, this might take the form of the taste for classical allusion and for the use of materials from the classical corpus by a group of fourteenth-century English friars identified by Beryl

[44] Scrope, *Chronicon*, ix; *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 185–6.
[45] Map, *De nugis curialium*, dist. i. 30, pp. 122–4.
[46] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, i, *MCH* 339.
[47] See Michael T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1993), 35–7, for recapitulation and discussion.

Smalley. One of these 'classicizing' friars was Robert Holcot, the critic of Carmelite claims to ancient origins.[48] The self-evident superiority of ancient writers over modern was taken by Richard of Bury, the fourteenth-century bibliophile, as an indication not only of advanced mental faculties but even of superior physical development. Richard was perhaps rendering too literally Bernard of Chartres' famous dictum about dwarves standing on the shoulders of giants.[49]

Perhaps more significant for our purposes, the converse was also true; if the antique was venerated, the modern was held to be suspect. Thus, for example, in the 1130s William of Saint-Thierry articulated his suspicion of contemporary philosophical teaching by use of the word 'novelty', just as a generation earlier Gregory VII had been condemned by the imperialist Manegold of Lutenbach for introducing 'nova lex, dogma novum, noviter fabricatum'.[50] *Novus* may itself have been a frightening word, connoting the unexpected, that which had not been tested, and thus lacked authentication.[51] In the twelfth century, Richard of St Victor, Rupert of Deutz, and the author of the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia* had all, writing in quite different contexts, to defend themselves against actual or perceived charges of novelty.[52] Most germane to this study is William of Saint-Amour's attack on the friars in the 1250s, in which innovation is equated with the advent of Antichrist.[53] Even attempts to authenticate

[48]   Smalley, *English Friars, passim*; on Holcot, 330–1.

[49]   Richard of Bury, *The Philobiblon of Richard of Bury*, ed. and trans. Emert C. Thomas (London, 1888), 81–2; 207–8 for English translation. For discussion of 'dwarves on the shoulders of giants', cited by John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, iii. 4, see R. Klibansky, 'Standing on the Shoulders of Giants', *Isis*, 26 (1936), 147–9; E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, 1953), 83–5, 252–5, 407–13, and now Jacqueline T. Miller, *Poetic License: Authority and Authorship in Medieval and Renaissance Contexts* (Oxford, 1986), 9–11.

[50]   William of Saint-Thierry, *De erroribus Guillelmi de Conchis*, PL 180, col. 333; and for Bernard of Clairvaux's rebuttal of Abelard in similar terms, J. Leclercq, *Etudes sur S. Bernard et le texte de ses écrits, App V: Autour des capitula d'Abélard*, Analecta sacri ordinis Cisterciensis, 9/1–2 (Rome, 1953); Manegold of Lutenbach cited in Beryl Smalley, 'Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Novelty, *c*.1100–*c*.1250', in Derek Baker (ed.), *Church, Society and Politics*, Studies in Church History, 12 (Oxford, 1975), 113, and 123 for a different view of William of Saint-Thierry. In general, see M-D. Chenu, *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, trans. J. Taylor and L. K. Little, Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching, 37 (Toronto, 1997), 310–30.

[51]   W. Freund, 'Modernus und andere Zeitbegriffe des Mittelalters', in K. von Raumer (ed.), *Neue münstersche Beiträge zur Geschichtsforschung*, iv (Münster, 1957), 107–8; J. Spörl, 'Das Alte und das Neue im Mittelalter', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 50 (1930), 297–341, 498–524.

[52]   Richard of St Victor, *In visionem Ezechielis*, prologue PL 196, col. 527; Rupert of Deutz, *In Apocalypsim*, prologue PL 169, col. 826; Smalley, 'Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Novelty', 121.

[53]   William of Saint-Amour, *De periculis*.

ideals based on a language of newness, such as Joachim of Fiore's *novus ordo* and the uses made of it by friars, articulated those ideals in terms of restoration or renewal. Bonaventure, for example, insisted that the Franciscan Rule was not *nova res* but *renovata*.[54] For some historians, the language of *renovatio* has even become the characteristic discourse of medieval culture.[55]

The medieval affinity for things ancient was neither simply an intellectual vanity nor simply an acknowledgement of the superior cultural achievements of antiquity. The immediate need for mendicant orders to locate themselves within history arose, as we have seen, from the prohibition on 'new orders' promulgated at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 and repeated at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. The decree *Ne nimium* may be read as an assault on 'modern' ideas by 'conservative' prelates—and as such, as an epilogue to a debate over renewal and novelty that had been current throughout the century of 'reformation'. But it was not the fact of an order or house being *new* that troubled the prelates at the Fourth Lateran Council so much as that each new foundation multiplied the number already in existence. The wording of the decree expresses the fear that a variety of religious orders will bring confusion upon the Church. It is, then, the 'seemingly inexhaustible capacity to generate new models for human identity', as one historian has expressed it, that troubled the council.[56] The fear of diversity—a quality that Anselm of Havelberg and the author of the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus* saw as a virtue—generated a concomitant fear of novelty. The link between the rejection of novelty and the rejection of diversity is expressed by the detractor in John of Hildesheim's *Dialogus*, who argues that if the Carmelites were a legitimate order, they would be numbered among those who follow one of the three authorized rules for religious, rather than introducing a new one of their own.[57] The critics of novelty—or perhaps 'modernity'—in the twelfth century feared a multiplicity of new forms of interpretation or behaviour because the generation of new forms appeared to threaten existing models.

[54] *S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, v (Quaracchi, 1891), 313.
[55] Gerhard Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (New York, 1967); *idem*, 'Terms and Ideas of Renewal', in Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 1–33; cf. J. S. Preuss, 'Theological Legitimation for Innovation in the Middle Ages', *Viator*, 3 (1972), 1–26.
[56] Preuss, 'Theological Legitimation', 5.
[57] John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, xvi, *MCH* 380.

These models, moreover, were what guaranteed order in the world. History was written in the Middle Ages within an implicitly teleological framework. Rather than a series of causal processes that might or might not be random, medieval historians saw each event as an image of a higher reality that could not be fully understood within the continuum of time. These images were indeed linked, but vertically rather than horizontally. The ultimate meaning of the past could only be fully understood once all the threads had been unified; in other words, once the process of time had itself come to an end. The guide to such understanding as could be gained by those living within the operation of time was Scripture. The models provided by the Bible were elastic, but not infinitely so. The introduction of any new element or structure into the field put increasing pressure on the interpretative possibilities of the Scriptures.

Anthony Kemp, writing about Orosius's vision of history, observes that the fifth-century author betrays a 'horror of absence, of separations, of otherness between time and time . . . the model's structure and method is a verbal, and hence mystical, evocation of the presence of the past through the denial of mutability and change, effectively a denial of time'.[58] This was a tightly packed model into which to fit new ideas or events. Novelty was suspect because it inevitably introduced new variations into an existing model. Thus Bernard condemns Abelard for trying to introduce a new gospel, a new understanding and faith for which there is no space in the accepted model of understanding the economy of salvation. To reconstitute the past is to reorder what has been ordained by God.

If we accept criticism of innovation in religion as essentially a fear of causing instability in an accepted model, then the construction of a historical tradition by new religious groups becomes comprehensible. Moreover, it becomes possible to see the mapping of specific elements from the past on to the present as necessary rather than quixotic or simply naïve. The Essenes, the disciples of Christ, and Cyril of Alexandria, for example, were encoded locations on a map of the past. Carmelite historians needed to find space on this map to plot the co-ordinates of their own tradition without straying beyond the map's edges. The scale of the map could be altered, but not its outlines. New elements could not be introduced retrospectively into Christian history; what could be done, instead, was to add extra layers of meaning

---

[58] Anthony Kemp, *The Estrangement of the Past* (Oxford, 1991), 33.

to those elements that had already become part of a validated and shared tradition.

NARRATIVE, TYPOLOGY, AND THE NOTION OF 'HISTORICAL TRUTH'

The need to define identity in historic terms did not necessarily mean that what was ancient was invariably privileged simply by virtue of its being old. If Richard of Bury represents a cultural affinity for antiquity, the later fourteenth-century Carmelite John Kyningham was less sure of the value of age as an index of authority. Did Plato carry more weight than the Gospels simply because he antedated them? Rejecting Wyclif's notion of eternity, Kyningham argued that the fact of age could not confer authority, because at the time of a text's composition it did not yet possess the attribute of age.[59]

If age by itself did not confer authority, the narrative process was needed in order to explain and legitimize the attribute of age. For example, the process of explaining how a particular family had acquired privileges, as demanded by the *quo warranto* proceedings, entailed a narrative. Narrative, moreover, guaranteed the preservation of an authenticated model of history, the fear of rupturing which moved St Bernard, the prelates at the Fourth Lateran Council, and others to condemn 'novelty'. For as long as an event could be plotted within an existing narrative, the model remained intact.[60] Narrative was indispensable in so far as it promised that the anarchy of individual events and moments were ultimately susceptible to understanding. Such a promise could be offered because narrative is essentially movement from one actuality to another, the quality of movement in time that Aristotle considered distinguished history from poetry.[61] What medieval historians had that Aristotle lacked was an apprehension of the finality of the narrative, and thereby the assurance of ultimate coherence.

[59] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif cum Tritico*, ed. W. W. Shirley, RS (London, 1858), 4–5, 17.

[60] Compare Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York, 1972), 12: 'continuous history is the indispensable correlative to the founding function of the subject: the guarantee that everything that has eluded him may be restored to him; the certainty that time will dispense nothing without restoring it in a reconstructed unity; the promise that one day the subject—in the form of historical consciousness—will once again be able to appropriate, to bring back under his sway, all those things that are kept at a distance by difference, and find in them what might be called his abode.'

[61] Aristotle, *Poetics*, xxiii, ed. and trans. Stephen Halliwell (Cambridge, Mass. 1995), 116.

This book has presented several different narratives, by Carmelites and others. Some of these overlap; some are complementary; some compete with each other. But could more than one narrative of the past be a true explanation of the past at the same time? Did the medieval reader—for example, of Ribot's account of his order's foundation—demand that his narrative govern the past to the exclusion of all others? In one sense, this is to pose the question of how plausible the Carmelite version of the past was to contemporaries. It raises further questions about the medieval reader's attitude toward what we consider an indispensable factor in historical narrative, objective truth, and about the status of historical fact in the mind of both reader and author.

Judgements about the 'historicity' of medieval historical writing depend largely on one's expectations of the genre. Gabrielle Spiegel has enumerated some of the most commonly cited failings attributed to medieval chroniclers:

a weak notion of historical evidence; lack of sense of anachronism; propagandistic intentions; substitution of symbolic interpretation for causal analysis; and vulnerability to invasion by fiction, forgery, myth, and miracle, not to mention genuine demons. In short, medieval historiography, by all critical odds, is inauthentic, unscientific, unreliable, ahistorical, irrational, borderline illiterate, and, worse yet, unprofessional.[62]

Of course it is. But, as Spiegel knows, the 'critical odds' are crucial. There is a difference between displaying such 'failings' because one knows no better way of writing history, and relating historical narratives by means of strategies designed to tease out from the reader the desired responses.

In suggesting that medieval historians be read according to their own, rather than our, assumptions about the 'critical odds' applicable to writing about the past, we need not reject on their behalf all sense of rational criticism. The fifteenth-century Benedictine chronicler John Trithemius—who was prepared to accept and even propagate the Carmelites' version of their origins—was scornful of the tradition of the Trojan ancestry of the French. Everyone, he remarked, was trying to find a Trojan ancestor, as though there were no other races in existence before the fall of Troy, and all Trojans were paragons of virtue.[63]

[62] Spiegel, *Past as Text*, 100.

[63] John Trithemius, *Chronologica Mystica*, in M. Freher (ed.), *Opera historica quotquot hactenus reperiri potuerunt*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt, 1601), I. xx. 5. Cited by Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (London, 1980), 23.

Trithemius had his own agenda of creating similar legends for the German people, but Elizabeth A. R. Brown has shown that the tradition of the Trojan ancestry of the French was in any case doubted by some as early as the twelfth century.[64]

It is a commonplace that chroniclers sometimes wove narratives from forged documents. A Carmelite example, the supposed foundation of the convent of Peralada, has been brought to light by Jill Webster.[65] But the use of this strategy did not mean that chroniclers were themselves invariably gullible, or intended to gull their readers. Skills in detecting forged documents were crucial from Late Antiquity onward—for example, in determining what was canonical Scripture, or whether a foundation charter or legal precedent was correct.[66] Elizabeth Brown has argued that medieval readers were quite able to exercise critical judgement over forged documents.[67] Robert Holcot's dismissal of the Carmelite tradition of Sobac, on the grounds that white-clad figures might just as well signify flour-coated millers as Carmelite friars, surely indicates the capacity to suspend a tendency toward symbolic interpretation over rational analysis.[68] The St Albans monk who wrote *De ortu et prioritate ordinis monachorum* relished the opportunity to provide a rational historical explanation for why the Dominicans were sometimes known as 'Jacobiti'—an explanation that had nothing to do with scriptural associations.

Critical judgement about source material, then, was not necessarily alien to the medieval view of the past. But sometimes we appear to see such judgement exercised only part of the time. Trithemius, for example, was sceptical about the Trojan origins of the French, but not about the Old Testament origins of the Carmelites. Was this because he was cynical enough to suspend disbelief when there was no political

[64] E. A. R. Brown, 'The Trojan Origins of the French: The Commencement of a Myth's Demise, 1450–1520', in Alfred P. Smyth (ed.), *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspective in Medieval Europe* (London, 1998), 162–3 n. 6.

[65] Webster, *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia*, 32–6, 127–32. On the practice of forgery in the English monastic tradition in general, see Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 318–27; C. N. L. Brooke, 'Approaches to Medieval Forgery', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 3 (1968), 377–86, repr. in *Medieval Church and Society*; Giles Constable, 'Forgery and Plagiarism', *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 29 (1983), 1–41.

[66] Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (London, 1980), 21.

[67] E. A. R. Brown, '*Falsitas pia sive reprehensibilis*: Medieval Forgers and their Intentions', in Horst Fuhrmann (ed.), *Fälschungen in Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress der MGH, München 16–19 Sept. 1986*, 5 vols. (Hannover, 1986), i. 101–20.

[68] Smalley, *English Friars*, 330–1.

agenda at stake? Let us take another example, the Hospitaller legend of foundation by Judas Maccabeus. The belief that the Hospital existed in the time of Christ was acknowledged by Pope Celestine II in 1143, and confirmed in 1191 by Celestine III and by Innocent IV in a bull of 1254.[69] Yet Stephen of Salagnac, writing twenty years or so after the last papal confirmation, dismissed as legend the Maccabean foundation, and dated the order's beginnings (inaccurately, in fact) to 1100.[70] We might assume from this that Stephen had better critical judgement than the popes; but a more satisfactory understanding of this apparent divergence lies in the nature and uses of the narratives in question. Celestine III might well have believed, in the 1140s, that the Maccabean legend was true. Innocent IV, a century later, would not have posed the question in such stark terms. A hundred years was a long time for a tradition to take root, and a pope who exercised critical judgement over the preamble to a charter of confirmation was denying not simply a particular narrative, but the very force of tradition itself. Innocent IV, let us remember, was the pope who understood that prayers made to saints of whom the historical testimony was no longer strictly accepted were not thereby rendered invalid.[71] The inherent plausibility and spiritual value of the tradition were more important than the authenticity of a document. This is what Monika Otter means when she refers, in the context of 'inventiones' in twelfth-century historical writing, to 'an oddly "closed" system of truth and confirmation, in which the allegorical reference to Christian revealed truth outweighs and sometimes eclipses the everyday reference to physical reality'.[72] Truthfulness in the sense of conforming to an objectively verifiable reality is less important than the meanings that are conveyed by the images contained in the narrative.

Does this mean that thinking about the past was for medieval writers, readers, and even lawmakers a kind of allegory, rather than an accurate reconstruction of past events? Perhaps, when we read Ribot, Paleonydorus, or the anonymous *Life* of St Angelo, for example, we

[69] *Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St Jean de Jérusalem 1100–1310*, ed. J. Delaville le Roulx, 4 vols. (Paris, 1894–1906), nos. 154, 911, 2674; *Hospitallers' Riwle*, p. xxii; Sylvia Schein, 'The *Miracula* of the Hospital of St John and the Carmelite Elianic Tradition—Two Medieval Myths of Foundation', in Michael Goodich, Sophia Menache, and Sylvia Schein (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Divergences in the Crusader Period: Essays Presented to Aryeh Grabois on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (New York, 1995), 287–96.

[70] Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor*, iv. 4, pp. 177–8.

[71] E. W. Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (Oxford, 1948), 108.

[72] Otter, *Inventiones*, 36.

should regard them less as narratives than as images or representations, recalling Lévi-Strauss's series of psychic moments that underlie the constitution of the historical fact. As an example, we might take the equation by chroniclers of the First Crusade such as Raymond d'Aguilers of the Franks with the Israelites of the Old Testament.[73] This can be dismissed as a rhetorical posture—'literary ideology', to borrow a phrase from Benedicta Ward's account of the Cistercians' attempt to trace a descent from the Desert Fathers.[74] Raymond's reader is not expected to imagine that the Franks were in dull fact Israelites, but that in God's view—in terms of the broad narrative—they stood to their Muslim enemies and to the Holy Land in the same relationship as the Israelites had to the Canaanites, Amalekites, and the land of Canaan itself.

Typology, which was by the twelfth century a mental reflex for writers trained in biblical exegesis, will take us up to a point in explaining such rhetoric.[75] The Carmelite narrative of the origins of monasticism is of course dependent on typology. To categorize it simply as such, however, is to reduce it to a kind of linguistic method. The reader, whether medieval or modern, cannot evade the question of whether the intent was to assert that, for example, Elijah had actually founded an order of prophet-monks on Mt Carmel, or simply that the Carmelites possessed monastic attributes that could be traced typologically back to the biblical account of Elijah and Elisha. Were Ribot's *De prima institutione monachorum*, or the Vienna manuscript *De genere monachorum*, or for that matter Cassian's allusion to Elijah as the 'proto-monk', illustrations of the typological method of understanding how history unfolded, or were they to be taken as 'historical fact'?

A linguistic distinction between typology and fact was a critical feature of later medieval theology. It was essential, for example, to the development of eucharistic theology, in which what had been taken as an analogy became, in the doctrine of transubstantiation, a literal identity. For historians in the Middle Ages, however, the question does not invariably demand one or the other response. In his *De substancialibus regule monachalis* (*c*.1374–6), Uthred of Boldon reflects on the historical meaning of the monastic profession. The fundamental attributes of monasticism—poverty, chastity, and obedience—are imposed by

---

[73] Raymond d'Aguilers, *Historia Hierosolymitana, RHC Occ*. III, 300.

[74] Ward, 'Desert Myth', 188.

[75] Spiegel, *Past as Text*, 91–3, argues that chroniclers' approach to the past can be traced to the methodology of monastic exegesis.

Nature on all humans to a degree. The history of monasticism is for Uthred in essence a history of rational (as opposed to involuntary or enforced) obedience, poverty, and chastity. Monastic obedience clearly derived from the scriptural precedents of Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha and the sons of the prophets in the Old Testament and of Christ in the New. This *religio* then formed the basis of the way of life of the primitive Church.[76] Here a historical chain of causation is made to rest on the identification of moral virtues or attributes residing in historical figures. The use of exempla from classical or biblical history in order to present critiques of the morality or virtue of one's protagonists by establishing types of behaviour was of course an inherent part of the medieval historical method. In Uthred's scheme, however, the exemplum is not simply transposed across time as an image to be reflected in present behaviour, but itself initiates a historical process. Typology and historical narrative are linked in the creation of a historical construct.

Uthred is aware that a fundamental objection may be raised to this thesis. The putative historical link between present-day Benedictine monks and those scriptural precedents (and indeed early Christian monks such as Basil, Pachomius, St Martin, and others) is split by the introduction of the Benedictine Rule, for it is the rule itself that determines the form and shape of Benedictine monasticism. Uthred's answer is strikingly similar to the argument employed by Ribot in support of the link between the sons of the prophets and the Carmelites: namely, that just as Christianity existed from the beginning of time, but only received its name and precise form from the Incarnation, so the Benedictine Rule existed *realiter* from the first occasion on which the attributes of monasticism were practised, even though they only received their name from Benedict himself. Thus, against the argument that the originators of monastic life were not monks in the way that we now understand the term (i.e. Benedictines), but were simply possessed of qualities that had come to be recognized as corresponding to monastic virtue, Uthred responds that the rule was not a historic event but an attribute of virtuous living. One could be a monk at any point in history, whether or not monasticism had yet been 'invented'.

Not all medieval readers were prepared to accept this argument. Robert Holcot's rejection of Carmelite and Augustinian foundation legends appears to offer a rational and counter-anachronistic response. The Carmelite friars of today cannot be members of the same order as

---

[76] Pantin, 'Two Treatises', 368–72.

the sons of the prophets because mendicancy did not exist as a religious practice then; in fact, it was prohibited in Jewish law.[77] Holcot's rationalism might itself be attacked as a failure of historical sensitivity. Perhaps more significant, it runs the risk of rejecting a theological orthodoxy. By way of analogy let us consider the question of whether the virtuous Jews of the Old Testament could be numbered among the saved. In the twelfth century this issue had provoked controversy when Peter Abelard dismissed Hugh of St Victor's thesis that for those who lived before the Incarnation, such sacrifices to God as were then thought to be virtuous were a sufficient path to salvation.[78] Against Abelard's insistence on confession of Christ as the Messiah as a necessary condition for salvation, Hugh remarked that in that case either the prophets could not be sure of a place in heaven, or else the number of Old Testament characters who had received direct personal revelations of Christ must be very high.[79] Hugh's argument shows what R. W. Southern called 'the power of intense realisation of remote situations'.[80] Hugh does not expect to find in the past exact correspondences to contemporary practices. Instead he locates in the past attributes that point toward their future fulfilment in Christian practice. Of course, Hugh's, and for that matter Uthred's, view of the past is deterministic, because both are shaped by the necessity to describe the story of salvation. But it also shows the capacity to see history as a series of developmental stages, each of which functions as a signpost toward the truth. Compared to this approach, the dismissal of claims to antiquity on the grounds that the author of a particular formula for living the religious life (Benedict) was not yet alive, or that the practice of preaching, hearing confessions, and so on was unknown in ancient Judaism, seems rather narrowly focused on the letter of interpretation.

Whether one accepted the Carmelite premiss that a contemporary religious order could trace its origins in linear fashion to the Old Testament depended not only on the functioning of a historical imagination. It also demanded a particular use of language. To argue that the Benedictine Rule existed as a quality with the capacity to be

[77] Smalley, *English Friars*, 330–1.

[78] Peter Abelard, *Theologia Christiana*, PL 188, col. 1285; but see his *Problemata Heloissae*, PL 188, col. 698, for a more modified view.

[79] R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing. II. Hugh of St Victor and the Idea of Historical Development', *TRHS* 23, 5th ser. (1971), 168, paraphrases Hugh's argument. The debate is clearly summarized by D. E. Luscombe, *The School of Peter Abelard: The Influence of Abelard's Thought in the Early Scholastic Period* (Cambridge, 1969), 186–7.

[80] Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition', 164.

apprehended by the virtuous, such as Elijah, independent of its being transmitted in written form by Benedict himself, is to take a supremely realist position. The nominalist response would be that it was the articulation of the idea that brought it into existence; the idea had no meaning, and thus no existence, until articulated by Benedict. In this view, language is the determinant of existence. The Carmelite historical enterprise demands a realist reading. For just as Uthred argues that the real meaning of Benedictine monasticism was understood and practised by the prophets, so the Carmelite historians were arguing that the monastic attributes that later came to be articulated in the evolving historical narrative were present from the beginning. Thus, although they were of course not called friars, monks, or even Christians, to Ribot the sons of the prophets were effectively all three, because they witnessed to the truth no less than the friars of the present day.[81]

POETIC LICENCE, RHETORIC, AND TRUTH

Carmelite historiography exemplified a particular attitude toward textual authority. As we have seen, its exponents invariably claimed the authority of older authors: for example, Jerome and Cassian among the 'ancients' and Jacques de Vitry and Vincent of Beauvais among the 'moderns'.[82] Two critiques of this method immediately spring to mind: first, the use of some sources of dubious status, notably 'Josephus Antiochenus', whom modern scholars have been unable to trace, or the apparent endowment of other Carmelite texts such as the *Universis christifidelibus* with a privileged status by means of a grandiloquent title, the *Cronica romana*; and second, the apparent misuse of such sources in cases where an authority is quoted but turns out not really to support the case being made.[83] In the first category we must also consider Ribot's compilation of 'primary' sources as a strategy for authenticating his narrative, and in the second, the characteristic displacement or slippage between the words of a source and the meaning which those words are given.

---

[81] Ribot, *De institutione*, v. 1; *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 47.

[82] For Cassian, see Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, i, *MCH* 117; for Jacques de Vitry, *Speculum*, i, ii, *MCH* 91–101, 122; for Vincent, Baconthorpe, *Compendium*, i, *MCH* 200.

[83] On 'Josephus Antiochenus', see John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus*, ix, *MCH* 357; Ribot, *De institutione*, viii; *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 53; for the *UC* as the *Cronica romana*, see *MCH* 80; for an example of the misuse of a citation, see Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, v, *MCH* 129–30, citing Cassian.

This latter feature, indeed, appears consistently throughout the Carmelite historical texts of the fourteenth century. Typical of this method is the use of the generic remark in a source to authenticate an aspect of the Carmelite narrative. For example, the *viri religiosi* living in Jerusalem at the time of Pentecost (Acts 2: 5), although described in Scripture only as Jews from every nation, are taken to mean the Carmelites, because at that time the only *religiosi*, in the technical sense of those following a religious rule, were the Carmelite hermits.[84] Again, John Cassian's account of the disciples of St Mark in Alexandria who followed a communal life is taken as a description of the early Carmelites, without explanation of why exactly 'pauci quidem sed probissimi' should refer to them rather than to any virtuous Christians.[85]

Anecdotal examples cannot do justice to what is in effect a methodology of interpretation. In a recent study Burt Kimmelmann has suggested that twelfth-century writers began to develop a theory of authorship in which the relationship between their own 'original' work and that of received authorities was readdressed. John of Salisbury, for example, acknowledged the privilege of certain authors to use 'figures', and thus to insert themselves into an 'otherwise rigidly determined hierarchy of specifically literary authority'.[86] Equally as pertinent to the transposing of facts from one account to another, as in Jean de Cheminot's appropriation of the Alexandrian Christians, is translation. Jeanette Beer has argued that boundaries between authority and author in regard to translation were fluid: 'No period . . . has been less servile to the literalities of a text, because the authority of that text was not recognized as absolute.'[87] Except, of course, Scripture; but here above all the newly discovered logic extended the interpretative resources available to scholars.[88] Kimmelmann argues that advances in linguistic and grammatical theory in the twelfth century opened the way for interpretative activity on a new scale, and that this activity was characterized by new freedoms in the use of textual authority. He is primarily interested in poets rather than chroniclers, but if such a development indeed took place, it could be rationalized by (and perhaps was to some extent based on) epistemological advances made in the

---

[84] First in *UC, MCH* 82; then in Ribot, *De institutione*, v–viii; *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 50–2.

[85] Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum*, v, *MCH* 129–30.

[86] Burt Kimmelmann, *The Poetics of Authorship in the Later Middle Ages: The Emergence of the Modern Literary Persona* (New York, 1996), 66, citing John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, i. 18.

[87] Jeanette Beer, *Medieval Translators and their Craft* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1989), 4.

[88] R. W. Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970), 45–8.

schools,[89] and all the Carmelite texts considered in this book were written by schoolmen.[90]

If authors of historical texts did not consider themselves constrained in their deployment of legitimizing sources by the intended literal meaning of the source itself, then it is hardly surprising that the past came to look increasingly like a mirror of the present. The potential for creativity in historical writing was greatly expanded by the acceptance of poetic licence in the reading of authoritative texts such as Jerome. Poetic licence also enabled multiple narratives to be held as simultaneously valid; for if narrative was a question of interpretation, there could be as many narratives as interpreters. This perception underlies William of Newburgh's attack on Geoffrey of Monmouth: 'Does he dream of another world in which there are innumerable kingdoms, where these events recounted by him took place? For it is certain that in our world such events never happened.'[91] What William resists here is Geoffrey's attempt to employ poetic strategies in a historical work.

In this context we might recall two Carmelite narratives recounted in these pages that appear at the most fundamental level of analysis to be 'false', because historically inaccurate. The fifteenth-century *Life of St Angelo* is, in the terms in which it is told, historically impossible, because it requires the reader to suspend knowledge of the actual events and personalities of the Church in the Holy Land from *c.*1180 to *c.*1220.[92] There was no Greek Orthodox patriarch in Jerusalem, and no functioning episcopal hierarchy, in the terms described. Yet if we see the *Vita* as representing an imagined narrative dependent on certain images—the existence of some Orthodox bishops as co-adjutors within the Latin hierarchy, the possibility of some Orthodox component among the hermits gathered together by Albert of Vercelli in the early years of the thirteenth century—then the narrative becomes comprehensible, if still not plausible according to the objective critical standards.[93]

---

[89] Kimmelman, *Poetics of Authorship*, 42–58.

[90] One might also recall the remark by A. Kemp, *Estrangement of the Past*, 46, that all medieval historical writing can best be understood as 'a species of poetry'.

[91] William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, i, p. 17.

[92] See above, 192–201.

[93] See Andrew Jotischky, 'The Fate of the Greek Orthodox Church of Jerusalem at the End of the Twelfth Century', in Thomas Hummel, Kervork Hintlian, and Ulf Carmesund (eds.), *Patterns of the Past, Prospects for the Future: The Christian Heritage of the Holy Land*, ii (London, 1999), 179–94.

William of Coventry's *De adventu Carmelitarum ad Angliam* similarly contains obvious historical inaccuracies. The siege of Acre that forms the backdrop to the narrative of how two Carmelite hermits were imported into England by crusading followers of Richard of Cornwall never in fact took place; moreover, the story of the siege is impossible as told, because it requires the spring of Elijah on Mt Carmel to be diverted to Acre under conditions of blockade by the Muslims, in a distortion of both geography and military reality.[94] But the purpose of the narrative survives these distortions. Carmelite hermits did reach England in the entourage of two English crusaders, and if William's date of 1238 is wrong, it nevertheless corresponds to the date accepted for the migration of the Carmelites to Cyprus.[95]

'Poetic licence' allowed William to use the story of the coming of the friars to England as a vehicle for linking the Carmelite heritage to the crusading ideal. Judicious use of prophecies from Jeremiah enables him to demonstrate the centrality of Mt Carmel as a monastic site to the security and viability of the crusader kingdom by drawing parallels between the fate of the Israelites at the hands of the Babylonians and the struggle of the Franks against the Muslims in the thirteenth century.[96] Carmel, in William's narrative, has an allegorical value. According to what, or whose 'critical odds', is this a distortion of historical truth? The events as described did not take place. Yet we cannot deny to William's narrative the authority of conveying an allegorical perception that may indeed reflect accurately how contemporaries understood the monastic presence on Mt Carmel.

The inventions of Carmelite historians may be made more comprehensible by seeing them, at least in part, in terms of rhetorical conventions. Ruth Morse has described how a 'hierarchy of pasts' was rendered inevitable by the lacunae in information available to historians—lacunae which were then filled by accounts of 'what ought to have happened' supplied by 'rhetorically inspired conventions'.[97] One of her examples is a chronicle description of atrocities perpetrated in the Anarchy of Stephen's reign;[98] we might supply, for our context, the miracles recorded in the *Life of St Angelo*.[99] Morse argues that our

---

94 William of Coventry, *De adventu, MCH* 282–3.

95 William of Coventry, *Cronica brevis, MCH* 276, gives the date as 1240, but in *De adventu, MCH* 282, 285, the only date given for the episode as a result of which the Carmelites went to England is 1238.   96 William of Coventry, *De adventu, MCH* 284–5.

97 Ruth Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality* (Cambridge, 1991), 104.

98 Ibid. 117.   99 Saggi, *Sant' Angelo*, 183–7.

categories for defining texts as 'history', 'literature', 'biography', and so on are misleading when we try to understand the representations of the past rendered by medieval authors.[100] Great care must be exercised, however, in applying the notion of rhetorical convention to the Carmelite texts we have considered. There is a considerable difference between, on the one hand, demonstrating that the content of a chronicler's description of a battle speech, or a monastery, for example, might not be literally 'true' but rather a representation of 'what it ought to have been like', and, on the other, reducing the factual content of the Carmelite historical narrative to 'rhetorically inspired convention'. William of Coventry's account of the siege of Acre may indeed fall into the category of rhetorical convention; but this will not suffice as an explanation for the appropriation of Cyril of Alexandria by John of Hildesheim, or for Ribot's account of the monasticism practised by the sons of the prophets on Mt Carmel.

One way of understanding the Carmelite historical method is through a tradition of *compilatio*. A recent study has demonstrated that the meaning of the term in the twelfth–thirteenth centuries was neutrally charged, even though compilers were not necessarily expected to make clear distinctions between their own work and that of other authors. A compiler was defined by Isidore of Seville as one who 'mixed the sayings of others with his own'.[101] From the beginning of the Carmelite historical tradition, compilation played an important part. The *rubrica prima*, Baconthorpe, and Jean de Cheminot all relied on it to a degree, in so far as they presented a defence of their order's historical claims by means of papal confirmations. It was Ribot, however, who went further than his predecessors in blurring the distinctions between his arguments and his received sources. His elaborate inventions provide vehicles for transmitting the Carmelite narrative that are intended to appear authoritative by virtue of being ancient (as in the case of the *De institutione primorum monachorum*) or through closeness to events (in the case of William of Sandwich's *Chronica de multiplicatione religiosum Carmelitarum*, supposedly an eye-witness account of thirteenth-century events). The insertion of supposedly authoritative texts to authenticate a narrative had of course been practised by poets and historians alike.[102] But Ribot realizes his sources as historical

[100] Morse, *Truth and Convention*, 194.

[101] Neil Hathaway, 'Compilatio: From Plagiarism to Compiling', *Viator*, 20 (1989), 19–44, esp. 19–21.

[102] For a little-known example of a common feature, see Otter, *Inventiones*, 45–8.

figures whose testimony is supposedly authentic because it is the report of contemporary involvement. There is no distance between the events described and the describer, because the describer is himself engaged in shaping the events.

From the standpoint of a modern critical sensibility, the greatest obstacle in encountering the Carmelite narrative is the appropriation of individuals or events in the service of that narrative. The addition of yet more historical figures with no apparent link to Mt Carmel—Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Gerard of Csanád, Peter the Hermit, even Sybil, countess of Flanders—surely only weakens the overall narrative by piling one implausibility upon another. But we might also see these appropriations as analogies to the material *inventiones* discussed by Monika Otter in her analysis of twelfth-century English historical writing. Discoveries of relics function in the monastic texts in which they appear as symbols of an appropriated past: 'inventiones are narrative realisations of . . . the ancient, venerable origin of their community and its continuity over time'.[103] In place of relics, the Carmelites' narrative rested on the appropriation of territory—Mt Carmel and the Holy Land—and its inhabitants. The whole Carmelite narrative depends for its force on the fixed location of the historical figures being claimed on Mt Carmel or one of its satellites—and if, as in the case of Basil, a relationship between person and territory cannot be demonstrated, then it must be 'invented'.[104]

It is when we consider the Carmelite historical narrative as a whole, and the forms in which it is transmitted, that observations regarding rhetorical conventions in medieval historiography become most useful. The narrative is essentially a compilation of monastic history from its supposed typological origins in the Old Testament to the present day. The method by which this is achieved can be seen as fundamentally rhetorical. There was nothing contentious in tracing the origins of monasticism to Elijah, Elisha, or the sons of the prophets. As we have seen, even the Benedictines did as much. The difference between the Carmelite version of the order's past and the versions produced by the Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinian Hermits lies in the relationship between typology and pure narrative. Even the Augustinian Hermits, who came close to producing a linear descent of eremitical life in Italy from Augustine to the thirteenth century, resort to the use of exemplum. The Carmelite account, by contrast, transforms

[103] Ibid. 31.
[104] Compare Otter's notion of 'gainable terre': *Inventiones*, 59–92, esp. 60–1.

the typology into a series of narrated historical facts. Rather than demonstrating that the monastic or mendicant practices of the Carmelite Order as ordained by St Albert, and as they developed in the thirteenth century, recall or represent the ideals and practices of the sons of the prophets, the disciples, the Desert Fathers, St Basil, and so on, the Carmelite account claims those ideals as part of a corporate history, as a series of verifiable historical facts. The result is to turn the past inside out. Instead of locating the Carmelites within a mapped history of monasticism, the history of monasticism becomes the Carmelite past.

Conclusion

This book has concentrated on textual representations of the past and their context. It has, moreover, claimed the central ground for a certain type of written history—the histories of the Carmelite Order by Carmelites themselves. Beginning with the *rubrica prima* to the 1281 constitutions, this was an identifiably important genre of writing within the order. A succession of Carmelite historical works demonstrates the importance to the Carmelites of reflecting upon their origins and of disseminating versions of their own and the Church's past to a wider community. These texts present a unique perspective of the Church looking at itself. But of course it is not the only perspective available. As Chapter 8 shows, all the mendicant orders engaged in similar reflective acts in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The written text, moreover, was not the only medium through which an order's identity could be represented, or through which claims to antiquity could be contested. Elijah might be claimed as a founder by the Carmelites, but the depiction of St Francis in the Franciscan church at Rivo Torte, for example, in which he ascends skyward in a fiery chariot, suggests that others saw Elijah as contributing to the formation of their own corporate identity.

Some types of image appear to have been so critical to an order's self-perception and sense of identity that they recur in only superficially different forms in the art produced or sponsored by all the mendicant orders. An example is the conferral of the rule on an order. The Lorenzetti 'Carmelite' altar-piece in Siena falls within a pattern of mendicant imagery from the mid-thirteenth century onward. The predella shows Albert of Vercelli giving the rule to the hermits of Mt Carmel, and a side panel the rule being confirmed by the pope. The Santa Croce altar-piece of *c*.1240 in Florence, in which Francis is shown kneeling before Innocent III, became a model for other renditions in tempera and fresco.[1] Monks and canons had been depicting similar

---

[1] Prominent examples include scenes in the Bardi Chapel frescos in S. Croce, Florence, the upper church in Assisi, the Franciscan 'Capodimonte' altar-piece in Naples, the altar-piece by Nelli for the Dominicans in Fano, and, as an example of the genre used by

images on their own behalf since the early twelfth century—in their cases, St Benedict or St Augustine giving the rule to their monks.[2] The addition of the pope to the mendicant renditions of the theme reflect the friars' need to circumvent the implied threat of the *Ne nimia* decree of the Fourth Lateran Council. These images, symbols of papal confirmation, are visual parallels to the bulls compiled by Carmelite writers since the 1320s as proof of their legitimacy.

The overtly political and institutional message of the 'rule' panel of the Lorenzetti altar-piece stands in contrast to the liturgical or theological symbolism of the altar-piece imagery generically.[3] The visual representation of all religious orders, indeed, seems to parallel their textual identities. Just as the Durham and St Albans monks countered mendicant pretensions to antique status in their treatises on the origins of monasticism, a fresco cycle of the life of St Benedict at Subiaco reminds the viewer of an older founder than Francis or Dominic. Art on behalf of a mendicant order could make the same points as the written word, but more powerfully, because less explicitly. A text arguing, for example, that the Dominicans were not a new order, because they were genuinely apostolic in manner of life, could never evade the problem that the order had been founded at a particular juncture and in known circumstances. An altar-piece, on the other hand, placed the friars physically next to Christ by the use of hinged panels adjoining the central image. A narrative sequence set in a contemporary framework could thus be lifted outside its own narrative logic and set down next to the ideal to which the narrative aspired—the imitation of Christ. Narrative and symbol are linked in a manner analogous to the textual elision of the two in Uthred of Boldon or Philip Ribot.

Carmelite art, like Carmelite textual history, made full use of narrative. Images that might be seen as anachronistic in any other composition make narrative sense in the context of the Carmelite historical enterprise; thus, for example, it is no great surprise to see Carmelite friars standing behind St Peter in the frescos by Masaccio and Masolino in the Brancacci chapel in Florence. Other mendicants might try to prove that they were *like* the Apostles; the Carmelites could

---

Benedictines, the fourteenth-century panel in Florence showing Benedict assigning his rule to St Romuald.

[2] Benedictines: Montecassino MS 73, fo. 2ʳ; Montecassino MS 175, fo. 1ᵛ; Zwettl MS 13–15, 24, fo. 188ʳ (*c.*1220); Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana MS Strozzi 11, fo. 1ʳ (1326); London, BL MS Add. 16979, fo. 21ᵛ (Rule, 1129). Augustinians: tomb of Augustine at San Pietro in Ciel' d'Oro (1362), missal of 1362 at Toulouse: Bibl. Mun. MS 91, fo. 121ʳ.

[3] As argued by Gilbert, 'Some Special Images for Carmelites', 171.

show that they had been *among* the Apostles.[4] Furthermore, both the Lorenzetti panel and the fresco painted by Filippo Lippi for the Carmelites of Florence represent the Carmelites by means of generic eremitical activity on Mt Carmel. This was an increasingly important genre in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as the Tuscan school developed a Thebaid imagery characterized by desert scenes peopled by early Christian monks. The fourteenth-century fresco cycle in the Camposanto in Pisa, for example, shows Macarius, Antony, Paphnutios, and other early Christian hermits engaged in supposedly typical occupations in a rustic idyll.[5] Such works of art naturally reflect the aspirations and tastes of patrons rather than any ideologies that framed the ways in which monks and friars themselves looked at the past. Asceticism and a return to 'primitive monasticism' were popular ideals among lay patrons in the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The sensibilities of the laity, and their role in the development of mendicant self-perception, have been touched on in Chapter 2. The relationship between author and audience must always be a crucial aspect of any discussion of mendicant discourse, because the mendicant orders depended, as monastic houses did not, on retaining such an audience. In practice, this meant being heard rather more often than being read. Our inability to measure the nature and quality of that relationship is particularly frustrating. The textual tradition considered in this book represents only one side of an equation, because it provides the Carmelites' arguments without the context of the reception of those arguments by the laity. It is like listening to the preacher from the vantage-point of the choir, and missing the grumbles and guffaws from the nave. We have little means, therefore, of judging the textual tradition according to the criteria of most immediate practical importance to contemporaries. The effectiveness of the Carmelite historical tradition can be measured only by its plausibility to its audience.

In broad terms, the sheer tenacity of the Carmelites provided its own answer to the question. The impressive expansion of the years *c.*1240–74, the order's capacity for survival between 1274 and 1286, the recognition of the security offered by the schools, and the ability to find

---

[4] See also the representation of the Ascension with Carmelites in a fifteenth-century Carmelite gradual, discussed by John B. Friedman, 'Carmelite Propaganda in a Fifteenth-Century French Gradual Fragment', *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association*, 8 (1987), 67–95.

[5] Millard Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena After the Black Death* (Princeton, 1951), 74; *idem*, 'An Illuminated "Inferno" and Trecento Painting in Pisa', *Art Bulletin*, 47 (1965), 21–34; M. Bucci *et al.*, *Camposanto monumentale di Pisa* (Pisa, 1960).

a place within the academic community in turn enabled the Carmel-
ites to attract important lay patrons. The period of Pietro Lorenzetti's
romantic vision of Carmelite origins coincides with the height of the
career of the order's most important theologian, John Baconthorpe,
with the foundation of new houses and the blessing of royal patronage.
By the middle of the fourteenth century, Carmelites in Norfolk were
able to commission sculpture from the same craftsmen as the Crown.
Advocates had been recruited from among the scholarly community,
and, no less significant as a measure of the order's impact, controversy
from detractors. Perhaps more significant is the steady accumulation of
testamentary bequests from the public. Where such research has been
done, it shows that those with money or property to leave continued to
favour the Franciscans and Dominicans above all, but that the Carmel-
ites were never forgotten.[6]

   The prosperity of the Carmelites in material terms, at least in the
fourteenth century, is one measure of the success of their appeal to the
laity. Yet there is much unexplored territory between the textual trad-
ition and the growth of the order. The historical writing studied in this
book was probably read by the friars themselves or by members of
other religious orders. This does not mean that the content of the his-
torical tradition was unknown outside this audience. The 'textual com-
munities' of the eleventh and twelfth centuries that have been the
subject of recent studies were more fluid and more porous than ever
before in the period of Carmelite growth and expansion. Moreover,
the texts themselves are only the most concentrated form of the histor-
ical tradition. Friars, even those with contemplative traditions to up-
hold, spent much of their time preaching. No activity can have given
greater opportunity for the projection of an image of who the Carmel-
ites were. Much of our knowledge of the Franciscans and Dominicans
comes from acquaintance with a corpus of sermons and exempla for
sermons. Scarcely any of this kind of material survives from Carmel-
ite sources. Until we know more of the substance and circumstances of
Carmelite preaching, our view of the order and its relations with the
world will be obscured.

   Given these limitations, the historical texts produced by Carmelites
remain central to our understanding of mendicant culture in the

---

[6] Compare Webster, 'Early Carmelite Foundations', 177, 181, and Tanner, *Church in Late
Medieval Norwich*, appx. 12, 222, where bequests to Carmelites are at the same level as those to
Franciscans and Dominicans; see also Helen Sutermeister's transcript of burials in Norwich
religious houses and of bequests to mendicants in Norwich, 1370–1532: NNRO MC 146/27.

Middle Ages. As we have seen, the development of a historical trad- ition was sparked by the challenge posed by the Second Council of Lyons. The identity thereby created followed and overlaid an existing spiritual identity based on devotion to the Blessed Virgin, which was al- ready established by the 1270s. The essence of the historical identity developed by Carmelites was continuity; for this reason, the spiritual tradition came to be incorporated within the historical. The Second Council of Lyons, moreover, was no sudden thunderclap. The *Ignea Sagitta*—whatever its subsequent impact and the circumstances of its composition—reflects the Carmelites' need to address tensions that had been apparent since the expansion to the West beginning in 1238. These tensions reverberated around the relationship between the strict eremitism demanded by the Rule of Albert and the requirements of mendicancy imposed by the modification to the rule in 1247. Until after the 1270s, however, there is little indication that these tensions were framed within a historical paradigm. The *Ignea Sagitta* has much to say about relationships between Carmelites and urban populations, be- tween contemplation and action, and about eremitical ideals of soli- tude, but the discourse owes more to traditions of monastic writing about such themes than to historical exemplars. The *Ignea Sagitta* exem- plifies continuity, but this continuity emerges through its debt to an older tradition of writing, rather than in any overtly historical content.

The need to establish continuity between present practice and ac- cepted tradition became more pressing after 1274. Perceptive Carmel- ites might have predicted that the long-standing opposition of the secular clergy would eventually come to a head. The change in appear- ance enacted by the formal mechanism of the general-chapter in 1287 was at once a practical and an imaginative response. The internal dis- cipline of the order was tightened, while at the same time the new habit provided an opportunity to give a visual demonstration of the histor- ical identity articulated in the *rubrica prima*, and perhaps of generic mo- nastic virtues associated with white garments. At the very least, the Carmelites might be associated in people's minds with Cistercians or Premonstratensians; those who enquired more closely would learn that white referred to Elijah. In any case, white was unlikely to provoke ridicule or arouse suspicions of exoticism.

Changing appearance was one strategy; more conventionally, the Carmelites also appealed, or persuaded others to do so on their behalf, to those with influence—Edward I of England, certainly, and perhaps, if the letters in Scrope's *Chronicon* are genuine, the pope as well. These

letters must have been authorized by the general-chapter of 1281, and are thus contemporary with the *rubrica prima* in its first known version. The letters emphasize the patronage of the Blessed Virgin, but say nothing about Elijah. It appears, therefore, that the Elianic tradition was at this stage largely for internal consumption. It was, in any case, as yet undeveloped. It was only a decade later, in the 1290s, that the *Universis christifidelibus*, perhaps the work of Sibert de Beka, refashioned the connection between his order and its place of origin into a poetic history of the circumstances of its foundation. It is no coincidence that Sibert was a liturgist, whose ordinal became standard throughout the order. The historical tradition in its earliest phase may indeed be seen as a kind of extended commentary on a liturgical tradition that sought to preserve elements of the order's origins in the Holy Land. By the 1290s the proportion of Carmelites with any direct experience of Mt Carmel must have been small. The historical tradition as summarized in the *Universis christifidelibus*, therefore, served to teach new recruits something of the history and culture of the order to which they were devoting their lives.

The timing of both the ordinal and the beginning of the historical tradition is also significant. After the fall of Acre in 1291 there was no Carmelite presence in the place of the order's origin. The Carmelites' centre of gravity had long since shifted to the West, and for most Carmelite friars the Holy Land must in any case have been little more than a symbol. Yet symbols convey a cultural authority. The loss of Mt Carmel less than two decades after the threat of suppression at the Second Council of Lyons, and only four years after the change in the friars' external appearance, must have effectively severed the most fundamental link to the Carmelites' origins. The fall of Acre did not initiate the historical tradition, for that had clearly begun at least as early as 1281, the date when the *rubrica prima* first appears, and very probably earlier.

External pressure was only one factor in the development of a new Carmelite image after 1274. That the Carmelite leadership was concerned in the 1280s with the internal unity of the order is apparent from the inclusion in the constitutions of 1281 of a clause emphasizing that the order had a single heart and soul and that its members followed a single rule.[7] The same emphasis on unity and uniformity emerges in the notarial documents about the change of habit in 1287.[8] Like the change in garb and the new ordinal, the historical tradition

---

[7] L. Saggi (ed.), 'Constitutiones capituli Londinensis', 208.
[8] *MCH* 63, and see above, 51.

served the cause of unity within the order. A single shared history was provided for Carmelites at much the same time as a new visual identity that was less prone to individual variation, and as the imposition of a standard liturgical observance. If the *Ignea Sagitta* did indeed represent broader divisions of thought and sentiment than simply the disillusionment of an individual, the generalship of Peter de Millau in the 1280s and 1290s provided decisive leadership in a new direction.

Whatever the purpose of the historical texts, those responsible for developing the tradition—friars like Baconthorpe, Jean de Cheminot, John Hornby, John of Hildesheim, Philip Ribot, and Bernard Oller —were theologians engaged in academic study and teaching. Two consequences followed from this: first, the historical account came increasingly to be articulated with reference to the textual authority of Scripture and canon law, rather than simply by the force of tradition; and second, the account drew responses from an academic audience. Thus the discourse as we encounter it became a dialogue—sometimes literally—between mendicant theologians.

This meant in turn that the historical tradition was subjected to the techniques of scholastic confrontation, and as a result became increasingly precise. Theologians from other orders, naturally enough, wanted to know exactly when the Carmelites had adopted a written rule, whose rule it was, in what language it had been written, and what the status of the Carmelites was, in the distant past before the Incarnation, during the early Christian period, and subsequently. Supplying factual content could only be done by inhabiting the past. But the scholarly nature of the tradition also meant that the theologians' wider concerns came to be reflected in the discourse itself. John Baconthorpe, for example, did not write his Carmelite apologetic work in a theological vacuum. His history of the Carmelites had to take account of current theological debates: notably, the controversy over apostolic poverty. These debates were themselves framed in historical terms. Inhabiting a space in the past meant, inevitably, negotiating the spaces that touched it on all sides. But those spaces were themselves still being contested by theologians. The Carmelite tradition, therefore, had to be sufficiently porous to absorb other traditions developing in parallel. In this way an identifiable ecclesiology evolved. The *Universis christifidelibus* presents simply a tradition with an inner narrative and logic, in which no attempt is made to explain how the narrative relates to external factors. A hundred and fifty years later, when Thomas Scrope was writing, Carmelite history could no longer be the history of

the order alone. The fundamental themes remained constant, but they were fragmented and rendered more precise by the confrontation with other narratives. Absorbing the Essenes, for example, into their past, meant dealing with a separate tradition of the history of monasticism that derived from Samuel, rather than Elijah. These forking paths of variant tradition could either be rejected or absorbed; but they could not be ignored. Carmelites chose to absorb them, and, in so doing, re-fashioned the history of the early Church itself. By the 1550s, a Protestant reader looking critically for the origins of the institution of monasticism would have found the target for blame in contemporary Carmelite historiography.

Such a synthetic view of the Church's past was inevitable once the central theme of the Carmelite tradition had been articulated. But the Carmelites were far from alone in seeking to demonstrate the integrity of their profession through identification with the Church's past. Indeed, in the course of the fourteenth century all mendicant orders, and even the Benedictines, did the same. A cultural gravity that focused the gaze backward towards antiquity determined that the locus of the spiritual should be faithfulness to tradition. There were many approaches to this end. Friars might seek to identify themselves with the attributes of the Apostles or the Desert Fathers, or St Augustine, or the early Christian tradition more generally. They might even assert that their founder was a living symbol of Christ. Or, of course, they could pose as the direct descendants of those who had formulated the tradition. Whichever path they took, however, led through a re-evaluation of the meaning of the regulated religious life.

What I hope emerges from this book is the importance, not only to friars, but more generally to the culture of medieval Europe, of constructed historical traditions. From today's perspective, the friars can often seem revolutionaries, breakers of the moulds in which the norms of Christian life had set. We have seen their willingness to embrace the swelling urban populations of Europe, the creativity with which they filled a vacuum in the instruction of the laity, the determination with which they attempted to create in their own day the conditions of the *vita apostolica*, their capacity to reinvent themselves. The Carmelites and the Augustinian Hermits turned from eremitism to mendicancy within a single generation; the Franciscans became learned; the Dominicans became papal inquisitors. Yet we should also recognize the debts that all friars acknowledged to the past, both immediate and more distant. The past was the location of corporate identities, and the

proving ground of religious ideologies. To negotiate the Jewish and Christian past, as the Carmelites did, so as to construct a *historia* that was both coherent and spiritually enriching, was to guarantee survival and to secure the promise of continued service to the Church. The Carmelites chose the most difficult, but perhaps also the most rewarding, path to the invention of a tradition. Their history rested on establishing unbroken continuity from past to present in a given place, Mt Carmel. It is a history that has been rejected by rivals since the fourteenth century, and is no longer accepted as objectively true by Carmelites themselves. Yet, in the end, our judgement of its worth may rest as much on our own imaginative capacity to see the possibilities of history as on our faithfulness to the idea of an objective truth.

Bibliography

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

I. Manuscripts

Cambridge, University Library MS Ff 6.11
Cambridge, University Library MS Ff 6.28
London, British Library, Harley MS 1819
London, British Library, Harley MS 3838
London, British Library, Cotton Titus MS D X
London, British Library, Additional MSS 29704, 29705, 44892
London, British Library, MS Stowe 938
London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 192
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc 722
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E Museo 86

II. Printed Sources

Acta beati Francisci, ed. Paul Sabatier, Collection d'études et de documents sur l'histoire religieuse et littéraire du moyen âge, 4 (Paris, 1902).

Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Beatae Virginae Mariae de Monte Carmelo, I (1318–1593), ed. Gabriel Wessels (Rome, 1912).

Adam of Dryburgh, *De ordine et habitu canonicorum Praemonstratensium*, PL 198, cols. 439–608.

—— *De quadripartito exercitio cellae*, PL 153, cols. 799–884.

Ambrose, St, *De Elia et jejunio*, PL 14, cols. 698–728.

—— *De viduis*, PL 16, cols. 233–62.

Amphilocius of Iconium, *Vita Basilii*, ed. François Combefis, in *Sanctorum patrum Amphilocii Iconiensis, Methodii Patarensis et Andreae Cetensis opera omnia quae supersunt* (Paris, 1644), 155–225.

Angeli Clareni Opera, i: Epistolae, ed. Lydia von Auw, Istituto storico italiano per il medi evo, 103 (Rome, 1980).

Angelo Clareno, *Expositio regulae fratrum Minorum*, ed. Livarius Oliger (Quaracchi, 1912).

Annales Monastici, ed. H. Luard, iii, RS (London, 1866).

Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, PL 188, cols. 1139–248.

Antoine-Marie de la Présentation (ed.), *Constitutions des Frères de Notre-Dame du Mont Carmel faites l'année 1357* (Marche, 1915).

Arbesmann, Richard (ed.), 'Henry of Friemar's *Treatise on the Origin and Development of the Order of Hermit Friars and its Real and True Title*', *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956), 37–145.

Baconthorpe, John, *Speculum de institutione ordinis pro veneratione beatae Mariae*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 184–93.

—— *Tractatus super regulam ordinis Carmelitarum*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 193–9.

—— *Compendium historiarum et iurium*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 199–217.

—— *Laus religionis Carmelitanae*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 218–53.

Bale, John, *Cronica seu fasciculus temporum ordinis Carmelitarum*, Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fos. 107–96.

—— *Anglorum Heliades*. London BL, Harley MS 3838, fos. 5–117ᵛ.

—— *Perpaucorum Carmeli scriptorum ab Helia Thesbite ad Bertoldum primum eorum magistrum generalem catalogus*. London BL, Harley MS 3838, fos. 118–55ᵛ.

—— *De praeclariis ordinis Carmeli scriptoribus ac theologis catalogus*. London BL, Harley MS 3838, fos. 156–256.

—— *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum* (Basel, 1548).

Bale, Robert, *Chronica ordinis Carmelitarum*. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 72, fos. 5–11ᵛ.

Banfi, F. (ed.), 'Vita di S. Gerardo da Venezia nel codice 1622 della Biblioteca Universitania di Padova', *Benedictina*, 2 (1948), 262–330.

Basil of Caesarea, *Constitutiones asceticae*, PG 31, cols. 1315–428, 1513–628.

Bostius, Arnold, *De illustribus viris ordinis fratrum beatissime virginis Mariae de monte Carmelo*, ed. Christine Jackson-Holzberg, in *Zwei literaturgeschichten des Karmelitenordens* (Erlangen, 1981), 122–69.

—— *Breviloquium tripartitum de institutione, intitulatione et confirmatione ordinis*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Vinea Carmeli*, 49–81.

—— *Speculum Historiale*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i, 274–80 (extracts).

—— *De patronatu et patrocinio beatissime Virginis Mariae*, ed. Richard Copsey (forthcoming).

Bullarium Carmelitanum, ed. E. Monsignanus and I. Ximinez, 4 vols. (Rome, 1715–68).

Burreau, Laurence, *Catalogus de illustribus Carmelitis*, ed. Christine Jackson-Holzberg, in *Zwei Literaturgeschichten des Karmelitenordens* (Erlangen, 1981), 170–205.

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Petitions, *I: 1342–1419*, ed. W. H. Bliss (London, 1896).

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Papal Letters, *IV: 1362–1404*, ed. W. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow (London, 1902).

Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St Jean de Jérusalem 1100–1310, ed. J. Delaville le Roulx, 4 vols. (Paris, 1894–1906).

Cartulary of Osney Abbey, ed. H. E. Salter, 6 vols., Oxford Historical Society (Oxford, 1929–36).

Cassian, John, *Collationes*, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 13 (Vienna, 1886).

—— *De institutione coenobiorum*, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 17 (Vienna, 1888).

—— *De institutis monachorum*, ed. J-C. Guy, SC 109 (Paris, 1965).

Cassiodorus, *Historia Tripartita*, ed. W. Jacob and R. Hanslik, CSEL 71 (Vienna, 1952).

Cattaneis, Battista (ed.), *Speculum ordinis fratrum Carmelitarum noviter impressum (Speculum antiquum)* (Venice, 1507).

Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, ed. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, 4 vols. (Paris, 1889–97).

Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynbroke, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1889).

Codex Diplomaticus Moenofrancofurtanus: Urkundenbuch der Reichstadt Frankfurt, I: 794–1314, ed. J. F. Boehmer (Frankfurt, 1901).

Conrad of Eberbach, *Exordium magnum ordinis Cisterciensis*, PL 185, cols. 995–1198.

—— *La Grande Exorde de Cîteaux ou récits des débuts de l'ordre cistercien*, trans. A. Piebourg and B. McGuire (Turnhout, 1998).

Constantine of Orvieto, *Legenda Constantini Urbevetani*, ed. H. C. Scheeben, MOPH 16 (Rome, 1935), 263–352.

Corpus Iuris Canonici, ed. E. Friedberg, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1881).

Correspondance administratif d'Alfonse de Poitou, ed. A. Molinier, 2 vols. (Paris, 1894, 1900).

Cotton, Bartholomew, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. R. Luard, RS (London, 1859).

Damian, Peter, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. Kurt Reindel, 4 vols. (Munich, 1983–93).

Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Vinea Carmeli seu historia Eliani ordinis beatae virginis Mariae de Monte Carmeli* (Antwerp, 1662).

—— (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum sive historia Eliani ordinis fratrum beatissime virginis Mariae de Monte Carmelo*, 2 vols. in 4 (Antwerp, 1680).

Daniel, Walter, *Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, ed. and trans. F. M. Powicke (Oxford, 1959).

'Definitiones capitulorum generalium ordinis Fratrum Minorum', ed. A. G. Little, *AFH* 7 (1914), 676–82.

De inceptione ordinis beatae Mariae Virginis de Monte Carmeli, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 98–106.

De ortu et prioritate ordinis monachorum, ed. W. Dugdale, in J. Caley, H. Ellis, and B. Bandinel (eds.), *Monasticon Anglicanum* i (London, 1846), pp. xxii–xxiv.

De prima institutione monachorum, ed. W. Dugdale, in J. Caley, H. Ellis, and B. Bandinel (eds.), *Monasticon Anglicanum* i (London, 1846), pp. xix–xxii.

Documents Illustrating the Activities of the General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks 1215–1540, ed. W. A. Pantin, Camden Society Publications, 3rd ser. 45, 47, 54 (London, 1931–7).

Domus in Terra Sancta, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 262–6.

Donckel, E. (ed.), 'Visio seu prophetia fratris Iohannis: Eine sud-italienische Prophezihung aus dem Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts', *Römische Quartalschrift*, 40 (1952), 361–79.

Dorland, Peter, *Historia perpulchra de Anna sanctissima* (Antwerp, 1490).

Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. and trans. H. T. Lawler and J. E. L. Oulton, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).

Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif cum Tritico, ed. W. W. Shirley, RS (London, 1858).

Ferrand, Peter, *Legenda Petri Ferrandi*, ed. M-H. Laurent, MOPH 16 (Rome, 1935), 197–260.

Galvanus della Flamma, *Cronica ordinis Praedicatorum 1170–1333*, ed. B. M. Reichert, MOPH 2 (Rome, 1897).

Gerald of Wales, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, in J. S. Brewer, (ed.), *Giraldi Cambriensis opera*, ii, RS (London, 1862).

Gerard de Edam, *De institutione, habitu, titulo et regulae ordinis Carmelitarum*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*. i. 318–19.

Gerard de Frachet, *Vitas fratrum ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. B. M. Reichert, MOPH i (Rome, 1897).

Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Liber de aedificio Dei*, PL 194, cols. 1187–336.

Graziano de S. Teresa (ed.), 'Viridarii auctore Joanne Grossi, Ordinis Carmelitarum prioris generalis, recensio Vaticana', *Ephemerides Carmeliticae*, 7 (1956), 240–86.

Grossi, John, *Viridarium de ortu religionis et floribus eiusdem*, in Battista Cattaneis (ed.), *Speculum antiquum* (Venice, 1507).

Guigo II the Carthusian, *Lettre sur la vie contemplative et Douze Méditations*, ed. E. Colledge and J. Walsh, SC 163 (Paris, 1970).

Gunther of Pairis, *Historia Constantinopolitana*, PL 212, cols. 221–54.

Higden, Ranulf, *Polychronicon*, ed. J. R. Lumby, 9 vols. RS (London, 1865–86).

The Hospitallers' Riwle: Miracula et Regula hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani, ed. K. V. Sinclair, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 42 (London, 1984).

Hrotsuithae monialis Gandersheimensis historia de conversione desperati adoloscentis per sanctum Basilium, PL 173, cols. 1109–16.

Humbert of Romans, *Legenda S. Dominici Humberti de Romans*, ed. A. Walz, MOPH 16 (Rome, 1935), 355–443.

Itinera Hierosolymitana et descriptiones Terrae Sanctae, ed. T. Tobler and A. Molinier, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1879–95).

Itinéraires à Jérusalem et descriptions de la Terre-Sainte rédigés en français aux XIe–XIIe et XIIIe siècles, ed. H. Michelant and G. Raynaud (Geneva, 1882).

Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, ed. T. Graesse (Leipzig, 1890).

Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Orientalis*, ed. F. Moschus (Douai, 1597; repr. Farnborough, 1971).

James of Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. W. G. Ryan, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1993).

Jean de Cheminot, *Speculum fratrum ordinis beatae Mariae de Monte Carmelo*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 107–46.

Jean de Malines, *Speculum historiale*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i, 211–19.

Jean de Venette, *Qualiter respondendum sit quaerentibus quomodo et quando ordo noster sumpsit exordium*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 152–75.

Jerome, St, *Epistolae*, PL 22, cols. 235–1182.

—— *Commentaria in Ionam prophetam*, CCSL 76 (Turnhout, 1969), 377–419.

Joachim of Fiore, *Liber concordiae* (Venice, 1519).

—— *Expositio in Apocalypsim* (Venice, 1527).

John of Hildesheim, *Dialogus inter directorem et detractorem de ordine Carmelitarum*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 336–88.

Joinville, Jean de, *Histoire de Saint Louis*, ed. Natalis de Wailly (Paris, 1874).

Jordan of Saxony (Quedlinburg), *Liber vitasfratrum*, ed. R. Arbesmann and W. Hümpfner (New York, 1943).

Jordan of Saxony, OP, *Libellus de principiis ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. H. C. Scheeben, MOPH 16 (Rome, 1935), 1–88.

Lambert of Hersfeld, *Annales*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, in *MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicorum* (Hannover, 1894).

Laurent, M. H. (ed.), 'La Lettre *Quae honorem conditoris* (1 Octobre 1247)', *Ephemerides Carmeliticae*, 2 (1946), 10–16.

Libellus de diversis ordinibus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia, ed. G. Constable and B. Smith (Oxford, 1970).

Liber memorandum ecclesie de Barnwell, ed. J. H. Clark (Cambridge, 1907).

Map, Walter, *De nugis curialium*, ed. and trans. M. R. James, rev. C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983).

Matthew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, ed. H. Luard, 7 vols., RS (London, 1872–84).

Netter, Thomas (of Walden), *Doctrinale antiquitatem fidei catholicae ecclesiae*, ed. Bonaventura Blanciotti (Venice, 1757).

Nicetae Choniatae Historia, ed. J. Van Dieten, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, xi/1 (Berlin, 1975).

Nicholas Gallicus, 'Nicolae prioris generalis Ignea Sagitta', ed. A. Staring, *Carmelus*, 9 (1962), 237–307.

'The Notarial Acts *Notum Sit* and *Invocantes*', ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 54–70.

Olivi, Peter, *Firmamentum trium ordinum* (Venice, 1513).

Oller, Bernard, *Informatio super tribus articulis ordinis Carmelitarum*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 395–416.

Ordinaire de l'Ordre de Notre-Dame du Mont Carmel par Sibert de Beka (vers 1312), ed. Benedict Zimmermann (Paris, 1910).

O'Sullivan, J. (ed.), *Cistercians and Cluniacs*, Cistercian Fathers Series, 33 (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1977).

Paleonydorus, John (Oudewater), *Liber trimerestus anaphoricus panegyricus de principio et processu ordinis Carmeliticae* (Moguntina, 1497).

—— *Manuale de inicio, titulo et confirmatione ordinis Carmelitici*. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 41, fos. 75–85.

Payen Bolotin, *De falsis heremitis qui vagando discurrunt*, ed. Jean Leclercq, 'Le poème de Payen Bolotin contre les faux ermites', *Revue Bénédictine*, 68 (1958), 77–84.

Pecham, John, *Tractatus contra fratrem Robertum Kilwardby*, in F. Tocco (ed.), *Tractatus tres de paupertate*, British Society of Franciscan Studies, 2 (Aberdeen, 1910), 91–147.

Peter the Venerable, *Letters*, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).

Philippe de Mezières, *The Life of Saint Peter Thomas by Philippe de Mezières*, ed. J. Smet, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 2 (Rome, 1954).

Phokas, John, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*, PG 133, cols. 927–63.

Piur, P. (ed.), 'Oraculum angelicum Cyrilli nebst dem Kommentar des Pseudojoachim', in K. Burdach (ed.), *Von Mittelalter zur Reformation*, iv (Berlin, 1912), 223–327.

Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edward III to that of Richard III, ed. Thomas Wright, 2 vols., RS (London, 1859–61).

Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, ed. T. Schermann (Leipzig, 1907).

The Registers of Roger Martivall, Bishop of Salisbury, ed. C. N. Elrington, 2 vols., Canterbury and York Society, 57 (Oxford, 1963).

Registres d'Alexandre IV, ed. C. Bourel de la Roncière, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 2 vols. (Paris, 1902).

Registres de Grégoire IX, ed. L. Auvray, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 3 vols. (Paris, 1896–1955).

Registres d'Honorius IV, ed. M. Prou, BEFAR, 2nd ser. (Paris, 1888).

Registres d'Innocent IV, ed. E. Berger, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 4 vols. (Paris, 1884–1921).

Registres d'Urbain IV, ed. J. Guiraud, BEFAR, 2nd ser., 4 vols. (Paris, 1901–29).

Registrum cartarum conventus de Holne, in C. H. Hartshorne (ed.), *Feudal and Military Antiquities of Northumberland and the Scottish Borders* (London, 1858), Appendix IV.

Registrum epistolarum fratris Iohannis Peckham Archiepiscopi Cantuarensis, ed. C. T. Martin, RS (London, 1886).

La Règle de Saint-Benoit, ed. A. de Vogue and J. Neufville, 2 vols., SC 35 (Paris, 1972).

Ribot, Philip, *Decem libri de institutione et peculiaribus gestis religiosorum Carmelitarum*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i (separate pagination).

Richard of Bury, *The Philobiblion of Richard of Bury*, ed. and trans. Emert C. Thomas (London, 1888).

Richard of St Victor, *De gradibus caritatis*, PL 196, cols. 1195–208.

Richard of St Victor, *De quatuor gradibus violentiae caritatis*, PL 196, cols. 1207–24.

Rishanger, Wilhelm, *Chronica et Annales*, ed. H. T. Riley, RS (London, 1865).

Robert of Bridlington, *The Bridlington Dialogue*, ed. and trans. anon. (London, 1960).

Robert of Ormeskirk, *Tractatus de confirmatione ordinis secundum libros et iura*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 419–21.

Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs, 4 vols. RS (London, 1868–71).

'The *Rubrica prima* of the *Constitutions*', ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 33–43.

The Rule of St Albert: Latin Text Edited with an Introduction and English Translation, ed. and trans. Bede Edwards (Aylesford and London, 1973).

Rymer, Thomas (ed.), *Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cujuscumque generis acta publica*, i, pt. 2 (London, 1818).

Saggi, Lodovico (ed.), 'Constitutiones capituli Londonensis anni 1281', *AOC* 15 (1950), 203–45.

—— (ed.). 'Constitutiones capituli Burdigalensis anni 1294', *AOC* 18 (1953), 123–85.

Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, ed. Giuseppe Scalia, CCCM 125 and 125A (Turnhout, 1998, 1999).

Salzburger Urkundenbuch, IV Band: Ausgewählte Urkunden 1247–1343, ed. Franz Martin (Salzburg, 1933).

Scripta Leonis, Rufini et Angeli sociorum S. Francisci, ed. and trans. R. B. Brooke (Oxford, 1970).

Scrope, Thomas (Bradley), *Chronicon de institutione, successione, intitulatione et propagatione ordinis fratrum beate virgine Dei genetricis Mariae de monte Carmeli*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i, 172–86.

—— *Tractatus de fundatione, intitulatione, antiquitate, regula et confirmatione ordinis beatae Mariae de monte Carmeli*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 190–4.

—— *Libellus de institutione fratrum Carmelitarum ordinis*, Cambridge UL MS Ff 6.11, fos. 16–23.

Sigebert of Gembloux, *Catalogus Sigeberti Gemblacensis monachi de viris illustribus*, ed. Robert Witte (Bern and Frankfurt, 1974).

Speculum perfectionis, seu S. Francisci Assisinensis legenda antiquissima, ed. P. Sabatier (Paris, 1898).

Staring, Adrian (ed.), 'Four Bulls of Innocent IV: A Critical Edition', *Carmelus*, 27 (1980), 273–85.

—— (ed.), *Medieval Carmelite Heritage: Early Reflections on the Nature of the Order*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 16 (Rome, 1989).

'Statuta generalia ordinis edita in capitulis generalibus celebratis Narbonae an. 1260, Assisii an. 1270 atque Parisiis an. 1292', ed. M. Bihl, *AFH* 34 (1941), 13–94.

Les Statuts de Prémontré réformés sur les ordres de Grégoire IX et d'Innocent IV au XIIIe siècle, ed. F. Lefèvre (Louvain, 1946).

Stephen of Salagnac, *De quatuor et in quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignavit*, ed. T. Käppeli, MOPH 22 (Rome, 1949).

Stones, E. L. G., and Simpson, G. G. (eds.), *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland 1290–1296: An Edition of the Record Sources for the Great Cause* (Oxford, 1978).

Super Hieremiam (Venice, 1516).

Sutton, Thomas, *Contra aemulos fratrum Praedicatorum*, ed. F. Pelster, 'Eine Kontroverse zwischen englischen Dominikanern und Minoriten über einige Punkte der Ordensregel', *AFP* 3 (1933), 74–80.

Tanner, Norman (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, i (Nicaea I–Lateran V)* (London and Georgetown, DC, 1990).

Telesforus of Cosenza, *Libellus de causis*, ed. E. Donckel, 'Studien über die Propheziehung des Fr. Telesforus von Cosenza, OFM (1365–86)', *AFH* 26 (1933), 29–104, 282–314.

Terrenus, Guy, *Quatuor unum*, ed. J. S. Volckmartianus (Cologne, 1631).

Thomas de Celano, *Vita secunda S. Francesci*, in *Legendae S. Francisci Assisiensis saeculis XIII et XIV conscripta*, Analecta Francescana, x (Quaracchi, 1926–41), 129–260.

Thomas of Eccleston, *Fratris Thomas vulgo dicti de Eccleston tractatus de adventu fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. A. G. Little (Manchester, 1951).

Trithemius, John, *Compendium sive breviarum primi voluminis annalium sive historiarum de origine regum et gentis Francorum* (Moguntina, 1515).

—— *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiae*, in J. A. Fabricius (ed.), *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Hamburg, 1718).

—— *Liber de ortu et progressu ac viris illustribus ordinis*, in Daniel a Virgine Maria (ed.), *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i. 291–304.

Universis christifidelibus, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 81–90.

Verba fratris Conradi: Extrait du MS 1/25 de S. Isidore, ed. P. Sabatier, *Opuscules de critique historique*, 1 (1903), 370–92.

Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, ed. B. Beller (Douai, 1624; repr. Graz, 1964).

Vita di Antonio, antico versione anonima latina, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink (Rome, 1974).

Vita et mors Edwardi Secundi, in W. Stubbs (ed.), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, 2 vols., RS, ii (London, 1883), 299–300.

Vita S. Basilii Cesarensis archiepiscopi ordinis carmeli. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 147–149[v].

Vita sancti Cyrilli greci doctoris ordinis carmeli. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 73, fos. 143–146[v].

Wessels, Gabriel (ed.), 'Epistola S. Cyrilli III prioris generalis et historia antiqua ordinis nostri', *AOC* 3 (1914), 267–86.

—— (ed.), 'Anonymi opusculum *De inceptione ordinis beate Marie Virginis de Monte Carmelo*', *AOC* 8 (1935–6), 178–82.

William of Coventry, *Chronica brevis*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 272–8.

—— *De duplici fuga fratrum de Carmelo*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 278–82.

William of Coventry, *De adventu Carmelitarum ad Angliam*, ed. A. Staring, *MCH* 282–6.

William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum Anglorum libri quinque*, ed. E. S. A. Hamilton, RS (London, 1870).

William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, in R. Howlett (ed.), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, 2 vols., RS (London, 1884–5).

William of Saint-Amour, *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, in Edward Brown (ed.), *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, ii (London, 1690), 20–2.

William of Saint-Thierry, *Expositio super Cantica Canticorum*, ed. J. Déchanet and M. Dumoutier, SC 82 (Paris, 1962).

—— *Epistola domni Willelmi ad fratres de Monte Dei*, ed. J. Déchanet, SC 223 (Paris, 1975).

William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CCCM 63 and 63A (Turnhout, 1986).

William Worcestre, *Itineraries*, ed. J. H. Harvey (Oxford, 1969).

Williams, Arnold (ed.), '*Protectorium pauperis*: A Defense of the Begging Friars by Richard of Maidstone, O.Carm. (d. 1396)', *Carmelus*, 5 (1958), 132–80.

Xiberta, Bartolomé, *De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex ordine Carmelitarum* (Louvain, 1931).

—— *De visione sancti Simonis Stock* (Rome, 1950).

Zimmermann, Benedict (ed.), *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*, i (Lérins, 1907).

—— (ed.), 'Ricardi archiepiscopi Armacani bini sermones', *AOCD* 6 (1932), 158–89.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

Accrocca, Felice, 'Angelo Clareno, testimone di S. Francesco. Testi sulla vita del santo e dei primi Fratri contenuti nell "Esposito Regulae Fratrum Minorum" e sconosciuti alle primitive fonti francescana', *AFH*, 81 (1988), 225–53.

Agostini, Pier Giuseppe, 'I primi tempi dei Carmelitani a Milano', *Carmelus*, 13 (1966), 134–70.

Alban, K., 'The Letters of Thomas Netter of Walden', in P. Lombard-FitzGerald (ed.), *Carmel in Britain: Essays on the Medieval English Carmelite Province*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1992), ii. 347–55.

Andrews, Frances, *The Early Humiliati* (Cambridge, 1999).

Ashley, Kathleen, and Sheingorn, Pamela (eds.), *Interpreting Cultural Symbols: St Anne in Late Medieval Society* (Athens, Ga., and London, 1990).

Beck, Hans-Georg, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959).

Beer, Jeanette, *Narrative Conventions of Truth in the Middle Ages* (Geneva, 1981).

—— *Medieval Translators and their Craft* (Kalamazoo, Mich. 1989).

Biller, Peter, 'Words and the Medieval Notion of "Religion"', *JEH* 36 (1985), 351–69.

Blacker, Jean, *The Faces of Time: Portrayals of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman 'Regnum'* (Austin, Tex., 1994).

Boaga, Emanuele, *Nella spiritu e nella virtù di Elia: antologia di documenti e sussidi* (Rome, 1990).

—— 'La storiografia carmelitana nei secoli XIII e XIV', in Chandler and Egan (eds.), *Land of Carmel*, 125–54.

Borchart, Bruno, 'L'Imaculée dans l'iconographie du Carmel', *Carmelus*, 2 (1955), 85–131.

Borgelleri-Severi, A., 'Due Carmelitani a Ferrara nel Rinascimento: Battista Paneti e Giovanni M. Verrati', *Carmelus*, 8 (1961), 63–131.

Botte, B., 'Le Culte d'Elie dans l'Eglise chrétienne', in *Elie le prophète*, i: *Etudes Carmélitaines*, 35 (Paris, 1956), 208–18.

Bourdua, Louise, '*De origine et progressu ordinis fratrum heremitarum*: Guariento and the Eremitani in Padua', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 66, new ser. 53 (1998), 177–92.

Boureau, Alain, *L'Evenement sans fin. Récit et christianisme au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1993).

Boyce, J. J., 'Medieval Carmelite Office Manuscripts: A Liturgical Inventory', *Carmelus*, 33 (1986), 18–34.

—— 'The Carmelite Choirbooks of Florence and the Liturgical Tradition of the Carmelite Order', *Carmelus*, 35 (1988), 67–93.

—— 'The Liturgy of the Carmelites', *Carmelus*, 43 (1996), 5–41.

—— *Praising God in Carmel: Studies in Carmelite Liturgy* (Washington, 1999).

Brandenberg, T., 'St Anne and her Family: The Veneration of St Anne in Connection with Concepts of Marriage and Family in the Early Modern Period', in C. H. H. Sion and R. M. J. Van der Wilden (eds.), *Saints and She-Devils: Images of Women in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (London, 1987), 101–28.

Bresc, Henri, 'L'Eremitisme franciscain en Sicilie', in *Francescanesimo e cultura in Sicilia (saec. XIII–XVI)*, *Schede Medievale*, 12–13 (1987), 37–44.

Brooke, C. N. L., 'St Dominic and his First Biographer', *TRHS*, 5th ser. 17 (1967), 23–40.

Brooke, Rosalind B., *The Coming of the Friars* (London, 1975).

Brown, E. A. R., '*Falsitas pia sive reprehensibilis*: Medieval Forgers and their Intentions', in Horst Fuhrmann (ed.), *Fälschungen in Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress der MGH, München 16–19 Sept. 1986*, 5 vols. (Hannover, 1988), i. 101–20.

—— 'The Trojan Origins of the French: The Commencement of a Myth's Demise, 1450–1520', in Alfred P. Smyth (ed.), *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe* (London, 1998), 135–79.

Bueno Conto, Gabriel P. 'Doctrina Ioannis Baconthorpe de Immaculata Conceptione', *Carmelus*, 2 (1955), 54–84, 216–303.

Bughetti, Benvenutus, 'Statutum concordiae inter 4 ordines mendicantes a. 1453, 1458 et 1475 sancitum', *AFH* 25 (1932), 241–56.

Burr, David, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty: The Origins of the Usus Pauper Controversy* (Philadelphia, 1989).

Bynum, Caroline Walker, 'Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?', *JEH*, 31 (1980), 1–17.

Cannon, Joanna, 'Simone Martini, the Dominicans and the Early Sienese Polyptych', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 45 (1982), 69–93.

—— 'Pietro Lorenzetti and the History of the Carmelite Order', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 50 (1987), 18–28.

Carroll, E. R., *The Marian Theology of Arnold Bostius, O.Carm.* (Rome, 1962).

Catena, Claudio, 'Le Donne nel Carmelo Italiano', *Carmelus*, 10 (1963), 23–33.

Ceroke, Christian, 'The Credibility of the Scapular Promise', *Carmelus*, 11 (1964), 81–123.

Chandler, Paul, and Egan, Keith J. (eds.), *The Land of Carmel: Essays in Honor of Joachim Smet, O.Carm.* (Rome, 1991).

Ciconetti, Carlo, *La Regola del Carmelo: Origine, Natura, Significato*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 12 (Rome, 1973).

—— 'Letture simboliche della regola del Carmelo', *Carmelus*, 39 (1992), 22–86.

Clanchy, Michael T., *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1993).

Clark, J. P. H., 'Thomas Maldon, O.Carm., a Cambridge Theologian of the Fourteenth Century', *Carmelus*, 29 (1982), 193–235.

—— 'A Defense of the Carmelite Order by John Hornby, O.Carm., AD 1374', *Carmelus*, 32 (1985), 73–106.

—— 'A Note on Robert Ivory, O.Carm. (d. 1392)', *Carmelus*, 33 (1986), 35–9.

Coleman, Janet, *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge, 1992).

Congar, Yves, 'Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIIIe siècle et le debut du XIVe', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 28 (1961), 35–151.

Constable, Giles, 'Twelfth-Century Spirituality and the Later Middle Ages', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 5 (1971), 41–50.

—— 'Renewal and Reform in Religious Life: Concepts and Realities', in Constable and R. L. Benson (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1982), 37–67.

—— 'Forgery and Plagiarism', *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 29 (1983), 1–41.

—— *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought* (Cambridge, 1995).

—— *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996).

Copsey, Richard, 'The Scottish Carmelite Province and its Provincials', in

Chandler and Egan (eds.), *Land of Carmel*, 189–203.

—— 'Historical Writings on the Carmelite Order: From *Medieval Carmelite Heritage* to John Bale' (unpublished manuscript, 1994).

—— 'Foundation Dates of the Scottish Carmelite Houses', *Innes Review*, 49, no. 1 (Spring 1998), 41–65.

—— 'The *Ignea Sagitta* and its Readership: A Re-evaluation', *Carmelus*, 46 (1999), 164–73.

—— 'Simon Stock and the Scapular Vision', *JEH* 50 (1999), 652–83.

Courcelle, P., *Les Lettres grec en occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, 2nd edn. (Paris, 1948).

Coureas, Nicholas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1195–1312* (Aldershot, 1997).

Cox, J. C., 'The Carmelites of King's Lynn: A Newly-Discovered Chartulary', in H. J. D. Astley (ed.), *Memorials of Old Norfolk* (London, 1908), 132–44.

Crompton, J., '*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*', *JEH* 12 (1961), 35–45.

Curtius, E. R., 'Rhetorische Naturschildung im Mittelalter', *Romanische Forschungen* 56 (1942), 219–56.

De Lubac, Henri, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Ecriture*, 4 vols., pt. 2, vol. 1 (Paris, 1961).

Denifle, H., 'Quellen zur Gelehrtengeschichte des Carmelitenordens im 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts', *ALKG* 5 (1899), 365–84.

De Villiers, C., *Biblioteca Carmelitana* (Orleans, 1752; repr. Rome, 1927).

Donckel, E., 'Die Prophezeihung des Telesforus', *AFH* 26 (1933), 29–104.

Douie, Decima L., *The Nature and Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli* (Manchester, 1932).

—— *The Conflict between the Seculars and the Mendicants at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1934).

DuBoulay, F. R. H., 'The Quarrel between the London Secular Clergy and the Carmelite Order 1464–68', *JEH* 6 (1955), 156–74.

Egan, Keith J., 'The Establishment and Early Development of the Carmelite Order in England', (unpublished Ph.D thesis, Cambridge, 1965).

—— 'Medieval Carmelite Houses, England and Wales', *Carmelus*, 16 (1969), 142–226.

—— 'An Essay Toward a Historiography of the Origins of the Carmelite Province in England', *Carmelus*, 19 (1972), 67–100.

—— 'Dating English Carmelite Foundations', *Carmelus*, 23 (1976), 98–118.

—— 'The Carmelites Turn to Cambridge', in Chandler and Egan (eds.), *Land of Carmel*, 155–70.

Elm, Kaspar, 'Italienische Eremitengemeinschaften des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts', in *L'eretismo in occidente nei secoli XI e XII: Atti della seconda settimana internazionale di studio 1962* (Milan, 1965), 491–559.

—— 'Elias, Paulus von Theben und Augustinus als Ordensgründer: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsdeutung der Eremiten- und Betttelorden des 13. Jahrhunderts', in Hans Patze (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstein im späten Mittelalter*, Vorträge und

Forschungen, 31 (Sigmaringen, 1987), 371–97.

—— 'Augustinus Eremita—Augustinus Canonicus: A Quattrocento Cause Célèbre', in T. Verdon and J. Henderson (eds.), *Christianity and the Renaissance: Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento* (Syracuse, NY, 1990), 84–107.

Emery, Richard W., 'The Friars of the Sack', *Speculum*, 18 (1943), 323–34, and 35 (1960), 591–5.

—— 'The Friars of the Blessed Mary and the Pied Friars', *Speculum*, 24 (1949), 228–38.

—— 'The Second Council of Lyons and the Mendicant Orders', *Catholic Historical Review*, 39 (1953), 257–71.

—— *The Friars in Medieval France: A Catalogue of Medieval French Convents, 1200–1550* (New York, 1962).

Etzweiler, James, 'Baconthorpe and Latin Averroism: The Doctrine of the Unique Intellect', *Carmelus*, 18 (1971), 235–92.

Evans, Joan, *Dress in Medieval France* (Oxford, 1952).

Fairfield, Leslie, *John Bale, Mythmaker for the English Reformation* (West Lafayette, Ind., 1976).

Flood, P. Bruce Jr., 'The Carmelite Friars in Medieval English Universities and Society 1299–1430', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 55 (1988), 154–83.

Folda, Jaroslav, 'Crusader Art in the Kingdom of Cyprus, *c.*1275–1291: Reflections on the State of the Question', in N. Coureas and J. S. Riley-Smith (eds.), *Cyprus and the Crusades* (Nicosia, 1995), 209–37.

Francescanesimo e cultura in Sicilia (saec. XIII–XVI): Atti del convegno internazionale di studio nell'ottavo centenario della nascita di San Francesco d'Assisi (Palermo, 1987).

Franchi, A., *Il concilio di Lione (1274) secondo la 'ordinatio concilii generalis Lugdunensis'*, Studi e testi francescani, 33 (Rome, 1965).

Friedman, Elias, *The Latin Hermits of Mount Carmel: A Study in Carmelite Origins* (Rome, 1979).

—— 'Nicola Calciuri, O.Carm. (d. 1466), a Genuine Witness to the Carmelite Monastery in Wadi 'Ain as-siah?', *Carmelus*, 32 (1985), 60–73.

Friedman, John, 'Carmelite Propaganda in a Fifteenth-Century French Gradual Fragment', *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association*, 8 (1987), 67–95.

Garnier, F., 'De la tunique d'Adam au manteau d'Elie', in *Le Vêtement: Histoire, archéologie et symbolique vestimentaires au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1989), 287–306.

Geagea, Nilo, *Maria, madre e decoro del Carmelo: la pietà mariana dei Carmelitani durante i tre primi secoli della loro storia*, Institutum Historicum Teresianum Studia, 4 (Rome, 1988).

Gilbert, Creighton, 'Some Special Images for Carmelites, *c.*1330–1430', in T. Verdon and J. Henderson (eds.), *Christianity and the Renaissance: Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento* (Syracuse, NY, 1990), 161–207.

Gill, Joseph, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198–1400* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1979).

Grafton, Anthony, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (London, 1980).

Grant, Alexander, 'Aspects of National Consciousness in Medieval Scotland', in Claus Bjorn, Alexander Grant, and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past* (Copenhagen, 1994), 68–95.

Grant, Robert, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford, 1980).

Gratien, P., 'Saint François d'Assise au Musée du Trocadéro: Notes d'Iconographie Franciscaine', *Etudes Franciscaines*, 38 (1926), 493–507.

Gray, J. W., 'Stability and Enthusiasm: A Twelfth-Century Monastic Dilemma in the Writings of St Bernard of Clairvaux', in John Bossy and P. Jupp (eds.), *Essays Presented to Michael Roberts* (Belfast, 1976), 1–10.

Gribomont, Jean, 'La *Scala Paradisi*, Jean de Raithou et Ange Clareno', *Studia Monastica*, 2 (1960), 345–58.

—— 'L'Expositio d'Ange Clareno sur la règle des frères mineurs et la tradition monastique primitive', in G. Cardaropoli and M. Conti (eds.), *Lettura della fonti francescane attraverso I secoli: il 1400* (Rome, 1981), 395–420.

Guenée, Bernard, 'Histoires, annales, chroniques: Essai sur les genres historiques au moyen âge', *Annales*, 28 (1973), 997–1016.

—— (ed.), *Le Metier d'historien au Moyen Age: Etudes sur l'historiographie médiévale* (Paris, 1977).

Hamilton, Bernard, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London, 1980).

—— 'Aimery of Limoges, Latin Patriarch of Antioch (*c.*1142–*c.*1199) and the Unity of the Churches', in K. Ciggaar and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States: Context, Contacts, Confrontations*, ii (Louvain, 1999), 1–12.

Happé, Peter, *John Bale* (London and New York, 1996).

Hartshorne, C. H., *Feudal and Military Antiquities of Northumberland and the Scottish Borders* (London, 1858).

Harvey, Margaret, 'The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', in L. Smith and B. Ward (eds.), *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson* (London, 1992), 281–94.

Hathaway, Neil, '*Compilatio*: From Plagiarism to Compiling', *Viator*, 20 (1989), 19–44.

Hendriks, Rudolf, 'La Succéssion héréditaire (1280–1451)', in *Elie le prophète*, i: *Etudes Carmélitaines*, 35 (Bruges, 1956), 34–81.

Hendriks, Rudolf, 'A Register of the Letters and Papers of John of Hildesheim, O.Carm. (d. 1375)', *Carmelus*, 4 (1957), 116–235.

—— 'De primagenia ordinis Carmelitarum inspiratione in regula expressa', *Carmelus*, 15 (1968), 46–53.

Hendrix, Scott, 'In Quest of the *vera ecclesia*: The Crises of Late Medieval Ecclesiology', *Viator*, 7 (1976), 347–78.

Herde, Peter, *Cölestin V (Peter von Morrone) Der Engelpapst* (Stuttgart, 1981).

Herde, Peter, 'Celestino V e la spiritualità francescana', in *Francescanesimo e cultura in Sicilia (saec. XIII–XVI)*, *Schede medievale*, 12–13 (1987), 11–24.

Hinnebusch, W. A., *A History of the Dominican Order*, 2 vols. (New York, 1966, 1972).

Hope, W. H. St John, 'On the Whitefriars or Carmelites of Hulne, Northumberland', *Archaeological Journal*, 47 (1890), 116–17.

James, M. R., 'An Ancient English List of the Seventy Disciples', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 11 (1910), 459–62.

—— 'Greek Manuscripts in England before the Renaissance', *The Library*, new ser. 7 (1926–7), 337–53.

Jotischky, Andrew, 'Gerard of Nazareth, John Bale and the Origins of the Carmelite Order', *JEH* 46 (1995), 214–36.

—— *The Perfection of Solitude: Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States* (University Park, Pa., 1995).

—— 'The Carmelites and Greek Orthodox Monasticism: A Study in Retrospective Unity', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, Studies in Church History, 32 (Oxford, 1996), 117–29.

—— 'St Gerard of Csanád and the Carmelites: Apocryphal Sidelights on the First Crusade', in M. Balard (ed.), *Autour de la première croisade: Actes du Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East 1995*, Byzantina Sorbonensia, 14 (Paris, 1996), 143–55.

—— 'Some Mendicant Views of the Origins of the Monastic Profession', *Cristianesimo nella Storia*, 19 (1998), 31–49.

—— 'Greek Orthodox Monasticism around Mar Sabas in the Crusader Period', in J. Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage* (Leuver, 2001), 85–96.

Kallenberg, Paschalis, *Fontes Liturgiae Carmelitanae*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 5 (Rome, 1962).

Kedar, Benjamin Z., 'Gerard of Nazareth, a Neglected Twelfth-Century Writer in the Latin East: A Contribution to the Intellectual History of the Crusader States', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 37 (1983), 55–77.

Kemp, Anthony, *The Estrangement of the Past* (Oxford, 1991).

Kemp, E. W., *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (Oxford, 1948).

Kennedy, Leonard, 'Osbert of Pickenham, O.Carm. (fl. 1360) on the Absolute Power of God', *Carmelus*, 35 (1988), 178–225.

Kimmelman, Burt, *The Poetics of Authorship in the Later Middle Ages: The Emergence of the Modern Literary Persona* (New York, 1996).

Koch, H. H., *Die Karmelitenklöster der Niederdeutschen Provinz* (Friburg, 1889).

Kopp, Clemens, *Elias und Christendum auf dem Karmel*, Collectanea Hierosolymitana, 3 (Paderborn, 1929).

Kuttner, Stephan, 'Conciliar Law in the Making: The Lyonese Constitutions of Gregory X in a Manuscript in Washington', *Miscellanea Pio Paschini*, ii, Lateranum, new ser. 15 (Rome, 1949), 39–81.

Ladner, Gerhard, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (New York, 1967).

—— 'Terms and Ideas of Renewal', in Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), 1–33.

Lallement, L. J., *Aux sources de la tradition du Carmel* (Paris, 1953).

Lambert, Malcolm, *Franciscan Poverty* (London, 1961).

Leclercq, Jean, 'Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médiévale', *Studia Anselmiana*, 38 (1956), 229–47.

—— 'Saint Gerard de Csanád et le monachisme', *Studia Monastica*, 13 (1971), 13–30.

Leff, Gordon, 'The Apostolic Ideal in Later Medieval Ecclesiology', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 18 (1967), 58–82.

—— 'The Making of the Myth of a True Church in the Later Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 1 (1971), 1–16.

—— 'The Franciscan Concept of Man', in Ann Williams (ed.), *Prophecy and Millenarianism: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves* (London, 1980), 217–38.

Le Goff, Jacques, *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Rendell and Elizabeth Claman (New York, 1992).

Lesur, Sabine, 'Le Couvent des grands Carmes de Toulouse au XIIIe siècle', in *Les Mendiants en pays d'Oc au XIIIe siècle*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 8 (Toulouse, 1973), 101–10.

Lickteig, Franz-Bernard, *The German Carmelites at the Medieval Universities*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 13 (Rome, 1981).

Lindley, Philip, 'The "Arminghall Arch" and Contemporary Sculpture in Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 40 (1987), 19–43.

Lowther Clarke, W. K., *Saint Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism* (Cambridge, 1913).

Luttrell, Anthony, 'Jean and Simon de Hesdin: Hospitallers, Theologians, Classicists', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 31 (1964), 137–40.

MacCartney, C. A., 'Studies on the Earliest Hungarian Historical Sources', *Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis*, 4 (1938), 456–507.

McCusker, Honor, *John Bale, Dramatist and Antiquary* (Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1942).

Manselli, Raoul, 'Spirituali missionari: l'azione in Armenia e in Grecia: Angelo Clareno', in *Espansione del francescanesimo tra occidente e oriente nel secolo XIII* (Assisi, 1979), 271–91.

Mason, Emma, 'Legends of the Beauchamps' Ancestors: The Use of Baronial Propaganda in Medieval England', *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984), 25–40.

—— 'Fact and Fiction in Crusading Tradition: The Earls of Warwick in the Twelfth Century', *Journal of Medieval History*, 14 (1988), 81–95.

Mestens, G., 'The Carmelite Province of Denmark, 1410–*c*.1540', *Carmelus*, 3 (1956), 217–42.

Metzger, Bruce M., 'Names for the Nameless in the New Testament: A Study

in the Growth of Christian Tradition', in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quarten*, 2 vols. (Munster, 1970), i. 79–99.

Miller, Jacqueline T., *Poetic License: Authority and Authorship in Medieval and Renaissance Contexts* (Oxford, 1986).

Monceaux, P., 'Saint Augustin et Saint Antoine: Contribution a l'histoire de monachisme', *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, 2 (1931), 72–86.

Moorman, J. H., *The Sources for the Life of St Francis of Assisi* (Manchester, 1940).

Morse, Ruth, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality* (Cambridge, 1991).

Mortier, D-A., *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs 1263–1323*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1903–20).

Mosca, Vincenzo, *Alberto patriarca di Gerusalemme: Tempo, vita, opere*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 20 (Rome, 1996).

Muckle, J. T., 'Greek Works Translated Directly into Latin before 1350', *Medieval Studies*, 4 (1942), 33–42, and 5 (1943), 102–14.

Murray, Alexander, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1978).

Musto, R. G., 'Angelo Clareno, OFM: Fourteenth-Century Translator of the Greek Fathers: An Introduction and a Checklist of Manuscripts and Printings of his "Scala Paradisi"', *AFH* 76 (1983), 215–38, 589–645.

Nimmo, Duncan, *Reform and Division in the Franciscan Order (1226–1538)* (Rome, 1987).

O'Dwyer, Peter, 'The Carmelite Order in Pre-Reformation Ireland', *Carmelus*, 16 (1969), 264–78.

Olsen, G., 'The Idea of the *ecclesia primitiva* in the Writings of the Twelfth Century Canonists', *Traditio*, 25 (1969), 61–89.

Otter, Monika, *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1996).

Pahlitzsch, Johannes, 'Die griechischen-orthodoxen Patriarchen von Jerusalem im ersten Jahrhundert der Kreuzfahrherrschaft' (unpublished M.A. thesis, Berlin, 1993).

Pantin, William A., 'Two Treatises of Uthred of Boldon on the Monastic Life', in R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (eds.), *Studies in Medieval History Presented to F. M. Powicke* (Oxford, 1948), 368–85.

—— 'Some Medieval English Treatises on the Origins of Monasticism', in V. Ruffer and A. J. Taylor (eds.), *Medieval Studies Presented to Rose Graham* (Oxford, 1950), 189–215.

Partner, Nancy 'The New Cornificius: Medieval History and the Artifice of Words', in Ernst Breisach (ed.), *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1985), 5–59.

Pásztor, Edith, 'Problemi di datazione della *Legenda maior S. Gerhardi episcopi*', *Bollettino dell' Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo*, 73 (1961), 113–40.

—— 'Le fonti biografiche di S. Francesco', in *Francesco d'Assisi nella storia*, i (1980), 9–20.

—— 'Falsi e tradizione apocrife nella "questione francescana"', in W. Setz (ed.), *Falschungen im Mittelalter*, v (Hannover, 1988), 441–55.

Patlagean, E., 'Recherches récentes et perspectives sur l'histoire du monachisme italo-grec', *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa Italiana*, 22 (1968), 146–66.

Patrich, Joseph, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, 4th–7th Centuries* (Washington, 1995).

Penco, G., 'Il capitolo *De generibus monachorum* nella tradizione medievale', *Studia Monastica*, 3 (1961), 241–57.

—— 'Il senso della natura nell'agiografia monastica occidentale', *Studia Monastica*, 11 (1969), 327–34.

Perrone, Lorenzo, 'Monasticism in the Holy Land: From the Beginnings to the Crusaders', *Proche-Orient Chrétien*, 45 (1995), 31–63.

Petit, F., *Norbert et l'origine des Prémontrés* (Paris, 1984).

Poirot, Eliane, *Les Prophètes Elie et Elisée dans la littérature chrétienne ancienne*, Collection Monastica (Turnhout, 1997).

Poskitt, Margaret, 'Thomas Netter of Walden', *Aylesford Review*, 1 (1957), 174–7.

—— 'The English Carmelites: Houses of Study and Educational Methods', *Aylesford Review*, 5 (1963), 226–37.

Potestà, Gian Luca, *Storia ed eschatalogia in Ubertino da Casale* (Milan, 1980).

—— *Angelo Clareno: dai poveri eremiti ai fraticelli* (Rome, 1990).

Preuss, J. S., 'Theological Legitimation for Innovation in the Middle Ages', *Viator*, 3 (1972), 1–26.

Pringle, Denys, *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Corpus, ii: L–Z* (Cambridge, 1997).

Reeves, Marjorie, 'Joachimist Expectations in the Order of Augustinian Hermits', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 25 (1958), 112–41.

—— *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford, 1969).

—— 'History and Prophecy in Medieval Thought', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, new ser. 5 (1974), 51–75.

—— *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future* (Stroud, 1999).

Remensnyder, Amy, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca, NY, 1995).

Reynolds, Susan, 'Medieval *origines gentium* and the Community of the Realm', *History*, 68 (1983), 375–90.

Richter, Michael, '*Urbanitas-rusticitas*: Linguistic Aspects of a Medieval Dichotomy', in Derek Baker (ed.), *The Church in Town and Countryside*, Studies in Church History, 16 (Oxford, 1979), 149–57.

Rickert, Margaret, *The Reconstructed Carmelite Missal* (London, 1953).

Robb, Fiona, '"Who hath chosen the better part? (Luke 10.42)": Pope Innocent III and Joachim of Fiore on the Diverse Forms of Religious Life', in J. Loades (ed.), *Monastic Studies*, ii (Bangor, 1991), 157–70.

Roest, Bert, *Reading the Book of History: Intellectual Contexts and Educational Functions of Franciscan Historiography 1220–c.1350* (Groeningen, 1996).

Roth, Francis, 'Cardinal Richard Annibaldi, First Protector of the Augustinian Order', *Augustiniana*, 2 (1952), 26–61, 108–49, 230–47.

—— *The English Austin Friars 1249–1538*, 2 vols. (New York, 1966).

Russell, J. C., 'The Clerical Population of Medieval England', *Traditio*, 2 (1944), 177–212.

Saggi, Lodovico, *La Congregazione Mantovana dei Carmelitani sino alla morte del B. Battista Spagnoli (1516)* (Rome, 1954).

—— 'La mitigazione del 1432 della regola carmelitana: tempo e persone', *Carmelus*, 5 (1958), 3–29.

—— *Sant' Angelo di Sicilia: Studio sulla vita, devozione, folklore*, Textus et studia Carmelitana, 6 (Rome, 1962).

Schein, Sylvia, 'The *Miracula* of the Hospital of St John and the Carmelite Elianic Tradition—Two Medieval Myths of Foundation?', in Michael Goodich, Sophia Menache, and Sylvia Schein (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Divergences in the Crusader Period: Essays Presented to Aryeh Grabois on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (New York, 1995), 287–96.

Schmithals, W., *The Apocalyptic Movement: Introduction and Interpretation* (Nashville, 1975).

Selge, Kurt-Victor, 'Un codice quattrocentesco dell' Archivio Generale dei Carmelitani, contenente opere di Arnaldo da Villanova, Gioacchino da Fiore e Guglielmo da Parigi', *Carmelus*, 36 (1989), 166–76.

Shepard, Lancelot, *The English Carmelites* (London, 1943).

Siebel, F. X., 'Die Kirche als Lehrautorität nach dem *Doctrinale antiquitatem fidei catholicae ecclesiae* des Thomas Waldensis', *Carmelus*, 16 (1969), 3–70.

Simons, Walter, 'Mendicant Collaboration in the Fourteenth Century: The Bruges Pact of 1370', in Chandler and Egan (eds.), *Land of Carmel*, 171–87.

Sinclair, K. V., 'The Anglo-Norman Miracles of the Foundation of the Hospital of St John in Jerusalem', *Medium Aevum*, 55 (1986), 102–8.

Smalley, Beryl, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1952).

—— 'John Russell, OFM', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 23 (1956), 277–320.

—— 'Robert Holcot, OP', *AFP* 26 (1956), 5–97.

—— 'John Baconthorpe's Postill on St Matthew', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 4 (1958), 91–145.

—— *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1960).

—— 'Jean de Hesdin, O.Hosp.S.Ioh.', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 28 (1961), 285–330.

—— 'Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Novelty c.1100–c.1250', in Derek Baker (ed.), *Church, Society and Politics*, Studies in Church History, 12 (Oxford, 1975), 113–31.

Smet, Joachim, *The Carmelites: A History of the Brothers of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, i: Ca 1200 AD until the Council of Trent* (Barrington, Ill., 1975).

—— 'The Carmelite Rule after 750 years', *Carmelus*, 44 (1997), 21–47.

Smith, Kirk Stevan, 'The Ecclesiology of Controversy: Scripture, Tradition and Church in the Theology of Thomas Netter of Walden' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, 1983).

—— 'An English Conciliarist? Thomas Netter of Walden', in J. Sweeney and S. Chodorow (eds.), *Popes, Teachers and Canon Law in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1989), 290–9.

Snyder, Joachim, 'Guido Terreni, O.Carm.: His Literary Participation in the Early Fourteenth-Century Poverty Disputes' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, 1950).

Southern, R.W., 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing. II. Hugh of St Victor and the Idea of Historical Development', *TRHS*, 5th ser. 23 (1971), 159–80.

Spiegel, Gabrielle, 'Pseudo-Turpin, the Crisis of the Aristocracy and the Beginnings of Vernacular History in France', *Journal of Medieval History*, 12 (1986), 207–23.

—— *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley, 1993).

—— *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, 1997).

Spörl, J., 'Das Alte und das Neue im Mittelalter', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 50 (1930), 297–341, 498–524.

Staring, Adrian, *Der Karmelitengeneral Nikolaus Audet und die katholische Reform des XVI Jahrhunderts* (Rome, 1959).

—— 'The Carmelite Sisters in the Netherlands', *Carmelus*, 10 (1963), 56–92.

—— 'Notes on a List of Medieval Carmelite Houses in France', *Carmelus*, 11 (1964), 150–60.

—— 'Cirillo di Constantinopoli', in *Santi del Carmelo* (Rome, 1972), 189–90.

—— 'The Miracles of Toulouse', *Carmelus*, 38 (1991), 136–52.

Stinger, Charles L., *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386–1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany, NY, 1977).

Stringer, Keith J., 'Nobility and Identity in Medieval Britain and Ireland: The de Vescy, *c.*1120–1314', in Brendan Smith (ed.), *Britain and Ireland, 900–1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European Change* (Cambridge, 1999), 199–239.

Swanson, Robert N., *Religion and Devotion in Europe c.1215–c.1515* (Cambridge, 1995).

Tanner, Norman, *The Church in Late Medieval Norwich, 1370–1537* (Toronto, 1984).

Thouzellier, Christine, 'La Place du "De periculis" de Guillaume de Saint-Amour dans les polémiques universitaires du XIIIe siècle', *Revue Historique*, 156 (1927), 69–82.

Tristram, E. W., *English Medieval Wall-Painting: The Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1950).

Tugwell, Simon, 'Friars and Canons: The Earliest Dominicans', *Monastic Studies*, ed. J. Loades, 2 (Bangor, 1991), 193–207.

Turley, Thomas, 'John XXII and the Franciscans: A Reappraisal', in James R. Sweeney and Stanley Chodorow (eds.), *Popes, Teachers and Canon Law in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1989), 74–91.

—— '*Ab apostolorum temporibus*: The Primitive Church in the Ecclesiology of Three Medieval Carmelites', in R. J. Castillo Lara (ed.), *Studia in honorem ementissimi Cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, Studia et textus historiae iuris canonici, 7 (Rome, 1992), 559–80.

Van Engen, John, 'Dominic and the Brothers: *Vitae* as Life-Forming *Exempla* in the Order of Preachers', in Kent Emery, Jr. and Joseph P. Wawrykow (eds.), *Christ among the Medieval Dominicans: Representations of Christ in the Texts and Images of the Order of Preachers*, Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies, 7 (Notre Dame, Ind., 1998), 7–25.

Velasco, Balbino, 'Documentos del siglo XIII sobre los carmelitas en Espana', *Carmelus*, 33 (1986), 109–23.

—— 'El convento del Carmelo de Valencia en los siglos XIII al XVI', *Carmelus*, 35 (1988), 94–137.

—— *Historia del Carmelo Espanol*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1990–3).

Von Auw, Lydia, *Angelo Clareno et les spirituels italiens* (Rome, 1979).

Walsh, Katherine, *A Fourteenth-Century Scholar and Primate: Richard Fitzralph in Oxford, Avignon and Armagh* (Oxford, 1981).

Ward, Benedicta, 'The Desert Myth: Reflections on the Desert Ideal in Early Cistercian Monasticism', in M. Basil Pennington (ed.), *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1976), 183–99.

Webster, Jill R., 'Early Carmelite Foundations in the Crown of Aragon', *Carmelus*, 32 (1985), 166–86.

—— 'The Carmelites in Majorca', *Carmelus*, 34 (1987), 94–112.

—— 'The Carmelites in Lunel and Montpellier in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', *Carmelus*, 36 (1989), 145–65.

—— 'La trista història del convent de Nostra Senyora del Carme del Vallparadis de Terrassa', *Annuario d'Estudis Medievals*, 25, no. 1 (1995), 215–34.

—— *Carmel in Medieval Catalonia* (Leiden, 1999).

Weiss, Roberto, 'The Study of Greek in England during the Fourteenth Century', *Rinascimento*, 11 (1951), 209–39.

—— 'Greek in Western Europe at the End of the Middle Ages', *Dublin Review*, 119 (1955), 68–76.

—— *Medieval and Humanist Greek: Collected Essays by Roberto Weiss*, Medioevo et Umanesimo, 8 (Padua, 1977).

Wessels, Gabriel, 'Epistola S. Cyrilli III prioris generalis et historia antiqua ordinis nostri', *AOC* 3 (1914), 267–86.

Williams, Arnold, 'Relations between the Mendicant Friars and the Secular

Clergy in England in the Later Fourteenth Century', *Annuale Medievale*, 1 (1960), 22–92.

Williams, J. G., 'The Prophetic "Father": A Brief Explanation of the Term "Sons of the Prophets"', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 85 (1966), 344–8.

Wilson, N. G., *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1992).

Wolfram, Herwig, 'Einleitung oder Uberlegungen zur Origo Gentis', in Herwig Wolfram and Walter Pohl (eds.), *Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bayern*, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1990), i. 19–33.

—— 'Le Genre de l'*origo gentis*', *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 68 (1990), 789–801.

Woodruff, Cumberland, 'Thirteenth-Century Wall-Painting at Upchurch', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 25 (1902), 88–96.

Wormald, Francis, 'An Early Carmelite Liturgical Calendar from England', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 39 (1966), 174–80.

Wortley, John, 'The Pseudo-Amphilocian *Vita Basilii*: An Apocryphal Life of Saint Basil the Great', *Florilegium*, 2 (1980), 217–39.

Xiberta, Bartolomé, 'Elias et religio christiana in Monte Carmelo', *AOC* 7 (1931–2), 180–211.

—— 'De Iohanne Baconthorpe, O.Carm.', *AOC* 6 (1932), 3–128, 516–25.

—— *Guia Terrena, Carmelita de Perpinya* (Barcelona, 1932).

Zimmermann, Benedict, 'De Roberto Baston, poeta, eiusque fratre germano Philippo', *AOC* 3 (1928–9), 164–86.

—— 'Fra Gerardo da Bologna e le provincie irlandese e scozzese', *Rivista storica Carmelitana*, 2 (1930), 77–87.

Zutshi, Patrick, and Ombres, Robert, 'The Dominicans in Cambridge, 1238–1538', *AFP* 60 (1990), 313–73.

Index